THE

# WESTMINSTER REVIEW.

JULY AND OCTOBER,

1881.

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

SHAKSPEARE.

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

GOETHE.

*NEW SERIES.*

VOL. LX.

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

OS - WF 2
vol. 118 (No. 60)

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

Uttarpara Jaikrishna Public Library
Acc. No. 7861 Date 2.8.75

# CONTENTS.

ART. PAGE

I. *Characteristics of Aristotle.*

1. Aristotelis Opera. Edidit Academia Regia Borussica. Berlin. 1831 1870.
2. Aristoteles By CHRISTIAN AUG. BRANDIS. Berlin. 1853-1857.
3. Die Philosophie der Griechen. Zweiter Theil, Zweite Abtheilung: Aristoteles u. d. Alten Peripatetiker. By Dr. EDWARD ZELLER. Leipzig. 1879.
4. Aristotle. By Sir ALEXANDER GRANT, Bart., LL.D. Edinburgh and London. 1877.
5. Outlines of the Philosophy of Aristotle. Compiled by EDWIN WALLACE, M.A. Oxford and London. 1880.
6. De la Métaphysique: Introduction à la Métaphysique d'Aristote. By BARTHELEMY SAINT-HILAIRE. Paris. 1879 . 1

II. *Island Life.*

Island Life—or the Phenomena and Causes of Insular Faunas and Floras—Including a Revision and attempted Solution of the Problem of Geological Climates. By ALFRED RUSSELL WALLACE . . . . . . . . . . . 41

III. *Mr. Fitzgerald's Life of George the Fourth.*

The Life of George the Fourth, including his Letters and Opinions; with a view of the Men, Manners, and Politics of his Reign. By PERCY FITZGERALD, M.A., F.S.A., Author of "The Life of Garrick." In Two Volumes. London: Tinsley Brothers, Catherine Street, Strand. 1881 . . . . . . . 70

IV. *The Sugar Bounties Question.*

1. Report from the Select Committee on Sugar Industries: Evidence and Proceedings July, 1879.
2. Report from the Select Committee on Sugar Industries. Final Report. August, 1880.
3. Parliamentary Return of all Subsequent Correspondence on the Subject of the Export Bounties on Sugar. May, 1881.
4. Petitions to Parliament from the West India Islands. 1881.
5. Annual "Bluebooks" of the various West Indian Colonies. 1880. . . . . . . . . . . . . 109

ART. PAGE

V. *The Development of Religion* . . . . . . . . 138

VI. *George Eliot: Her Life and Writings.*

Works of George Eliot. William Blackwood and Son . . 154

*India and our Colonial Empire* . . . . . . 199

*Contemporary Literature.*

Theology . . . . . . . . . . . . . 221
Philosophy . . . . . . . . . . . . 232
Politics, Sociology, Voyages, and Travels . . . . . 240
Science . . . . . . . . . . . . . 255
History and Biography . . . . . . . . . 264
Belles Lettres . . . . . . . . . . . 283
Miscellanea . . . . . . . . . . . 295

THE

# WESTMINSTER

AND

# FOREIGN QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JULY 1, 1881.

## ART. I.—CHARACTERISTICS OF ARISTOTLE.

1. *Aristotelis Opera.* Edidit Academia Regia Borussica. Berlin. 1831-1870.
2. *Aristoteles.* By CHRISTIAN AUG. BRANDIS. Berlin. 1853-1857.
3. *Die Griechische Philosophie der Griechen.* Zweiter Theil, Zweite Abtheilung: *Aristoteles u. d. Alten Peripatetiker.* By Dr. EDWARD ZELLER. Leipzig. 1879.
4. *Aristotle.* By Sir ALEXANDER GRANT, Bart., LL.D. Edinburgh and London. 1877.
5. *Outlines of the Philosophy of Aristotle.* Compiled by EDWIN WALLACE, M.A. Oxford and London. 1880.
6. *De la Métaphysique: Introduction à la Métaphysique d'Aristote.* By BARTHÉLEMY SAINT-HILAIRE. Paris. 1879.

WITHIN the last twelve years several books, both large and small, have appeared, which deal either with the philosophy of Aristotle as a whole, or with particular parts of it. The Berlin edition of Aristotle's collected works was supplemented in 1870 by the publication of a magnificent index, filling nearly nine hundred quarto pages, for which we have to thank the learning and industry of Bonitz. Then came the unfinished treatise of George Grote, planned on so vast a scale that it would, if completely carried out, have rivalled the author's *History of Greece,* in bulk, and perhaps exceeded the authentic remains of

the Stagirite himself. As it is, we have a full account, expository and critical, of the *Organon*, a chapter on the *De Anima*, and some fragments on other Aristotelian writings, all marked by Grote's wonderful sagacity and good sense. Two years ago a new and greatly enlarged edition brought that portion of Zeller's work on Greek Philosophy, which deals with Aristotle and the Peripatetics fully up to the level of its companion volumes: and we are glad to see that, like them, it is shortly to appear in an English dress. The older work of Brandis, which we have also placed at the head of this article, goes over the same ground, and, though much behind the present state of knowledge, may still be consulted with advantage, on account of its copious and clear analyses, a feature in which Zeller is somewhat deficient. Together with these ponderous tomes, we have to mention the little work of Sir Alexander Grant, which, although intended primarily for the unlearned, is a real contribution to Aristotelian scholarship, and, probably as such, received the honours of a German translation almost immediately after its first publication. Mr. Wallace's *Outlines of the Philosophy of Aristotle* is of a different and much less popular character. Originally designed for the use of the author's own pupils, it does for Aristotle's entire system what Trendelenburg has done for his logic, and Ritter and Zeller for all Greek philosophy—that is to say, it brings together the most important texts, and accompanies them with a remarkably lucid and interesting interpretation. Finally, we have M. Barthélemy Saint-Hilaire's Introduction to his translation of Aristotle's "Metaphysics," republished in a pocket volume. We can safely recommend it to those who wish to acquire a knowledge of the subject with the least possible expenditure of trouble. The style is delightfully simple, and that the author should write from the standpoint of the French spiritualistic school is not altogether a disadvantage, for that school is partly of Aristotelian origin, and its adherents are, therefore, most likely to reproduce the master's theories with sympathetic appreciation. The naïve confidence of M. Saint-Hilaire in the object of his life-long study is, indeed, almost pathetic, and one can only hope that the French Minister of Foreign Affairs knows more about the forces which now threaten the peace of Europe than he does of those which are shaking dogmatic philosophy to its foundations.

In view of such extensive labours we might almost imagine ourselves transported back to the times when Chaucer could describe a student as being made perfectly happy by having

> "At his beddes hed
> Twenty bookes clothed in blake or red
> Of Aristotle and his philosophie."

It seems as if we were witnessing a revival of Mediævalism under another form, as if, after neo-Gothic architecture, præ-Raphaelitism, and ritualism, we were threatened with a return to the scholastic philosophy which the great scientific reformers of the seventeenth century were supposed to have irrevocably destroyed. And, however chimerical may seem the hopes of such a restoration, we are bound to admit that they do actually exist. One of the most cultivated champions of Ultramontanism in this country, Professor St. George Mivart, not long ago informed us, at the close of his work on *Contemporary Evolution*, that, "if metaphysics are possible, there is not, and never was, or will be, more than one philosophy which, properly understood, unites all truths and eliminates all errors—*the* Philosophy of *the* Philosopher—Aristotle." It may be mentioned also, as a symptom of the same movement, that Leo XIII. has recently directed the works of St. Thomas Aquinas to be reprinted for use in Catholic colleges; having, according to the newspapers, laid aside 300,000 *lire* for that purpose—a large sum, considering his present necessities; but not too much for the republication of twenty folio volumes. Now, it is well known that the philosophy of Aquinas is simply the philosophy of Aristotle, with such omissions and modifications as were necessary in order to piece it on to Christian theology. Hence, in giving his sanction to the teaching of the Angelic Doctor, Leo XIII. indirectly gives it to the source from which so much of that teaching is derived.

It may, perhaps, be considered natural that obsolete authorities should command the assent of a Church whose boast is to maintain the traditions of eighteen centuries intact. But the Aristotelian reaction extends to some who stand altogether aloof from Catholicism. M. Saint-Hilaire speaks in his preface of theology with dislike and suspicion; he is at the present moment member of a bitterly anti-clerical Government; yet his acceptance of Aristotle's metaphysics is almost unreserved. The same tone is common to all official teaching in France, and any departure from the strict peripatetic standard has to be apologized for as if it was a dangerous heresy. On turning to our own country we find, indeed, a marked change since the time when, as Mr. Matthew Arnold tells us, Oxford tutors regarded the *Ethics* as absolutely infallible. The great place given to Plato in public instruction, and the rapidly increasing ascendancy of evolutionary ideas are at present enough to hold any rival authority in check; still, not only are the once neglected portions of Aristotle's system beginning to attract fresh attention—which is an altogether commendable movement—but we also find a scholar like Mr. Wallace writing as follows:—

"We are still anxious to know whether our perception of a real world comes to us by an exercise of thought, or by a simple impression of sense—whether it is the universal that gives the individual reality, or the individual that shapes itself by some process not explained, into a universal—whether bodily movements are the causal antecedents of mental functions, or mind rather the reality which gives truth to body—whether the highest life is a life of thought, or a life of action—whether intellectual also involves moral progress—whether the state is a mere combination for the preservation of goods and property, or a moral organism developing the idea of right. And about these, and such like questions, Aristotle has still much to tell us. . . . . His theory of a creative reason, fragmentary as that theory is left, is the answer to all materialistic theories of the universe. To Aristotle, as to a subtle Scottish preacher [Principal Caird] 'the real pre-supposition of all knowledge, or the thought which is the *prius* of all things, is not the individual's consciousness of himself as individual, but a thought or self-consciousness which is beyond all individual selves, which is the unity of all individual selves and their objects, of all thinkers and all objects of all thought.'"*

Our critics are not content with bringing up Aristotle as an authority on the metaphysical controversies of the present day, and reading into him theories of which he never dreamed, they proceed to credit him with modern opinions which he would have emphatically repudiated, and modern methods which directly reverse his scientific teaching. Thus, Sir A. Grant takes advantage of an ambiguity in the word Matter as used respectively by Aristotle and by contemporary writers, to claim his support for the peculiar theories of Professor Ferrier, although the Stagirite has recorded his belief in the reality and independence of material objects (if not of what he called matter) with a positiveness which one would have thought left no possibility of misunderstanding him.† And Mr. Wallace says that Aristotle "recognizes the genesis of things by evolution and development;" a statement which, standing where it does, and with no more qualifications than are added to it, would make any reader not versed in the subject think of the Stagirite rather as a forerunner of Mr. Darwin and Mr. Herbert Spencer, than as the intellectual ancestor of their opponents; while, on a subsequent occasion, he quotes a passage about the variation of plants under domestication, from a work considered to be un-Aristotelian by the best critics, apparently with no

---

* Wallace's *Outlines*, preface, pp. vi–viii. Our own opinion respecting Aristotle's metaphysics, which differs widely from that expressed in the passage quoted, must be reserved for a future occasion.

† See last note. For the present we must content ourselves with requesting the reader to compare Grant's *Aristotle* pp. 165-168 with *Metaphysica*, iv. 5, p. 1010, b. 30, ff., *ib.* 6, p. 1011, a. 17; and *De Anima*, iii. 2, p. 425, b. 27.

other object than that of finding a piece of Darwinism in his author.*

In Germany Neo-Aristotelianism has already lived out the appointed term of all such movements, having, we believe, been brought into fashion by Trendelenburg about forty years ago. Since then the Aristotelian system in all its branches has been studied with such profound scholarship that any illusions respecting its value for our present needs must have by this time been completely dissipated; while the Hegelian dialectic, which it was originally intended to combat, no longer requires a counterbalance, having been entirely driven from German university teaching. Moreover, Lange's famous *History of Materialism* has dealt a staggering blow to the reputation of Aristotle, not merely in itself, but relatively to the services of Early Greek thought; although Lange goes too far into the opposite extreme when exalting Democritus at his expense.† We have to complain, however, that Zeller and other historians of Greek philosophy start with an invariable prejudice in favour of the later speculators as against the earlier, and especially in favour of Aristotle as against all his predecessors, even Plato included, which leads them to slur over his weak points, and to bring out his excellencies into disproportionate relief.‡

It is evident, then, that Aristotle cannot be approached with the same perfect dispassionateness as the other great thinkers of antiquity He is, if not a living force, still a force that must be reckoned with in contemporary controversy. His admirers persist in making an authority of him, or at least of quoting him, in behalf of their own favourite convictions. We are, therefore, bound to sift his claims with a severity which would not be altogether gracious in a purely historical review. At the same time it is hoped that historical justice will not lose, but gain, by such a procedure. We shall be the better able to understand what Aristotle was, after first showing what he neither was nor could be. And the utility of our investigations will be still further enhanced if we can show that he represents a fixed type regularly recurring in the revolutions of thought.

Personally, we know more about Aristotle than about any other Greek philosopher of the classic period; but what we know does not amount to much. It is little more than the skeleton of a life, a bald enumeration of names and dates and places, with a few more or less doubtful anecdotes interspersed. These we shall now relate, together with whatever inferences the facts seem to warrant. Aristotle was born 384 B.C., at Stageira, a

* *Outlines*, pp. 29 and 38.

† Zeller, p. 513.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 407.

Greek colony in Thrace. It is remarkable that every single Greek thinker of note, Socrates and Plato alone excepted, came from the confines of Hellenedom and barbarism. It has been conjectured by Auguste Comte, we know not with how much reason, that religious traditions were weaker in the colonies than in the parent states, and thus allowed freer play to independent speculation. Perhaps also, the accumulation of wealth was more rapid, thus affording greater leisure for thought; while the pettiness of political life liberated a fund of intellectual energy, which in more powerful communities might have been devoted to the service of the State. Left an orphan in early youth, Aristotle was brought up by one Proxenus, to whose son, Nicanor, he afterwards repaid the obligation. In his eighteenth year he settled at Athens, and attended the school of Plato until the death of that philosopher twenty years afterwards. It is not clear whether the younger thinker was quite conscious of his vast intellectual debt to the elder, and he continually emphasizes the points on which they differ; but personally his feeling towards the master was one of deep reverence and affection. In some beautiful lines, still extant, he speaks of "an altar of solemn friendship dedicated to one of whom the bad should not speak even in praise; who alone, or who first among mortals, proved by his own life and by his system, that goodness and happiness go hand in hand;" and it is generally agreed that the reference can only be to Plato. Again, in his *Ethics* Aristotle expresses reluctance to criticize the ideal theory because it was held by dear friends of his own; adding the memorable declaration, that to a philosopher truth should be dearer still. What opinion Plato formed of his most illustrious pupil is less certain. According to one tradition, he surnamed Aristotle the Nous of his school. It could, indeed, hardly escape so penetrating an observer that the omnivorous appetite for knowledge, which he regarded as most especially characteristic of the philosophic temperament, possessed this young learner to a degree never before paralleled among the sons of men. He may, however, have considered that the Stagirite's method of acquiring knowledge was not the wisest. An expression has been preserved which can hardly be other than genuine, so distinguished is it by that delicate mixture of compliment and satire in which Plato particularly excelled. He is said to have called Aristotle's house the "house of the reader." The author of the *Phædrus* himself a tolerably voluminous writer, was, like Carlyle, not an admirer of literature. Probably it occurred to him that a philosophical student, who had the privilege of listening to his own lectures, might do better than shut himself up with a heap of manuscripts, away from the human inspiration of social intercourse, and the divine inspiration of solitary thought. We

moderns have no reason to regret a habit which has made Aristotle's writings a storehouse of ancient speculations; but from a scientific, no less than from an artistic point of view, those works are overloaded with criticisms of earlier opinions, some of them quite undeserving of serious discussion.

Philosophy was no sooner domiciled at Athens than its professors came in for their full share of the scurrilous personalities, which seem to have formed the staple of conversation in that enlightened capital. Aristotle, himself a trenchant and sometimes a bitterly scornful controversialist, did not escape; and some of the censures passed on him were, rightly or wrongly, attributed to Plato. The Stagirite, who had been brought up at or near the Macedonian Court, and had inherited considerable means, was, if report speaks truly, somewhat foppish in his dress, and luxurious, if not dissipated in his habits. It would not be surprising if one who was left his own master at so early an age had at first exceeded the limits of that moderation which he afterwards inculcated as the golden rule of morals; but the charge of extravagance was such a stock accusation at Athens, where the continued influence of country life seems to have bred a prejudice in favour of parsimony, that it may be taken almost as an exoneration from graver imputations; and, perhaps, an admonition from Plato, if any was needed, sufficed to check his disciple's ambition for figuring as a man of fashion.

We cannot tell to what extent the divergences which afterwards made Plato and Aristotle pass for types of the most extreme intellectual opposition were already manifested during their personal intercourse. The tradition is that the teacher compared his pupil to a foal that kicks his mother after draining her dry. There is a certain rough truth as well as rough wit about the remark; but the author of the *Parmenides* could hardly have been much affected by criticisms on the ideal theory which he had himself reasoned out with equal candour and acuteness; and if, as we sometimes feel tempted to conjecture, those criticisms were first suggested to him by Aristotle in conversation, it will be still more evident that they were received without offence.*

In some respects Aristotle began not only as a disciple, but as a champion of Platonism. On the popular side that doctrine was distinguished by its essentially religious character, and by its opposition to the rhetorical training then in vogue. Now Aristotle's dialogues, of which only a few fragments have been preserved,

* Zeller's opinion that all the Platonic Dialogues, except the *Laws*, were composed before Aristotle's arrival in Athens, does not seem to be supported by any satisfactory evidence.

contained elegant arguments in favour of a creative First Cause, and of human immortality; although in the writings which embody his maturer views, the first of these theories is considerably modified, and the second is absolutely rejected. Further, we are informed that Aristotle expressed himself in terms of rather violent contempt for Isocrates, the greatest living professor of declamation, and opened an opposition school of his own. This step has, curiously enough, been adduced as a further proof of disagreement with Plato, who, it is said, objected to all rhetorical teaching whatever. It seems to us that what he condemned was rather the methods and aims of the then fashionable rhetoric; and a considerable portion of his *Phædrus* is devoted to proving how much more effectually persuasion might be produced by the combined application of dialectics and psychology to oratory. Now this is precisely what Aristotle afterwards attempted to do in the treatise on Rhetoric still preserved among his writings; and we may safely assume that his earlier lectures at Athens were composed on the same principle.

In 347 Plato died, leaving his nephew Speusippus to succeed him in the headship of the Academy. Aristotle then left Athens, accompanied by another Platonist, Xenocrates, a circumstance tending to prove that his relations with the school continued to be of a cordial character. The two settled in Atarneus, at the invitation of its tyrant Hermeias, an old fellow-student from the Academy. Hermeias was a eunuch who had risen from the position of a slave to that of vizier, and then, after his master's death, to the possession of supreme power. Three years subsequently a still more abrupt turn of fortune brought his adventurous career to a close. Like Polycrates, he was treacherously seized and crucified by order of the Persian Government. Aristotle, who had married Pythias, his deceased patron's niece, fled with her to Mitylene. Always grateful, and singularly enthusiastic in his attachments, he celebrated the memory of Hermeias in a manner which gave great offence to the religious sentiment of Hellas, by dedicating a statue to him at Delphi, and composing an elegy, still extant, in which he compares the eunuch-despot to Heracles, the Dioscuri, Achilles, and Ajax; and promises him immortality from the Muses in honour of Xenian Zeus.

When we next hear of Aristotle he is at the Macedonian Court, acting as tutor to Alexander, the future conqueror of Asia, who remained under his charge between the ages of thirteen and sixteen years. The philosopher is more likely to have obtained this appointment by court interest—his father was Court-physician to Alexander's grandfather, Amyntas—than by his reputation,

which could hardly have been made until several years afterwards. Much has been made of a connection which, although it did not last very long, appeals strongly to the imagination, and opens a large field for surmise. The greatest speculative and the greatest practical genius of that age—some might say of all ages—could not, one would think, come into such close contact without leaving a deep impression on each other. Accordingly, the philosopher is supposed to have prepared the hero for his future destinies. Milton has told us how Aristotle "bred great Alexander to subdue the world." Hegel tells us that this was done by giving him the consciousness of himself, the full assurance of his own powers; for which purpose, it seems, the infinite daring of thought was required; and he observes that the result is a refutation of the silly talk about the practical inutility of philosophy.* It would be unfortunate if philosophy had no better testimonial to show for herself than the character of Alexander. It is not the least merit of Grote's History to have brought out in full relief the savage traits by which his conduct was marked from first to last. Arrogant, drunken, cruel, vindictive, and grossly superstitious, he united to the vices of a Highland chieftain those of an Oriental despot. No man ever stood further from the gravity, the gentleness, the moderation—in a word, the Sôphrosynê of a true Hellenic hero. The time came when Aristotle himself would have run the most imminent personal risk had he been within the tyrant's immediate grasp. His nephew, Callisthenes, had incurred deep displeasure by protesting against the servile adulation, or rather idolatry, which Alexander exacted from his attendants. A charge of conspiracy was trumped up against him, and even the exculpatory evidence, taken under torture, of his alleged accomplices did not serve him. "I will punish the sophist," wrote Alexander, "and those who sent him out." It was understood that his old tutor was included in the threat. Fortunately, as Grote observes, Aristotle was not at Ecbatana but at Athens; he therefore escaped the fate of Callisthenes, who suffered death in circumstances, according to some accounts, of great atrocity.

Zeller finds several good qualities in Alexander—precocious statesmanship, zeal for the extension of Hellenic civilization, long-continued self-restraint under almost irresistible temptation, and through all his subsequent aberrations a nobility, a moral purity, a humanity, and a culture, which raise him above every other great conqueror; and these he attributes, in no small degree, to the fostering care of Aristotle; yet, with the exception of moral purity, which was probably an affair of temperament,

---

* *Gesch. d. Phil.* ii. 302.

and has been remarked to an equal extent in other men of the same general character, he was surpassed, in all these respects, by Julius Cæsar; while the ruthless vindictiveness, which was his worst passion, exhibited itself at the very beginning of his reign by the destruction of Thebes. A varnish of literary culture he undoubtedly had, and for this Aristotle may be thanked; but any ordinary sophist would probably have effected as much. As to the Hellenizing of Western Asia this, according to Grote, was the work, not of Alexander, but of the Diadochi after him.

The profit reaped by Aristotle from the connection seems equally doubtful. Tradition tells us that enormous sums of money were spent in aid of his scientific researches, and a whole army of crown servants deputed to collect information bearing on his zoological studies. Modern explorations, however, have proved that the conquests of Alexander, at least, did not, as has been pretended, supply him with any new specimens; nor does the knowledge contained in his extant treatises exceed what could be obtained either by his own observations or by private inquiries. At the same time we may suppose that his services were handsomely rewarded, and that his official position at the Macedonian Court gave him numerous opportunities for conversing with the grooms, huntsmen, shepherds, fishermen, and others, from most of what he tells us about the habits of animals was learned. In connection with the favour enjoyed by Aristotle, it must be mentioned as a fresh proof of his amiable character, that he obtained the restoration of Stageira, which had been ruthlessly destroyed by Philip, together with the other Greek cities of the Chalcidic peninsula.

Two passages in Aristotle's writings have been supposed to give evidence of his admiration for Alexander. One is the description of the magnanimous man in the *Ethics*. The other is a reference in the *Politics* to an ideal hero, whose virtue raises him so high above the common run of mortals that their duty is to obey him as if he were a god. But the magnanimous man embodies a grave and stately type of character quite unlike the chivalrous, impulsive, theatrical nature of Alexander, while probably not unfrequent among real Hellenes; and the god-like statesman of the *Politics* is spoken of rather as an unattainable ideal than as a contemporary fact. On the whole, then, we must conclude that the intercourse between these two extraordinary spirits has left no distinct trace on the actions of the one or on the thoughts of the other.

On Alexander's departure for the East Aristotle returned to Athens, where he now placed himself at the head of a new philosophical school. The ensuing period of thirteen years was fully occupied by the delivery of public lectures, and by the com-

position of those encyclopædic writings which will preserve his memory for ever, along, perhaps, with many others which have not survived. Like Anaxagoras, he was not allowed to end his days in the city of his adoption. His youthful attacks on Isocrates had probably made him many enemies among that rhetor's pupils. It is supposed by Grote, but warmly disputed by Zeller, that his trenchant criticisms on Plato had excited a similar animosity among the sectaries of the Academy. Anyhow, circumstances had unavoidably associated him with the detested Macedonian party, although his position, as a metic, or resident alien, debarred him from taking any active part in politics. With Alexander's death the storm broke loose. A charge was trumped up against Aristotle, on the strength of his unlucky poem in honour of Hermeias, which was described as an insult to religion. That such an accusation should be chosen is characteristic of Athenian bigotry, even should there be no truth in the story that certain philosophical opinions of his were likewise singled out for prosecution. Before the case came on for trial Aristotle availed himself of the usual privilege allowed on such occasions, and withdrew to Chalcis, in order, as he said, that the Athenians need not sin a second time against philosophy. But his constitution, naturally a feeble one, was nearly worn out. A year afterwards he succumbed to a stomach complaint, aggravated, if not produced, by incessant mental application. His contemporary Demosthenes perished about the same time, and at the same age, sixty-two. Within little more than a twelvemonth the world had lost its three greatest men; and after three centuries of uninterrupted glory, Hellas was left unrepresented by a single individual of commanding genius.

We are told that when his end began to approach, the dying philosopher was pressed to choose a successor in the headship of the School. The manner in which he did this is characteristic of his singular gentleness and unwillingness to give offence. It was understood that the choice must lie between his two most distinguished pupils, Theophrastus of Lesbos, and Eudemus of Rhodes. Aristotle asked for specimens of the wine grown in those islands. He first essayed the Rhodian vintage, and praised it highly, but remarked after tasting the other, "The Lesbian is sweeter," thus revealing his preference for Theophrastus, who accordingly reigned over the Lyceum in his stead.

A document purporting to be Aristotle's will has been preserved by Diogenes Laertius, and although some objections to its authenticity have been raised by Sir A. Grant, they have, in our opinion, been successfully rebutted by Zeller. The philosopher's testamentary dispositions give one more proof of his thoughtful consideration for the welfare of those about him,

and his devotion to the memory of departed friends. Careful provision is made for the guardianship of his youthful children, and for the comfort of his second wife, Herpyllis, who, he says, had "been good to" him. Certain slaves, specified by name, are to be emancipated, and to receive legacies. None of the young slaves who waited on him are to be sold, and on growing up they are to be set free "if they deserve it." The bones of his first wife, Pythias, are, as she herself desired, to be laid by his. Monuments are to be erected in memory of his mother, and of certain friends, particularly Proxenus, who had been Aristotle's guardian, and his family.

In person Aristotle rather resembled the delicate student of modern times than the athletic figures of his predecessors. He was not a soldier like Socrates, nor a gymnast like Plato. To judge from several allusions in his works, he put great faith in walking as a preservative of health—even when lecturing he liked to pace up and down a shady avenue. And probably a constitutional was the severest exercise that he ever took. He spoke with a sort of lisp, and the expression of his mouth is said to have been sarcastic; but the traits preserved to us in marble tell only of meditation, and perhaps of pain. A free spoken and fearless critic, he was not over-sensitive on his own account. When told that somebody had been abusing him in his absence, the philosopher replied, "he may beat me, too, if he likes—in my absence." He might be abused, even in his own presence, without departing from the same attitude of calm disdain, much to the disappointment of his petulant assailants. His equanimity was but slightly disturbed by more public and substantial affronts. When certain honorary distinctions, conferred on him by a popular vote at Delphi, were withdrawn, probably on the occasion of his flight from Athens, he remarked with his usual studied moderation, that without being entirely indifferent, he was not very deeply concerned; a trait which illustrates the character of the "magnanimous man" far better than anything related of Alexander. Two other sayings have an almost Christian tone; when asked how we should treat our friends, he replied, "as we should wish them to treat us;" and on being reproached with wasting his bounty on an unworthy object, he observed, "it was not the person, but the human being that I pitied."

Still, taking it altogether, the life of Aristotle gives one the impression of something rather desultory and dependent, not proudly self-determined, like the lives of the thinkers who went before him. We are reminded of the fresh starts and the appeals to authority, so frequent in his writings. He is first detained at Athens twenty years by the attraction of Plato; and

no sooner is Plato gone, than he falls under the influence of an entirely different character—Hermeias. Even when his services are no longer needed, he lingers near the Macedonian Court, until Alexander's departure leaves him once more without a patron. The most dignified period of his whole career is that during which he presided over the Peripatetic School, but he owes this position to foreign influence, and loses it with the temporary revival of Greek liberty. A longer life would probably have seen him return to Athens in the train of his last patron Antipater, whom, as it was, he appointed executor to his will. This was just the sort of character to lay great stress on the evidentiary value of sensation and popular opinion. It was also the character of a conservative who was likely to believe that things had always been very much what they were in his time, and would continue to remain so ever afterwards. Aristotle was not the man to imagine that the present order of Nature had sprung out of a widely different order in the remote past, nor to encourage such speculations when they were offered to him by others. He would not readily believe that phenomena, as he knew them, rested on a reality which could neither be seen nor felt. Nor, finally, could he divine the movements which were slowly undermining the society in which he lived, still less construct an ideal polity for its reorganization on a higher and broader basis. And here we at once become conscious of the chief difference separating him from his master, Plato.

It is an often quoted observation of Friedrich Schlegel's that every man is born either a Platonist or an Aristotelian. If we narrow the remark to the only class which, perhaps, its author recognized as human beings, namely, all thinking men, it will be found to contain a certain amount of truth, though probably not what Schlegel intended; at any rate something requiring to be supplemented by other truths before its full meaning can be understood. The common opinion seems to be that Plato was a transcendentalist, while Aristotle was an experientalist; and that this constitutes the most typical distinction between them. It would, however, be a mistake to suppose that the *à priori* and *à posteriori* methods were marked off with such definiteness in Plato's time as to render possible a choice between them. The opposition was not between general propositions and particular facts, but between the most comprehensive and the most limited notions. It was as if the question were now to be raised whether we should begin to teach physiology by at once dividing the organic from the inorganic world, or by directing the learner's attention to some one vital act. Now, we are expressly told that Plato hesitated between these two methods; and in his Dialogues, at least, we find the easier and more popular one employed by pre-

ference. It is true that he often appeals to wide principles which do not rest on an adequate basis of experimental evidence; but Aristotle does so also, more frequently even, and, as the event proved, with more fatal injury to the advance of knowledge. In his *Rhetoric* he even goes beyond Plato, constructing the entire art without any reference, except for the sake of illustration, to existing models of eloquence, from the general principles of dialectics, psychology, and ethics.

According to Sir A. Grant, it is by the mystical and poetical side of his nature that Plato differs from Aristotle. The one "aspired to a truth above the truth of scientific knowledge;" the other to "methodized experience and the definite."* Now, setting aside the question whether there is any truth above the truth of scientific knowledge, we doubt very much whether Plato believed in its existence. He held that the most valuable truth was that which could be imparted to others by a process even more rigorous than mathematical reasoning; and there was no reality, however transcendent, that he did not hope to bring within the grasp of a dialectic without which even the meanest could not be understood. He did, indeed, believe that, so far, the best and wisest of mankind had owed much more to a divinely implanted instinct than to any conscious chain of reflection; but he distinctly asserted the inferiority of such guidance to the light of scientific knowledge, if this could be obtained, as he hoped that it could. On the other hand, Aristotle as a poet was probably superior to Plato; and in speaking about the highest realities he uses language which, though less rich and ornate than his master's, is not inferior to it in force and fervour; while his metaphysical theories contain a large element of what would now be considered mysticism, that is, he often sees evidence of purpose and animation where they do not really exist. His advantage, in definiteness is, of course, indisputable, but this was perhaps because he came after Plato and profited by his lessons.

Yet there *was* a difference between them, marking off each as the head of a whole School much wider than the Academy or the Lyceum, which we can best express by saying that Plato was pre-eminently a practical, Aristotle pre-eminently a speculative, genius. The object of the one was to reorganize all human life, that of the other to reorganize all human knowledge. Had the one lived earlier he would more probably have been a great statesman or a great general, than a great writer; the other would at no time have been anything but a philosopher, a mathematician, or a historian. Even from birth they seemed to be respectively marked out for an active and for a contemplative

---

* Grant's *Aristotle*, p. 7.

life: the one, a citizen of the foremost State in Hellas, sprung from a family in which political ambition was hereditary, himself strong, beautiful, fascinating, eloquent, and gifted with the keenest insight into men's capacities and motives; the other a Stagirite and an Asclepiad, that is to say, without opportunities for a public career, and possessing a hereditary aptitude for anatomy and natural history, fitted by his insignificant person and delicate constitution for sedentary pursuits, and better able to acquire a knowledge even of human nature from books than from a living converse with men and affairs. Of course we are not for a moment denying to Plato a foremost place among the masters of those who know; he embraced all the science of his age, and to a great extent marked out the course which the science of future ages was to pursue; nevertheless, for him knowledge was not so much an end in itself as a means for the attainment of other ends, among which the preservation of the State seems to have been, in his eyes, the most important. Aristotle, on the other hand, after declaring happiness to be the supreme end, defines it as an energizing of man's highest nature, which again he identifies with the reasoning process or cognition in its purest form. The same fundamental difference comes out strongly in their respective theologies. Plato starts with the conception that God is good, and being good wishes everything to resemble Himself; an assumption from which the divine origin and providential government of the world are deduced. Aristotle thinks of God as exclusively occupied in self-contemplation, and only acting on Nature through the love which His perfection inspires. If, further, we examine in what relation the two philosophies stand to ethics, we shall find that to Plato its problems were the most pressing of any, that they haunted him through his whole life, and that he made contributions of extraordinary value towards their solution; while to Aristotle it was merely a branch of natural history, a study of the different types of character to be met with in Greek society, without the faintest perception that conduct required to be set on a wider and firmer basis than the conventional standards of his age. Hence it is, that, in reading Plato, we are perpetually reminded of the controversies still raging among ourselves. He gives us an exposition, to which nothing has ever been added, of the theory now known as Egoistic Hedonism; he afterwards abandons that theory, and passes on to the social side of conduct, the necessity of justice, the relation of private to public interest, the bearing of religion, education, and social institutions on morality, along with other kindred topics, which need not be further specified, as they have recently been discussed with sufficient fulness in the pages of this Review. Aristotle, on the contrary,

Uttarpara Jaikrishna Public Library
Acc. No. 7861 Date 2.8.75.

takes us back into old Greek life as it was before the days of Socrates, noticing the theories of that great reformer only that he may reject them in favour of a narrow, common-sense standard. Virtuous conduct, he tells us, consists in choosing a mean between two extremes. If we ask how the proper mean is to be discovered, he refers us to a faculty called φρόνησις, or practical reason; but on further inquiry it turns out that this faculty is possessed by none who are not already virtuous. To the question, How are men made moral? he answers, By acquiring moral habits; which amounts to little more than a restatement of the problem, or, at any rate, suggests another more difficult question—How are good habits acquired? An answer might conceivably have been supplied had Aristotle been enabled to complete that sketch of an ideal State, which was originally intended to form part of his *Politics*. But the philosopher evidently found that to do so was beyond his powers. If the seventh and eighth books of that treatise, which contain the fragmentary attempt in question, had originally occupied the place where they now stand in our manuscripts, it might have been supposed that Aristotle's labours were interrupted by death. Modern criticism has shown, however, that they should follow immediately after the first three books, and that the author broke off, almost at the beginning of his ideal polity, to take up the much more congenial task of analysing and criticizing the actually existing Hellenic constitutions. But the little that he has done proves him to have been profoundly unfitted for the task of a practical reformer. What few actual recommendations it contains are a compromise—somewhat in the spirit of Plato's *Laws*—between the *Republic* and real life. The rest is what he never fails to give us—a mass of details about matters of fact, and a summary of his speculative ethics, along with counsels of moderation in the spirit of his practical ethics; but not one practical principle of any value, not one remark to show that he understood what direction history was taking, or that he had mastered the elements of social reform as set forth in Plato's works. The progressive specialization of political functions, the necessity of a spiritual power, the formation of a trained standing army, the admission of women to public employments, the elevation of the whole race by artificial selection, the radical reform of religion, the reconstitution of education both literary and scientific, the redistribution of property, the enactment of a new code, the use of public opinion as an instrument of moralization—these are the ideas which still agitate the minds of men, and they are also the ideas of the *Republic*, the *Statesman*, and the *Laws*. Aristotle, on the other hand, occupies himself chiefly with discussing how far a city should be built from the sea, whether it should be fortified, how its citizens

should *not* be employed, when people should *not* marry, what children should *not* be permitted to see, and what music they should *not* be taught. Apart from his enthusiasm for philosophy, there is nothing generous, nothing large-minded, nothing inspiring. The territory of the city is to be self-sufficing, that it may be isolated from other States; the citizens are to keep aloof from all industrial occupations; science is put out of relation to the material well-being of mankind. It was, in short, to be a city where every gentleman would hold an idle fellowship; a city where Aristotle could live without molestation, and in the enjoyment of congenial friendships; just as the God of his system was a still higher Aristotle, perpetually engaged in the study of formal logic. Even in his much-admired criticisms on the actually existing types of government our philosopher shows practical weakness and vacillation of character. There is a good word for them all—for monarchy, for aristocracy, for middle-class rule, and even for pure democracy.* The fifth book, treating of political revolutions, is unquestionably the ablest and most interesting in the whole work; but when Aristotle quits the domain of natural history for that of practical suggestions, with a view to obviate the dangers pointed out, he can think of nothing better than the old advice—to be moderate, even where the constitutions which it is to preserve are, by their very nature, so excessive that their readjustment and equilibration would be equivalent to

* We think, however, that Mr. Wallace has overstated the case, when he makes Aristotle say that "democracy is not unlikely with the spread of population to become the ultimate form of government; and may be anticipated without dread by considering that the *collective* voice of a people is as likely to be sound in state administration as in criticisms on art," pp. 57-8. In the first place, the expressions of opinions which are brought together in Mr. Wallace's summary are separated in the original text by a considerable interval—an important circumstance when we are dealing with so inconsistent a writer; then what Aristotle says about the collective wisdom of the people, besides being advanced with extreme hesitation, is not a reassurance against any danger to be dreaded from their supremacy, but an answer to the argument that the few had a natural right to political power from their greater wealth and better education; the whole question being in this connection one of political justice, not of political expediency; finally, not only is "ultimate form of government" a very strong rendering of the Greek words, but what Aristotle says on the subject in his third book is virtually retracted in the fifth, where oligarchy, democracy, and tyranny are regarded as succeeding each other in any order indifferently, and Plato (or the Platonic Socrates) is censured for assuming a constant sequence of revolutions. The explanation of this change seems to be that when Aristotle wrote his third book he was only acquainted with the history of Athens and a few other of the greater states, but that subsequently a vast collection of facts bearing on the subject came to his knowledge, showing that each form of government embraced more varieties and admitted of more mutations than he had been originally aware of; and this led to a complete recast of his opinions.

their destruction. And, in fact, Aristotle's proposals amount to this—that Government by the middle class should be established wherever the ideal aristocracy of education is impracticable; or else a Government in which the class interests of rich and poor should be so nicely balanced as to obviate the danger of oligarchic or democratic injustice. His error lay in not perceiving that the only possible means of securing such a happy mean was to break through the narrow circle of Greek city life; to continue the process which had united families into villages, and villages into towns; to confederate groups of cities into larger states; and so, by striking an average of different inequalities, to minimize the risk of those incessant revolutions which had hitherto secured the temporary triumph of alternate factions at the expense of their common interest. And, in fact, the spontaneous process of aggregation, which Aristotle did not foresee, has alone sufficed to remedy the evils which he saw, but could not devise any effectual means of curing, and at the same time has bred new evils of which his diagnosis naturally took no account. But if this be so, it follows that Mr. Wallace's appeal to Aristotle as an authority worth consulting on our present social difficulties cannot be upheld. Take the question quoted by Mr. Wallace himself: "Whether the State is a mere combination for the preservation of goods and property, or a moral organism developing the idea of right?" Aristotle certainly held very strong opinions in favour of State interference with education and private morality, if that is what the second alternative implies; but does it follow that he would agree with those who advocate a similar supervision at the present day? By no means; because experience has shown that in enormous industrial societies like ours, protection is attended with difficulties and dangers which he could no more foresee than he could foresee the discoveries on which our physical science is based. Or, returning for a moment to ethics, let us take another of Mr. Wallace's problems: "Whether intellectual also involves moral progress?" What possible light can be thrown on it by Aristotle's exposure of the powerlessness of right knowledge to make an individual virtuous, when writers like Buckle have transferred the whole question from a particular to a general ground; from the conduct of individuals to the conduct of men acting in large masses, and over vast periods of time? Or, finally, take the question which forms a point of junction between Aristotle's ethics and his politics: "Whether the highest life is a life of thought or a life of action?" Of what importance is his decision to us, who attend far more to the social than to the individual consequences of actions; who have learned to take into account the emotional element of happiness, which Aristotle neglected; who are uninfluenced by his appeal to the blissful

theorizing of gods in whom we do not believe; for whom, finally, experience has altogether broken down the antithesis between knowledge and practice, by showing that speculative ideas may revolutionize the whole of life. Aristotle is an interesting historical study; but we are as far beyond him in social as in physical science.

On turning to Aristotle's *Rhetoric* we find that, from a practical point of view, his failure is, if possible, still more complete. This treatise contains, as we have already observed, an immense mass of more or less valuable information on the subject of psychology, ethics, and dialectic, while giving exceedingly little advice about the very essence of rhetoric as an art, which is to say whatever you have to say in the most telling manner, by the arrangement of topics and arguments, by the use of illustrations, and by the choice of language; and that little is to be found in the third book, the genuineness of which is open to very grave suspicion. It may be doubted whether any orator or critic of oratory was ever benefited in the slightest degree by the study of Aristotle's rules. His collections of scientific data add nothing to our knowledge, but only throw common experience into abstract formulas; and even as a body of memoranda they would be useless, for no memory could contain them, or if any man could remember them he would have intellect enough not to require them.* The professional teachers whom Aristotle so heartily despised seem to have followed a much more effectual method than his; they gave their pupils ready-made speeches to analyse and learn by heart, rightly trusting to the imitative instinct to do the rest. He compares them to a master who should teach his apprentices how to make shoes by supplying them with a great variety of ready-made pairs. But this would be a much better plan than to give them an elaborate lecture on the anatomy of the foot, with a full enumeration of its bones, muscles, tendons, nerves, and blood-vessels, which is the most appropriate parallel to *his* system of instruction.

The *Poetics* of Aristotle contain some hints on the subject of composition, which entitle it to be mentioned in the present connection. The deficiencies, even from a purely theoretical point of view, of this work, once pronounced infallible, have at last become so obvious that elaborate hypotheses have been

* Many of the topics noted are not only trite enough but have no possible bearing on the subject under which they stand. For instance, in discussing judicial eloquence Aristotle goes into the motives for committing crime; among these are pleasurable feelings of every kind, including the remembrance of past trouble. Even the hero of a spasmodic tragedy would hardly have committed an offence for the purpose of procuring himself this form of experience.

constructed, according to which the recension handed down to us is a mere mutilated extract from the original treatise. Enough, however, remains to convince us that poetry was not, any more than eloquence, a subject with which Aristotle was fitted to cope. He begins by defining it, in common with all other art, as an imitation. Here we at once recognize the spirit of a philosophy, the whole power and interest of which lay in knowledge; and in fact he tells us that the love of art is derived from the love of knowledge. But the truth seems to be that æsthetic enjoyment is due to an ideal exercise of our faculties, among which the power of perceiving identities is sometimes, though not always, included. That the materials of which every artistic creation is composed are taken from the world of our experience makes no difference; for it is by the new forms in which they are arranged that we are interested, not because we remember having met them in some natural combination already. Aristotle could not help seeing that this was true in the case of music at least, and he can only save his principle by treating musical effects as representations of passions in the soul. To say, however, that musical pleasure arises from a perception of resemblance between certain sounds and the emotions with which they are associated, would be an extremely forced interpretation; the pleasure is due rather to a sympathetic participation in the emotion itself. And when Aristotle goes on to tell us that the characters imitated in epic and dramatic poetry may be either better or worse than in ordinary life, he is obviously admitting other æsthetic motives not accounted for by his general theory. If, on the other hand, we start with ideal energizing as the secret of æsthetic emotion, we can easily understand how an imaginary exaltation of our faculties is yielded by the spectacle of something either rising above, or falling below, the level on which we stand. In the one case we become momentarily invested with the strength put into action before our eyes; in the other, the consciousness of our own superiority amounts to a fund of reserve power, which *not* being put into action is entirely available for ideal enjoyment. And, if this be the correct view, it will follow that Aristotle was quite wrong when he declared the plot to be more important than the characters of a drama. The reason given for his preference is, even on the principles of his own philosophy, a bad one. He says that there can be plot without character-drawing but never character-drawing without plot. Yet he has taught us elsewhere that the human soul is of more value than the physical organism on which its existence depends. This very parallel suggests itself to him in his *Poetics*; but, by an almost inconceivable misjudgment, it is the plot which he likens to the soul of the piece, whereas in

truth it should be compared to the body. The practice and preference of his own time may have helped to mislead him, for he argues (rather inconsistently, by the way) that plot must be more indispensable, as young writers are able to construct good stories before they are able to pourtray character; and more artistic, as it was developed much later in the historical evolution of tragedy. Fortunately for us the Alexandrian critics were guided by other canons of taste, or the structurally faulty pieces of Æschylus might have been neglected, and the ingeniously constructed pieces of Agathon preserved in their place.

It is probable, however, that Aristotle's partiality was determined more by the systematizing and analytical character of his own genius than by the public opinion of his age; or rather, the same tendency was at work in philosophy and in art at the same time, and the theories of the one were unconsciously pre-adapted to the productions of the other. In both there was a decay of penetration and of originality, of life and of inspiration; in both a great development of whatever could be obtained by technical proficiency; in both an extension of surface at the expense of depth, a gain of fluency, and a loss of force. But poetry lost far more than philosophy by the change; and so the works of the one have perished while the works of the other have survived.

Modern literature offers abundant materials for testing Aristotle's theory, and the immense majority of critics have decided against it. Even among fairly educated readers few would prefer Molière's *L'Etourdi* to his *Misanthrope*, or Schiller's *Maria Stuart* to Goethe's *Faust*, or Lord Lytton's *Lucretia* to George Eliot's *Romola*, or Dickens's *Tale of Two Cities* to the same writer's *Nicholas Nickleby*, or his *Great Expectations* to his *David Copperfield*, although in each instance the work named first has the better plot of the two.

Characters, then, are not introduced that they may perform actions; but actions are represented for the sake of the characters who do them, or who suffer by them. It is not so much a ghostly apparition or a murder which interests us as the fact that the ghost appears to Hamlet, and that the murder is committed by Macbeth. And the same is true of the Greek drama, though not perhaps to the same extent. We may care for Œdipus chiefly on account of his adventures; but we care far more for what Prometheus, or Clytemnestra, or Antigone, or Ajax, say about themselves than for what they suffer or what they do. Thus, and thus only are we enabled to understand the tragic element in poetry, the production of pleasure by the spectacle of pain. It is not the satisfaction caused by seeing a skilful imitation of reality, for few have witnessed such awful events in real life as on the stage; nor is it pain, as such, which interests us, for the scenes of

torture exhibited in some Spanish and Bolognese paintings do not gratify, they revolt and disgust an educated taste. The true tragic emotion is produced, not by the suffering itself, but by the reaction of the characters against it; for this gives, more than anything else, the idea of a force with which we can synergize, because it is purely mental; or by the helpless submission of the victims whom we wish to assist because they are lovable, and whom we love still more from our inability to assist them, through the transformation of arrested action into feeling, accompanied by the enjoyment proper to tender emotion. Hence the peculiar importance of the female parts in dramatic poetry. Aristotle tells us that it is bad art to represent women as nobler and braver than men, because they are not so in reality.* Nevertheless, he should have noticed that on the tragic stage of Athens women first competed with men, then equalled, and finally far surpassed them in loftiness of character. But with his philosophy he could not see that, if heroines did not exist, it would be necessary to create them. For if women are conceived as reacting against outward circumstances at all, their very helplessness will lead to the storing of a greater mental tension in the shape of excited thought and feeling debarred from any manifestation except in words; and it is exactly with this mental tension that the spectator can most easily synergize. The wrath of Orestes is not interesting because it is entirely absorbed into the premeditation and execution of his vengeance. The passion of Electra is profoundly interesting because it has no outlet but impotent denunciations of her oppressors, and abortive schemes for her deliverance from their yoke. Hence, also, Shakspeare produces some of his greatest effects by placing his male characters to some extent in the position of women, either through their natural weakness and indecision, as with Hamlet, and Brutus, and Macbeth, or through the paralysis of unproved suspicion as with Othello; while the greatest of all his heroines, Lady Macbeth, is so because she has the intellect and will to frame resolutions of dauntless ambition, and eloquence to force them on her husband, without either the physical or the moral force to execute them herself. In all these cases it is the arrest of an electric current which produces the most intense heat, or the most brilliant illumination. Again, by their extreme sensitiveness, and by the natural desire felt to help them, women excite more pity, which, as we have said, means more love, than men; and this in the highest degree when their sufferings are undeserved. We see, then, how wide Aristotle went of the truth when he made it a rule that the sufferings of tragic characters should be partly

* *Poet.* 15, p. 1454, a. 20.

brought on by their own fault, and that, speaking generally, they should not be distinguished for justice or virtue, nor yet for extreme wickedness.* The "immoderate moderation" of the Stagirite was never more infelicitously exhibited. For in order to produce truly tragic effects, excess of every kind not only may, but must, be employed. It is by the reaction of heroic fortitude, either against unmerited outrage, or against the whole pressure of social law, that our synergetic interest is wound up to the intensest pitch. It is when we see a beautiful soul requited with evil for good that our eyes are filled with the noblest tears. Yet so absolutely perverted have men's minds been by the Aristotelian dictum that Gervinus, the great Shakspearian critic, actually tries to prove that Duncan, to some extent, deserved his fate by imprudently trusting himself to the hospitality of Macbeth, that Desdemona was very imprudent in interceding for Cassio, and that it was treasonable for Cordelia to bring a French army into England! The Greek drama might have supplied Aristotle with several decisive contradictions of his canons. He should have seen that the *Prometheus*, the *Antigone*, and the *Hippolytus* are affecting in proportion to the pre-eminent virtue of their protagonists. The further fallacy of excluding very guilty characters is, of course, most decisively refuted by Shakspeare, whose Richard III., whose Iago, and whose Macbeth excite keen interest by their association of extraordinary villainy with extraordinary intellectual gifts.

So far Aristotle gives us a purely superficial and sensational view of the drama. Yet he could not help seeing that there was a moral element in tragedy, and he was anxious to prove, as against Plato, that it exercised an improving effect on the audience. The result is his famous theory of the Catharsis, so long misunderstood, and not certainly understood even now. The object of Tragedy, he tells us, is to purify (or purge away) pity and terror by means of those emotions themselves. The *Poetics* seem originally to have contained an explanation of this mysterious utterance, now lost, and critics have endeavoured to supply the gap by writing eighty treatises on the subject. The result has been at least to show what Aristotle did *not* mean. The popular version of his dictum, which is that tragedy purges the passions by pity and terror, is clearly inconsistent with the wording of the original text. Pity and terror are both the object and the instrument of purification. Nor yet does he mean, as was once supposed, that each of these emotions is to counterbalance and moderate the other; for this would imply that they are opposed to one another, whereas in the *Rhetoric* he speaks

* *Poet.* 13, p. 1453, a. 8.

of them as being akin; while a parallel passage in the *Politics** shows him to have believed that the passions are susceptible of homœopathic treatment. Violent enthusiasm, he tells us, is to be soothed and carried off by a strain of exciting, impassioned music. But whence come the pity and terror which are to be dealt with by tragic poetry? Not, apparently, from the piece itself, for to inoculate the patient with a new disease, merely for the sake of curing it, could do him no imaginable good. To judge from the passage in the *Politics* already referred to, he believes that pity and terror are always present in the minds of all, to a certain extent; and the theory apparently is, that tragedy brings them to the surface, and enables them to be thrown off with an accompaniment of pleasurable feeling. Now, of course, we have a constant capacity for experiencing every passion to which human nature is liable; but to say that in the absence of its appropriate external stimulus we are ever perceptibly and painfully affected by any passion, is to assert what is not true of any sane mind. And even were it so, were we constantly haunted by vague presentiments of evil to ourselves or others, it is anything but clear that fictitious representations of calamity would be the appropriate means for enabling us to get rid of them. Zeller explains that it is the insight into universal laws controlling our destiny, the association of misfortune with a divine justice which, according to Aristotle, produces the purifying effect;† but this would be the purgation of pity and terror, not by themselves, but by the intellectual framework in which they are set, the concatenation of events, the workings of character, or the reference of everything to an eternal cause. The truth is that Aristotle's explanation of the moral effect produced by tragedy is irrational, because his whole conception of tragedy is mistaken. The emotions excited by its highest forms are not terror and pity, but admiration and love, which, in their ideal exercise, are too holy for purification, too high for restriction, and too delightful for relief.

Before parting with the *Poetics* we must add that they contain one excellent piece of advice to dramatists, which is, to imagine themselves present at the scenes which they are supposing to happen, and also at the representation of their own play. This however, is an exception which proves the rule, for Aristotle's exclusively theoretic standpoint here, as will sometimes happen, coincides with the truly practical standpoint.

A somewhat similar observation applies to the art of reasoning, which it would be possible to compile by bringing together all the rules on the subject, scattered through the

* *Pol.* viii. 7, p. 1342, a. 10. † *Zeller*, p. 780.

*Organon.* Aristotle has discovered and formulated every canon of theoretical consistency, and every artifice of dialectical debate, with an industry and acuteness which cannot be too highly extolled; and his labours in this direction have perhaps contributed more than those of any other single writer to the intellectual stimulation of after ages; but the kind of genius requisite for such a task was speculative rather than practical; there was no experience of human nature in its concrete manifestations, no prevision of real consequences involved. Such a code might be, and probably was to a great extent, abstracted from the Platonic dialogues; but to work up the processes of thought into a series of dramatic contests, carried on between living individuals, as Plato has done, required a vivid perception and grasp of realities which, and not any poetical mysticism, is what positively distinguishes a Platonist from an Aristotelian.*

---

* As an illustration of the stimulating effect produced by the study of Aristotle's logic, we quote the following anecdote from the notes to Whately's edition of Bacon's *Essays*:—"The late Sir Alexander Johnstone, when acting-as temporary Governor of Ceylon (soon after its cession), sat once as judge in a trial of a prisoner for a robbery and murder; and the evidence seemed to him so conclusive, that he was about to charge the jury (who were native Cingalese) to find a verdict of guilty. But one of the jurors asked and obtained permission to examine the witnesses himself. He had them brought in one by one, and cross-examined them so ably as to elicit the fact that they were *themselves* the perpetrators of the crime, which they afterwards had conspired to impute to the prisoner. And they were accordingly put on their trial and convicted. Sir Alexander Johnstone was greatly struck by the intelligence displayed by this juror, the more so as he was only a small farmer, who was not known to have had any remarkable advantages of education. He sent for him, and after commending the wonderful sagacity he had shown, inquired eagerly what his studies had been. The man replied that he had never read but one book, the only one he possessed, which had long been in his family, and which he delighted to study in his leisure hours. This book he was prevailed on to show to Sir Alexander Johnstone, who put it into the hands of one who knew the Cingalese language. It turned out to be a translation into that language of a large portion of Aristotle's *Organon*. It appears that the Portuguese when they first settled in Ceylon and other parts of the East translated into the native languages several of the works then studied in the European Universities, among which were the Latin versions of Aristotle. The Cingalese in question said that if his understanding had been in any degree cultivated and improved, it was to that book that he owed it. It is likely, however (as was observed to me [Whately] by the late Bishop Copleston), that any other book, containing an equal amount of close reasoning and accurate definition, might have answered the same purpose in sharpening the intellect of the Cingalese." Possibly, but not to the same effect. What the Cingalese got into his hands was a triple-distilled essence of Athenian legal procedure. The cross-examining elenchus was first borrowed by Socrates from the Athenian courts and applied to philosophical purposes; it was still further elaborated by Plato, and finally reduced to abstract rules by Aristotle; so that in using it as he did the juror was only restoring it to its original purposes.

But if Aristotle had not his master's enthusiasm for practical reforms, nor his master's command of all the forces by which humanity is raised to a higher life, he had, more even than his master, the Greek passion for knowledge as such, apart from its utilitarian applications, and embracing in its vast orb the lowliest things with the loftiest, the most fragmentary glimpses, and the largest revelations of truth. He demanded nothing but the materials for generalization, and there was nothing from which he could not generalize. There was a place for everything within the limits of his world-wide system. Never in any human soul did the theorizing passion burn with so clear and bright and pure a flame. Under its inspiration his style more than once breaks into a strain of sublime, though simple and rugged eloquence. Speaking of that eternal thought which, according to him, constitutes the divine essence, he exclaims:

"On this principle the heavens and Nature hang. This is that best life which we possess during a brief period only, for there it is so always, which with us is impossible. And its activity is pure pleasure, wherefore waking, feeling, and thinking, are the most pleasurable states, on account of which hope and memory exist. . . . . And of all activities theorizing is the most delightful and the best, so that if God always has such happiness as we have in our highest moments, it is wonderful, and still more wonderful if He has more."*

Again, he tells us that—

"If happiness consists in the appropriate exercise of our vital functions, then the highest happiness must result from the highest activity, whether we choose to call that reason or anything else which is the ruling and guiding principle within us, and through which we form our conceptions of what is noble and divine; and whether this be intrinsically divine, or only the divinest thing in us, its appropriate activity must be perfect happiness. Now this, which we call the theoretic activity, must be the mightiest; for reason is supreme in our souls and supreme over the objects which it cognizes; and it is also the most continuous, for of all activities theorizing is that which can be most uninterruptedly carried on. Again, we think that some pleasure ought to be mingled with happiness; if so, of all our proper activities philosophy is confessedly the most pleasurable, the enjoyments afforded by it being wonderfully pure and steady; for the existence of those who are in possession of knowledge is naturally more delightful than the existence of those who merely seek it. Of all virtues this is the most self-sufficing; for while in common with every other virtue it presupposes the indispensable conditions of life, wisdom does not, like justice and temperance and courage, need human objects for its exercise; theorizing may go on in perfect solitude; for the co-operation of other men, though helpful, is not absolutely necessary to its activity.

* *Metaph.* xii. 7, p. 1072, b. 13.

All other pursuits are exercised for some end lying outside themselves; war entirely for the sake of peace, and statesmanship in great part for the sake of honour and power; but theorizing yields no extraneous profit great or small, and is loved for itself alone. If, then, the energizing of pure reason rises above such noble careers as war and statesmanship by its independence, by its inherent delightfulness, and, so far as human frailty will permit, by its untiring vigour, this must constitute perfect human happiness; or rather such a life is more than human, and man can only partake of it through the divine principle within him; wherefore, let us not listen to those who tell us that we should have no interests except what are human and mortal like ourselves; but, so far as may be, put on immortality, and bend all our efforts towards living up to that element of our nature which, though small in compass, is in power and preciousness supreme."*

Let us now see how he carries this passionate enthusiasm for knowledge into the humblest researches of zoology:—

"Among natural objects, some exist unchanged through all eternity, while others are generated and decay. The former are divinely glorious, but being comparatively inaccessible to our means of observation, far less is known of them than we could wish; while perishable plants and animals offer abundant opportunities of study to us who live under the same conditions with them. Each science has a charm of its own. For knowledge of the heavenly bodies is so sublime a thing that even a little of it is more delightful than all earthly science put together; just as the smallest glimpse of a beloved beauty is more delightful than the fullest and closest revelation of ordinary objects; while, on the other hand, where there are greater facilities for observation, science can be carried much further; and our closer kinship with the creatures of earth is some compensation for the interest felt in that philosophy which deals with the divine. Wherefore, in our discussions on living beings we shall, so far as possible, pass over nothing, whether it rank high or low in the scale of estimation. For even such of them as displease the senses, when viewed with the eye of reason as wonderful works of Nature afford an inexpressible pleasure to those who can enter philosophically into the causes of things. For surely it would be absurd and irrational to look with delight at the images of such objects on account of our interest in the pictorial or plastic skill which they exhibit, and not to take still greater pleasure in a scientific explanation of the realities themselves. Wherefore, we ought not to shrink with childish disgust from an examination of the lower animals, for there is something wonderful in all the works of Nature: and we may repeat what Heracleitus is reported to have said to certain strangers who had come to visit him, but hung back at the door when they saw him warming himself before a fire, bidding them come in boldly, for that there also there were gods; not allowing ourselves to call any creature common or unclean, because there is a kind of natural beauty

* *Eth. Nic.* x. 7 (somewhat condensed).

about them all. For, if anywhere, there is a pervading purpose in the works of Nature, and the realization of this purpose is the beauty of the thing. But if any one should look with contempt on the scientific examination of the lower animals, he must have the same opinion about himself; for the greatest repugnance is felt in looking at the parts of which the human body is composed, such as blood, muscles, bones, veins, and the like.* Similarly, in discussing any part or organ we should consider that it is not for the matter of which it consists that we care, but for the whole form; just as in talking about a house it is not bricks and mortar and wood that we mean; and so the theory of Nature deals with the essential structure of objects, not with the elements which, apart from that structure, would have no existence at all."†

It is well for the reputation of Aristotle that he could apply himself with such devotion to the arduous and, in his time, inglorious researches of natural history and comparative anatomy, since it was only in those departments that he made any real contributions to physical science. In those studies, which were to him the noblest and most entrancing of any, his speculations are one long record of wearisome, hopeless, unqualified delusion. If, in the philosophy of practice and the philosophy of art, he afforded no real guidance at all, in the philosophy of Nature his guidance has always led men fatally astray. So far as his means of observation extended there was nothing that he did not attempt to explain, and in every single instance he was wrong. He has written about the general laws of matter and motion, astronomy, chemistry, meteorology, and physiology, with the result that he has probably made more blunders on those subjects than any human being ever made before or after him. And, if there is one thing more astounding than his unbroken infelicity of speculation, it is the imperturbable self-confidence with which he puts forward his fallacies as demonstrated scientific certainties. Had he been right it was no "slight or partial glimpses of the beloved" that would have been vouchsafed him, but the "fullest and closest revelation" of her beauties. But the more he looked the less he saw. Instead of drawing aside he only thickened and darkened the veils of sense

* It is perfectly possible that Aristotle was not acquainted at first hand with human anatomy. But Sir A. Grant is hardly justified in observing that the words quoted above "do not show the hardihood of the practised dissector" (p. 3). Aristotle simply takes the popular point of view in order to prove that the internal structure of the lower animals is no more offensive to the eye than that of man. And, as he took so much delight in the former, nothing but want of opportunity is likely to have prevented him from extending his researches to the latter.

† *De Part. An.* i. 5.

which obscured her, by mistaking them for the glorious forms that lay concealed beneath.

Modern admirers of Aristotle labour to prove that his errors were inevitable, and belonged more to his age than to himself; that without the mechanical appliances of modern times science could not be cultivated with any hope of success. But what are we to say when we find that on one point after another the true explanation had already been surmised by Aristotle's predecessors or contemporaries, only to be scornfully rejected by Aristotle himself. Their hypotheses may often have been very imperfect, and supported by insufficient evidence; but it must have been something more than chance which always led him wrong when they were so often right. To begin with, the infinity of space is not even now, nor will it ever be, established by improved instruments of observation and measurement; it is deduced by a very simple process of reasoning, of which Democritus and others were capable, while Aristotle apparently was not. He rejects the idea because it is inconsistent with certain very arbitrary assumptions and definitions of his own, whereas he should have rejected them because they were inconsistent with it. He further rejects the idea of a vacuum, and with it the atomic theory, entirely on *à priori* grounds, although, even in the then existing state of knowledge, atomism explained various phenomena in a perfectly rational manner which he could only explain by unmeaning or nonsensical phrases.* It had been already maintained in his time that the apparent movements of the heavenly bodies were due to the rotation of the earth on its own axis.† Had Aristotle accepted this theory one can imagine how highly his sagacity would have been extolled. We may, therefore, fairly take his rejection of it as a proof of blind adherence to old-fashioned opinion. When he argues that none of the heavenly bodies rotate because we can see that the moon does not, as is evident from her always turning the same side to us,‡ nothing is needed but the simplest mathematics to demonstrate the fallacy of his reasoning. Others had surmised that the Milky Way was a collection of stars, and that comets were bodies of the same

* Compare the arguments in *Phys.* iv. 9.

† The hypothesis of the earth's diurnal rotation had clearly been suggested by a celebrated passage in Plato's *Timæus*, though whether Plato himself held it is still doubtful. That he accepted the revolution of the celestial spheres is absolutely certain; but while to our minds the two beliefs are mutually exclusive, Grote thinks that Plato overlooked the inconsistency. It seems probable that the one was at first actually a generalization from the other; it was thought that the earth must revolve *because* the crystal spheres revolved; then the new doctrine, thus accidentally struck out, was used to destroy the old one.

‡ *De Cœl.* ii. 8, 290, a. 26.

nature as planets. Aristotle is satisfied that both are appearances like meteors, and the aurora borealis—caused by the friction of our atmosphere against the solid æther above it. A similar origin is ascribed to the heat and light derived from the sun and stars; for it would be derogatory to the dignity of those luminaries to suppose, with Anaxagoras, that they are formed of anything so familiar and perishable as fire. On the contrary, they consist of pure æther like the spheres on which they are fixed as protuberances; though how such an arrangement can co-exist with absolute contact between each sphere and that next below it; or how the effects of friction could be transmitted through such enormous thicknesses of solid crystal, is left unexplained.* By a happy anticipation of Roemer, Empedocles conjectured that the transmission of light occupied a certain time: Aristotle declares it to be instantaneous.†

On passing to terrestrial physics, we find that Aristotle is, as usual, the dupe of superficial appearances, against which other thinkers were on their guard. Seeing that fire always moved up, he assumed that it did so by virtue of a natural tendency towards the circumference of the universe, as opposed to earth which always moved towards the centre. The atomists erroneously held that all matter gravitated downwards through infinite space, but correctly explained the ascent of heated particles by the pressure of surrounding matter, in accordance, most probably, with the analogy of floating bodies.‡ Chemistry as a science is, of course, an entirely modern creation, but the first approach to it was made by Democritus, while no ancient philosopher stood farther from its essential principles than Aristotle. He analyses bodies, not into their material elements, but into the sensuous qualities, hot and cold, wet and dry, between which he supposes the underlying substance to be perpetually oscillating; a theory which, if it were true, would make any fixed laws of Nature impossible.

It might have been expected that, on reaching physiology, the Stagirite would stand on firmer ground than any of his contemporaries. Such, however, is not the case. As already observed, his achievements belong entirely to the dominion of anatomy and descriptive zoology. The whole internal economy of the animal body is, according to him, designed for the purpose of creating and moderating the vital heat; and in apportioning their functions to the different organs he is entirely dominated by this fundamental error. It was a common notion among the Greeks, suggested by sufficiently obvious considerations, that the brain is the seat of the psychic activities. These, however,

---

* *Zeller*, p. 469. † *De Sens.* vi. 446, a. 26.
‡ *De Cœl.* i. 8, 277, b. 2.

Aristotle transports to the heart, which, in his system, not only propels the blood through the body, but is also the source of heat, the common centre where the different special sensations meet to be compared, and the organ of imagination and of passion. The sole function of the brain is to cool down the blood—a purpose which the lungs also subserve. Some persons believe that air is a kind of food, and is inhaled in order to feed the internal fire; but their theory would involve the absurd consequence that all animals breathe, for all have some heat. Anaxagoras and Diogenes did, indeed, make that assertion, and the latter even went so far as to say that fish breathe with their gills, absorbing the air held in solution by the water passed through them—a misapprehension, says Aristotle, which arose from not having studied the final cause of respiration.* His physiological theory of generation is equally unfortunate. In accordance with the metaphysical system, hereafter to be explained, he distinguishes two elements in the reproductive process, of which one, that contributed by the male, is exclusively formative; and the other, that contributed by the female, exclusively material. The prevalent opinion was evidently, what we know now to be true, that each parent has both a formative and a material share in the composition of the embryo. Again, Aristotle, strangely enough, regards the generative element in both sexes as an unappropriated portion of the animal's nutriment, the last and most refined product of digestion, and therefore not a portion of the parental system at all; while other biologists, anticipating Mr. Darwin's theory of pangenesis in a very wonderful manner, taught that the semen is a conflux of molecules derived from every part of the body, and thus strove to account for the hereditary transmission of individual peculiarities to offspring.†

All these, however, are mere questions of detail. It is on a subject of the profoundest philosophical importance that Aristotle differs most consciously, most radically, and most fatally from his predecessors. They were evolutionists, and he was a stationarist. They were mechanicists, and he was a teleologist. They were uniformitarians, and he was a dualist. It is true that, as we mentioned at the beginning of this Article, Mr. Wallace makes him "recognize the genesis of things by evolution and development," but the meaning of this phrase requires to be cleared up. In one sense it is, of course, almost an identical proposition. The genesis of things must be by genesis of some kind or other. The great question is, what things have been evolved, and how have they been evolved? Modern science tells us, that not only have all particular aggregates of matter

---

* *De Respir.* 1 & 2. † *De Gen. An.* i. 17.

and motion now existing come into being within a finite period of time, but also that the specific types under which we arrange those aggregates have equally been generated; and that their characteristics, whether structural or functional, can only be understood by tracing out their origin and history. And it further teaches us that the properties of every aggregate result from the properties of its ultimate elements, which, within the limits of our experience, remain absolutely unchanged. Now, Aristotle taught very nearly the contrary of all this. He believed that the Cosmos, as we now know it, had existed, and would continue to exist, unchanged through all eternity. The sun, moon, planets, and stars, together with the orbs containing them, are composed of an absolutely ungenerable, incorruptible substance. The earth, a cold, heavy, solid sphere, though liable to superficial changes, has always occupied its present position in the centre of the universe. The specific forms of animal life —except a few which are produced spontaneously—have, in like manner, been preserved unaltered through an infinite series of generations. Man shares the common lot. There is no continuous progress of civilization. Every invention and discovery has been made and lost an infinite number of times. Our philosopher could not, of course, deny that individual living things come into existence and gradually grow to maturity; but he insists that their formation is teleologically determined by the parental type which they are striving to realize. He asks whether we should study a thing by examining how it grows, or by examining its completed form: and Mr. Wallace quotes the question without quoting the answer.* Aristotle tells us that the genetic method was followed by his predecessors, but that the other method is his. And he goes on to censure Empedocles for saying that many things in the animal body are due simply to mechanical causation; for example, the segmented structure of the backbone, which that philosopher attributes to continued doubling and twisting—the very same explanation, we believe, that would be given of it by a modern evolutionist.† Finally, Aristotle assumes the only sort of transformation which we deny, and which Democritus equally denied—that is to say, the transformation of the ultimate elements into one another by the oscillation of an indeterminate matter between opposite qualities.

* *Outlines*, p. 30.

† There is a passage in the *Politics* (i. 2, *sub. in.*) in which Aristotle distinctly inculcates the method of studying things by observing how they are first produced, and how they grow; but this is quite inconsistent with the more deliberate opinion referred to in the text (*De Part An.* i. 1, p. 640, a. 10). Perhaps in writing the first book of the *Politics* he was more immediately under the influence of Plato, who preferred the old genetic method in practice, though not in theory.

The truth is that while our philosopher had one of the most powerful intellects ever possessed by any man, it was an intellect strictly limited to the surface of things. He was utterly incapable of divining the hidden forces by which inorganic nature and life and human society are moved. He had neither the genius which can reconstruct the past, nor the genius which partly moulds, partly foretells the future. But wherever he has to observe or to report, to enumerate or to analyse, to describe or to define, to classify or to compare; and whatever be the subject, a mollusc, or a mammal, a mouse, or an elephant; the structure and habits of wild animals; the different stages in the development of an embryo bird; the variations of a single organ or function through the entire zoological series; the hierarchy of intellectual faculties; the laws of mental association; the specific types of virtuous character; the relation of equity to law; the relation of reason to impulse; the ideals of friendship; the different members of a household; the different orders in a State; the possible variations of political constitutions, or within the same constitution; the elements of dramatic or epic poetry; the modes of predication; the principles of definition, classification, judgment, and reasoning; the different systems of philosophy; all varieties of passion, all motives to action, all sources of conviction;—there we find an enormous accumulation of knowledge, an unwearied patience of research, a sweep of comprehension, a subtlety of discrimination, an accuracy of statement, an impartiality of decision, and an all-absorbing enthusiasm for science, which, if they do not raise him to the supreme level of creative genius, entitle him to rank a very little way below it.

It was natural that one who ranged with such consummate mastery over the whole world of apparent reality, should believe in no other reality; that for him truth should only mean the systematization of sense and language, of opinion, and of thought. The visible order of Nature was present to his imagination in such precise determination and fulness of detail that it resisted any attempt he might have made to conceive it under a different form. Each of his conclusions was supported by analogies from every other department of inquiry, because he carried the peculiar limitations of his thinking faculty with him wherever he turned, and unconsciously accommodated every subject to the framework which it imposed. The clearness of his ideas necessitated the use of sharply-drawn distinctions, which prevented the free play of generalization and fruitful interchange of principles between the different sciences. And we shall have occasion to show hereafter, that when he attempted to combine rival theories, it was done by placing them in juxtaposition rather than by mutual inter-penetration. Again, with his vivid perceptions, it was

impossible for him to believe in the justification of any method claiming to supersede, or even to supplement, their authority. Hence he was hardly less opposed to the atomism of Democritus than to the scepticism of Protagoras or the idealism of Plato. Hence, also, his dislike for all explanations which assumed that there were hidden processes at work below the surface of things, even taking surface in its most literal sense. Thus, in discussing the question why the sea is salt, he will not accept the theory that rivers dissolve out the salt from the strata through which they pass, and carry it down to the sea, because river-water tastes fresh; and propounds in its stead the utterly false hypothesis of a dry saline evaporation from the earth's surface, which he supposes to be swept seawards by the wind.* Even in his own especial province of natural history the same tendency leads him astray. He asserts that a spider throws off its web from the surface of its body like a skin, instead of from within, as Democritus had taught.† The same thinker endeavoured to prove by analogical reasoning that the invertebrate animals must have viscera, and that only their extreme minuteness prevents us from perceiving them; a view which his successor will not admit.‡ In fact, wherever the line between the visible and the invisible is crossed, Aristotle's powers are suddenly paralysed, as if by enchantment.

Another circumstance which led Aristotle to disregard the happy *aperçus* of earlier philosophers was his vast superiority to them in positive knowledge. It never occurred to him that their sagacity might be greater than his, precisely because its exercise was less impeded by the labour of acquiring and retaining such immense masses of irrelevant facts. And his confidence was still further enhanced by the conviction that all previous systems were absorbed into his own, their scattered truths co-ordinated, their aberrations corrected, and their discords reconciled. But in striking a general average of existing philosophies, he was in reality bringing them back to that anonymous philosophy which is embodied in common language and common opinion. And if he afterwards ruled the minds of men with a more despotic sway than any other intellectual master, it was because he gave an organized expression to the principle of authority, which, if it could, would stereotype and perpetuate the existing type of civilization for all time.

Here, then, are three main points of distinction between our philosopher and his precursors, the advantage being, so far, entirely on their side. He did not, like the Ionian physiologists,

---

* *Meteor.* ii. 3, 357, a. 15 ff. † *Hist. An.* ix. 39, *sub. fin.*
‡ *De Part An.* iii. 4, *sub. in.*

anticipate in outline our theories of evolution. He held that the Cosmos had always been, by the strictest necessity, arranged in the same manner; the starry revolutions never changing; the four elements preserving a constant balance; the earth always solid; land and water always distributed according to their present proportions; living species transmitting the same unalterable type through an infinite series of generations; the human race enjoying an eternal duration, but from time to time losing all its conquests in some great physical catastrophe, and obliged to begin over again with the depressing consciousness that nothing could be devised which had not been thought of an infinite number of times already; the existing distinctions between Hellenes and barbarians, masters and slaves, men and women, grounded on everlasting necessities of Nature. He did not, like Democritus, distinguish between objective and subjective properties of matter; nor admit that void space extends to infinity round the starry sphere, and honeycombs the objects which seem most incompressible and continuous to our senses. He did not hope, like Socrates, for the regeneration of the individual, nor, like Plato, for the regeneration of the race by enlightened thought. It seemed as if Philosophy, abdicating her high function, and obstructing the paths which she had first opened, was now content to systematize the forces of prejudice, blindness, immobility, and despair.

For the restrictions under which Aristotle thought were not determined by his personality alone; they followed on the logical development of speculation, and would have imposed themselves on any other thinker equally capable of carrying that development to its predetermined goal. The Ionian search for a primary cause and substance of Nature led to the distinction, made almost simultaneously, although from opposite points of view, by Parmenides and Heracleitus, between appearance and reality. From that distinction sprang the idea of mind, organized by Socrates into a systematic study of ethics and dialectics. Time and space, the necessary conditions of physical causality, were eliminated from a method having for its form the eternal relations of difference and resemblance, for its matter the present interests of humanity. Socrates taught that before inquiring whence things come we must first determine what it is they are. Hence he reduced science to the framing of exact definitions. Plato followed on the same track, and refused to answer a single question about anything until the subject of investigation had been clearly determined. But the form of causation had taken such a powerful hold on Greek thought, that it could not be immediately shaken off, and Plato, as he devoted more and more attention to the material universe, found himself compelled, like the older

philosophers, to explain its construction by tracing out the history of its growth. What is even more significant, he applied the same method to ethics and politics, finding it easier to describe how the various virtues and types of social union came into existence, than to analyse and classify them as fixed ideas without reference to time. Again, while taking up the Eleatic antithesis of reality and appearance, and re-interpreting it as a distinction between noumena and phenomena, ideas and sensations, spirit and matter, he was impelled by the necessity of explaining himself, and by the actual limitations of experience, to assimilate the two opposing series, or, at least, to view the fleeting, superficial images as a reflection and adumbration of the being which they concealed. And of all material objects, it seemed as if the heavenly bodies, with their orderly, unchanging movements, their clear brilliant light, and their remoteness from earthly impurities, best represented the philosopher's ideal. Thus, Plato, while on the one side he reaches back to the pre-Socratic age, on the other reaches forward to the Aristotelian system.

Nor was this all. As the world of sense was coming back into favour, the world of reason was falling into disrepute. Just as the old physical philosophy had been decomposed by the sophisticism of Protagoras and Gorgias, so also the dialectic of Socrates was corrupted into the sophistry of Eubulides and Euthydêmus. Plato himself discovered that by reasoning deductively from purely abstract premises contradictory conclusions could be established with apparently equal force. It was difficult to see how a decision could be arrived at except by appealing to the testimony of sense. And a moral reform could hardly be effected except by similarly taking into account the existing beliefs and customs of mankind.

It is possible, we think, to trace a similar evolution in the history of the Attic drama. The tragedies of Æschylus resemble the old Ionian philosophy in this, that they are filled with material imagery, and that they deal with remote interests, remote times, and remote places. Sophocles withdraws his action into the subjective sphere, and simultaneously works out a pervading contrast between the illusions by which men are either lulled to false security or racked with needless anguish, and the terrible or consolatory reality to which they finally awaken. We have also, in his well-known irony, in the unconscious self-betrayal of his characters, that subtle evanescent allusiveness to a hidden truth, that gleaming of reality through appearance which constitutes, first the dialectic, then the mythical illustration, and finally the physics of Plato. In Æschylus also we have the spectacle of sudden and violent vicissitudes, the abasement of insolent prosperity, and the punishment of long

successful crime; only with him the characters who attract most interest are not the blind victims, but the accomplices or the confidants of destiny, who, like Prometheus, Darius, Eteocles, Clytemnestra, and Cassandra, stand on a higher level because the secrets of past and future are disclosed to their gaze. Far otherwise with Sophocles. The leading actors in his most characteristic works, Œdipus, Electra, Dejanira, Ajax, and Philoctêtes are surrounded by forces which they can neither control nor understand; moving in a world of illusion, if they help to work out their own destinies it is unconsciously, or even in direct opposition to their own designs.* Hence in Æschylus we have something like that superb self-confidence which distinguishes a Parmenides and a Heracleitus; in Sophocles that confession of human ignorance which the Athenian philosophers made on their own behalf, or strove to extract from others. Euripides introduces us to another mode of thought, more akin to that which characterizes Aristotle. For, although there is abundance of mystery in his tragedies, it has not the profound religious significance of the Sophoclean irony; he uses it rather for romantic and sentimental purposes, for the construction of an intricate plot, or for the creation of pathetic situations. His whole power is thrown into the immediate and detailed representation of living passion, and of the surroundings in which it is displayed, without going far back into its historical antecedents like Æschylus, or, like Sophocles, into the divine purposes which underlie it. On the other hand, as a Greek writer could not be other than philosophical, he uses particular incidents as an occasion for wide generalizations and dialectical discussions; these, and not the idea of justice or of destiny, being the pedestal on which his figures are set. And it may be noticed as another curious coincidence that, like Aristotle again, he is disposed to criticize his predecessors, or at least one of them, Æschylus, with some degree of asperity.

The critical tendency just alluded to suggests one more reason why philosophy, from having been a method of discovery, should at last become a mere method of description and arrangement. The materials accumulated by nearly three centuries of observation and reasoning were so enormous that they began to stifle the imaginative faculty. If there was any opening for originality it lay in the task of carrying order into this chaos by reducing it to a few general heads, by mapping out the whole field of knowledge, and subjecting each particular branch to the new-found processes of definition and classification. And along with the

* This characterization applies neither to the *Antigone* nor to the *Œdipus at Colônus*, the first and the last extant dramas of Sophocles. The reason is that the one is still half Æschylean, and the other distinctly an imitation of Euripides.

incapacity for framing new theories there arose a desire to diminish the number of those already existing, to frame, if possible, a system capable of selecting and combining whatever was good in any or all of them.

This, then, was the revolution effected by Aristotle, that he found Greek thought in the form of a solid, and unrolled into a surface of the utmost possible tenuity, transparency, and extension. In so doing he completed what Socrates and Plato had begun, he paralleled the course already described by Greek poetry, and he offered the first example of what since then has more than once recurred in the history of philosophy. It was thus that the residual substance of Locke and Berkeley was resolved into phenomenal succession by Hume. It was thus that the unexplained reality of Kant and Fichte was drawn out into a play of logical relations by Hegel. And, if we may venture on a forecast of the future towards which speculation is now advancing, it is thus that the limits imposed on human knowledge by positivists and agnostics in our own day, are yielding to the criticism of those who wish to establish either a perfect identity or a perfect equation between consciousness and being. This is the position represented in France by M. Taine, a thinker offering many points of resemblance to Aristotle, which it would be interesting to work out had we space at our command for the purpose. The forces which are now guiding English philosophy in an analogous direction have hitherto escaped observation on account of their disunion among themselves, and their intermixture with others of a different character. But on the whole we may say that the philosophy of Mill and his school corresponds very nearly in its practical idealism to Plato's teaching; that Mr. Herbert Spencer approaches Aristotle on the side of theorizing systematization, while sharing to a more limited extent the metaphysical and political realism which accompanied it; that Lewes was carrying the same transformation a step further in his unfinished *Problems of Life and Mind*; that the philosophy of Mr. Shadworth Hodgson is marked by the same spirit of actuality, though not without a vista of multitudinous possibilities in the background; that the Neo-Hegelian school are trying to do over again for us what their master did in Germany; and that the lamented Professor Clifford had already given promise of one more great attempt to widen the area of our possible experience into co-extension with the whole domain of Nature.

The systematizing power of Aristotle, his faculty for bringing the isolated parts of a surface into co-ordination and continuity, is apparent even in those sciences with whose material truths he was utterly unacquainted. Apart from the falseness of their

fundamental assumptions, his scientific treatises are, for their time, master-pieces of method. In this respect they far surpass his moral and metaphysical works, and they are also written in a much more vigorous style, occasionally even rising into eloquence. He evidently moves with much more assurance on the solid ground of external nature than in the cloudland of Platonic dialectics, or among the possibilities of an ideal morality. If, for example, we open his *Physics* we shall find such notions as Causation, Infinity, Matter, Space, Time, Motion, and Force, for the first time in history, separately discussed, defined, and made the foundation of natural philosophy. The treatise *On the Heavens* very properly regards the celestial movements as a purely mechanical problem, and strives throughout to bring theory and practice into complete agreement. While directly contradicting the truths of modern astronomy, it stands on the same ground with them; and anyone who had mastered it would be far better prepared to receive those truths than if he was only acquainted with such a work as Plato's *Timæus*. The remaining portions of Aristotle's scientific encyclopædia follow in perfect logical order, and correspond very nearly to Auguste Comte's classification, if indeed they did not directly or indirectly suggest it. We cannot, however, view the labours of Aristotle with unmixed satisfaction until he comes on to deal with the provinces of natural history, comparative anatomy, and comparative psychology. Here, as we have shown, the subject exactly suited the comprehensive observation and systematizing formalism in which he excelled. Here, accordingly, not only the method but the matter of his teaching is good. In theorizing about the causes of phenomena he was behind the best science of his age; in dissecting the phenomena themselves he was far before it. Of course very much of what he tells was learned at second-hand, and some of it is not authentic. But to collect such masses of information from the reports of uneducated hunters, fishermen, grooms, shepherds, beemasters, and the like, required an extraordinary power of putting pertinent questions, such as could only be acquired in the school of Socratic dialectic. Nor should we omit to notice the vivid intelligence which enabled even ordinary Greeks to supply him with the facts required for his generalizations. But some of the most important researches must be entirely original. For instance, he must have traced the development of the embryo chicken with his own eyes; and here we have it on good authority that his observations are remarkable for their accuracy, in a field where accuracy, according to Caspar Friedrich Wolff, is almost impossible.*

* Aristotle's *Von d. Zeugung u. Entwickelung d. Thiere* Aubert u. Wimmer, Einleitung, p. 15.

Still more important than these observations themselves is the great truth he derives from them—since rediscovered and worked out in detail by Von Baer—that in the development of each individual the generic characters make their appearance before the specific characters.* Nor is this a mere accidental or isolated remark, but, as we shall show on another occasion, intimately connected with one of the philosopher's metaphysical theories. Although not an evolutionist, he has made other contributions to biology, the importance of which has been first realized in the light of the evolution theory. Thus he notices the antagonism between individuation and reproduction;† the connection of increased size with increased vitality;‡ the connection of greater mobility,§ and of greater intelligence,‖ with increased complexity of structure; the physiological division of labour in the higher animals;¶ the formation of heterogeneous organs out of homogeneous tissues;** the tendency towards greater centralization in the higher organisms††—a remark connected with his two great anatomical discoveries, the central position of the heart in the vascular system, and the possession of a backbone by all red-blooded animals;‡‡ the resemblance of animal intelligence to a rudimentary human intelligence, especially as manifested in children;§§ and, finally, he attempts to trace a continuous series of gradations connecting the inorganic with the organic world, plants with animals, and the lower animals with man.‖‖

The last mentioned principle gives one more illustration of the distinction between Aristotle's system and that of the evolutionist, properly so called. The continuity recognized by the former only obtains among a number of coexisting types; it is a purely logical or ideal arrangement, facilitating the acquisition and retention of knowledge, but adding nothing to its real content. The continuity of the latter implies a causal connexion between successive types evolved from each other by the action of mechanical forces. Moreover, our modern theory, while accounting for whatever is true in Aristotle's conception, serves, at the same time, to correct its exaggeration. The totality of existing species only imperfectly fill up the interval between the highest human life and the inorganic matter from which we assume it to be derived, because they are collaterally, and not lineally,

* *De Gen. An.* ii. 3, 736, b. 1.
† *Ibid.* i. 18, 725, b. 25.
‡ *De Respir.* 477, a. 18.
§ *De Part. An.* iv. 7, *sub. in.*
‖ *Ibid.* ii. 10, 656, a. 4.
¶ *Ibid.* iv. 6, 683, a. 25.
** *Ibid.* ii. 1.
†† *Ibid.* iv. 5, 682, a. 8; *De Long.* 6, 467, a. 18; *De Ingr. An.* 7, 707, a. 24.
‡‡ *De Part. An.* ii. 9, 654, b. 11; Zeller, 522.
§§ *Hist. An.* viii. 1, *sub. in.*
‖‖ Zeller, 553.

related. Probably no one of them corresponds to any less developed stage of another, although some have preserved, with more constancy than others, the features of a common parent. In diverging from a single stock (if we accept the monogenetic hypothesis), they have become separated by considerable spaces, which the innumerable multitude of extinct species alone could fill up.

Here, for the present, we must pause. So far, we have been engaged in studying the mind of Aristotle rather than his system of philosophy. On another occasion we shall attempt to give a more complete account of that system in its internal organization not less than in its relations to modern science and modern thought.

---

## Art. II.—Island Life.

*Island Life—or The Phenomena and Causes of Insular Faunas and Floras—Including a Revision and attempted Solution of the Problem of Geological Climates.* By Alfred Russel Wallace.

AN essentially modern problem, which may be described as still awaiting solution, is that which concerns the origin and distribution of life upon our globe. The theory of Darwin, that all animal life is the result of the development of a few protoplasmic germs, aided by natural and sexual selection, is now generally accepted by men of science, as that which most nearly meets the requirements of recent discoveries in geology and zoology, elucidating, to a certain extent, the perplexing facts in the history of long buried, and as yet only imperfectly recovered records, preserved for us in the rocks and gravels beneath our feet; as well as those which every student of anatomy and embryology must encounter in the course of his studies. For it has come to be acknowledged that animal and vegetable life as at present existing, cannot be separated by a vast gulf, as was once supposed, from the former life of our planet, but that in many instances, fossil forms, only slightly modified, are found to exist as living species in remote regions, where they have remained undisturbed by that struggle for existence, which has caused the extinction of so many species, not only in early geologic but even in modern epochs.

It is this fact which renders the study of Island Life peculiarly interesting and instructive, for it is obvious that islands, separated as most of them are, by many hundreds of miles of deep sea

from the nearest continent, would be less likely to be overrun by new species than the continents—connected as all of these are by isthmuses, or separated by straits so narrow, as to offer no insuperable obstacle to the emigration of some species—and would, therefore, be more likely to retain the animal and vegetable forms received in the first instance, either through ancient connection with some continent, or by some accidental trans-oceanic emigration from distant lands, repeated from time to time.*

The difficulties which beset an enquiry such as that undertaken by Mr. Wallace, may be better appreciated by a brief reference to two or three of the singular facts which present themselves in the geographical distribution of animals.

It would be natural to suppose that the animal and vegetable life of islands would in all cases resemble that of the nearest continent, slightly modified perhaps by changes in the environment, and always wanting in such of the larger mammals as were unable to cross the intervening seas. But although this holds good to a certain extent with regard to some of those islands classified by Mr. Wallace as continental, it is by no means universally the case. The most noteworthy perhaps of the islands as regards the anomalous character of its fauna and flora is Madagascar, which, judging from its position we should look upon as peculiarly and exclusively African, and yet we find that although it possesses *some* African forms, yet the majority of its fauna and flora resemble more nearly American and West Indian forms, with affinities in the Miocene fauna and flora of Europe and Asia. Again the peculiarities of the fauna and flora of Australia are well known, but the nearest congeners of the curious marsupial mammals of that antipodean land are found among the fossil remains of Europe, whilst as Mr. Wallace says:—

"Let an inhabitant of Australia sail to New Zealand, a distance of less than thirteen hundred miles, and he will find himself in a country whose productions are totally unlike those of his own. Kangaroos and wombats there are none, the birds are almost all entirely new, insects are very scarce and quite unlike the handsome or strange Australian forms, while even the vegetation is all changed, and no gum-tree or wattle, or grass-tree meets the traveller's eye."†

* "There are," says Sir Joseph Hooker, "only two possible hypotheses to account for the stocking of an oceanic island with plants from a continent; either seeds were carried across the ocean by currents, or the winds, or birds, or similar agencies; or the islands once formed part of the continent and the plants spread over intermediate land that has since disappeared."—*Lecture on Insular Floras*, by Sir J. D. HOOKER.

† "Island Life," p. 4.

That mere proximity does not cause identity in the productions of adjacent islands is shown in many instances, the most remarkable perhaps, being that of the islands of Bali and Lombok in the Malay archipelago, separated by a strait only fifteen miles wide at its narrowest part.

"Yet these islands differ far more from each other in their birds and quadrupeds than do England and Japan. The birds of the one are extremely *unlike* those of the other, the difference being such as to strike even the most ordinary observer. Bali has red and green woodpeckers, barbets, weaver-birds, and black and white magpie robins, none of which are found in Lombok, where, however, we find screaming cockatoos and friar-birds, and the strange mound-building magapodes, which are all equally unknown in Bali. Many of the kingfishers, crow-shrikes, and other birds, though of the same general form, are of very distinct species; and although a considerable number of birds are the same in both islands, the difference is none the less remarkable—as proving that mere distance is one of the least important of the causes which have determined the likeness or unlikeness in the animals of different countries."*

These two islands have long been associated with Mr. Wallace's name, the strait which divides them having been termed Wallace's line, remarkable as cutting off abruptly the fauna and flora of the Malay archipelago from that of the Australian continent and islands, the most singular point about this sudden change being the diversity in the *birds* of the two islands, because of all terrestrial creatures birds would seem to possess the greatest facilities for locomotion, and to most of them fifteen miles would be only a short flight. Nevertheless it is one of the curious and anomalous facts brought to our notice in this inquiry, that those creatures which seem the least capable of wide distribution are exactly those which are most cosmopolitan; such are beetles and land shells, which, although they may be few in number and peculiar in species on some of the islands, yet have commonly affinities in every part of the world. Mr. Wallace shows also that *climate* has less to do with changes in fauna and flora than is usually supposed. He says:—

"Hot countries usually differ from cold ones in all their organic forms; but the difference is by no means constant, nor does it bear any proportion to difference of temperature. Between frigid Canada and sub-tropical Florida, there are less marked differences in the animal productions than between Florida and Cuba, or Yucatan, so much more alike in climate, and so much nearer together. So the differences between the birds and quadrupeds of temperate Tasmania

* "Island Life," p. 4.

and tropical North Australia, are slight and unimportant as compared with the enormous differences we find when we pass from the latter country to equally tropical Java."*

These are only a few of the instances given by Mr. Wallace to prove that neither distance, nor difference of climate can be looked upon as a guide in tracing the distribution of animal and plant life on the globe, and if we look to geology to help us the task appears to become still more complicated, since the nearest congeners of the peculiar fauna and flora of the Australian continent are found in the Miocene deposits of Europe, whilst the ancestors of the horse and camel are specific to America, where neither existed at the date of the visit of Columbus.

But notwithstanding the anomalies of distribution apparently so numerous, it has been found possible and convenient to map out the world into various zoological regions, corresponding to a certain extent with the geographical regions, the classification now generally adopted being that of Mr. Sclater, which is as follows:—

| *Region.* | *Geographical Equivalent.* |
|---|---|
| Palæarctic . . . | Europe with north temperate Africa and Asia. |
| Ethiopian . . . | Africa (south of the Sahara), with Madagascar. |
| Oriental . . . | Tropical Asia to Philippines and Java. |
| Australian. . . | Australia with Pacific Islands, Moluccas, &c. |
| Nearctic . . . | North America to North Mexico. |
| Neotropical . . | South America with tropical North America and West Indies. |

These regions, although they may to a certain extent overlap just at the boundaries, yet mark out fairly the present divisions in the distribution of animal life on the globe; but, as may be seen from the instances we have noticed above, these divisions cannot be extended beyond the present or most recent geological period, since if we go back to the Miocene, not only do we find great changes in the distribution of existing species, but an abundance of strange forms, having at present no representatives. Now, the two things requisite to reconcile these facts with the Darwinian theory, would seem to be, enormous changes in the distribution of land and water, and unlimited time. We are, therefore, somewhat startled to find that Mr. Wallace, who is not only a devout believer in the Darwinian theory, but a fellow-worker and co-discoverer with Mr. Darwin of the important bearing of the theory of evolution upon the origin of species, should to a certain extent deny the necessity for both these factors, commencing his inquiries by declaring his belief in the fixity of the great con-

* "Island Life," p. 5.

tinents, and announcing that, according to his judgment, the time required by geologists for the formation of strata is much too long. It is true that when we come to examine what he means by the permanence of the continental areas, we are somewhat reminded of the sailor's knife, which, after having had two new handles and three new blades, was yet cherished as the original knife, for he says,—

"It will be observed that the very same evidence which has been adduced to prove the *general* stability and permanence of our continental areas, also goes to prove that they have been subjected to wonderful and repeated changes in *detail.* Every square mile of their surface has been again and again under water, sometimes a few hundred feet deep, sometimes perhaps several thousands. Lakes and inland seas have been formed, have been filled up with sediment, and been subsequently raised into hills, or even mountains. Arms of the sea have existed, crossing the continents in various directions, and thus completely isolating the divided portions for varying intervals. Seas have been changed into deserts and deserts into seas. Volcanoes have grown into mountains, have been degraded and sunk beneath the ocean, have been covered with sedimentary deposits, and again raised up into mountain ranges; while other mountains have been formed by the upraised coral reefs of inland seas. The mountains of one period have disappeared by denudation or subsidence, while the mountains of the succeeding period have been rising from beneath the waves. The valleys, the ravines, and the mountain peaks have been carved out and filled up again; and all the vegetable forms which clothe the earth and furnish food for the various classes of animals have been completely changed again and again."*

It would, therefore, seem that all that Mr. Wallace means by the *Permanence of Continents* is, that large masses of land have always existed in the northern hemisphere, corresponding to a certain extent with the present continents, and having extensions southwards, resembling the Africa and South America of our present epoch. Mr. Wallace entirely rejects the idea of the existence of the fabled Atlantis, so firmly believed in by philosophers of old, and which has its adherents even in our own day; and he is still more sceptical with regard to the hypothetical Lemuria, which has found favour with many excellent geologists and naturalists of the modern school; nevertheless, in accounting for the facts of the distribution of life upon oceanic islands, he is obliged to enlarge the present area of most of those now isolated, and to hypothesize the existence of other large islands, serving as stepping-stones to continents, or to other islands; but such islands could never have served as stepping-

* "Island Life," p. 99.

stones to mammals, or even to birds, since, according to Mr. Wallace's own showing, fifteen miles of deep sea has been a sufficient barrier in the islands of Bali and Lombok to prevent any interchange of mammals; whilst even with the extension allowed to existing lands, there must have been in most cases a far greater width of deep-sea between the islands and the mainland than in that typical example. It is certainly true that most oceanic islands are destitute of warm-blooded terrestrial mammals, but many of them possess reptiles, birds, and insects, the migration of which over deep seas appears almost as impossible as that of the larger mammalia; and, indeed, in accounting for the poverty of the British Islands in mammalia and reptiles as compared with the European continent, to which they were doubtless at one time united, Mr. Wallace says:—

"When England became continental, these entered our country; but sufficient time does not seem to have elapsed for the immigration to have been completed, before subsidence again occurred, cutting off the further influx of purely terrestrial animals, and leaving us without the number of species which our favourable climate and varied surface entitle us to. To this cause we must impute our comparative poverty in mammalia and reptiles—more marked in the latter than the former owing to their lower vital activity and *smaller powers of dispersal*."*

It therefore seems difficult to account for the existence of gigantic tortoises, lizards, and snakes on the Galapagos Islands, which are 600 miles from the coast of South America—a sea-depth of 2,000 to 3,000 fathoms intervening. Yet these reptiles are all supposed to have been derived from the American continent. There are also two species of lizards in the Sandwich Islands; but since Mr. Wallace denies the possibility of these oceanic islands ever having formed part of a continent, he is obliged to account for these and similar anomalies by chance migrations, aided by storms and oceanic currents.

In this theory of the permanence of existing continents and oceans, Mr. Wallace would appear to stand almost alone among geologists and naturalists; and it is easy to point out discrepancies in his arguments; nevertheless, it is fair to him to acknowledge that his views seem to be in general accordance with those of Darwin, and to be corroborated, to a certain extent, by the recent investigations of the *Challenger*, for in the recently published "Report of the Scientific Results of the Exploring Voyage of H.M.S. *Challenger*," vol. i., treating of that curious and interesting abyssal fauna which appears to occupy all ocean depths from 500 or 600 fathoms to the bottom, and to be of vast antiquity and great uniformity, Sir Wyville Thomson remarks:—

* "Island Life," p. 319.

"I suppose I am now entitled to regard the view as widely accepted by geologists, that the age of the most obvious depressions in the crust of the earth which are now filled by the sea is much greater than we were at one time led to believe. I long ago expressed the opinion that the primary meridional grooves of the earth's crust dated from its original cooling; whether this be so or not there seems to be sufficient evidence that all changes of level since the close of the palæozoic period are in direct relation to the present coast-lines. There does not seem to be a shadow of reason for supposing that the gently undulating plains, extending for over a hundred millions of square miles at a depth of two thousand five hundred fathoms beneath the surface of the sea, and presenting like the land their local areas of secular elevation and depression, and their centres of more active volcanic disturbance were *ever* raised, at all events in mass, above the level of the sea; such an arrangement indeed is inconceivable. If, then, such a condition did not at any time exist, a continuous ocean must always have extended over the greater part of the earth's surface, and must have occupied continuously any secular areas of depression due to the assumption by the world of its present physical features."*

To this subject we shall return later, but will now proceed to speak of Geological time, the second point upon which Mr. Wallace's views are at variance with those of most geologists. Basing his arguments upon the calculations of physicists, and particularly on those of Sir William Thomson and Dr. Croll, as to the rate of the primary cooling of the earth's crust, which both these eminent men agree cannot have extended beyond 400 millions of years, Mr. Wallace proceeds to calculate the time required for the formation of the various sedimentary strata, and the rate of organic change on the surface of the earth; and considering that these must have been greatly accelerated by changes of climate, brought about by the varying excentricity of the earth's orbit, combined with the precession of the equinoxes, he fixes the "height of the glacial epoch at the period of high excentricity which occurred 200,000 years back, and that the next great period of very high excentricity, 850,000 years ago, fell within the Miocene epoch." "An earlier epoch of great altitude in the Alps, coinciding with the very high excentricity 2,500,000 years ago, may have caused the local glaciation of the middle Eocene period, when the enormous erratics of the Flysch conglomerate were deposited in the inland seas of Northern Switzerland, the Carpathians, and the Apennines."† Thus he estimates the duration of the Tertiary epoch at about four million years, and allows sixteen million years as the time elapsed since the

* "Report of the Scientific Results of the Exploring Voyage of H.M.S. *Challenger*," vol. i. p. 46.

† "Island Life," p. 165.

Cambrian, according to Lyell, or sixty, according to Dana, and he believes the mean between these authorities—twenty-eight million years—to represent nearly the time, as calculated from the rate of denudation and deposition, at the same time reminding us that an approximation only can be attempted in a calculation such as this, adding—

"The only value of such estimates is to define our notions of geological time, and to show that the enormous periods, of hundreds of millions of years, which have sometimes been indicated by geologists are neither necessary nor warranted by the facts at our command; while the present result places us more in harmony with the calculations of physicists by leaving a very wide margin between geological time, as defined by the fossiliferous rocks, and that far more extensive period which includes all possibility of life upon the earth."*

Twenty or twenty-eight millions of years, to those who have been accustomed to the six thousand of the Hebrew cosmogony as interpreted by Usher, would seem a time incomprehensible and altogether excessive, but calculated by the theories of evolutionists, it appears an inconveniently narrow estimate. It is true that if we deduct twenty-eight millions from the one hundred million years which Sir William Thomson gives as his estimate of the probable age of the earth, we shall find seventy-two millions reserved for the period of chaos and the slow development of the low forms of life of the Cambrian; nevertheless, when we look around us and see the innumerable forms of life, both animal and vegetable, at present existing and mentally add to these the prolific forms of the various geological periods, most of which after playing a lengthened *rôle* in the ever ascending scale of animated beings have gradually died out, we feel ourselves forced to the conclusion, that if all these have been developed from a few primal germs, originating, no one knows how, within twenty-eight millions of years, they must have been supplemented, not once but many times by more highly organized forms from disrupted planets, in Sir William Thomson's far famed meteorites.

It would perhaps be well to note here the vast difference which exists between the estimate of Mr. Wallace and that of the most celebrated geologists as quoted by him. Sir Charles Lyell basing his calculation upon the rate of modification of the species of mollusca, gives two hundred and forty millions of years as his estimate of time since the Cambrian period. Professor Haughton gives two hundred millions of years as the time denoted by the formation of stratified rocks, whilst Darwin, in the first edition of the "Origin of Species" estimated that the erosion of the Wealden Valley must have taken three hundred millions of years.

* "Island Life," p. 228.

It would seem to us, therefore, that Mr. Wallace, in limiting the age of the stratified rocks in obedience to the requirements of the physicists, strikes a heavy blow at his own doctrines. The physicists are men, and as such are as liable to error as geologists, and there is no reason why their estimate "Of the possible sources of the heat of the sun and calculations of the period during which the earth can have been cooling to bring about the present rate of increase of temperature as we descend below the surface,"* may not be as erroneous as Mr. Wallace supposes the calculations of our best geologists to be, as to the rate of deposition of the sedimentary rocks. Darwin and Huxley both demand vast periods for the development of the numerous forms of life, and Mr. Wallace quotes the address of the latter to the Geological Society in 1870 as follows:—

"Professor Huxley adduced a number of special cases showing that, on the theory of development, almost all the higher forms of life must have existed during the Palæozoic period. Thus, from the fact that almost the whole of the tertiary period has been required to convert the ancestral Orohippus into the true horse, he believes that, in order to have time for the much greater change of the ancestral Ungulata into the two great odd-toed and even-toed divisions (of which change there is no trace even among the earliest eocene mammals), we should require a large portion, if not the whole, of the mesozoic or secondary period. Another case is furnished by the bats and whales, both of which strange modifications of the mammalian type occur perfectly developed in the Eocene formation. What countless ages back must we then go for the origin of these groups, the whales from some ancestral carnivorous animal, and the bats from the insectivora. And even then we have to seek for the common origin of carnivora, insectivora, ungulata, and marsupials at a far earlier period; so that on the lowest estimate we must place the origin of the mammalia very far back in Palæozoic times."

Again—

"If the very small differences which are observable between the crocodiles of the older secondary formations and those of the present day, furnish any sort of an approximation towards an estimate of the average rate of change among reptiles, it is almost appalling to reflect how far back in Palæozoic times we must go before we can hope to arrive at that common stock from which the crocodiles, lizards, Ornithoscelida, and Pleiosauria—which had attained so great a development in the Triastic epoch—must have been derived."

Again Mr. Wallace quotes Professor Ramsay, who, speaking of

* "Island Life" p. 203.

the "abundant, varied, and well-developed fauna of the Cambrian period," says:

"In this earliest known *varied* life we find no evidence of its having lived near the beginning of the zoological series. In a broad sense compared with what must have gone before, both biologically and physically, all the phenomena connected with this old period seem to my mind to be of quite a recent description, and the climates of seas and lands were of the very same kind as those the world enjoys at the present day."*

A curious comment on these words of Professor Ramsay is to be found in the recent investigations of the *Challenger*, for Sir Wyville Thomson in speaking of the curious abyssal fauna before noticed says:—

"The recent abyssal fauna has a relation to the deep water fauna of the Oolite, the Chalk and Tertiary formations, so close that it is difficult to suppose it, in the main, other than the same fauna which has been subjected to a slow and continuous change under slightly varying circumstances, according to some law, of the nature of which we have not as yet the remotest knowledge. . . . There is every reason to believe that the existing physical conditions of this area date from a very remote period, and that the present fauna of the deep sea may be regarded as being directly descended from fauna which have successively occupied the same deep sea. In the meantime, changes involving lesser depths have been accompanied by the appearance and disappearance of the land and shallow water faunæ of the Jurassic, Cretaceous and Tertiary periods. That the present abyssal fauna is the result of progressive change there can be no room to doubt, but it would seem that in this case the progress has been extremely slow, and that it has been brought about almost in the absence of those causes—such as minor and local oscillations of the crust of the earth producing barriers, and affecting climate—on which we are most inclined to depend for the modification of faunæ. The discovery of the abyssal fauna accordingly, seems to have given us an opportunity of studying a fauna of extreme antiquity, which has arrived at its present condition by a slow process of evolution from which all causes of rapid change have been eliminated."†

Here it will be observed that the antiquity claimed for the present abyssal fauna must be extended to include that of the strictly allied fauna of the Oolite, Chalk and Tertiary periods, which, being so nearly alike, may have lived under similar conditions, that is, in *deep* sea of an equable temperature,

---

* "Island Life," pp. 204, 205: quotations from Huxley's "Address to Geological Society," 1870, and Ramsay "On Comparative Value of Geological Ages as Items of Geological Time," Pro. Royal Soc., 1874.

† "Report of the Scientific Results of the Exploring Voyage of H.M.S. *Challenger* 1873-1876," vol. i. General Conclusions, VIII.

generally only *just* above freezing-point, and unaffected by currents. But if so little change has taken place in deep-sea fauna since times so remote as are indicated by the Oolite and Chalk formations, how many ages back are we to look for the beginnings of this varied life, so slowly changing, which had yet attained so much perfection in Oolitic seas? It would seem impossible to place definite limits, however vast, to that which appears to demand greater expansion with each fresh discovery, and if geological time must be narrowed within the period demanded by physicists, the theory of evolution must either be discarded or greatly modified.* We need scarcely say that the latter alternative is scarcely likely to be accepted, seeing that every new fact in physical science, and every new discovery in Palæontology, only adds fresh proofs to the already abounding evidence in favour of the evolutionary hypothesis. Huxley, in the article upon "Evolution," in the new edition of the "Encyclopædia Britannica," writes:

"No exception is at this time known to the general law that every living thing is evolved from a particle of matter in which no trace of the distinctive characters of the adult form of that living thing is discernible. . . . . How far 'Natural selection' suffices for the production of species, remains to be seen. Few can doubt that if not the whole cause, it is a very important factor in that operation, and that it must play a great part in the sorting out of varieties into those which are transitory and those which are permanent. . . . . The strongest and most conclusive arguments in favour of evolution are those which are based upon the facts of geographical, taken in conjunction with those of geological, distribution. Both Mr. Darwin and Mr. Wallace lay great stress on the close relation which obtains between the existing fauna of any region, and that of the immediately antecedent geological epoch in the same region, and rightly, for it is in truth inconceivable that there should be no generic connection between the two. It is possible to put into words the proposition, that all the animals and plants of each geological epoch were annihilated, and that a new set of very similar forms were created for the next epoch, but it may be doubted if any one who ever tried to form a distinct mental image of this process of spontaneous generation on the grandest scale, ever really succeeded in realizing it."†

---

* It is true that Mr. Wallace considers that geographical and climatic changes have greatly hastened the naturally slow process of evolution, and that Sir Wyville Thomson believes the slow change in the abyssal fauna to be the result of unchanging conditions in deep seas; but this only pushes back to a yet more remote antiquity the origin of these slowly developed forms, and Huxley has shewn, as quoted above, how very slow has been the change in terrestrial faunæ, acted upon as they must have been by geographical and climatic changes.

† "Encyclopædia Britannica," 9th edition, Article, "Evolution."

Sir Wyville Thomson's researches on board the *Challenger* lead him to the same conclusion, he says: "I believe that the study of the abyssal fauna, revealing many delicate chains of structural affinity linking the fauna of the present with that of the past, brings into prominence a new mass of facts morphological, ontological and Palæontological in powerful support of the doctrine of Evolution." Here, however, he parts company with Messrs. Darwin, Huxley, and Wallace, for he adds:—

"On the other hand, it seems to me that in this as in all cases in which it has been possible to bring the question, however remotely, to the test of observation, the character of the abyssal fauna refuses to give the least support to the theory, which refers the evolution of species to extreme variation, guided only by natural selection. Species are just as distinctly marked in the abyssal fauna as elsewhere, each species varying within its definite range as each species appears to have varied at all times past and present. If all the species living on the floor of ocean were, and had always been, in a state of instability, acted upon by external influences and perpetually passing by insensible gradations into other species, it seems certain that the general impressions drawn from a fauna, such as that of the abyssal region, must have been one of indefiniteness and transition. This is not the case. Transition forms, linking species so closely as to cause a doubt as to their limit, are rarely met with. There is usually no difficulty in telling what a thing is."*

Between the theory of evolution guided by some unknown law, as propounded by Sir Wyville Thomson, and evolution aided by natural and sexual selection accentuated by the struggle for existence and survival of the fittest, according to Darwin, we cannot pretend to decide, but it is evident that the former theory would require even longer periods for the production of the results observed, than the latter, and it is well known that the absence of intermediate or transition forms is one of the most serious objections to Mr. Darwin's theory. In the sixth edition of the "Origin of Species," the learned naturalist fully explains the difficulties which beset his theory through the absence of those rich fossiliferous deposits belonging to the assumed earliest periods prior to the Cambrian, and confesses that hitherto no satisfactory reason has been assigned for the deficiency. The geological record is admittedly imperfect, not only because many forms have undoubtedly died out without leaving a trace of their former existence, but also from the small space of the earth's surface as yet systematically and

* "Report of the Scientific Results of the Exploring Voyage of H.M.S. *Challenger.*"

scientifically explored; every year adds to our list of fossils, and the American continent especially has yielded great results to recent investigations, so that each fresh field of exploration may be expected to yield prolific results, and to supply some at least of the many links at present missing from the chain of life. It must not however be forgotten that the greater part of the Tertiary, Secondary and Palæozoic geological strata are of marine, fluviatile, or lacustrine origin, and although they do undoubtedly show to a certain extent the nature of the fauna and flora of the land from which those deposits were derived, they cannot be expected to yield the full total of the terrestrial productions of the period which they represent. The question therefore naturally arises what has become of those ancient continents from which these enormous deposits have been derived? and this brings us back to the question of the "Permanence of Continents."

Mr. Wallace's views upon this subject have been noticed earlier, and the quotation from page 99 of "Island Life" will show how many modifications he is obliged to allow in the shape and dimensions of these early continents to account for the geographical distribution of animals and plants at present existing. He endeavours to prove that the Cretaceous, Oolitic and Silurian deposits could only have been formed "within 50 or 100 miles of then existing continents, or, if at a greater distance, in shallow inland seas receiving deposits from more sides than one, or in certain exceptional areas where deep ocean currents carry the *débris* of land to greater distances.* In this view he appears to be supported not only by the recent investigations of the *Challenger* but by the great authority of Mr. Darwin, who says:

"Looking to existing oceans which are thrice as extensive as the land, we see them studded with many islands; but hardly one truly oceanic island (with the exception of New Zealand, if this can be called a truly oceanic island), is as yet known to afford even a fragment of any Palæozoic or Secondary formation. Hence we may perhaps infer that during the Palæozoic and Secondary periods, neither continents nor continental islands existed where our oceans now extend; for had they existed, Palæozoic and Secondary formations would in all probability have been accumulated from sediment derived from their wear and tear; and these would have been at least partially upheaved by the oscillations of level which must have intervened during these enormously long periods. If then we may infer anything from these facts, we may infer that, where our oceans now extend, oceans have extended from the remotest period of which we have any record; and on the other hand, that where continents now exist, large tracts of

* "Island Life," p. 84.

land have existed, subjected no doubt to great oscillations of level since the Cambrian period."*

But in spite of this great authority we cannot help reiterating the question "What has become of those great land areas which must have furnished the deposits of the sedimentary rocks?" Mr. Darwin to a certain extent answers this question, for he goes on to explain that which is omitted by Mr. Wallace, that prior to the Cambrian period continents may have existed where oceans now spread out.

That even the highest of existing mountains has at some time formed a portion of a deep sea bottom, is testified by the Silurian fossils recently found by Lieutenant Whymper on the top of some of the highest of the Andes, but it must not be forgotten that most of the high peaks of that great range of mountains, as well as those in other parts of the world, are of volcanic origin, like the islands now slowly sinking beneath the waves in the broad Pacific, and therefore the absence of Secondary and Tertiary strata on these islands would not appear to be absolutely conclusive evidence against their having ever formed part of a submerged continent. One thing is evident, if the present balance between land and water is to be maintained, an area of subsidence in one part of the world, must always mean an area of upheaval in some other part. Mr. Wallace's maps, however, appear to us to give everywhere great regions of subsidence, without, as far as we can judge, any corresponding areas of upheaval. The oceanic islands are everywhere sinking, the continental islands have been separated from the mainland by the depression of intervening land, but for all this no compensating upheaval appears to be allowed.

Let us now see how, in the absence of that land connection which most naturalists have deemed essential, Mr. Wallace accounts for the curious anomalies of distribution apparent in island life.† He first takes oceanic islands, that is, islands

* "Origin of Species," 6th edition, p. 288.

† It seems somewhat difficult to follow Mr. Wallace's definition of the permanence of continents, for on page 221 of "Island Life" we read as follows:—"In the first place, every continent, though permanent in a general sense, has been ever subject to innumerable physical and geographical modifications...... But such changes as these must necesarily have led to repeated union and separations of the land masses of the globe, joining together continents which were before divided, and breaking up others into great islands or extensive archipelagoes. Such alterations of the means of transit would probably affect the organic world even more profoundly than the changes of area, of altitude, or of climate, since they afforded the means, at long intervals, of bringing the most diverse forms into competition, and of spreading all the great animal and vegetable types widely over the globe."

This would appear to meet all the requirements of naturalists; but it seems in direct variance with the assertions in other parts of the book as to that permanence of continental and oceanic areas, so much insisted upon.

everywhere surrounded by a deep sea, and therefore apparently never united with a continent. Of these the Azores are first noticed, as having been the most thoroughly explored, the map annexed shows a shallow sea surrounding all the islands of the group so as to make it possible that they were all originally one; although Mr. Wallace does not consider that as probable. They are wholly volcanic, excepting one small island which possesses some Miocene deposits, a fact which Mr. Wallace passes over lightly, as simply proving the group to have been of great antiquity, but does not look upon it as indicating a former union of the group or any considerable extension. The nearest island of the group is about 900 miles from Portugal, the nearest part of Europe, and 550 miles from Madeira. The Islands contain no indigenous mammals, but abound in birds, of which fifty-three species have been observed, thirty-one being either aquatic or waders. All these are common in Europe and North Africa, except three which inhabit Madeira and the Canaries; therefore Mr. Wallace concludes that they are all stragglers, since such are frequently found by vessels in strong gales of wind many hundreds of miles from shore. There are a few butterflies, moths, and Hymenoptera of European origin, whose presence is accounted for in like manner; 212 species of beetles are known, 175 being European, most of which are supposed to have been introduced by human agency. Twenty-three are not found in any other Atlantic island, thirty-six are not found in Europe, nineteen are natives of Madeira or the Canaries, three are American, and fourteen are peculiar to the Azores, but are allied to European species, although two are so distinct as to constitute a new genera. The presence of these peculiar beetles and of many land shells, is accounted for by two suppositions, either that they are remnants of a former widespread group which have survived the glacial epoch and become extinct in their native country, or that they have been drifted across the ocean, either in the egg or in the transformation stage, in floating timber or stems of plants. Of the flora, 440 out of 480 flowering plants and ferns are found in Europe, Madeira, or the Canaries, whilst forty are peculiar to the Azores, but allied to European species. Some of these are supposed to have been conveyed by birds, many have winged seeds, and might have been borne by the winds and waves—trees and plants with heavy seeds being suggestively absent. The deductions drawn from the fauna and flora of the Azores is:

"That the peopling of remote islands is not due so much to ordinary or normal as to extraordinary causes. These islands lie in the course of the south-westerly return trades and also of the Gulf Stream, and we should therefore naturally expect that American birds, insects and plants would preponderate if they were conveyed by the regular winds

and currents, which are both such as to prevent European species from reaching them. But the violent storms to which the Azores are liable, blow from all points of the compass; and it is evidently to these combined with the greater proximity and more favourable situation of the coasts of Europe and North Africa, that the presence of a fauna and flora so decidely European is to be traced."*

The next group of islands noticed is that of Bermuda, which consists of about a hundred small coral islands surrounded by reefs, beyond which is a very deep ocean. They are situated about 700 miles from North Carolina, and from cedar trees being found forty-eight feet below high-water mark, the whole area now occupied by shoals would seem at one time to have been included in the group. There is on these islands a layer of red earth or clay, which has been supposed to prove the elevation of the ocean bed to the surface, the red clay representing the red deposit discovered by the *Challenger* in mid-ocean, but Mr. Wallace concludes from the same red clay having been found "two feet thick under coral rock at a depth of forty-two feet below low-water mark, and resting on a bed of compact calcareous sandstone," which he says could never have been formed at the bottom of the ocean 700 miles from land, that this red clay is more probably due to some process of decomposition of the rock itself. The islands possess one peculiar lizard, 180 species of birds, only ten of which are permanent residents, and very few insects, all common North American or West Indian species. Of land shells one-fourth are peculiar, while almost all the other productions of the islands are identical with those of the adjacent continent and islands. Dr. Rein and Mr. Moseley found 250 wild flowering plants, less than half being indigenous. The origin of this flora is attributed to the Gulf Stream and to the annual cyclones, the migratory birds likewise often bringing seeds.

"If now, we consider," says Mr. Wallace, in summing up the evidence regarding the Azores and Bermuda, "the extreme remoteness and isolation of these islands, their small area, and comparatively recent origin, and that notwithstanding all these disadvantages they have acquired a very considerable and varied flora and fauna, we shall, I think, be convinced, that with a larger area and greater antiquity, mere separation from a continent by many hundred miles of sea, would not prevent a country from acquiring a very luxuriant and varied flora, and a fauna also rich and peculiar as regards all classes except terrestrial mammals, amphibia and some groups of reptiles."†

He then goes on to treat of the Galapagos Islands, remarkable for their gigantic tortoises, and also as possessing several lizards,

* "Island Life," chap. xii. p. 253. † Ibid. p. 264.

and two species of snakes. These islands are volcanic, situated on the Equator, about 600 miles from the West Coast of South America, and are surrounded by a bank at a depth of 1,000 feet. The tortoises, Dr. Gunther believes, to be of American origin, as also are the lizards and the snakes; but their presence in the Galapagos seems not easily accounted for. Mr. Wallace thinks they might have been conveyed on uprooted trees. Of the birds of these islands, thirty-eight out of fifty-seven species are peculiar, although all are allied to birds inhabiting tropical America. This Mr. Wallace attributes to the fact that the Galapagos are not subject to storms, so that birds arriving by accidental migrations would have time to acquire peculiarities, not being disturbed by frequent additions from the continent. The insects and land-shells are also almost all peculiar. Of these, Mr. Wallace says: "The observation of Captain Collings, that drift-wood, bamboos, canes, and the nuts of a palm, are often washed on the south-eastern shores of the islands, furnishes an excellent clue to the manner in which many of the insects and land-shells may have reached the Galapagos." He also thinks some may have been conveyed by whirlwinds.

Of St. Helena, the next island described, we shall not say much, since its original fauna and flora have been so completely changed by human agency that very little now remains. It was formerly covered with forests of ebony, which were destroyed wastefully by Europeans, and by the goats introduced by them; but it still contains forty flowering plants and ten ferns peculiar to the island, mostly of South African affinities, which may, perhaps, be accounted for by a fact stated by Mr. Mellis, that large seeds which have floated from Madagascar or Mauritius round the Cape of Good Hope, have been thrown on the shores of St. Helena, and have then sometimes germinated. There are great peculiarities in the beetles of this island; judging from the flora, we should expect these, also, to have South African affinities; but although this is so to a certain extent, there is also a strong European element more difficult to account for; and, in order to do so, Mr. Wallace has to call to his aid great antiquity, the changes of climate produced by glacial epochs, warm polar climates, alterations of winds and currents, and probable changes in the height of mountains in equatorial Africa.

"During the changes of climate, which there is good reason to believe periodically occurred, there would be much migration from the temperate zones towards the Equator and the reverse. If, therefore, the nearest ally of any insular group now inhabits a particular country, we are not obliged to suppose that it reached the island from that

country, since we know that most groups have ranged in past times over wider areas than they now inhabit."*

At all events, Mr. Wallace believes St. Helena to have always been an isolated oceanic island, surrounded by deep sea, and never to have been connected with any continent.

The last group of oceanic islands described is the Sandwich Islands, separated by enormous ocean depths from the nearest continent, and therefore certainly never united to a continent, but with possible extension towards some of the other Pacific groups of islands at a remote period. These islands possess no mammalia, but have twenty-four species of aquatic and wading birds, four birds of prey, and of Passeres, sixteen species, all peculiar, their affinities being chiefly with Australia and the Pacific Islands, with

"Slight indications of very rare or very remote communication with America. The amount of speciality is, however, wonderful, far exceeding that of any other islands; the only approach to it being made by New Zealand and Madagascar, which have a much more varied bird fauna and a smaller proportionate number of peculiar genera. These facts undoubtedly indicate an immense antiquity for this group of islands or the vicinity of some very ancient land (now submerged) from which some portion of their peculiar fauna might be derived."†

The islands possess two lizards, one of which is said to be found also in Timor, Australia, and the Samoa Islands. The land-shells of the Sandwich Islands are also very remarkable. They are more numerous than in all the other Polynesian Islands, and three-fourths of the whole belong to peculiar genera, fourteen of which, constituting the sub-family Achatinellinæ, are entirely confined to these islands; thirteen genera are found in other Polynesian Islands, whilst three genera of Auriculidæ are not found in the Pacific; but one inhabits Australia, China, Bourbon, and Cuba, and the two others are found in the West Indian Islands. The insects have not as yet been fully enumerated; but all the chief tribes of Coleoptera seem to be represented. Most of them are peculiar, but have affinities in Polynesian, Australian, or Malayan forms; some are South American, and some show north temperate affinities. The flora of these islands is equally strange. Of 554 flowering plants, and 135 ferns, three-fifths are peculiar, their affinities being with Polynesian, Australian, New Zealand, and American forms; and some of those known to us as small plants, there grow to woody shrubs—

---

* "Island Life," p. 290. † Ibid. p. 303.

shrubby geraniums fifteen feet high growing on forest trees.—The Compositæ are also highly peculiar, but have strong affinities with American forms.

These strange facts Mr. Wallace accounts for, as regards the Compositæ, by considering that group of plants to represent the most ancient portion of the flora conveyed to the Sandwich Islands

"At a very remote period, when the facilities for communication with America were greater than they are now. This may be indicated by the two deep submarine banks in the North Pacific, between the Sandwich Islands and San Francisco, which from an ocean floor nearly 3,000 fathoms deep, rise up to within a few hundred fathoms of the surface, and seem to indicate the subsidence of two islands, each about as large as Hawaii. The plants of north temperate affinity may be nearly as old, but these may have been derived from northern Asia by way of Japan, and the extensive line of shoals which run north-westward from the Sandwich Islands. Those which exhibit Polynesian or Australian affinities, consisting for the most part of less highly modified species usually of the same genera, may have had their origin at a later, though still somewhat remote, period, when large islands, indicated by the extensive shoals to the south and south-west, offered facilities for the transmission of plants from the tropical portions of the Pacific."*

Mr. Wallace considers this singular flora to be consistent with what is known of the fauna of the islands, which also shows some indication of an ancient approach to America, and believes that the organic forms in oceanic islands show long isolation, whilst preserving for us in archaic forms some record of the primæval immigration which clothed them with verdure. They are all less rich in animal and vegetable life than islands which have at any time formed parts of continents, and all agree in the absence of mammalia, are all volcanic or coralline, built upon degraded and submerged volcanic islands, and none of them possess a single type preserved from Mesozoic times.

Let us now see what the continental islands have to tell us respecting the origin of their animal and vegetable forms.

We shall pass over Great Britain and Ireland for want of space, and because their geological, zoological, and botanical records are tolerably well known. Suffice it to say, that whilst zoologically and botanically they are almost identical with the European continent, having been comparatively recently separated from it, that yet this separation has caused the evolution, or pre-

* "Island Life," p. 309.

servation, of three peculiar species of birds, fifteen species of fresh-water fishes, sixty-nine species of Lepidoptera, seventy-two species of Coleoptera, several fresh-water shells, and many flowering plants and mosses, whilst they possess fewer mammals even than Scandinavia, which has sixty species, the number for Great Britain being forty, and for Ireland—probably earlier separated—only twenty-two. Of reptiles, Belgium has twenty-two species, Britain thirteen, and Ireland only four. This poverty of reptiles Mr. Wallace attributes "to their lower vital activity and smaller powers of dispersal," which seems, as previously remarked, to be somewhat at variance with the records given of the oceanic islands, which almost all possess one or more species of reptile, although wholly deficient in mammalia.

In addition to the British Isles, the Malay Islands, Borneo and Java, the Philippine Islands, Japan and Formosa, are given as types of *Recent* Continental Islands. These all, whilst strongly resembling the Asiatic continent, from which, and from each other, they have been separated at different periods, yet possess a great many peculiar species, Java being especially remarkable, because although only separated from Sumatra by the narrow Straits of Sunda, it shows greater differences than Borneo, which is much more remote. Java has also resemblances to the Siamese Peninsula, and to the Himalayas, which Borneo and Sumatra do not possess; whilst it is also remarkable for the absence of no less than thirteen genera of mammalia, which inhabit the two adjoining islands and the Malayan peninsula; in some cases the same species being found in all three of the Malay countries, but represented in Java by an *allied* species. These peculiarities Mr. Wallace accounts for by a series of geographical changes, aided by changes of climate, "driving a portion of the Himalayan fauna southward, leaving a few species in Java, from which they could not return, owing to its subsequent isolation by subsidence."*

The geographical changes Mr. Wallace supposes to have commenced in Miocene times, in which the whole of the shallow seas uniting Sumatra, Java, Borneo, and the Philippines with Asia, became dry land by elevation, and here the Malayan fauna was developed. After a long period of stability, the Philippines were first separated; then, considerably later, Java; a little later, Sumatra and Borneo; and, finally, the islands south of Singapore to Banca and Biliton.

Japan may be aptly compared to Great Britain, not only in climate, but geologically in its recent connection with the adjacent

* "Island Life," chap. xvii.

continent: and singularly enough, although separated by the breadth of two continents from the British Islands, it possesses forty identical species of birds, and many more bearing a strong resemblance to ours; indeed, Mr. Wallace begins his work by pointing out that the traveller from Britain to Japan will, after his long voyage, find less difference in the productions of these remote countries than between Australia and New Zealand, only thirteen hundred miles apart. Nevertheless, Japan possesses many peculiar forms, some of which are allied to America, and some to the Himalayas and the Malay Islands; but owing to the easy passage still existing from the northern extremity of Japan through Saghalien to the mainland of Asia, a large number of temperate forms of insects and birds are still able to enter the country, and thus diminish the proportionate number of peculiar species. There are some great peculiarities in the mammalia of Japan and Formosa, which have American as well as European, and Asiatic affinities. But we have not space to recapitulate them, as we must pass on to the yet more interesting class of islands, termed by Mr. Wallace the *Ancient* Continental, including the Madagascar group, Celebes, and New Zealand.

Madagascar lies so close to Africa that one would naturally expect it to resemble that continent in its organic productions, as nearly as Great Britain resembles Europe, and Japan Asia. But what do we find? In an exceedingly rich and beautiful fauna and flora there is a most singular combination of types from all parts of the world.

Of sixty-six species of mammals, not one of the great African groups is found in Madagascar; but there are Lemurs, which are found from "West Africa to India, Ceylon, and the Malay Archipelago." Insectivora, among which is a peculiar family (Centetidæ), which exists nowhere else on the globe, except in the two largest West Indian Islands, Cuba and Hayti; Carnivora, including civets of peculiar genera, but allied to African groups, and a peculiar cat-like animal, Cryptoprocta, having no allies in any part of the globe; Rodents, among which are four rats and mice of peculiar genera, and a small sub-fossil hippopotamus. Of reptiles, the Colubrine snakes are represented by two American genera, whilst another genus is found in America and China; the other genera are all peculiar, whilst two abundant African families are absent. The lizards are all peculiar, some (as the Iguanidæ) belonging to families exclusively American; "while a genus of geckoes, inhabiting America and Australia, also occur in Madagascar." The birds are equally peculiar, and are more nearly allied to those of India and the Malay Islands than to Africa, several well-known African families being wholly absent. The islands round Madagascar share in its peculiarities. The

giant tortoises of the Mascarene Islands are well known, from specimens in the Zoological Gardens and the British Museum, whilst the curious recently-extinct birds which inhabited Mauritius, Bourbon, and Rodriguez, the Dodo, and its allies, are found nowhere else, but are supposed to be a degraded pigeon. The flora of Madagascar and the neighbouring islands is as anomalous as the fauna, presenting many peculiar forms, some of African, but more of Asiatic affinities; a few found elsewhere, only in South America, Australia, and Polynesia; "whilst more than half the total number (536 of 1,058) are found *only* in some of the islands of the Madagascar group." Mr. Wallace thus explains the curious and apparently irreconcilable anomalies here briefly recapitulated.

"In Madagascar we have a continental island of the first rank and undoubtedly of immense antiquity; we have detached fragments of this island in the Comoros and Aldabra; in the Seychelles we have the fragments of another very ancient island, which may perhaps never have been continental; in Mauritius, Bourbon, and Rodriguez, we have three undoubtedly oceanic islands; while in the extensive banks and coral reefs of Cargados, Saya de Malha, the Chagos and the Maldive Islands, we have indications of the submergence of many large islands which may have aided in the transmission of organisms from the Indian Peninsula. But between and around all these islands, we have depths of two thousand five hundred fathoms and upwards, which renders it very improbable that there has ever been here a continuous land surface, at all events during the Tertiary or Secondary periods of Geology."*

He then goes on to argue that in no one case do we find animals necessitating an actual land connection with India. That the distribution of the lemurs supposed to require this connection,

"Can be far more naturally explained by a general dispersion of the group from Europe, where we know it existed in Eocene times; and such an explanation applies equally to the affinity of the Insectivora of Madagascar and Cuba; the snakes of Madagascar and America, and the lizards of Mauritius and Australia. To suppose in all these cases and in many others, a direct land-connection is really absurd, because we have the evidence afforded by geology of wide differences of distribution directly we pass beyond the most recent deposits; and when we go back to Mesozoic, and still more to Palæozoic times, the majority of the groups of animals and plants appear to have had a world-wide range. A large number of our European Miocene genera of vertebrates were also Indian or African or even American; the South American Tertiary fauna contained many European types; while many

* "Island Life," p. 417.

Mesozoic reptiles and mollusca ranged from Europe and North America to Australia and New Zealand."*

Now granting Mr. Wallace's favourite theory of the permanence of continents and oceans, it would seem to us as impossible to account for the world-wide distribution of these mammalian forms in Palæozoic and Mesozoic as in Tertiary times, and to suppose that they could cross the ocean from Europe to South America, Australia, and Madagascar, with only intervening islands, would appear quite as absurd as the existence of that hypothetical Lemuria so strenuously denied by Mr. Wallace, but still firmly believed in by many geologists and naturalists, and which would seem to be indicated not only by the fauna of Madagascar and adjacent islands, but also by the submerged islands indicated by Mr. Wallace himself:—

"Africa," says Mr. Wallace, "was cut off from Europe and Asia by an arm of the sea in early Tertiary times. . . . . The large mammalia now found in Africa (but which are absent from Madagascar) inhabited Europe and Asia and many of them also North America in the Miocene period. At a still earlier epoch, Africa may have received its lower types of mammals, lemurs, insectivora and small carnivora, together with its ancestral struthious birds, and its reptiles and insects of American or Australian affinity."

But *how* and *by what route* he fails to say, seeing that Africa at that time is itself supposed to have been an island continent like Australia, and unable to obtain the higher mammals then inhabiting Europe and Asia.

"At that period," he adds, "Africa was joined to Madagascar. Before the later continental period of Africa, Madagascar had become an island; and thus when the large mammalia from the northern continent overran Africa, they were prevented from reaching Madagascar, which thenceforth was enabled to develop its singular forms of low type mammalia, its gigantic ostrich-like Æpyornis, its isolated birds, its remarkable insects, and its rich and peculiar flora."†

Reluctantly passing over Celebes with its very peculiar fauna, which Mr. Wallace supposes to have been derived from Asia by means of migration across narrow straits—Celebes never having been united to the continent—we turn to New Zealand, classed among continental, rather than oceanic islands, because the 1,000 fathom line indicates a former extension towards Australia, to which it would appear to have been once united by a narrow isthmus, which stretches across to the Great Barrier Reef towards the north. The most remarkable thing therefore about the fauna and flora of New Zealand is, that they show so *few* Australian

* "Island Life," p. 418. † Ibid. p. 419.

forms. The great Australian marsupials are wholly wanting in New Zealand, which contains only two doubtfully indigenous mammals, a rat and an otter-like animal, and two species of bats, no snakes, and only one frog, but has an extensive group of birds incapable of flight, which has recently become extinct, these birds are classed with the ostrich tribe, though differing in many respects from all known birds; they have, however, resemblances with the apteryx still living in New Zealand, with the emu of Australia, and the cassowaries of New Guinea.

The flora of New Zealand has always been regarded as peculiarly puzzling. Of 935 species of flowering plants, 677 are endemic, of 258 species not peculiar to the islands, 222 are Australian, but many of these are also Antarctic, South American, or European. On the other hand seven great genera of Australian plants, each containing more than 100 species, are entirely absent from New Zealand, whilst many other Australian genera are only partially represented, and only about one-eighth of those occurring in both countries belong exclusively to that region, and of these several are better represented in New Zealand than in Australia. Among those conspicuously absent are the Eucalyptus and Acacia, which form such noticeable features in Australian landscapes. Of these New Zealand peculiarities Sir Joseph Hooker speaks thus:—

"New Zealand does contain certain Australian species and types, but these are not the most common or most likely to have arrived by trans-oceanic migration. The arboreous vegetation of Australia mainly consists of gum trees and leguminous plants, which cover three-fourths of the wooded parts of that continent, but not one is found in New Zealand; yet the seeds of the gum trees are very minute, are shed in inconceivable quantities, retain their vitality long, and both gum trees and acacias when introduced by man into New Zealand, become naturalized at once, and actually displace the indigenous vegetation of the island."*

Let us see how Mr. Wallace accounts for the singular facts we have briefly recorded. He first supposes a union with North Australia and New Guinea at a very remote epoch; that at that time that portion of Australia united to New Zealand was separated from the rest of Australia by a sea, and possessed no mammalia, since which period it has been reunited to Australia, and so completely severed from New Zealand as to prevent any migration even of winged birds; he further thinks that there may have been an extension northwards even as far as the Tonga and

* "A Lecture on Insular Floras," by J. D. Hooker, D.C.L., L.L.D., F.R.S., F.L.S., &c.

Fiji Islands, and southward towards the Antarctic continent; but he imagines the theory of the breaking up of this extensive land into islands, in which the various species of moa and kiwi were developed, their union at a later period, and the final submergence of all but the existing islands, as advocated by Captain Hutton to be hypothetical, although it would account for some anomalies of bird and plant distribution.

In following "Island Life" thus far, as closely as space will permit, we shall at least have given our readers some idea of the difficult and intricate nature of the problems dealt with by Mr. Wallace and by others who have sought to give some reason for the singular facts in the distribution of animal and plant life, which seem to set all theories at defiance. Moreover, it must be remembered that the difficulties which beset all explanations hitherto offered, are by no means lessened, when we take the records of geology to our aid: we have already spoken of the proofs of the ancestors of the horses and camels of the eastern hemisphere having inhabited America in early geologic times, and of kangaroos and other marsupials having been found in our islands, but another enigma of the same kind is afforded by the distribution of struthious birds past and present. "The New Zealand Struthiones," says Mr. Wallace, "very nearly equal in number those of all the rest of the world, and nowhere do more than three species occur in any one continent or island, while no more than two ever occur in the same district;"* but in New Zealand ten out of the eleven known species of Dinornis have been found in a single swamp in the south island, where also three species of Apteryx are now found. At present

"There appear to be two closely allied species of Ostriches inhabiting Africa and south-western Asia respectively, South America has three species of Rhea each in a separate district, Australia has an eastern and a western variety of Emu, and a Cassowary in the north, while eight other species of Cassowaries are known from the islands north of Australia."†

The geological record is as follows:—

"Remains of extinct rheas have been found in Central Brazil, and those of ostriches in North India; while remains, believed to be of struthious birds, are found in the Eocene deposits of England; and the Cretaceous rocks of North America have yielded the extraordinary toothed bird Hesperornis which Professor O. Marsh declares to have been 'A carnivorous swimming ostrich.'"‡

Since Mr. Wallace will not allow a land connection to account for these facts, he resorts to the theory that these struthious

* "Island Life," p. 449. † *Ibid.* ‡ *Ibid.* p. 451.

birds had not a common origin, but, like the Dodo, are degenerated descendants of flying birds, which could also swim, as the Rhea and Emu can now. It must, however, be allowed that Mr. Wallace's utterances on this point are somewhat obscure, for he says:—

"We have found in almost every case that groups now scattered over two or more continents, formerly lived in intervening areas of existing land. Thus the marsupials of South America and Australia are connected by forms which lived in North America and Europe. The camels of Asia, and the llamas of the Andes, had many extinct common ancestors in North America; the lemurs of Africa and Asia had their ancestors in Europe, as did the trogons of South America, Africa, and tropical Asia."*

Wherever we find instances of peculiar distribution like those given above, or discontinuous distribution of living species, Mr. Wallace supposes it to represent a group in process of extinction, which had formerly a much wider range, but how under his theory of the permanence of continents, this wider range could have been attained, he does not explain. It is tolerably certain that such creatures as lemurs, kangaroos, camels, &c., would find even one hundred miles of sea an insuperable barrier, how, therefore, some could have ranged from America to Europe, and others from Europe to Australia, without any assistance excepting a few intervening islands, whilst they seem to have altogether scorned New Zealand, which one would have supposed equally attractive and easy of approach, is certainly a problem which "Island Life" leaves unsolved.† The peopling of the world under the existing distribution of land and water, according to the ancient Biblical story, would require not one but many hundreds of Noah's arks, or many hundreds of new creations, but even accepting the doctrine of evolution, we cannot imagine creatures of the same species springing up spontaneously in different parts of the world, nor mammals crossing miles of ocean unaided. We believe, therefore that Mr. Wallace's theory will have to be considerably modified before it meets with general acceptance. Professor Huxley speaking, not of Mr. Wallace's book, but of the similar theory enunciated by Sir Wyville Thomson, says:—

"Surely there is evidence enough and to spare, that the cretaceous sea, inhabited by various forms, some of whose descendants

---

* "Island Life," p. 451.

† Mr. Starkie Gardiner says, "A much more southerly land connection between England and America seems required to explain the presence of tropical American plants, such as palms, in our Eocene, because their absence in beds of corresponding age in the United States and Greenland, implies that they did not pass along the northern route traced out for them.

Sir W. Thomson, as I believe justly, recognizes in the present deep-sea fauna, once extended from Britain, over the greater part of central and southern Europe, North Africa, and western Asia to the Himalayas. In what possible sense can the change of level which has made dry land of, and sometimes mountain masses of, nine-tenths of this vast area, be said to be 'In direct relation to the present existing coast lines.'"

It is, however, this cretaceous deposit which is one of Mr. Wallace's points of attack, for he endeavours to prove by many arguments that chalk instead of being a deep sea deposit is always formed in shallow water near to the shore, an opinion ably controverted by Mr. Starkie Gardner in the *Popular Science Review*. It must not, however, be supposed that Mr. Wallace in formulating his theory of the permanence of continents, ignores or repudiates geographical changes, on the contrary, he admits so many oscillations of the earth's crust, that most readers will be considerably mystified as to the meaning to be attached to the word *permanent*, whilst a glance at his maps showing the supposed land extensions, will lead many to infer that in indignantly denying the possibility of the existence of a Lemuria, the quarrel is more with the name than the reality, for the southward extension of the Indian peninsula and the islands connecting it with Madagascar, require but little to perfect the chain, and if we place Lemuria more to the east, it will be seen that the great extent of shallow sea enclosed within the 1,000 fathom line, embracing the great islands of Borneo, Celebes, New Guinea, and New Zealand, and uniting them to Australia, has an extremely continental appearance, whilst the great islands allowed to have extended across the Atlantic differ but little from the fabled Atlantis of the ancients.

Mr. Wallace justly lays great stress upon change of climate as affecting the distribution of animal and vegetable life, and naturally brings forward the glacial period or periods, as having greatly modified the then existing fauna and flora, he also devotes many pages to the discussion of the causes which produced these glacial epochs, and the yet more enigmatical mild arctic climates, the existence of which has been demonstrated by recent discoveries. In this matter also Mr. Wallace has a theory of his own. Whilst agreeing in the main with Croll as to the effect of high periods of excentricity of the earth's orbit in producing glacial epochs, he does not allow that every period of high excentricity must necessarily produce a glacial epoch, because he believes that geographical changes, causing alterations in the ocean currents, would be sufficient to neutralize the effect of greater solar distance, and to produce even those mild arctic climates proved to have formerly prevailed by recent discoveries

of coal, corals, and fossil plants of sub-tropical type, within the arctic circle. This theory has been warmly discussed in *Nature*, and we have not space to treat of it at present, but would only remark that a point incidentally alluded to by Mr. Wallace—that of the necessity for a greater amount of *light* as well as of *heat* for the development of these sub-tropical forms, than can be had within the polar circle under present circumstances—requires much greater attention than has hitherto been given to it, for within it we believe lies the key to that problem which has long exercised the minds of geologists and physicists, but which we still regard as unsolved—that of the alternations of glacial and temperate or sub-tropical climates in the northern hemisphere.

The effect of ocean currents is doubtless very great, and it is difficult to estimate what would be the amount of heat conveyed by several tropical streams having free access to the North Pole: that the Gulf Stream sensibly affects the climate of Great Britain is universally acknowledged, although many people think the effects exaggerated. Sir Charles Lyell believed that the flooding of the Sahara would be a great factor in the production of cold in the northern hemisphere, whilst Mr. Wallace would apparently regard it as a heat producer. The conflict of opinions between geologists on points such as these is great, and until some means can be found of ascertaining the exact distribution of land and water during the different geologic periods, and the contemporaneity of those periods, such conflicts of opinion are likely to continue. The theory of Mr. Wallace and Sir Wyville Thomson as to the permanence of continents, if it could be maintained, would certainly help towards a solution of some disputed points, but the stability claimed is so very unstable that it would at present seem to render the subject more intricate than before. The absence of mammals from the oceanic islands is a point in favour of Mr. Wallace's views, but we cannot regard his theories as to the various peculiarities observable in the fauna and flora of remote islands, whether oceanic or continental, as satisfactory. Every reader of "Island Life" will be struck by the purely hypothetical air pervading it. As a natural consequence of the rejection of the older theory of geologists, of the necessity of a land connection in the distribution of animals and plants, everything becomes the result of accident. Birds incapable of lengthened flight are driven hundreds of miles by storms; seeds and insects are caught up by whirlwinds and deposited on oceanic islands, or they are conveyed on driftwood, or in the crops or claws of birds, seeds and even plants are swept away hundreds of miles by ocean currents, and germinate after long immersion in sea water, &c. &c. That such things do

sometimes happen has been proved by Mr. Darwin, but whether these accidents are sufficient in number and in frequency to account for the stocking of remote oceanic islands with plants and animals must remain doubtful, notwithstanding the strong points urged in favour of trans-oceanic migration by Messrs. Darwin and Wallace. Sir Joseph Hooker has placed before us the difficulties which beset the trans-oceanic as well as the continental theory, in his interesting Paper on "Insular Floras," where he points out that winds and ocean currents would bring American and not European plants to the Azores, giving also innumerable instances where the animals and plants of an island are derived not from the nearest but from the most distant continent, as we have before pointed out in the cases of Madagascar and New Zealand. Nevertheless he, in common with almost all men of science, looks upon Darwin's theory as that best calculated to account for the various anomalies observable both in animal and plant distribution, and as giving some reason for the specialized varieties which are sure to be found on islands long isolated. When, therefore, we find Darwin, Wallace, and Sir Wyville Thomson, agreed as to the general permanence of the present continental areas, and the trans-oceanic migration of animals and plants, we may be sure that in venturing to oppose their ideas, either scientifically or dogmatically, we shall feel ourselves face to face with very powerful adversaries, and shall have need to buckle on our most efficient armour; for they are never exponents of crude ideas, but have well weighed every theory, and viewed it from every possible point, before presenting it to public criticism. Therefore, in venturing to differ somewhat from Mr. Wallace's views in some few points, we do so with much diffidence, feeling that these differences are probably due to want of proper apprehension on our part, rather than to error in the author. In any case we feel sure that a perusal of "Island Life" will afford pleasure both to the scientific and to the general reader, and will yield much food for earnest thought, although the theories it enunciates may perhaps remain unproved and unprovable for years, until fresh geological Palæontological and astronomical discoveries, shall have removed them from the Limbo of doubt, either into the Hades of darkness, or the region of truth and light.

## Art. III.—Mr. Fitzgerald's Life of George the Fourth.

*The Life of George the Fourth, including his Letters and Opinions; with a view of the Men, Manners and Politics of his Reign.* By Percy Fitzgerald, M.A., F.S.A., Author of "The Life of Garrick." In Two Volumes. London: Tinsley Brothers, Catherine Street, Strand. 1881.

Mr. Percy Fitzgerald has industriously gathered together the facts as to George IV., his character and career, notices of which have appeared in biographies, whether of the King himself or of statesmen and officials of his day, and has woven them into a continuous narrative; his book is both valuable and interesting, but its worth is lessened by many inaccuracies, and it is in many passages disfigured by repetitions and redundancies, and by a logic truly Milesian. Mr. Fitzgerald labours under one fatal defect for the work of a political biographer; he is—as every reader of his utterly worthless sketch of Charles Townshend knows—no politician; he has little knowledge of, and scanty sympathy with, the political leaders of whom, and the political movements of which, he writes. Hence his narrative is often unsatisfactory, seeing that he does not understand the men and the events of which he is writing.

Availing ourselves, however, of his work as far as we can do so safely, we proceed to discuss one of the darkest, most disagreeable and melancholy chapters in English history—the Life and Times of George IV. Every one remembers Walter Savage Landors' compendious history of the first four sovereigns of the House of Brunswick:

> "George the First was always reckoned
> Vile! But viler George the Second,
> And what mortal ever heard
> Any good of George the Third?
> When from earth the Fourth descended,
> Heaven be praised! the Georges ended."

By way of prose commentary on this poetico-historical summary, we have an estimate of the four Georges by one of their own family. Lord Colchester narrates a curious conversation which he had in 1827 with William IV., then Duke of Clarence, in which the Duke said:—

"Those of my family who have sat on the throne have been all very

different men. George I. had not fair play, and had a hard time of it. George II. was a thorough straightforward man, determined to do his duty, which with his German notions was not always very easy. My father was a thorough John Bull, a very clever man; knew other men well, and could play them off against each other. The present King is a different sort of man."*

The difference we think consisted in the fourth George being the vilest and most despicable of the four.

It has been lately said, "It would be impossible to find in the writings of those who have illustrated the private life of princes, from Suetonius to Mr. Greville, a character so completely despicable as that of Frederick Lewis," Prince of Wales and father of George III., George IV., intellectually far superior to his grandfather, morally was nearly his equal. Walpole said of the grandfather that "he was a poor, feeble, irresolute, false, lying, dishonest, contemptible wretch." Those who best knew the grandson had much the same opinion of him. Of Frederick Lewis it is said, "He was a wastrel without a spark of generosity, and a libertine without a grain of sentiment." The first part of this description is in a great degree, and the latter wholly, true of George IV. It is true of each of these princes that "he supported popular liberty to vex his family."†

If ever there was a person to whom at first sight the lines—

> "Fortune came smiling to his youth and wooed it,
> And purpled greatness met his ripened years,"

seem applicable, it was George, Prince of Wales, and yet a very slight search below the surface of things show us the facts were not so.

At first everything seemed bright and hopeful—we quote with assent Mr. Fitzgerald's remark, "the contrast between the joyful acclamation and the splendid retinue which welcomed his birth,‡ and the desertion and indifference which attended his death, was significant and worthy of the study of princes."§

Full of satisfaction at the birth of an heir to his throne, the young King presented the messenger who brought the good news "with a gratification of five hundred pounds."

It is not too much to say that in future years the King would have gladly given the same amount to anyone who brought him the news of his son's death. While at any time after his arrival at man's estate the son would, with equal gladness have given,

* "Diary," vol. iii. p. 519.

† *Vide Quarterly Review*, No. 302, April, 1881, p. 341, article "Literary Life of Lord Bolingbroke," attributed by common rumour to Mr. J. A. Froude.

‡ He was born at St. James's Palace, 12th August, 1762.

§ "Life," vol. i. p. 1.

or more probably promised, a like gratification to any one who brought him the good news of a demise of the Crown.

A dislike to their next heir seems to be an inseparable accident in the character of the sovereigns of the House of Brunswick. In George III. it was enhanced by a disposition naturally savage and vindictive, and still more by the insanity from which more or less, and more rather than less, he from his fourteenth year suffered all through his life.* The language of Lord Brougham, strong as it is, is by no means stronger than the facts warrant.

"His treatment of his eldest son whom he hated with a hatred scarcely consistent with the supposition of a sound mind, might seem to illustrate the shadier part of his personal disposition, but it was in truth only another part of his public, his professional conduct, for he had no better reason for this implacable aversion than the jealousy which men have of their successors, and the consciousness that the prince who must succeed him was unlike him."†

Yet there were points of likeness in the characters of the father and the son. One who knew the Prince well wrote of him:

"I fear there is in the Prince this feature of his father—that he loves closets within cabinets, and cupboards within closets; that he will have secret advisers besides his ostensible ones, and still more invisible ones behind his secret advisers—that he will be faithful to none of them, a most uncomfortable master to the ministers who would really serve him."‡

Severe as is this character, we agree with Mr. Fitzgerald that it is not overdrawn. If kept in mind during the study of the Prince's life it will be found to explain many of his proceedings. Mr. Fitzgerald fixes the date at which George III.'s hatred of his son commenced at his fourteenth year.§ The Prince himself said of his father to the first Lord Malmesbury, "He hates me; he always did from seven years old."|| Unfortunate in his father, the Prince was not more fortunate in his mother, who, according to Mr. Fitzgerald, "is the person most accountable for the whole course of treatment adopted towards the prince."¶ The world has formed its judgment on Queen Charlotte. "The sweet queen," as Madame D' Arblay called her, is now known to have been as proud, ignorant, bigoted, and narrow-minded, as only those

* "The king was mad when a lad of fourteen. . . . , Lord Bute found the greatest difficulty to keep the matter a secret from the nation." "Life of Lord Campbell," vol. i. p. 266.

† "Sketches of Statesmen of the Time of George III.," title George III.

‡ Sir Gilbert Elliot, afterwards Lord Minto, quoted by Mr. Fitzgerald, "Life," vol. i. p. 234.

§ Ibid., p. 22. || Ibid., p. 73. ¶ Ibid., pp. 9.

brought up in the petty German Courts of 120 years ago could be. To take the word of George IV. as evidence against the truthfulness of another person is like quoting the retort of Cardinal Newman to Charles Kingsley, "taking the word of a professor of lying that he does not lie;" but when Regent, he once called on Lady Spencer to ask her to do him a great service—this was to assist him in the choice of a governess for his daughter.

"Above all things he desired that the lady should teach his daughter always to tell the truth. Lady Spencer betrayed by the expression of her features what was passing in her mind, on which he observed, 'You know I don't speak the truth, and my brothers don't, and I find it a great defect, from which I would have my daughter free. We have always been brought up badly; the Queen having taught us to equivocate, and I want you to help me in the matter.'"

Lord Essex used to tell how George III. on one occasion noticed that the Prince, who stood uncovered by his side, wore a wig, and asked him sharply why he did so. The Prince replied, "that he found himself subject to cold, and that he had been advised by his physician to take this precaution;" whereon the King turned to Lord Essex and said, "A lie ever ready when it's wanted." To whatever source George IV.'s untruthfulness is attributable, we have the testimony of the Duke of Wellington and Lord Ellenborough that the habit remained unbroken to the close of his life.*

He was equally unfortunate in his governors and tutors. He was handed over from the care of one dull nobleman to another, from one pompous prelate to another. A brief experience of his ungovernable temper soon led governors, tutors, and sub-tutors to seek less onerous and more peaceful, if less important, occupations.†

Two of the Prince's tutors were in their day men of some mark. Markham, "a preacher of divine right," at one time Head Master of Westminster, and afterwards successively Bishop of Chester and Archbishop of York, and Hurd, Bishop of Lichfield, Warburton's Correspondent and Lord Macaulay's "sneak."‡ Dr. Parr describes Markham as a pompous schoolmaster, and Hurd as a stiff, cold, but correct gentleman. Their relative merits as tutors once formed the subject of a lively discussion between the Prince and Dr. Parr. The Prince, with

---

* "Memoirs of Viscount Melbourne," vol. i. pp.156–7.

† "Life," chap. ii. pp 7, 17.

‡ "In Macaulay's copy of the Letters from Warburton to Hurd, the first is headed in pencil with the words Bully to Sneak."—*Life of Macaulay*, vol. ii. p. 464.

specious reasoning, maintained the superiority of Markham. Parr, speaking with the experience, and, we must add, with the dogmatism, of a schoolmaster, vindicated the superiority of Hurd.* Hurd, in Johnson's opinion, was "one of a set of men who account for everything systematically; for instance, it has been a fashion to wear scarlet breeches; these men would tell you that, according to causes and effects, no other wear could at that time have been chosen."† The bishop failed to impart any of this systematic method of thinking to his pupil, who, throughout his life, was most unconnected and discursive both in thought and speech. The bishop once expressed himself as doubtful "whether the Prince would be the most polished gentleman or the most accomplished blackguard in Europe, possibly (he added) an admixture of both."‡

This possibility was realized. A passage in one of Burke's works was handed by the Prince's unfortunate wife to one of her ladies. "Read it," she said; "he has drawn the Prince's character exactly." The passage ran—"A man without any sense of duty as a prince, without any regard to the dignity of his Crown, and without any love to his people—dissolute, false, venal, destitute of any positive good qualities whatever, except a pleasant temper and the manners of a gentleman."§

This seems to us to describe exactly the Prince's moral character. If there be anything lacking in this estimate it is supplied in Moore's ever-memorable parody of the Prince's letter to the Duke of York—

> "My heart is a sieve, where some scattered affections
> Are danced just about for a moment or two,
> And the *finer* they are the more sure to run through."||

With regard to his intellectual character we think Mr. Fitzgerald overrates both his knowledge and his abilities. Great pains had been taken with his education, and he had a superficial knowledge of many subjects, and from his position he could display his knowledge to the best advantage. Sir Walter Scott remarked "that it was impossible to form a fair judgment of the abilities of a man who introduced what subject he chose, discussed it just as long as he chose, and dismissed it when he chose." But even Lord Brougham, who says that "he was a man of very uncultivated mind," admits "that his natural abilities were far above mediocrity; he was quick, lively, gifted with a retentive memory, and even with a ready wit—endowed

---

* "Life of Parr," i. 322. "Life of George IV.," i. 11, 12.

† Boswell's "Johnson," p. 439, Routledge's Standard Library Edition.

‡ "Life," vol. i. p. 12. § Ibid., p. 435.

|| See it at length in the "Life," vol. ii. p. 83–4–5.

with an exquisite ear for music, and a justness of eye that fitted him to attain refined taste in the arts—possessing, too, a nice sense of the ludicrous, which made his relish for humour sufficiently acute, and bestowed upon him the power of an accomplished mimic. Admitting all that can be justly said in his favour, it could only be flatterers who bestowed on him the title by which it was his peculiar pride to be called, "The first Gentleman in Europe."*

Kept during childhood in the dullest of homes, which even Queen Charlotte herself found to be like a convent;† under a discipline more resembling that of a German barrack than an English family; deprived of rational amusements, and with little of any society but that of servants and grooms, the self-willed, self indulgent, hot-tempered boy developed into such a young man as might have been expected. He early formed a habit of private drinking. In this and other excesses he was encouraged by his bolder and more adventurous next brother, the Duke of York, and by his uncles, the Dukes of Cumberland and Gloucester, and both the Prince and his brother, notwithstanding the seclusion in which they were jealously kept, contrived to form an acquaintance with some of the wilder nobles of the day. At length, in 1780, in which the Prince attained his eighteenth year, a small establishment was conceded to him by the King, but everything was on the smallest scale, and every item of expense was cut down to an inadequate sum.

Launched into the world with small means, extravagant tendencies, and innumerable temptations, he early fell into that chronic state of insolvency in which he continued almost to the close of his life. What made the King's treatment of his son more iniquitous was, that during the eighteen years of his minority the King had received and appropriated the revenues of his son's Duchy of Cornwall. In the painful discussions which took place in the House of Commons on the subject, Fox contended that the Duchy revenues with interest on them amounted to £500,000. Mr. Pitt admitted the receipt of £234,000, but contended that the King had a right to set-off the costs of his son's education, amounting to £83,000. The Duchy revenues had in fact been applied in payment of the King's debts, which were enormous, and the King had also taken fines from tenants for long leases, leaving the Prince's powers as a landlord much impaired, and the value of his property much lessened.‡

Very early after his entrance into the world the Prince fell

* "Statesmen of Geo. III.," title Geo. IV.

† See the extract from Mrs. Harcourt's Diary quoted in "Life," vol. i. p. 6.

‡ "Life," vol. i. p. 292-3-4; 341-2.

"under the rod of the magician."* He made acquaintance with Charles James Fox. It was a disastrous acquaintance for the Prince. He was incapable of receiving the good which politically, Fox, beyond all men of his time, was able to impart to him, while the example of Fox's dissipation, in which Fox was as pre-eminent as he was in political capacity, encouraged the Prince to go on in the dissipated career which he had begun. While still in his nineteenth year he formed the first of the many *liasons* of his life. This was with a Mrs. Robinson, an actress of notoriously bad fame, and commonly called, from her favourite character, *Perdita*. Letters of a compromising character, probably promising marriage, were written by the Prince to the lady. The worried King, to rescue his son from "this shameful scrape," purchased back these letters at no less a cost than £5,000. But, besides the letters, the Prince had given the venal beauty a bond for £20,000, a fact which appears to have been unknown to the King. This bond was rescued from the lady's clutches at a further cost of the promise of an annuity of £400.†

The Prince's negotiator in the matter of this bond was Fox. Gratitude to Fox for this service—so far forth as that feeling can be attributed to the Prince—led to his connecting himself with the Whig party. It was just at the time that the Rockingham Ministry, of 1782, was formed, and forced on the King against his will. The Prince publicly said "that his father had not yet agreed to take them (the Whigs), but he should be made to agree to it." This rude and indecent remark was reported to the King, and increased the ill-feeling with which he already regarded his son; it was further aggravated by the hope, strongly and profanely expressed by the Prince, that "that d—d fellow, the Chancellor, might be turned out."‡ The Chancellor, being Thurlow, who at time stood nearly as high in the King's favour as did afterwards Eldon, and who not long afterwards became one of the secret advisers of the Prince.

In the following year, 1783, the Prince came of age, and the cost of his establishment was henceforth to be paid by the country. The Shelburne Ministry were then in power, and they sought to purchase the goodwill of the heir-apparent by the promise of the magnificent allowance of £100,000 a year. Before they could perform their promise they were superseded by the ill-starred Coalition Ministry.

It was one of the many causes which made the Coalition so abhorrent to George III., that Fox, its author and real head,

---

* Pitt's well-known phrase applied to Fox.

† "Life," vol. i. p. 20-21.

‡ Ibid. p. 30.

who, on account of his opposition to the Royal Marriage Act, the King hated with an undying hatred, was his son's "guide, philosopher and friend," he regarded the Coalition as "his son's Ministry."

Situated as was Fox in relation to the prince, he could not propose that a less allowance should be made to him than had been suggested by the Shelburne Ministry. His proposal was regarded as extravagant by Lord North and others of the Coalition. Fox himself wrote to a friend, that the Foxite Chancellor of the Exchequer, Lord John Cavendish, would not fight with any heart in the cause. In this state of things the King had recourse to that "kingcraft which he began early and practised late." He proceeded to set one section of the Coalition against the other, while collectively he, not without reason and justice, upbraided them with having forsaken their professions of economy, and with their readiness "to sacrifice the public interests to the wishes of an ill-advised young man."*

In the end the Prince was induced to submit to his father's wish, that he should have an allowance, not from Parliament but from the King, of £50,000 a year, which, with the revenues of the Duchy of Cornwall, would give him an income of £62,000 or £63,000 a year, Parliament being only asked to vote £30,000 for payment of the Prince's debts and an equal sum for an outfit. This proposal, which certainly was a beneficial one for the country, was, notwithstanding some opposition from Pitt, agreed to.

In the Parliamentary struggles which led to the dismissal of the Coalition, the Prince openly avowed "that not only Fox's talents were the highest in the Empire, but that his principles were the best and his notions the purest." †

On the first division in the Lords on Fox's much misrepresented India Bill, the Prince voted with his friends in favour of the measure. This revived and strengthened the King's animosity towards his son, and Fox judiciously and disinterestedly advised the Prince to take no further part in the contest. Politics being closed to him, the Prince with increased ardour devoted himself to a life of dissipation. "It would be impossible," says Mr. Fitzgerald, "to give an idea of the whirl of folly and extravagance in which the pleasure-loving young Prince now lived."‡ One of the best portions of Mr. Fitzgerald's book is the description—in the 6th and 7th chapters of his first volume—of the fashionable world at the time the Prince entered it. Even thus early the Prince's thoughts were turned towards domestic life. "He supposed," he dejectedly and prophetically said, "he

---

* "Life," vol. i. p. 35.

† Ibid. p. 48.

‡ Ibid. p. 46.

should be forced to marry some ugly German." The King's well-meant economy in fixing low the Prince's allowance was ill-judged, and its results disastrous. Before he was five-and-twenty he was "as fairly crippled and ruined as the most abandoned spendthrift." He wished to break up his establishment and travel on the Continent — that delusive method of economizing common to all extravagant men. The King peremptorily refused his permission to the proposed travelling—but offered, with more or less of sincerity, to pay the Prince's debts if a detailed account of them were given him. The King naturally and properly censured the Prince's extravagance and dissipation, but his conduct altogether was harsh and severe, and aggravated rather than improved the disastrous condition of his son's affairs. The first Lord Malmesbury narrates at length a conversation between him and the Prince, in which he offered to propose to Mr. Pitt to increase the Prince's income to £100,000, provided the Prince would set aside £50,000 a year to pay his debts, and that he would cease to be a party man and reconcile himself to the King. The Prince said that, even if it were not an impossibility, he should be most reluctant to get rid of his partiality in politics, and he strongly expressed his opinion that Lord Malmesbury's attempt would be useless, as the King hated him, and would turn out Pitt for entertaining such an idea. This he again and again reiterated. Lord Malmesbury would not willingly renounce an idea which, by its accomplishment, would relieve the Prince from a state of distress and even discredit, and place him in one of affluence and comfort, and continued—

"'May I suggest, sir, the idea of your marrying? It would, I think, be most agreeable to the King, and I am certain most grateful to the nation!' The Prince (with vehemence): 'I never will marry. My resolution is taken on that subject. I have settled it with Frederick;* no, I never will marry.' Lord Malmesbury replied, 'Give me leave to say, sir, most respectfully, that you cannot have really come to such a resolution; and you must marry, sir; you owe it to the country, to the King, to yourself.' The Prince: 'I owe nothing to the King. Frederick will marry, and the Crown will descend to his children, and as for myself, I do not see how it affects me.' Lord Malmesbury rejoined, 'Till you are married, sir, and have children, you have no solid hold on the affections of the people, even while you are Prince of Wales; but if you come to the throne a bachelor, and his Royal Highness the Duke of York is married, and has sons to succeed you, your situation, when king, will be more painful than it is at this

* The Duke of York.

moment. Our own history furnishes strong examples of the truth of what I say.' "*

The Prince, though "apparently angry," was "greatly struck with this observation," and dismissed Lord Malmesbury with the assurance, "I will think of what you have said." Far better would it have been for him, for two unfortunate women, and for the people of this country, had he remained to the end of his life unshaken in his resolution never to marry. But *Dis Aliter visum*, while the Prince was yet in his twenty-fourth year,"A beautiful woman, attractive and gifted in many ways, excited a violent passion in him." This was Mrs. Fitzherbert. Lord Brougham describes her as "a woman of the most amiable qualities, and the most exemplary virtue. Her abilities were not shining, nor were her personal charms dazzling, nor was she even in the first stage of youth,† but her talents were of the most engaging kind; she had a peculiarly sweet disposition, united to sterling good sense, and was possessed of manners peculiarly fascinating."‡ The daughter of a Hampshire squire, she married early in life one of the old Romanist family of the Welds of Lulworth, and nephew to the Cardinal of that name. Her husband, dying within a year of their marriage, she married a Mr. Fitzherbert, of Swinnerton, Staffordshire; he died in 1781, leaving her his widow, with a fortune of £2,000 a year. Whether she was of a Romanist family, or whether she was received into the Roman Church on her first marriage, we know not, but when in 1787-8 she disastrously for them both made the acquaintance of the Prince, she was in religious profession a Romanist, but not a devotee; rather a woman of the first fashion."§

How and when she first attracted the Prince's notice does not appear, but she soon became the object of his most ardent attentions, which she resisted for some time, when he had recourse to the stratagem of attempting his life for her sake—a course, as we lately remarked, not unusual with him and his brothers under like circumstances.‖ She was fetched by a party of friends, or perhaps co-conspirators, to Carlton House, where she found the Prince pale and covered with blood, but "with some brandy and water by his bedside."

The Prince told her nothing would induce him to live unless

---

* Quoted, but without any reference, in "Life," vol. i. pp. 72–77.

† According to Mr. Fitzgerald she was at this time twenty-eight.—" Life," vol. i. p. 79.

‡ "Statesmen of George III.," title George. IV.

§ "Life," vol i. p. 78.

‖ *Vide* Westminster Review, N.S., No. cxvi., Oct. 1880, art. "Caroline Von Linsingen and King William IV.," p. 385.

she promised to become his wife, and put a ring on her finger. To escape his importunities, Mrs. Fitzherbert quitted England, and for a time abode in Holland. During her absence the Prince repeatedly conversed with Fox and his wife on the subject of his griefs.

"He cried," Mrs. Fox told Lord Holland, "by the hour; he testified the sincerity and violence of his passion and his despair by the most extravagant expressions and actions, rolling on the floor, striking his forehead, tearing his hair, falling into hysterics, and swearing that he would abandon the country, forego the Crown, sell his jewels and plate, and scrape together a competence to fly with the object of his affections to America."*

Mrs. Fitzherbert kept to the end of her life, a letter of the Prince's, thirty seven pages long, in which he said, "that the King would connive at the union," on which Mr. Fitzgerald, with his peculiar logic observes, "this it would be going too far to call a falsehood, and may have been meant as inference merely." Our inference would be that it was a confirmatory illustration of the King's remark, "a lie always ready when it's wanted." "Wearied out with the Prince's importunities," continues Mr. Fitzgerald, "the lady at last agreed to return under a solemn engagement on his part of a formal marriage as would justify her conscience."†

This, for reasons which will presently appear, is in our judgment and belief a mistake.

The lady was a Romanist, what the law calls a Papist, and the Bill of Rights enacts,

"That any person who shall marry a Papist shall be excluded and for ever incapable to inherit, possess, or enjoy the Crown, and that in such cases the people shall be absolved from their allegiance, and the Crown shall descend to such persons, being Protestants, as would have inherited the same in case the person so marrying were actually dead."‡

Moreover, by the Royal Marriage Act,§ the consent of the King was a condition precedent to render the marriage valid, and without such consent any attempted marriage would be void; and his consent had not even been asked for, and, if asked for, most assuredly would never have been given. Nay, although such an attempted marriage be void, it is by no means clear that the attempt to contract it

---

* Imperfectly and without reference quoted by Mr. Fitzgerald in "Life," vol i. p. 80, but to be found at length in Lord Holland's "Memoirs of the Whig Party," vol. ii. p. 126; and in Sir G. C. Lewis's "Administrations of Great Britain, 1783-1830," p. 106, note.

† "Life," vol. i. p. 80. ‡ 1 W. & M., st. 2, c. 2; 12 Geo. III., c. 11.

§ 1 W. &. M., c. 2; 12 Geo. III., C. xi.

would not operate as a forfeiture of the Crown. Lord Brougham points out that the law of England, and every other country, abounds in cases of acts prohibited and made void, yet punished by a forfeiture of the rights of him who contravenes the prohibition as much as if they were valid and effectual—*e.g.*, in England, if a tenant for life makes a feoffment in fee, this forfeits his life estate, although the attempt to enlarge his estate is altogether ineffectual, and the feoffee takes nothing by the grant.*

Mrs. Fitzherbert returned to England in the first week of December, 1785. Fox evidently suspected that some simulation of marriage was intended, and on the 10th December wrote the Prince a faithful and masterly letter of advice, which we regret we have not space to transcribe at length. After stating the dangers of such a marriage, even supposing "that it could be a real one, but," continued Fox, "your Royal Highness knows as well as I that according to the present laws of the country it cannot be;" and after dwelling fully on that subject, he added—

> "A mock marriage (for it can be no other) is neither honourable for any of the parties, nor with respect to your Royal Highness even safe. This appears so clear to me that if I were Mrs. Fitzherbert's father or brother I would advise her not by any means to agree to it, *and to prefer any other species of connection with you to one leading to so much misery and mischief.*"†

The Prince, therefore, acted with a perfect knowledge of the consequences of his proceedings. He replied the next day to his faithful counsellor in a letter which Sir G. C. Lewis properly stigmatizes as "false, hypocritical, and canting"‡; and on the 21st of the same month the form of marriage was privately gone through between the Prince and the lady.

According to Lord Colchester, who had heard it from Mr. Burton, a well-known member of the House of Commons, a Rev. Mr. Burt, of Twickenham, was the officiating clergyman, and received five hundred pounds for doing it, as he himself declared to his family on his death-bed.§ Written evidence of the so-called marriage still exists in a sealed packet kept at Coutts' Bank.

Lord Brougham says of this transaction—

> "The forfeiture of the Crown was the Prince's own risk assuredly; but he trepanned Mrs. Fitzherbert into a sacrifice of her honour to

---

* "Statesmen of Geo. III.," *ubi supra.*

† Quoted without reference, "Life," vol. i. pp. 81–2; conf. "Memoirs of the Whig Party," vol. ii. p. 127; "Memorials of Fox," vol. ii. pp. 281–3.

‡ *Ubi supra.* Vide the letter, "Life," vol. i. p. 83; Sir G. C. Lewis, "Administrations," &c., pp. 106–7, notes.

§ "Diary," vol. i. p. 68.

gratify his passion, when he well knew that the ceremony which she was made to believe a marriage could only be regarded as a mere empty form, of no legal validity or effect whatever, unless, indeed, that of exposing her, and all who assisted to the high pains and penalties of a premunire; while he pretended that he was making her his wife, and made her believe she was such, he was only making her the victim of his passions and the accomplice of his crimes."*

Lord Brougham wrote this not knowing Mrs. Fitzherbert's own account of the transaction, given to Lord Holland, which Mr. Fitzgerald, as is his custom, imperfectly quotes, and then describes "as admittedly absurd as regards the religious portion, and in the eyes of any one acquainted with the Roman Catholic religion, ridiculous." How far this comment is well founded, our readers may judge by reading the passage, as we will quote it at length:—

"The account"—we transcribe Lord Holland's words—"given of some part of the transaction by Mrs. Fitzherbert herself to a friend of mine, a man of strict veracity, is curious, and I believe, correct. It was at the Prince's own earnest and repeated solicitations, not at Mrs. Fitzherbert's request, that any ceremony was resorted to. She knew it to be invalid in law; she thought it nonsense, and told the Prince so. *In proof that such had been her uniform opinion she added a very striking circumstance—namely, that no ceremony by a Roman Catholic priest took place at all—the most obvious method of allaying her scruples, had she had any; I believe, therefore, she spoke with truth when she frankly owned, 'that she had given herself up to him, exacted no conditions, trusted to his honour, and set no value on the ceremony which he insisted on having solemnized.'* It was performed by an English clergyman, a certificate was signed by him, and attested by two witnesses, both, I believe, Catholic gentlemen, and one a near relation of Mrs. Fitzherbert—Mr. Errington. Mrs. Fitzherbert, from mixed feelings of fear and generosity, tore off the names of the witnesses at some subsequent period lest they should by possibility be involved in any legal penalties for being present at an illegal transaction."*

This false step was the cause of much that was tortuous and sinister in the Prince's after-career. The cloud of debt and embarrassment which lowered over him at the beginning of his intimacy with Mrs. Fitzherbert spread and thickened. He was

---

* "Statesmen of George III.," *ubi supra.* Mrs. Fitzherbert's account first appeared in Lord Holland's "Memoirs of the Whig Party," which were not published until long after the first publication of Lord Brougham's "Statesmen."

† The words in italics are omitted by Mr. Fitzgerald in the passage quoted without reference, "Life," vol. i. p. 85; conf. "Memoirs of the Whig Party," vol. ii. p. 140-2; Sir G. C. Lewis, "Administrations," &c., p. 111. Vide remarks on this affair, WESTMINSTER REVIEW, N.S., No. cxvi., Art. "Caroline von Linsingen and King William IV.," p. 384-6.

compelled again to apply for relief to his father, who in harsh terms declared that neither then nor at any future time would he sanction an increase to his son's income. The Prince held himself out to the nation as reduced to poverty by his father. He broke up his establishment, sold his carriages and horses, shut up half Carlton House, stopped the improvements going on there, and ostentatiously "proclaimed that he was setting aside £40,000 a year for the payment of his debts." The King's injudicious harshness produced the only result to be expected — the Prince borrowed money from the Duke of Orleans, soon afterwards to be known as Citizen *Egalité*. Fox again came to the rescue, and recovered from the Duke the bonds given him by the Prince. Attempts were then made to induce the House of Commons to come to the Prince's rescue, but they were met by Pitt with cool contempt. At the beginning of 1787 the Prince was in a state of almost actual penury, and, contrary to the advice of all the Whig leaders, it was determined that an independent member should bring the state of his affairs before the House. One Newnham, an Alderman of London, was selected, we know not why, as the Prince's mouthpiece, and asked the Minister if he proposed taking any steps to relieve the Prince from his embarrassments. Pitt, in his coldest manner, said he had no commands from the King on the matter, and Newnham gave notice that he would bring forward a motion on the subject.

In the course of some preliminary skirmishes, Mr. Rolle, one of the Members for Devon, George III.'s own model Country Gentleman, the Hero of the "Rolliad," and the "Jan Rolle" of Peter Pindar*—no doubt instigated by the Court—alluded to something which he said "involved matters of Church and State." Pitt made mysterious and even menacing allusions to the "delicacy of the question," and his determination, if need be, however distressing it might be to him—to discharge his duty to the public and enter fully into the subject. He subsequently explained that he only referred to the Prince's pecuniary affairs; but we agree with Mr. Fitzgerald, that there can be no doubt that what was passing in Pitt's mind was the mock marriage with Mrs. Fitzherbert. In the next sitting of the House, Fox interposed, and with reference to what previously fell from Rolle, said, "If allusion were made to a certain low and malicious rumour, he was authorized to declare it to be a falsehood." He further denounced it as "an invention gross and malicious, a report of a fact which actually could not have happened."

* Afterwards created Baron Rolle. He survived to do homage at the coronation of Queen Victoria in 1838.

Rolle replied, "they all know that the law forbade such a transaction, and made it null and void; but still it might have taken place, though not under the formal sanction of the law; and upon that point he wished to be satisfied." Fox, after alluding contemptuously to Rolle, rejoined, "that when he denied the calumny in question he meant to deny it *in toto*, in point of fact as well as law. The fact not only never could have happened legally; but never did happen in any way whatsoever, and had from the beginning been a base and malicious falsehood." To a further question by Rolle, Fox replied that "what he had last said was to be understood as spoken from direct authority. Lord Brougham assures us that before Fox thus far committed his honour, "he took care to be well assured of the fact by direct personal communication with the Prince himself;" and as Sir G. C. Lewis points out, "If Fox had spoken without authority, the Prince would unquestionably, either in public or private, have disavowed his act, which he never did except to one person"—viz., Mrs. Fitzherbert herself. To her, the morning after Fox's declaration, he gaily said, "Only conceive, Maria, what Fox did yesterday! He went down to the House and denied you and I were man and wife. Did you ever hear of such a thing?" She made no reply, but turned pale. Notwithstanding she had in her power the documentary evidence now lying at Coutts' Bank, "she saw that her fate was sealed." The Prince having made Fox commit himself, now proceeded to disavow him. He sent for Grey, then a young member of the House of Commons; but already the rising hope of the Whigs—whom after, like a second Moses leading for forty years through the wilderness of opposition, he more happy than the original Moses, brought into the promised land of place and power—with much agitation he exclaimed, "Charles certainly went too far last night. You, my dear Grey, shall explain it." Grey, as the Prince might have expected, "positively refused to do what he desired." "No other person can," he added, "be employed without questioning Mr. Fox's veracity, which nobody, I presume, is prepared to do." In the course of the conversation the Prince admitted that a ceremony had been gone through, and ended it by saying abruptly, "Well, if nobody else will, Sheridan must;" accordingly Sheridan did come down to the House, and, as Lord Holland tells us:—

> "Utter some unintelligible trash about female delicacy, which implied the displeasure of the Prince, and still more of Mrs. Fitzherbert, at what had passed in Parliament, but did not directly or even remotely insinuate that what Mr. Fox had spoken was either beyond or without the authority of the Prince."

For more than a year afterwards Fox never spoke to the Prince, and Mrs. Fitzherbert never again during their joint lives spoke

to Fox. In this difficulty the Prince fulfilled Sir Gilbert Elliott's prophecy, that he would always have secret advisers behind his responsible advisers. He could not trust himself to upright and honourable men like Fox and Grey, but consulted the shifty clever, good-natured Sheridan, who as long as he lived exercised a bad influence over the Prince. To the end of the Prince's life he never forgave Grey for the part he took in this matter.

On the publication of Moore's "Life of Sheridan," the Prince, then King, denied that absurd story "of his supposed marriage." After his death, Mrs. Fitzherbert produced to William IV. the documents now deposited at Coutts' Bank.*

The Prince's treachery was all for lucre of gain. It was intended to smooth the difficulties that stood in the way of a vote of the Commons to relieve him from his embarrassments, and it was successful. The Commons voted £160,000 towards the payment of his debts, and £60,000 for the completion of Carlton House—his gambling debts were, it is said, kept out of the accounts presented to the King and to Parliament. Three years more had not elapsed when his debts had again mounted up to £650,000.

The story of the plots and intrigues between opposing parties and of the quarrels in the Royal Family which arose in 1788-9 in consequence of the first more serious development of George III.'s ever latent insanity and the anticipated appointment of a Regent, is told by Mr. Fitzgerald with some inaccuracies, but on the whole fully and clearly. We find, however, in his narrative nothing unknown before. In these transactions the Prince again fulfilled Sir Gilbert Elliott's prophecy as to his predilection for secret and more secret advisers. At the commencement of the King's illness, Fox, the Prince's special friend and counsellor, was in Italy. In his absence the Duke of Portland and the other members of the Cabinet of 1783, "the Prince's Ministry," were the natural persons for the Prince to consult. Undoubtedly his proper adviser on the grave questions as to his constitutional rights in this emergency was Erskine, then his Attorney-General.† He, however, appears never to have been consulted at all. The Prince in preference sought the advice of Lord Loughborough, Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, a renegade Whig,‡ who had been Solicitor-General in Lord

* Vide "Life," vol. i. pp. 88–106, vol. ii. pp. 438–441; Brougham's "Statesmen of George III." tit. George IV.; Sir G. C. Lewis, "Administrations," &c., pp. 106–112; and Lord Holland's "Memoirs of the Whig Party," and the other authorities there cited and referred to.

† Erskine was his Attorney General from 1786 to 1793, when he resigned. In 1805 he was made Chancellor of the Prince's Duchy of Cornwall.

‡ See the story of his defection from the Whigs in Trevelyan's "Life of Fox," p. 380, seq. George III.'s epitaph on him, and Thurlow's comment on it, are both equally well known.

North's administration. Behind Loughborough was Sheridan, and behind Sheridan again, a lower depth still, a Captain Payne, familiarly called Jack Payne, one of the Prince's gambling and betting friends. Separate from this group of advisers was Thurlow, oscillating between the King and the Prince, as the medical reports of the King's state varied from day to day, and between whom and Loughborough there was an internecine struggle for the Great Seal. We may remark in passing, that the difference between Pitt and Fox as to the Prince's right to the Regency, illustrates what Lord Harrowby remarked to Mr. Greville, "that the natural disposition of Fox was to arbitrary power, and that of Pitt to be a Reformer."* This accounts for Fox asserting on behalf of the Prince the claim originated by Loughborough of an indefeasible right to all the regal powers and prerogatives undiminished—and for Pitt favouring the plan of restrictions which the Prince, or rather some of his advisers, described "as an experiment to ascertain with how small a portion of kingly power the executive government of this country may be carried on."† The Regency debates did not pass off without an attempt to reopen the Fitzherbert question. It was generally believed that Fox's statement in the House was, unconsciously on his part, a fiction. Rolle, with the pertinacity of a dull, obstinate man, vowed that, in spite of threats and opposition, he would fathom that matter, and with that view he proposed a clause excluding from the Regency any one already married to a Papist, either in law or fact. Fox was conveniently absent; but, in his absence, Grey rebuked Rolle for his conduct, and imputed to him the worst of motives.

The half measures taken in 1787 towards payment of the Prince's debts were, of course, ineffective, and he and the Dukes of York and Clarence raised money, mostly abroad, on their joint bonds. Double the sum lent was to be paid when the King should die, and any of the three brothers should come to the throne. On the authority of a Mr. Huish, who wrote some now forgotten "memoirs" of the time, and whom Mr. Fitzgerald calls "an industrious chiffonier, whose garbage seems always to contain a certain amount of facts," he gives many details of these transactions. We trust, however, the details are garbage and not facts. It is painful for Englishmen to read that much of the money was advanced by French

---

* Vide Sir G. C. Lewis, "Administrations," &c., p. 120; Greville's "Journal," vol. i. p. 184.

† Vide the Prince's letter, "Life," vol. i. p. 161. It is said, p. 163, to have been composed by Burke, altered a little, but not improved, by Sheridan, Loughborough, and other critics.

emigrants flying from the Revolution; that some of them, when settled in England, became troublesome for their money; and that at the Prince's instigation high-handed proceedings were adopted by our Government against these unfortunate persons, many of whom were sent out of England; and in more instances than one, for alleged treason to France, they were sent to the guillotine. Claims arising out of these bonds remained unsettled as late as 1829, the last year of George IV.'s life.* Next, the Prince, in order to mend his fortunes, took to racing. To do Mr. Fitzgerald justice, we must here quote his own words:—

"It can scarcely be understood how passionate and successful a follower of racing was the Prince. Nothing, indeed, more completely disposes of the conventional idea of his character that he was a frivolous being without talents, and engrossed in pleasure."

We pause, in our quotation, to add, by way of comment, the last words of Mr. Fitzgerald's book, in which he says the Prince

"Offers one more disastrous spectacle of a life wrecked by self-indulgence and an unbounded love of pleasure."

We resume our quotation:—

"To be successful in this sport requires, as is well known, qualities of judgment, sagacity, and calculation, with the power of analyzing experience and turning it to profit."†

This is the theory of racing; by way of contrast let us hear another passionate and successful follower of racing narrate his twenty years' experience of his pursuit:—

"Nothing but the hope of gain would induce me to go through this demoralizing drudgery, which I am conscious reduces me to the level of all that is most disreputable and despicable, for my thoughts are eternally absorbed by it; jockeys, trainers, and blacklegs are my companions; and it is like dram-drinking, having once entered upon it I cannot leave it off, though I am disgusted with the occupation all the time. Let no man, who has no need, who is in no danger of losing all he has, and is not obliged to grasp at every chance, make a book on the Derby."‡

The result of the Prince's racing career was that in its four years' duration "he won about £30,000; but the cost of his stud was stated to have been £30,000 a year." Comment on these proofs of his success, judgment, and sagacity in this pursuit is needless. We may apply Mr. Fitzgerald's words to the Prince's racing career:—"Almost every step in his long life, rashly and

---

* See "Life," vol. i. pp. 227-233.

† Ibid. vol. i. c. xxii. pp. 246, 255. Conf. vol. ii. p. 444.

‡ Greville's "Journal," vol. ii. p. 374.

improvidently taken, seemed destined to lead to a train of inconvenience and misfortune."* Not one step was more fruitful in this direction than his marriage, which was the next event in his disastrous career. Lord Thurlow said of the Prince, in reference to his political conduct, "that he was the worst anchoring-ground in Europe." This dictum was equally true of his domestic connections, and not only of his marriage, but of his pseudo-marriage with Mrs. Fitzherbert, and of his other more irregular connections. So far as his marriage was concerned, it was impossible—as Lord Malmesbury, who negotiated it, confessed, with regret—"to foresee or conceive any comfort from the connection." The pressure of his debts, then (1794) exceeding £600,000, was the sole cause which made him consent to a marriage. This was avowed by the Duke of Clarence. With all a sailor's bluntness, and the indiscreet garrulity for which he was remarkable throughout his life, he told his astonished peers in Parliament:

> "That the marriage was part of a bargain, the price being the payment of the Prince's debts. Advantage then being taken of the difficulties in which he was involved, in order to procure from him this consent. He was in the situation of a man who, if he cannot get a haunch of venison will rather take any other haunch than go without."

The Prince suddenly announced to the King his wish to marry, and named the lady of his choice—his cousin, the Princess Caroline of Brunswick.† He had never seen the lady; but in this respect he followed his father's example. The King never saw his intended wife till he met her at the threshold of St. James's Palace, where she mistook one of the attendants for her bridegroom. It is doubtful by whose advice the Prince made his choice. All well-informed persons, according to Mr. Fitzgerald, say that it was directed by Lady Harcourt, and more especially by Lady Jersey, who had for the time superseded Mrs. Fitzherbert in the Prince's favour. Lord Malmesbury thought the Princess had been suggested by the Duke of Clarence. By whomever directed a more unhappy choice could not possibly have been made. There was a rooted mutual dislike between the female members of the Royal families of England and Brunswick. The Princess's father's life was disgraced by the most open and shameless infidelity to his marriage vow. We know the feelings with which she looked on her coming marriage. She

---

* Vol. i. p. 271.

† The Princess Caroline was the daughter of George III.'s sister, who was married to the reigning Duke of Brunswick.

frankly wrote to a confidante, "I am indifferent to my marriage, but not averse to it. . . . . The man of my choice I am debarred from possessing, and I resign myself to my destiny." She seems to have confided the fact of this prior attachment to Lady Jersey, who was appointed her lady-in-waiting. Lady Jersey lost no time in disclosing this misplaced confidence to the Prince. Independently of these untoward circumstances, the Princess was in herself essentially unfitted to be the wife of such a man as the Prince. Mr. Canning, whom Lord Brougham pronounces to be "a judge, alike experienced and severely fastidious," did indeed describe her in the House of Commons "as formed to be the life, grace, and ornament of polished society;" and Lord Brougham himself has left a brilliant *éloge* on her; but it is not the testimony of a witness, still less the opinion of a judge; it is the pleading of an accomplished advocate. Certain grains of fact, however, can be winnowed from his heap of words. "Her talents were, indeed, far above the ordinary level of women; but her education had been rather below the average stock of princesses," even of her day and generation, and her "buoyant spirits were little compatible with the etiquette and the decorum of English palaces."*

The impression she made on Lord Malmesbury, who escorted her to England, he thus records:—

> "She has quick parts, without a sound or distinguishing understanding; a ready conception, but no judgment; . . . . some natural, but no acquired, morality, and no strong innate notions of its value and necessity; warm feelings, and nothing to counterbalance them; great good-humour and much good-nature; but wanting in character and tact. Her father said of her: 'She was not *bête*, but had no judgment.' Her actions were sometimes nasty and indelicate, and she was neglectful of her toilette, and offensive from this neglect."

A fact, the more unfortunate, because the Prince was at this time very delicate in his personal habits, though in his last years he was described by the Duke of Wellington as "extremely slovenly and dirty in private." As to the Princess's personal appearance, accounts differ; some describe her as being in her youth "lovely," a description not warranted by her likenesses which have come down to us. Lord Malmesbury thought her at the age of twenty-seven "a rather ungraceful, hard-featured young woman, with a certain air of coarse good humour." Of the first impression she made upon the Prince there can be no doubt. When introduced to her by Lord Malmesbury, he exclaimed, "I am not well; pray get me a glass of brandy." The envoy replied, "Sir, had you not better have a glass of water?"

* See sketch of her in "The Statesmen of George III.," title George IV.

Upon which the Prince, much out of humour, said, *with an oath*, "No, I will go directly to the Queen." The lady on her part exclaimed, "*Mon Dieu!* is he always like that?" then added, "I find him very fat, and not at all like the picture sent me." A little while afterwards she told Lady Jersey "that the Prince looked like a serjeant-major with his ears full of powder."

No fact is better attested than that the Prince, to nerve himself for the marriage ceremony, had recourse to wine or spirits, of which he partook so freely that he could scarcely either walk or stand. It is needless to retell the story, as well known as painful, of the one year of married life of this unhappy couple, ending within three months of the birth of their only child, in what Lord Thurlow coarsely, but not incorrectly, described as the "Letter of Licence," given by the Prince to his unfortunate wife.* Within two years of the Prince's marriage, his connection with Mrs. Fitzherbert was renewed, and continued for some years.

In 1797 the Prince turned again to politics, and offered to go as Viceroy to Ireland, declaring "his decided opinion that no time ought to be lost in repealing every exclusive restriction and disqualification on the Irish Roman Catholics." This decided opinion was probably inspired by Fox. Certainly it was not the native growth of the Prince's mind. When King he asserted that he had always been opposed to Catholic Emancipation, a pretence which the Duke of Wellington refuted by "looking up" in 1829 the Prince's correspondence with Mr. Pitt in 1797. Could the Prince have been trusted to govern Ireland on the liberal principles he at this time avowed, both England and Ireland might have been saved from irreparable calamities. Mr. Pitt's knowledge of the King's indisposition to any change of the law on the Roman Catholic Question and his distrust of the Prince's honesty and ability, led him to decline making any representation to the King of the Prince's views and wishes on the subject of Ireland.† Deprived of the opportunity of distinguishing himself in civil affairs, the Prince (who was titular colonel of a regiment), in view of the French invasion then feared, personally addressed the King, soliciting to be employed in active military service. The King bluntly refused this request, on the ground that "military command was incompatible with the situation of the Prince of Wales;" but Mr. Fitzgerald tells us that privately the King expressed the opinion that there was but one of his

* See the passages from Lord Malmesbury's work, quoted without reference in "Life," vol. i. c. xx. iv. v. vi., pp. 272–290; and Sir G. C. Lewis, "Administrations," &c., pp. 355, 361, and the authorities there quoted.

† See the Prince's letters in "Life," vol. i. p. 298.

family deficient in personal courage, and he could not name him because he would be his successor.*

During the time of the Addington Administration, the Prince renewed his application for active military employment; the King "applauded" his spirit, but referred him to the answers given before. This refusal aggravated the ill-feeling of the Prince towards the King. By the advice, it is said, of Lords Thurlow and Hutchinson, and Sir Philip Francis, the correspondence on the subject,† between the Prince, the King, the Minister, and the Duke of York, was published in *The Morning Chronicle*, the organ of the Whig opposition. The King regarded the fact "that his son had published his letters" as a crowning insult, and it completed the alienation between them.

The Prince was in no slight degree mixed up with the Ministerial intrigues and complications of 1801, arising out of the King's opposition to Mr. Pitt's proposal for Catholic Emancipation, when, to use Sir James Graham's memorable words, "Mr. Pitt was prepared to do the right thing at the right moment, but genius gave way to madness; and two generations have in vain deplored the loss of an opportunity which will never return."‡ The King's mind was affected by the crisis—"*mon père est aussi fou que jamais*," was the Prince's plain-spoken but indecorous description of his state. A Regency seemed imminent, and the Prince pursued his usual tortuous course. He did not consult Fox and his other Whig friends—but he took counsel with Lord Moira,§ who now for the first time appeared as one of his advisers. It is uncertain whether he consulted Sheridan, but he certainly did consult his most secret adviser of all, Captain Payne. He opened negotiations with Pitt, who had resigned, and with Addington, who had accepted office, and assured him of his readiness to conduct the King's Government by the Addington Ministry (with the addition of Lord Moira), and upon the same principles. The King, however, recovered, and the Prince only sustained fresh mortification, and inspired all sections of politicians with distrust.||

At the beginning of 1804, the King had another attack of insanity, mainly caused by the Prince's publication of the correspondence between them. The Prince again acted with the same duplicity. Lord Moira was his ostensible adviser. With him was associated Sheridan, with whom the Prince had quarrelled, but who was now again in high favour. An incident eminently

* "Life," vol. i. p. 327. Conf. p. 382.
† See the correspondence given at length in "Life," vol. i. pp. 343-363.
‡ Quoted in Sir G. C. Lewis's "Administrations," &c., p. 213, note.
§ Afterwards the first Marquis of Hastings.
|| "Life," vol. i. c. xxx. p. 329; Lord Colchester's "Diary," vol. i. 262.

characteristic of the Prince now occurred—the receivership of the Duchy of Cornwall, worth £2,000 a year, fell vacant, the Prince gave the vacant office to Sheridan, but a claim was made to it by General Lord Lake, whose brother produced a deed formally granting the reversion of the office to the general. Sheridan, however, we are told by Moore,* retained it.

Lord Moira and Sheridan, on behalf of the Prince, negotiated with Addington, as to the arrangements for a Regency, which was now again imminent. They were ready to have joined Addington's Ministry, and Addington offered the Attorney-Generalship to Erskine. He being the Prince's Chancellor,† thought it needful to consult the Prince, and was astonished at receiving an expression of his regret, "that a proposal of this nature should be submitted to his consideration . . . . and that he was the very last person that should have been applied to for either his opinion or countenance respecting the political conduct or connections of any public character, especially of one so intimately connected with him and belonging to his family."

The Prince sent a message to Fox and Grey, assuring them that he was sensible of their attachment, but that, in the event of a Regency, he intended to throw himself into Lord Moira's hands, and therefore would not see them. Lord Moira, in view of the coming Regency, was anxious for the formation of a Fox-Grenville Ministry, such as was formed in 1806, and so advised the Prince; but the Prince assured him that "Pitt and Fox would never act together." Fox, on his part, was arranging for a union between his followers, the old Whigs, and the Grenvilles, for the purpose of ousting Addington, who all agreed was unfit for his post; but Sheridan, at the Prince's instigation, got up an address to Fox, "deprecating all party struggle at that moment." Lord Colchester records that the Prince at this time "repeatedly saw Addington, but nothing passed on political subjects, and the Prince professedly abstained from them." The Prince was again doomed to be disappointed. The King once more recovered, and the Prince had increased the distrust of him felt by all parties.‡

In the formation of Mr. Pitt's second administration in 1804, the Prince seems to have taken no part. His friendly relations with Fox were renewed, and he assured Sir Philip Francis—the reported Junius, who was one of his many secret advisers—that

* "Life of Sheridan," vol. ii. cxix.

† As Duke of Cornwall, Erskine was his Chancellor of the Duchy.

‡ As to these transactions see "Life," vol. i. c. xxxii. p. 364; Sir G. C. Lewis, "Administrations," &c., p. 239; Lord Colchester's "Diary" for 1804, vol. i. p. 474, et seq.

"He desired it might be published to all the world in his name and authority, that in the personal rejection of Mr. Fox from the Ministry to please the King, he considered himself as the party injured; that he saw clearly that Mr. Fox was rejected as his friend, and that it was meant to wound him through his side."*

This was probably only another instance of his habitual duplicity. It is equally probable that another such instance was his assurance to Lord Colchester—

"That he had prevailed with Mr. Fox not to think of bringing forward the whole Roman Catholic claim, but to soften it down for a question for a Committee."†

But it is evident that he was now meditating a change, from the decided opinion in favour of the claim which he avowed when seeking to be Viceroy of Ireland.

A newspaper devoted to him, and known to be inspired by Sheridan, announced—

"That the leading members of both the (Fox and Grenville) Oppositions have declared themselves decidedly in favour of Catholic Emancipation, the personal friends of an illustrious personage alone excepted."

During the latter months of Mr. Pitt's second administration, the Prince's friendship for Fox again cooled, and, through Sheridan, he was renewing his approaches to Addington. The death of Mr. Pitt led to the formation of the Fox-Grenville Ministry, known by the nickname of "All the Talents."‡

The Prince, through his influence with Fox, procured the admission of Lord Moira into the Cabinet as Master of the Ordnance, and the appointment of Erskine to be Chancellor, much to the disadvantage both of that great man and of the country.§

Probably the Prince wished to get rid of an adviser so high-minded and honourable as Erskine, and to find a Chancellor for his Duchy more suitable for his tortuous and dirty ways. This much we know, that when he first suspected the Princess of Wales of conjugal infidelity, he, *more suo*, did not ha[illegible] recourse

---

* "Life," vol. i. p. 381.

† "Diary," vol. i. p. 558. Conf. Moore's "Life of Sheridan," vol. ii. cxix.

‡ Mr. Fitzgerald is mistaken in supposing that this nickname was first given to this Ministry at the time it was reformed after the death of Mr. Fox. *Vide* vol. i. p. 428.

§ Erskine had never practised at the Chancery Bar. It was wished to make him Chief Justice of England, for which high office he was admirably suited, and the Great Seal was accordingly offered to Lord Ellenborough, who refused it on the ground that "neither he nor any person exclusively educated for the Common Law (meaning, as he afterwards owned, Erskine) could be fit for it." The Seal was then offered to Sir James Mansfield, Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, but he declined it, and Erskine became Chancellor. Sir G. C. Lewis, "Administrations." Lord Colchester's "Diary," vol. ii. p. 34.

to Erskine, but to Thurlow, now his private adviser on every important subject, and to an adviser, still more impracticable for his purposes than even Erskine—Romilly. The circumstances disclosed to Thurlow and Romilly led to the first of those miserable inquiries into the delinquencies of the Princess of Wales which is known as "The Delicate Investigation." Considering the events of 1820, it is an odd coincidence that that investigation should have been conducted by the Whigs, and that the cause of the Princess was warmly taken up by the Tories, thus reversing the situations occupied by the two parties in 1820. In both instances the position of each party was one of the accidents of political life. The investigation must have been conducted by whichever party was in office, and the Whigs then happened to be in power, as were the Tories in 1820. Mr. Fitzgerald says, "that it was remarkable that no official action should have been taken till the Prince's friends were in power;" but the particulars of the case were not put in the Prince's hands till December, 1805, and the Fox-Grenville Ministry was formed early in 1806.

We may dismiss the unsavoury history of the Delicate Investigation with this remark—that the manner in which the investigation was conducted, the Princess not being present or represented at it, nor evidence heard on her behalf, and yet a conclusion adverse to her come to, shows that those who conducted the investigation either knew not, or had forgotten, that great maxim of justice which has been thus beautifully enunciated: "Qui statuerit parte inauditâ altera, etiam si æquum statuerit haud æquus fuerit."*

There exist two graphic sketches of the King and the Prince at this time, by two different hands, which are amusing. In June, 1806, Lord Campbell was—

> "Within half-a-foot of the old King. I fear"—he wrote to his father—"he is again going off as 'the blooming of the peas approaches.' He was habited in the most grotesque manner that it is possible to conceive. White leather pantaloons and half-boots; a German great coat without any coat under it; a long rapier sticking out beneath the great coat; a flaxen unpowdered bob-wig; a shovel hat like a bishop's, with a high grenadier feather on it; and he groped his way with a huge gold-headed cane. He seemed in good spirits, and was as talkative as ever."†

Lord Albemarle, then a boy, described, "the first Gentleman in Europe," at the same period as—

---

* "Life," vol. i. c. xxxvi. p. 408. Sir G. C. Lewis, "Administrations," &c., p. 361. Lord Brougham's "Statesmen of George III.," tit. George IV.

† "Lord Campbell's Life," vol. i. p. 183.

"A merry, good-humoured man, tall, though somewhat portly in stature, in the prime of life, with laughing eyes, pouting lips, and nose which very slightly turned up, gave a peculiar poignancy to the expression of his face. He wore a well-powdered wig, adorned with a profusion of curls, which, in my conscience, I believed to be his own hair, as I did a very large pigtail appended thereto. His clothes fitted him like a glove, his coat was single-breasted, and buttoned up to the chin. His nether garments were leather pantaloons and Hessian boots. Round his throat was a huge white neckcloth of many folds, out of which his chin seemed to be always struggling to emerge."*

In the fall of 1806 Fox died. His influence over the Prince, though at times great, was always precarious, and had for some time been waning. His death produced a complete change in the relations of the Prince and the Whig party. Within a few days of Fox's death the Prince wrote to Grey, the new Chief of the Foxite Whigs, a letter which Mr. Fitzgerald would have us believe was not sincere, or intended to be sincere; but which the Prince himself, six months afterwards, called "a most sincere and warm disposition of my mind and views." This "disposition" contained this declaration:—

"As to ourselves, my friend, the old and steady adherents and friends of Fox, we have but one line to pursue, one course to steer—to stick together, to remain united, and to prove by our conduct, in our steady and unshaken adherence to those principles which we imbibed from Fox when living, that now (though, alas! he is no more) we were not unworthy of him, and that his memory will for ever live in our hearts."

At an earlier period, at the time of that schism in the Whig body, which the Gallophobia of Burke produced, the Prince boasted to Georgiana, Duchess of Devonshire:—

"That there never was heard 'a stronger eulogium than I this day pronounced upon Fox, in complete refutation of all the absurd doctrines and foolish distinctions which they (the seceding Whigs) have grounded their late conduct upon . . . . they were completely driven to the wall, and positively pledged themselves hereafter to follow no other line of politics than that which Fox and myself would hold out to them; and this with a certain degree of contrition expressed by them at their ever having ventured to express a doubt either respecting Charles or myself."

In another letter to Grey, written within four days of the letter to him from which we have already quoted, the Prince expressed his grief:—

---

* Lord Albemarle's "Recollections," quoted, without reference, by Mr. Fitzgerald, vol. i. p. 403.

"That any of Fox's friends should of themselves think of retiring from their situations at a moment which imperiously called on them to remain in office to further and bring to bear the system which the great and powerful mind of our poor friend would soon have effected."

In spite of these protestations, the Prince might well have imitated the candour of one of the law officers of the late Beaconsfield Administration, who told his constituents "that he did not know much about politics, but that he found Liberalism would not pay." Fox had obtained over the Prince an influence due to those extraordinary powers of attraction, which both Pitt and Wilberforce owned they felt, and which overcame the prepossessions of Lord Sidmouth, and the repugnance of George III. That influence was now gone, and Grey, Fox's successor, from the independent conduct he pursued in reference to the Prince's connection with Mrs. Fitzherbert, was the object of the Prince's hatred. "The unbending honesty and straightforwardness of dealing with all men and subjects," which Lord Brougham attributes to Grenville, the leader of the other section of the Whigs, and in fairness it must be added, "his neglect of those courtesies, and that spirit of conciliation, which facilitate political and personal intercourse;" which, according to the same authority, equally characterized Grenville, made him repugnant to the Prince—above and beyond these personal considerations Whig principles are essentially anti-pathetic to kings and princes; even when, as in the case of the House of Brunswick, they owe to those principles their throne. Toryism is naturally subservient to them, and the Prince, looking to the prospect of his early accession to power, whether as Regent or King, as naturally turned towards that party, "which has always been inclined to king-worship," and shrewdly judged that he would find advisers more subservient and—chief point of all—more disposed to facilitate his designs on the public purse in Eldon, Sidmouth, Vansittart, and Percival, than in Grenville, Grey, Petty, Erskine, and Romilly.

It is not surprising, therefore, to find that within six months of the death of Fox, and on occasion of the break-up of the Ministry of "All the Talents," the Prince wrote to Lord Moira that he was determined (we quote his own words) "to resume my original purpose, sincerely prepared in my own mind on the death of poor Fox, to cease to be a party man, although in alliance with him it had been the pride of my life to be so; and to retire from taking any active line whatever, at least for the present, in political affairs," and further that he had deemed it his duty to communicate his resolution to the King. We know also from Lord Holland that, after the death of Fox, the Prince "distinctly disclaimed to him all connection with the Ministry, and repeated

above once his total indifference to politics since the death of Fox.*

The truth was, as Sir G. C. Lewis puts it," The Prince's pecuniary extravagance kept him constantly in a state in which it was inconvenient to him to be on bad terms with the King and his Ministers, and therefore made it necessary for him to ride perpetually at single anchor."†

The unsettled state of the King's mind was now aggravated, and the peace of the whole Royal family destroyed by the enquiry, justly and necessarily made by the House of Commons, as the Great Inquest of the Nation, into the scandal as to the Duke of York and Mrs. Clarke. Here the Prince again shewed his shifty, unreliable character. At first he declared he regarded the attack on his brother as an attack on himself. Then finding that the current of parliamentary and public opinion ran strongly against the Duke, he sent one of his household to the Speaker to announce "his intended forbearance not to interfere by his friends or opinions in the discussion of the case." The King, who was in agony at the unhappy position of his favourite son, implored (through the Queen) the Prince to come forward in defence of his brother, urging that his neutrality in such a case was equal to joining in the proposed condemnation. The Prince, however, could not be induced to do more than send Colonel MacMahon, who had succeeded Payne in his household and confidence, to vote in favour of the Duke in order to show that he did not agree in the condemnation of his brother, but he declined to interfere with those members who sat as nominees for the close boroughs of his Parliamentary friends, and whose votes he might therefore have influenced.‡

In 1810 George III. became permanently insane, and his reign virtually came to an end, although for another ten years the coins of the realm bore his image and superscription, writs ran in his name, and the statutes passed were said to be of such a year in his reign. The Prince now was in all but name King. Henceforth his life is the history of this country for the ensuing twenty years, and is known to all; we therefore confine the remainder of our narrative to such facts as illustrate his character, and such as will enable our readers to test the truth of Lord Campbell's astounding dictum, that "George IV. is the model of

* The particulars of the transactions are given by Mr. Fitzgerald, in vol. i. pp. 422–432.

† "Administrations," &c., p. 298.

‡ "Life," vol. ii. c. i. p. 1, 12. Lord Colchester's "Diary," vol. ii. p. 169. Sir G. C. Lewis "Administrations," &c. p. 311.

a Constitutional King of England. . . . He has stood by and let the country govern itself.*

The establishment of the Regency, and its opening, were marked by similar intrigues to those of 1788–9. The Queen was determined that the restrictions of the scheme then proposed should at least for a time be imposed upon the Regent, and to retain in office for that purpose the Percival Ministry, one of the most active and influential members of which was Lord Chancellor Eldon, who had framed the measure of 1788. The Prince in this crisis acted with all his habitual tortuousness and duplicity. He disliked both Percival and Eldon, who had taken his wife's part at the time of the "Delicate Investigation." He, therefore, gave express authority for saying "that he abhorred the present men." We have before said that he hated Lords Grey and Grenville, and shortly afterwards we find that Lord Moira, "who talked unguardedly," said that "the Prince did not mean to remove the present Ministry, but merely to introduce a friend into the Cabinet." Parliament having voted the Regency Resolutions, the Prince sent for the two Whig leaders, to frame his answer to the Addresses of the two Houses, and communicated to them his intention of calling on them to form a Ministry of which Lord Grenville was to be the head. But it was impossible for him not to consult secret and still more secret advisers. Behind the Whig Chiefs, and, far more confidentially, he consulted Sheridan, to whom during their joint lives he adhered as firmly as it was in him to adhere to any one; Adam, who had succeeded Erskine as Chancellor of the Duchy, and Michael Angelo Taylor, a familiar figure in the Carlton House Circle. The answer prepared by Grey and Grenville was set aside, and it was settled that the answer should be prepared by the trio of secret advisers.

Mr. Taylor's graphic account of its concoction deserves to be given in his own words. He was sent for at about three o'clock on the morning of the day the Address was to be presented.

"He found the Prince, Sheridan, and Adam all in consultation. The Prince showed him a rough draft of the address, asking him to make two fair copies, adding, in his own style, 'Those damned fellows will be here in the morning.' On Taylor's advice the Prince went to bed, while he himself proceeded with the task set to him. All the time Sheridan and Adams walked up and down, the latter occasionally stooping to whisper the scribe 'The damnedest rascal existing,' referring to his companion, while Sheridan would occasionally mutter 'Damn them all.' Taylor went home, and returned betimes to Carlton House where he found the Prince in bed, and the deputations from the

* "Life of Lord Campbell," vol. i. p. 467.

Houses waiting below. 'Are those damned fellows come?' the Prince asked. "Yes, sir." After a little while came the ejaculation, 'Damn them all.' Mr. Taylor was then directed to make fresh copies, as further alterations had been made."

If the new Ministry was not completely formed, great progress had been made in its formation, when the Queen and Court set on foot an intrigue to keep the Percival Ministry in office. The success of this intrigue was greatly promoted by the existence of those reasons which, as we have stated, induced the Prince to incline to the Tory party. In this intrigue a leading, if not conspicuous, part was played by Sir Henry Halford, whom Mr. Fitzgerald accurately describes "as one of those adroit physicians whom a Court training forms," and of which he also with equal accuracy says, "there has been a regular succession about the English Royal Family:" a fact which the instances of Knighton, in George IV.'s reign, and Stockmar, in the reign of Victoria, prove. Halford, either directly, or through the Queen, represented to the Prince that when the King, whose early recovery was said to be anticipated, came to learn the change there had been in the Ministry, his malady would be so aggravated that it would be fatal to his life. Halford worked so powerfully and so insidiously on the Prince's fears and feelings, that the day before the Regency Bill received the sanction of the "phantom," as the Great Seal was called in the political slang of the day, the Prince informed Percival that exclusively from motives of filial duty and affection he should retain him and his colleagues in office.*

About the time that the Prince became Regent, "a new, influence," to quote Mr. Fitzgerald, "began to direct his policy and inclinations, and which grew stronger with successive years." This refers to the Marchioness of Hertford, whom Mr. Fitzgerald describes as "a decorous lady of quality, whose connection with her admirer must be accepted as that of a correct and platonic kind."† There is no advantage in reviving dead scandals, and we need therefore only observe that Mr. Fitzgerald here shows his ignorance of the persons of whom he is writing. At first the Regent showed, or affected to show, dislike to Percival and his colleagues. "We have to do business," said one of them, "with a man who hates us, and only wishes to turn us out." At first he would only communicate with his Ministers through the members of his household, an indignity which the Ministers

* "Life," vol. ii. c. ii. p. 13. Sir G. C. Lewis "Administrations," &c. p. 325. "Lord Campbell's Life," vol. i. 267.

† "Life," vol. ii. 57.

would not stand, and the Prince had to give way. He soon showed by his conduct that he was guided, not by principle but by humour and prejudice, and that he would sacrifice even his dislike to persons to gratify his paramount desire of saving himself trouble and annoyance. At the close of the first year of the Regency (1812), the restrictions on the Regent's exercise of the kingly power and prerogative expired. A recent writer observes, "that whatever may have been the faults and shortcomings of George IV., he never, as a King, neglected public duty," and censures "the poisoned pen of faction" which "before and since the death of this unfortunate Prince has not been idle."*

We may remark in passing that this writer would have some difficulty in reconciling his dictum with the facts narrated *passim* by Mr. Fitzgerald, who writes not at all with "the poisoned pen of faction," but rather as the apologist of George IV. We take at random one instance out of many we could give. Lord Moira, attending at Carlton House by the Regent's command for an audience on the Catholic question, was told by the page in waiting "that the Prince had been so drunk the night before, he was not well enough to see him, but had ordered the page to tell him that he (the Prince) had settled the Catholic question, which was not any longer to be a Ministerial question."† The first part of this communication was as true as the remainder was false. The Regent, on his complete assumption of power, sent his well-known letter to the Duke of York. This letter will long be remembered from its having been made by Moore the subject of the "wittiest and most pungent piece of political satire in our language.‡ It will be remembered that the Prince by this letter proposed to Lords Grey and Grenville not to form a Ministry, but to join the Percival Cabinet. It was made, as Sir G. C. Lewis truly says, "in an indirect, ungracious, and suspicious form, and was calculated to deter the Whig leaders from acceptance and even from negotiation." The sinister conduct of the Prince on former occasions had inspired them both with "a rooted distrust of his sincerity." Lord Grenville wrote to a connection, "I have been once betrayed by the King, and I have no taste for affording his son the same opportunity, when I have so little cause to doubt that he has the same disposition." This negotiation fell through. On the assassination of Percival, and the consequent dissolution of his Ministry, the

* "Foreign Secretaries of the Nineteenth Century, to 1834," by Percy M. Thornton, vol. ii. pp. 281-2.

† "Life," vol ii. p. 72.

‡ It is reprinted in "Life," vol. ii. p. 83. See our quotation, *ante*.

Prince, with more or less sincerity, suggested rather than proposed that the Whigs should join a Ministry under the premiership of the Marquis of Wellesley. The distrust of the Prince, perhaps excessive, but under the circumstances most natural, of Lords Grey and Grenville, and the deliberate treachery of Sheridan, frustrated this negotiation. We concur in Horner's and Romilly's opinion of this transaction. It was "the triumph of inveterate duplicity, and the low arts of a palace over an inflexible and proud integrity,"* and we assent to Sir G. C. Lewis's judgment on it, that "the country suffered materially in its best interests by a decision which excluded from the Government, for a long series of years, some of the ablest, wisest, and purest-minded statesmen of the day." We dismiss with one remark Mr. Fitzgerald's laboured attempt to vindicate the Prince from the charge of abandoning the Whigs and Whig principles. It amounts merely to this—that the Prince cannot be said to have abandoned the Whigs, for, spite of his professions, he never was a Whig, nor Whig principles, for political principles of any kind, he never had at any time. The shade of George IV.—if indeed shades indulge in trite quotations—may well say of Mr. Fitzgerald, "Non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis."

The Prince's connection with the Whigs now ended for ever, unless, indeed, Mr. Fitzgerald be right that as late as 1812 the Prince boasted that he had had his daughter trained "in the principles of his most revered and lamented friend, Mr. Fox, who asserted and maintained, with such transcendant force, the just principles on which the Government, under the excellent Constitution, ought to be administered for the true and solid dignity of the Crown, and the real security, freedom, and happiness of the people." It is doubtful when this speech was made.†

In one respect the Prince endeavoured to follow the example of his father, who interfered in the giving away not only "of judgeships, bishoprics, and regiments, but in the subordinate promotions, lay and clerical." The following animated conversation between the Regent and Percival took place within the first few months of the Regency.

Referring to an intended appointment to the episcopate, Percival said—

"On that point, sir, I am positively pledged." "Positively pledged, Mr. Percival," said the Prince,—"positively pledged to give away one of my bishoprics? I don't understand you." "I mean," said Percival, humbly, "that it was the King's positive and declared intention to

---

* Horner's "Life," vol. ii. p. 111. *Vide* "Life," vol. ii. cc. iii. to vii. pp. 60 to 108. Sir G. C. Lewis "Administrations," &c. pp. 328-341.

† "Life," vol. ii. p. 108.

give it to Dean Legge." "Mr. Percival," replied the Prince, insolently, "if I had any direct intimation of what were really the King's wishes upon the subject, I could not only make Dean Legge, Bishop of Oxford, but Archbishop of Canterbury, if it were in my power. But as that is not the case, I shall make my own bishop."*

This was his usual policy, but when he met a Minister firm enough to oppose him he gave way. In the first year of his reign as King he promised a canonry of Windsor to a young clergyman who was then only a curate, but whose appointment was solicited by the then reigning female favourite, in whose family he had been a tutor. The Premier, Lord Liverpool, on hearing of the proposed appointment, went at once to the King, and told him that unless he was allowed to have the distribution of his patronage as Premier, without any interference, he could not carry on the Government, and that he should resign office if the curate was appointed. The King gave way, but, as the Duke of Wellington wrote to the Premier, "He never forgave your opposition to his wishes in that case. This feeling has influenced every action of his life in relation to his Government from that moment." When the weak and inefficient Goderich was Premier, the King, without the least consultation with his Minister, raised this clergyman to the episcopate.† We give another illustration of his supposed devotion to his kingly duties. Mr. Percival, when Premier, at an audience with the Regent, remained with him four hours. One of the Prince's intimates hinted to the Minister, that "nothing annoyed the Prince so much as a long audience; he could not bear the sight of a man for a week after."‡ It was his common practice on such occasions to talk so much that the Minister was compelled to withdraw without having entered on the business on which he had asked an audience. In the mind of George IV. an audience was what the Scotch call "a hearing," which in common English parlance means "a good talking to."

Lord Aberdeen, who knew much of George IV., described him to Bishop Wilberforce as being, towards the close of the Regency, "certainly a Sybarite, but his faults were exaggerated; he was to the full as true a man as his father." By which we understand that the father was fully as false as the son.

---

* "Life," vol. ii. p. 65, referring to "Buckingham Papers," p. 172. Conf. Brougham's "Statesmen," &c. Tit: Geo. III.

† Greville's "Journal," vol. i. p. 45, and "Editor's Note" and "The Duke's Letter," there quoted, and same vol., p. 115. During the same Ministry, the King unconstitutionally made Mr. J. C. Herries Chancellor. *Vide* Greville; "The Memoirs of the Rt. Hon. C. J. Herries" and the *Edinburgh Review* for April, 1881.

‡ "Life," vol. ii. p. 69.

"He would embrace you—kiss you—seized on the Duke* and kissed him. He certainly could be the most polished of gentlemen, or the exact opposite. They said he was always partial to me, and when I was sent to him, he asked, 'What d——d thing have I got to yield to now, that they have sent *you* to break it to me?' In 1818, he was indolent, but he always read important papers, especially foreign affairs. He would not wade through long-winded colonial papers, but *that* is always the case—the foreign affairs are what interests them, they concern the family of princes." †

Would that some artist had painted, or would now paint, "The Iron Duke, in the embrace of the First Gentleman in Europe."

Mr. Fitzgerald tells at length the mournful and familiar tale of the woes of the Regent's wife and daughter, but it is needless to follow him. We agree with him that the Regent's jealousy of his daughter amounted to insanity. He says, what we do not recollect to have seen mentioned before, that so early as 1813 the Regent "was being persuaded by the Duke of Cumberland and Lord Yarmouth that he might obtain a divorce, and by marrying again secure the chance of a male heir to the throne." He gives no authority for this, but it agrees with what we know, on the authority amongst others of George IV. himself, of the mischief-making character of the duke. So much did this idea of a divorce at this time absorb the Regent's mind, that in the midst of a conversation on Wellington's victories in Spain, he burst out in his usual style: "D——n Wellington; the question is, how am I to be rid of this d——d Princess of Wales?"‡ To promote this object he, in his usual underhand way, made through Nash, the architect, one of his creatures, repeated advances to Romilly to induce him to take the Chancellorship without his party. These advances it is needless to say were peremptorily rejected.§ From the same motive arose the renewed investigation into the subject matter of the "Delicate Investigation" of 1806-7. The documents relating to it were referred to a committee of the Privy Council, consisting of the Cabinet, the three Archbishops, the Bishop of London, the principal Judges, and the Speaker of the House of Commons. The question referred to this committee was, whether it was fit that the intercourse between the Princess of Wales and her daughter should continue to be subject to regulations and restric-

* The Duke of Wellington.

† "Life of Bishop Wilberforce," vol. ii. p. 411. The Regency ended in 1820.

‡ "Life," vol. ii. p. 109-117.

§ See the detailed account in Romilly's "Life," vol. ii.

|| See his character of the Duke of Cumberland, given to the Duke of Wellington, and by him reported to Greville. "Greville's Journal," vol. ii. p. 218.

tions. Twenty-one out of the twenty-three members of this committee signed a report, answering the question referred to them with an unqualified affirmative. Some, who were then members of the Liverpool Cabinet, had been in 1806–7 the Princess's confidential advisers, and now found themselves considerably embarrassed. One of them, Lord Eldon, refused to sign any report which would leave it open to any conclusion that he had altered his opinion, that the charges of 1806–7 "were either contradicted, or rested on evidence wholly undeserving of credit." On the other hand, Lord Chief Justice Ellenborough, who was one of the "investigators" of 1806–7, insisted as peremptorily that he could not concur in any declaration "importing the Princess's innocence, although the proof was not legally complete, his moral conviction being that the charges were true." Under these circumstances it was thought, we are told by Lord Colchester, who was then Speaker, "fairer to the Princess to pass the whole matter by," and for the committee merely to answer the question referred to them. Lord Campbell, writing to his father at this date, gives the following lines, whether composed or merely copied by him he does not say:—

> "'Tis strange this pair should disagree,
> Although so equal are their lives;
> The very worst of husbands he,
> And she the very worst of wives."*

Such, however, was not the general feeling. "The embarrassed position of some of the Ministers, their stupid blunders, the extreme unpopularity of the Prince, and the natural interest inspired by a wife abandoned by her husband, gained for the Princess the entire sympathy of the great body of the people of this country."† The Regent could not then show himself without being saluted by hisses and hooting, and cries of "George, where is your wife?"

At the end of January, 1820, the long and melancholy life of George III. ended, and the Regent assumed the name of King. Within the first few days of his reign the new King, as it was said, not only succeeded, but nearly followed his father. For a short time he was ill, and in great danger; but his wonderful constitution enabled him to rally, and he lived ten years longer.

He was now in his 57th year, but he was enfeebled by his excesses, and by many previous illnesses, and after this renewed attack, his weakness, both of mind and body, evidently and

---

* Lord Campbell's "Life," vol. i. p. 295.

† "Life," vol. II. cc. viii. to xiii. p. 112 to p. 184. See Sir Geo. C. Lewis, "Administrations," &c.

rapidly increased. He now became subject to various delusions—one was, that he had taken an active part in all the notable events of his time; he believed, not only that he had ridden Fleur-de-lis for the Goodwood Cup, but that he led the heavy Dragoons at Salamanca and commanded at Waterloo. On one occasion he asserted to the Duke of Wellington—on whose authority we have it—that George III. had said to himself, "Of all the men I have ever known, you are the most perfect gentleman!!!" On another, he told the Duke that the old Lord Chesterfield had said to him—

"I must give your Royal Highness one piece of advice; stick to your father; as long as you adhere to your father you will be a great and happy man, but if you separate yourself from him you will be nothing, and an unhappy one; and by God (added the King) I never forgot that advice, I acted upon it all my life." "We all," said the Duke, "looked at one another with astonishment."

Such power had this habit of self-deception gained on him, and so well was its existence known, that on the occasion of the duel between the Duke of Wellington and Lord Winchilsea some one said, "The King will be wanting to fight a duel himself." "He," replied Lord Sefton, who knew him well, "will be sure to think he has fought one."*

True to his lifelong habits, he, throughout his reign, was under the influence of a female favourite, the Marchioness of Conyingham. Of course he had secret advisers. The Princess Lieven, wife of the Russian Ambassador, had her share of secret irresponsible influence. Another secret adviser was Sir William Knighton, who had been a physician, but was now his keeper of the Privy Purse.† The king hated him. "I wish to God somebody would assassinate Knighton," he exclaimed on one occasion—but it was too much trouble to get rid of him. Knighton served him faithfully, and ruled him with a rod of iron, by the influence a strong mind has over a weak one. Another secret adviser was Sir John Leach, Master of the Rolls and Chancellor of the Duchy of Cornwall, who looked for the higher place of Chancellor of England as the reward of his devoting himself to ensure the success of his master's one great object in life—the getting rid of his hated wife, who had become Queen Consort. Mr. Fitzgerald describes Leach as "a pliant lawyer, the only man of position and ability who adopted and favoured the King's plans." A more accurate knowledge of the man would have taught Mr. Fitzgerald the accuracy of Lord Brougham's

* Greville's "Journal," vol. i. pp. 195-241.

† See Sir Denis le Marchant's "Character of Knighton," "Life of Lord Althorp," p. 217, note. According to Lord Colchester, Lady Conyngham and Lady Knighton were "two intriguants looking only to themselves. "Diary," vol. iii. p. 539.

judgment on Leach—viz., that "not all England, certainly not all its Bar, could have produced a more unsafe counsellor, or one who was as sure to mislead the King as ever man was that undertook to advise another, than his 'vulgar adviser.'"* It was said at the time, "If Leach be in his Sovereign's confidence he has the confidence of no other person in his dominions."

The two great events of the reign were those popularly called the Queen's Trial and Roman Catholic Emancipation. The first, with all its attendant evils, was due to the conceited arrogance of Leach. The second, though its long delay hindered and marred much of its good results, was due to the firmness of the Duke of Wellington. Into the well-beaten track of the history of these events we shall not accompany Mr. Fitzgerald, whose laborious compilation does not seem to us to contain anything new.

On the Queen's trial we gain some fresh information from a quarter not noticed by Mr. Fitzgerald. In the "Memoirs of Metternich," whom Byron well styled "a drawing-room coxcomb," we find him saying, with all his usual self-sufficiency—

"If I had seen the Prince Regent a year ago everything would have been prevented. Castlereagh & Co. have not behaved cleverly. Two years ago I could have put them in a position to manage matters differently. Alarm and want of quickness have brought them into a position from which they will not easily emerge. I gather that this shameful trial makes a shocking impression in England; what would it be if people knew the circumstances more exactly."

From the same witness we have an account of his interview with George IV. when he visited Hanover. It is extremely characteristic of the man.

"The King was lying in a *chaise longue* in a rather fantastic Austrian Hussar's coat. He wore the small cross of the Austrian order. The reception accorded me was that of a dear friend. *I do not remember ever to have been embraced with so much tenderness.* . . . . The King was so good as to compare me with all the great men of antiquity, the Middle Ages, and modern times—naming them—as if he were saying a Litany of Saints. . . . . He ended with a frightful explosion against his own Ministry, especially against Lord Liverpool, but entirely excepting Lord Castlereagh of whom he said, '*He understands you; he is your friend, that says everything.*'"†

The King's conduct with regard to Catholic Emancipation, though professedly based on his "religious feeling," was marked

---

* "Statesmen of George III.": Tit., Geo. IV. As to the Queen's Trial, see WESTMINSTER REVIEW, N.S., No. cxii. Oct. 1879: Art. "Lord Brougham," pp. 500–515.

† Metternich's "Memoirs," vol. iii. pp. 384, 563–6–9.

by more than his usual duplicity, vacillation, and love of intrigue, or, as Mr. Fitzgerald, his apologist, phrases it, "a display of the acts of delay, wheedling, and craft, in all of which he was a proficient." Lord Russell truly says, "George III.'s religious scruples were respected by the nation; the religious scruples of George IV. did not meet with ready belief."* "Nobody," said the Duke of Wellington, when Premier, "can ever know where he stands upon any subject." "It is painful," says Mr. Fitzgerald, "to find Ministers till the matter [of Roman Catholic Emancipation] was settled, declining to trust the King. The Duke of Wellington told the Cabinet that, from his suspicions, 'they ought to keep supply in hand.'" Another Minister, Lord Ellenborough, tells us simply and tersely the reason for this conduct: "The misery is, we have a lying master." On another page of his diary, he writes, "It is impossible not to feel the most perfect contempt for the King's conduct. We should be justified in declaring we will have no further intercourse with one who has not treated us like a gentleman." Again, "The Duke of Wellington gives up the King as a bad job. He sees him very seldom. . . . . He found what he did one day was undone the next, and he is in despair. The King has no constancy. There is no depending upon him from one day to another."†

During the summer of 1829 the King lost the sight of one eye, and the sight of the other became indistinct. Early in 1830 he fell ill, and the people about him became seriously alarmed, and he was alarmed about himself. At the close of the month bulletins began to be issued; and then, to use a well-known phrase of Lord Beaconsfield's, "the initiated knew that all was over." It is painful to read that the King, during his last illness, and even when he spoke of himself as a dying man, continued to indulge in the excesses which had been his habit all his life. As late as May he talked of the necessity of having a new dining-room at the cottage at Windsor ready for Ascot, and of attending the races. The physicians then thought he could not last a week. They are said, by Lord Ellenborough, to have been afraid of telling the King of his danger; but his chief physician, Sir H. Halford, afterwards declared that it was not opportune before the end of May.

"To acknowledge to the King my fears for his safety," and after this, "when he had set his house in order, I thought myself at liberty to interpret every symptom as it arose in as favourable a light as I could, for his Majesty's satisfaction; and we were enabled thereby to rally his spirits in the interval of his frightful attacks, to maintain his con-

* "Recollections and Suggestions," p. 59.

† Lord Ellenborough's "Diary," vol. i. p. 377; vol. ii. pp. 31, 41, 100.

fidence in his medical resources, and to spare him the pain of contemplating approaching death, until a few minutes before his Majesty expired." *

The King continued hovering between life and death until June 26th. At a little before three on the morning of that day, after a sleep of about two hours, he awoke. Soon afterwards he suddenly put his hand to his breast, exclaiming, "Good God! what is the matter? This is death! I have been deceived;" and soon afterwards expired without the least struggle or pain.

None of his family, only his physicians and servants—friends he had none—were present.

Mr. Fitzgerald relates, but does not give his authority, "that Mrs. Fitzherbert offered to come to the King and watch over and soothe his last moments." This is said to have given the dying man much comfort. He also states, but his proofs are by no means convincing, that the King always wore Mrs. Fitzherbert's miniature round his neck, and that it was buried with him.

So lived and died the fourth Sovereign of the House of Brunswick. Lord Campbell said of him, "When he is missed, he may be mourned;"† but "Certainly," we quote Mr. Greville's record of the time, "nobody was ever less regretted; and the breath was hardly out of his body before the press burst forth in full cry against him, and raked up all his vices, follies, and misdeeds, which were numerous and glaring enough."‡

Mr. Bright once spoke of "the monarchy of this country, venerable with the willing homage of a thousand years."

"No people, no rational set of men," says Lord Brougham, "ever displayed to an admiring world the fondness for kings and queens, the desire to find favour in the royal sight, the entire absorption in loyal contemplations, which has generally distinguished the manly, reflecting, free-born English nation." §

Certainly, the devotion to royalty which could stand the long-continued strain of the insanity of George III., and the selfish libertinism of George IV., and which to all appearance is undiminished, seems powerful enough to carry the monarchy through any future trials which human foresight can anticipate.

---

* See the passage from Sir Henry Halford's "Essays and Orations," p. 89, extracted at length by Mr. Fitzgerald, vol. ii. p. 438, note.

† "Life," vol. i. p. 467. ‡ "Journal," vol. ii. p. 2.

§ The account of George IV.'s reign is contained in "Life," vol. ii. book iii. p. 219, to end. Conf. Sir Geo. C. Lewis "Administrations," p. 339-470. Greville's "Journal," vol. i. *passim*. Lord Brougham's "Statesmen of George III.;" and for the last two years, the "Memoirs of the Right Hon. C. J. Herries," and the "Diary of Lord Ellenborough," *passim*. See the account of the King's funeral, vol. ii. p. 291.

## Art. IV.—The Sugar Bounties Question.

1. *Report from the Select Committee on Sugar Industries: Evidence and Proceedings.* July, 1879.
2. *Report from the Select Committee on Sugar Industries.* Final Report. August, 1880.
3. *Parliamentary Return of all subsequent Correspondence on the Subject of the Export Bounties on Sugar. May,* 1881.
4. *Petitions to Parliament from the West India Islands.* 1881.
5. *Annual "Bluebooks" of the various West Indian Colonies.* 1880.

MR. RITCHIE'S Committee was appointed "to inquire into the effects upon the Home and Colonial Sugar Industries of this country by the system of taxations, drawbacks, and bounties on the exportation of sugar now in force in various foreign countries." It is our present purpose to deal specially with the second of these two provinces of inquiry. A very large share of the committee's attention was directed to this effect of bounties on our colonial sugar industries; and a proportionately large percentage of the evidence is concerned with this special aspect of the case.

But there is, for the present, some strange fatality that appears to haunt the very term "colonies." No sooner is this term used than the affairs treated of fail of just appreciation, not only here in England, but even in the colonies themselves. The very men who should know most, are often misled themselves into statements that are hard to reconcile with the records upon which they themselves found these statements. In the records of this particular committee there occur instances of this; and instances, moreover, directly compromising the most important points involved. For instance, in his answer to question 3,858, one of our most trusted authorities on West Indian matters tells us that "the diminished production (of sugar in the West Indies) commenced in 1872." But the figures of sugar exported recorded in the tables provided by this same authority are as follows:—

Sugar Exported from the British West Indies in Tons.

| | 1871 | 1872 | 1873 | 1874 | 1875 | 1876 | 1877 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| British Guiana | 89,000 | 76,000 | 84,000 | 84,000 | 80,000 | 102,000 | 96,000 |
| West India Islands | 211,000 | 173,000 | 195,000 | 188,000 | 237,000 | 214,000 | 181,000 |
| Totals | 300,000 | 249,000 | 279,000 | 272,000 | 317,000 | 316,000 | 277,000 |

The "diminished production that commenced in 1872" did not continue even till the following year.

Again, the same high authority tells us (3960)—

"I think that in, say, ten years half the production of the West Indies would be knocked on the head altogether; in fact it has begun already. I do not think I should be outside the mark if I stated that nearly fifty estates are in course of abandonment now (1879). I think about fifty have come under my own knowledge, principally in Jamaica; about six or eight months ago, so far as my recollection goes, twenty-six estates were advertised for sale without any buyer."

This latter sentence somewhat qualifies the former; but if we turn to the Jamaica Bluebook itself, we find recorded in dry and hard official columns that only *four* estates were abandoned during the year 1879. And it is further to be noticed that these four were of very small size, making altogether only 323 hogsheads of sugar, in an island which exports annually over 30,000 hogsheads. Moreover, there is, in the opposite column, the very significant entry of one "abandoned" estate brought back into cultivation.

In the colonies themselves we have evidence that knowledge of the actual state of the case is not a conspicuous attribute of those interested. It seems that early in the present year a petition to Parliament lay for signature in our various West Indian colonies, this petition, purporting to back up the report of Mr. Ritchie's committee; but in one point, at the least, those who drew up the petition ignored altogether the Report of the committee. The point of the petition is a request for a counteracting duty. The committee, in their Report, "feel themselves precluded from recommending the adoption of a countervailing duty;" and proceed to declare that: "The only certain mode of altogether abolishing bounties, is manufacturing and refining under excise supervision;" and again: "The most effectual way of stopping the granting of bounties is manufacturing and refining under excise supervision." And yet this petition, with the avowed object of supporting the recommendations of Mr. Ritchie's committee, distinctly supports the course which that committee explicitly abandons, and significantly omits all reference to that course which the committee warmly advocates.

It is somewhat remarkable to find this lack of knowledge as to what is actually proceeding, even in those who are commercially and personally connected with the West India Islands. It is, however, more than remarkable—it calls for protest—to find this ignorance reflected in the highest official circles. Among the Board of Trade letters is one, dated Dec. 2, 1880, and addressed to the "Workmen's Committee for the Abolition of

Sugar Bounties." In this there are three paragraphs dealing with the colonial aspect of the question, and the first of these three is penned in ignorance of facts, some of which are detailed in the second; the third is penned in ignorance of facts not only well known in the colonies, but which has been specially and ably treated by the Colonial Office in recent years. Speaking of the proposal to "remedy the complaint of the West Indian sugar grower" by the means of a countervailing duty, the letter runs:—

"The question at once arises whether, under any circumstances, it would be right to ask the consumers of the mother country to forego cheap sugar, and to change their commercial policy, in order to encourage an industry with which their connection is so indirect. To do so would be to make the possession of the colonies a burden, and not a gain to this country, which would then have to bear taxes which would not be imposed if we had no colonies.

"But, independently of these general considerations, I have further to point out, for your information, that the production of cane sugar in the colonies has not diminished under the influence of competition with beet-root sugar, but has, on the contrary, increased during the period in which the bounty system has prevailed. The average of the production of the principal West Indian Colonies was, for the five years ending 1869, about 166,000 tons; for the next five years about 181,000; and for the four years ending 1878 about 200,000.

"It should be remembered, also, that many of the colonies themselves at the present time place an export duty upon their own sugar, and in the face of this impediment, created by themselves, it seems unreasonable that they should ask the consumers of the mother country to give up the cheap beet-root sugar they now get, and to accept in place of it the cane-grown sugar burdened by duties imposed solely for the advantage of the colonies."

The general spirit of this passage ill consorts with the ideal colonial policy which Liberals and Conservatives alike have for years agreed to. To speak of the connection between the consumers in England and the planters in the West Indies as "so indirect," is to ignore altogether the intricate commercial union at the present subsisting between England and the West Indies—a commercial union which is supposed, in these days of freedom for the individual, to subsist on its own strength alone; and which, if it exist at all, must be direct and close, and by no means vague and indirect. Is it possible that the Board of Trade can be ignorant of the fact that Englishmen, for the most part resident in England, and for the most part belonging to the great body of English consumers, own the capital invested in the West Indies, and the West Indian trade? The producers and carriers of the West Indies are most of them residents in and "consumers" belonging to the mother country; their connection with

the West Indian sugar-growing industry is of a most palpable and direct kind. The West Indies are, in Mill's happy phrase, "the tropical farms of the British Islands."

It is much to be regretted that the Board of Trade, after satisfying itself that the West Indies were resisting with marked success the supposed action of the bounties, should have inserted into these letters clauses, now happily meaningless, implying that the refiners and consumers of the mother country still asked whether the colonies were "a burden, and not a gain to this country." Such phrases have not been heard since the days of the notorious crude and bygone "colonial policy," which the English were the first to break through, and which regarded the colonies, not as free portions of the mother country, but as segregated enterprises which could only be supported by the mother country if they proved to be a gain and not a burden to herself. Such language is all the less desirable seeing that, as a matter of fact, no such "change of commercial policy" would do the West Indian sugar growers any good. As a matter of fact he has no need of such change of policy. The proof follows in the succeeding paragraph of the letter.

It is also to be deprecated that the paragraph concerning the export duties should have been inserted. It ought to have been well-known at the Board of Trade that these export duties levied in the West Indian colonies are levied, not "for the advantage of the colonies," but as part and parcel of the various local enterprises, especially that of sugar growing. Usually the export duty is simply a method of levying a tax on sugar estates, on the ratio of their profits, for the purpose of ensuring to these estates certain necessaries. These export duties are thus "specially appropriated revenues" raised on special property, either to secure a supply of labour (as in Jamaica, where they are devoted to the immigration of coolies and the support of labourers' hospitals), or to secure peace and quiet among the unorganized crowds of labourers (as in St. Kitts, where they are devoted to maintaining a yeomanry militia). They are impediments only in so far as all the expenses of production are impediments to its cheapness. But they are raised by, out of, and for, special industries. The method may be faulty, but it is a method, not of general revenue, or for "State purposes," but simply of self-existence for one particular industry.

It is indeed high time that more attention were paid to the actual condition and the actual prospects of this sugar growing in the West Indies. We shall here briefly lay out the facts of the case, collating all by the aid of recent personal experience in almost every West Indian island. We shall confine our exposition, in the main, to these islands; they yield us normally three-

quarters of our own colonial supply. Sugar that is grown in the Mauritius and the East Indies, in Natal and in Queensland, finds its chief market in the Eastern Hemisphere. It may be noticed incidentally that the local demand in South Africa and in Australia is increasing rapidly, but it is increasing out of all proportion to the increase of sugar-planting in these large colonies. In Australia, at the beginning of this century, there was no market for sugar. Now, in the Australias there has come to exist a rapidly increasing population of nearly 3,000,000, and all great consumers of sugar. Over the vast interior of the "island continent" sugar is among the most important of the "rations," which form part of the pay of shepherds, stockmen and others; and in the cities, that are appearing with such rapidity, well-to-do communities of Englishmen are vying with the mother country in their large consumption of sugar per head. But these West Indies—these "tropical farms of the British Isles," as they have been termed—are the English sugar colonies in most direct connection with the English market, and therefore the group of colonies most typical of our colonial sugar industries, so far as they are influenced by European Bounties.

At the very threshold we must notice that there is one great fact persistent throughout the history of West Indian sugar-planting, and that is the fact of the perpetual plaint that all is going wrong. The "groans of the planters," that made so great a stir in 1670, have never ceased since then to burden the atmosphere. This is, indeed, fresh evidence in support of the plausible theory that the secret of Englishmen's success is their native propensity to grumble. West Indian planters, like their fellow-agriculturists in England, are never satisfied; and it is well they are not. They will have it that what they attempt is done better elsewhere, and the consequence is that they do things better than they are done elsewhere. They grumble that the French have tramways in Guadaloupe, and with this grumbling they introduce better trams on their own estates. This "groan of the planters" must be taken "cum grano." The remembrance of the persistent recurrence of those groans is necessary to any complete explanation of the case.

The outrageous assertions of the present evil effect of the bounties do not surpass the frantic anticipations of evil which centred, in days gone by, respectively round the abolition of slave labour, the competition of slave *versus* free-grown sugar, and, more lately, the extinction of the sugar duties in England. Forebodings just as dismal, arrays of figures just as curious, arguments just as little founded on fact, cropped up in these episodes, and with the same urgency and the same need of explanation as in this last. But the sugar-growing industry has

managed to survive. It may be it has changed; it may be it is destined to yet further change; but its destruction would seem to be as far off as ever.

The emancipation of the West Indian slaves, and the whole movement that has abolished slavery in this western civilization, entailed, like all radical changes, much incidental loss and trouble. For long Cuba and Brazil kept slavery alive and smouldering, though the trade itself was doomed. In this interval loss was occasioned to the West Indies by two distinct causes. In the first place, the West Indian planters themselves, for the moment, failed to devise any efficient substitute for the abolished slave labour; in the second place, the Cubans, foreseeing the doom of the slave system, drove the machine to the utmost of its power. The very impending end of slavery largely stimulated the transhipment of negroes from Africa to Cuba, and largely stimulated the Cuban endeavours to force all the work possible out of the doomed slaves. The consequence was a frightful rate of mortality, which, in the end, made its heavy mark on the cost of this kind of labour, and in great measure hastened the change that was to ensue when civilized cruisers had at last managed to stop this importation of fresh material—a change which again set West Indian planters on their legs.

The gradual extinction of the English sugar duties was again a subsidiary cause that soon figured as a main pretext in these renewed complaints of West Indian sugar-growers. We have here a significant example of the practical difficulties that surround even the doing away with government interference with industrial affairs. We have again dominant the rule that, in such interference, if you benefit one class you *must* disadvantage some other, at all events for the time being. When England took the step of substituting for the graduated scale the one uniform duty on all sugars, it is obvious that the inferior raw sugars suffered, while the superior gained. The West Indians at once found a cause of complaint; and, on the whole, it is probable that this step towards the abolition of the duties had some temporary adverse effect on the West Indian industry. But with the abolition of these duties there ensued a majority of redeeming features. The English public, for instance, that abolished slavery and the sugar duties, offered speedy compensation in the greatly increased consumption of sugar in England that followed on each of these high-principled acts. In 1840 the total sugar consumed in England was 4,500,000 cwt., its value was about £10,000,000, and the consumption at the rate of 15 lbs. per head. In 1873 the consumption had risen to 51 lbs. per head. The duties were finally abolished in 1874, and for the year 1879 the total of consump-

tion was at the rate of 65 lbs. per head, representing a total of 20,000,000 cwt., for which no less than £27,000 000 was paid.

We are now face to face with the latest phase of these complaints. We are told that the abolition of these duties injured West India sugar growing by allowing unbridled play to the baneful effects of bounties that are given in sundry foreign countries on the export of sugar. Incidentally, however, it will be remarked that these very bounties themselves only exist in countries where sugar duties continue to be levied; and the abolition of these duties in England set up England herself as a most successful example of a country thriving in an atmosphere where bounties are impossibilities, and where the market for cane sugar is free of access. That this example has not been without effect we see in the fact that the French and other bounty-yielding countries are already exclaiming they can no longer compete with English refiners, or with colonial growers of sugar. Thus this much complained of abolition of sugar duties has in itself come to be one of the most powerful arguments towards the destruction of these very bounties that are regarded with such pious and unfeigned horror.

Before considering the bounties themselves, the real measure of their effect, and the best means to their removal, it is well briefly to examine, by the light of recent local knowledge, the present condition of the industry of sugar growing in our West Indian colonies. We shall at once find that these colonies have, during the present century, passed through three periods—the one, of corruption and collapse culminating in the abolition of slavery in 1838; the second, of mismanagement and uncertainty, until some ten or eleven years ago, when matters became more settled; the third period that has since set in is of steady progress, and of a far more healthy and hopeful tone generally of enterprise and management. The most significant feature of the middle or transition period was the odd reluctance with which those most concerned came to recognize the dawn of new and more favourable conditions. It has always been common to confine causes to the single influence of slavery and emancipation. And this common error is rarely rectified by the altogether necessary, if forgotten addition of the fact that prices of sugar have seen as great changes as this labour question. In the world's market, from causes quite extrinsic to the West Indies, the price of sugar has, since the period of emancipation, fallen from £50 to £20 a ton. It is true, that here again the vast increase in consumption which England's free trade policy has enabled her to enter upon, has in great measure compensated this enormous fall in prices. Prices may have fallen to one-third of what they were, but the Englishman consumes just

three times as much as he used to do. This would be very palpable compensation, but for the fact that the West Indian growers do not provide him with the extra supply he now consumes. And this is in great measure the fault of the West Indian grower himself; but it is a fault he is fast remedying. His chief obstacle has, hitherto, been his being trammelled at every step by the traditions and the arrangements created by and for a state of affairs that has passed away. And the dying voice of this old dispensation is the present persistent outcry that bounties are creating much loss, suffering, and injury to our West Indian sugar-growers.

As a matter of fact the West Indian colonies, even under present arrangements, seem capable of producing sugar *cheaper* than it can be produced elsewhere, or from other plants. Mr. Quintin Hogg pointed out (Ques. 3871): "You get in saccharine matter *four times* as much to the acre in Demerara as you would get in France." Any one conversant with the West Indies will acknowledge that the actual cost of growing and manufacturing sugar range from £9 to £12 per hogshead. The cost of putting this sugar in the English market ought not to exceed £3 or £4 a hogshead. Beet-root growers and manufacturers universally declare that a price of £18 a ton is a price that will, if permanent, destroy their industry altogether. The limit that will destroy beet growing will only *curtail profit* in cane growing as at present carried on in the West Indies. This fact should suffice to show bounty-giving countries the prompt necessity of a reform of their ways. The boasted effect of these bounties is to lower prices in the great English market; but this, in the end, is to abolish bounties, by rendering impossible the industry they were instituted to support. The "bounty-fed" refiners already cry out. M. Léon Say himself complains: "Ce qui est certain, dans tous les cas, c'est qu'à l'inverse de ce qui existe pour les raffineurs Français, les raffineurs Anglais peuvent obtenir leur natière premièrs a un prix inférieur in ce qui devrait être son prix normel."

Growers are also discovering their error. In his Report for Mr. Ritchie's Committee on the sugar industry in Germany, our Secretary to the Embassy tells us, "the average cost of manufacturing raw sugar from beet would be about thirty marks (30s.) a cwt." And at the present, whatever the actual cost of production on the spot, the governments of these countries allow the general public to subscribe to make good any losses the refiners and growers may become subject to, owing to the low prices forced upon the market. How far, and for how long, a confiding public will thus continue this thankless and baneful charity time only can prove.

Among our West Indian colonies the Island of Jamaica may be taken as a fair sample of what is now proceeding in that part of the world, for the Island of Jamaica has not, so far as sugar growing is concerned, advanced in recent years with the rapidity shown by others of our West Indian colonies. And yet, even in this matter of sugar, Jamaica has a tale to tell that is quite contrary to the prevailing ideas, not only in England, but in Jamaica itself. A great collapse or alteration of all conditions occurred in Jamaica on the abolition of slavery. Then followed a period of trial and stagnation. Since then there has been steady recovery; but also, right through, there have survived, even until now, not only traditions but experiences of the older state of things: and the contrast, though becoming daily less and less marked, has for many years exerted only too much influence.

In general terms it may be asserted that, from 1800 to 1840, there was a general and rapid decline in the prosperity of Jamaica. The climax was reached in the abolition of slavery, and the consequent period of confusion.

| | Population. | Total Export. |
|---|---|---|
| 1800 ... ... | 260,000 ... ... | 3,000,000 |
| 1850 ... ... | 400,000 ... . | 850,000 |
| 1880 ... ... | 560,000 ... ... | 1,500,000 |

The period antecedent to the abolition of slavery was a period of marked and continuous decline. The period that followed, from 1840 to 1865, was a period of false ideas, of mismanagement, of absenteeism, of debt, of extravagance. The turning point came with the Morant Bay troubles; and with the consequent inauguration of good government commences a period of steady recovery. But public opinion in Jamaica has not even yet emancipated itself from the traditions of the slavery period, or from the sad experiences of the transition period. These seem burnt into the heart of Jamaica, and they powerfully prevent all timely recognition of the totally different conditions and prospects the present offers. It is, perhaps, useful to remember that this feeling is mirrored faithfully in the one or two leading newspapers. Minds thus affected cannot bring themselves to believe that the new Jamaica is, or ever can be, prosperous; and yet facts stand out in strong contrast to this sentimental conservatism. For instance, the totals of the three chief exports for the last four decades stand as follow:—

| | Sugar. hhds. | Coffee. lbs. | Rum. puncheons. | Pimento, &c. cwts. | Total values exported. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1840-9 ... | 402,000 ... | 64,000,000 ... | 170,000 ... | 37,000,000 ... | £9,000,000 |
| 1850-9 ... | 369,000 ... | 53,000,000 ... | 170,000 ... | 61,000,000 ... | 8,000,000 |
| 1860-9 ... | 329,000 ... | 70,000,000 ... | 190,000 ... | 54,000,000 ... | 8,400,000 |
| 1870-9 ... | 352,000 ... | 87,000,000 ... | 210,000 ... | 59,000,000 ... | 12,900,000 |

Previously to 1840 there had been a steady and very large decline. Sugar fell from an annual average production in 1800

of 120,000 hgds. to 40,000 in 1840; rum fell in the same period from 50,000 to 17,000 puncheons. There has been, then, in Jamaica a great falling down, but now there is a great recovery. This has been most definitely shown in the records of the area under cultivation. Such land becomes liable to a tax of 3d. an acre. In 1868 there were 39,000 acres paying this tax; in 1876 there were no less than 49,000. During the last eight years fruit has been grown largely, and exported in fast increasing quantities. In 1870 the value of fruit exported was £6,000; in 1879 it had reached a total of over £40,000. Real social prosperity appears to be spreading fast in Jamaica. The rapid increase of the negro in numbers is, no doubt, partly result and partly cause of this. The census gave 346,000 negroes in 1861, and in 1871 393,000, an increase of 46,000 in only ten years, with no aid from immigration. This increase is a vast benefit, not only to the negro, but to the whole island, and—heresy though it is to say so—above all to the sugar planters themselves. The negro increasing thus fast fills up the land with population; and it is only in comparatively empty and virgin lands that man can feed himself in idleness. With increase of population, land available for agriculture rises in value; the negro, to obtain this extra value, must work for wages. The more the negro increases in numbers the greater will be the need that he work; the more the negro increases in numbers the surer will be the supply of much needed labour to the planter. Barbadoes is witness to this.

In every way, then, there is in Jamaica hope of better prosperity, not only for the community as a whole, but for the sugar industry in particular. Among other incidental advantages the prosperous negro eats beef; of late years the keeping of "pens," or cattle farms, has thus become a most profitable undertaking; and many a sugar planter is enabled now to live in and out of his pens, and take all the clearances from his sugar as so much pure profit. Pimento, logwood, fruit, and this supplying the local meat market, are opening up to the planter new mines of profits; he need not now look solely to sugar. He will consequently be enabled to stand pressure in prices which other sugar growers will be little able to face. Year by year he will become better enabled to hold up through prices that would, if maintained, put an end altogether to beet cultivation; and he will, in addition, reap considerable reward in the sudden rise of price that will follow any definite failure of other supplies. He will not forget that even the shortness of the beet crops in 1876-7, really a difference of, say 270,000 tons in the world's supply, at once sent up prices nearly 50 per cent.

We have in Jamaica, it would seem, every sign of a prosperous

community. We in England must not be misled by the counter-statements of a small clique still extant in Jamaica which, wedded to the older conditions, vents its displeasure at the undisguised success of the new dispensation by clamorous exaggeration of every small ill. The present governor, it seems, with the apt instincts of an unbiassed statesman, thoroughly recognizes the real tendencies of affairs; and it is a great advantage for the Jamaican community that it is under the care of one who is not blinded by the traditions of a state of things that has passed away: otherwise, these clamorous remnants of "old Jamaica," blind to the actual resulting facts of the present, would prove but sorry leaders of their equally blinded fellow-citizens. We have nothing but an historical interest in the fact that such a clique still survives. By a strange misnomer the old dispensation was termed "representative government." Government in those days lay in the hands of the more prosperous among the 13,000 whites, and its rule extended over 500,000 negroes and coloured inhabitants; in other words, there existed an oligarchic despotism, a system which destroyed itself by its own proven incapacity to fulfil the functions of a government. The Morant Bay crisis brought in a definite change. In all such changes there are some who do not approve, and these in Jamaica are strongly stirred against the present governor because he tells them that the whole community is advancing fast in prosperity. This is to them little short of "flat heresy," and in direct contradiction not only to their convictions, but, above all to their vaticinations. They are soured to find that, under a new dispensation, Jamaica can achieve a prosperity proved to have been impossible under the old dispensation.

Governor Musgrave has done Jamaica a real service in calling attention to facts. Both imports and exports have increased fifty per cent. in the last fifteen years; debt has been paid off to the amount of £100,000; population has increased from 450,000 to 550,000; savings-banks, telegraphs, government railways are all introduced and rising rapidly in public estimation; the tram-cars, started in Kingston only eighteen months ago, already yield 15 per cent. profit; education is not only extending with great rapidity, it is also increasing with equal strides in efficiency; and the people year by year are becoming better housed and better clothed. In such a community, no doubt, the home market is a chief concern; but it is additional and crowning testimony to prosperity to find that the industries that result in exportable products are likewise in flourishing development; and for our special purpose it is important to notice that among these industries sugar retains the premier position.

EXPORTS FROM JAMAICA, 1879.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Sugar ... ... | £400,000 | £600,000 sugar. |
| Rum ... ... | 200,000 | |
| Coffee ... ... | 250,000 | £660,000 all other products. |
| Dye-woods ... | 200,000 | |
| Pimento & Fruit | 150,000 | |
| Miscellaneous ... | 60,000 | |
| Total, | £1,260,070 | |

It would appear, then, that the industry of sugar-growing in Jamaica has come to be a leading industry in an essentially flourishing community ; and there is not even logic in the assertion that this particular industry can be in a languishing or decrepid condition.

And the same account, with increased point, applies to the other West Indian colonies. These are, in the aggregate, exporting year by year more and more sugar; and they did this in spite of the falling off in prices, which was so much commented upon in late years, but which is now over. And there is little marvel in this, for those who know the West Indies know that this falling off in price represents, not an endangering of production by a falling of price beyond possible limits of cost of production, but merely a curtailment of profits which, so far as this falling off has yet gone, is a curtailment that West Indian planting can well meet. Can the same be said for beet growing? And, in addition, there are phases of West Indian planting, as we shall presently see, greatly benefited by this temporary fall in price. This fall hastens the creation of a new and free class of planters, untrammelled by the encumbrances and engagements of the older class, that has brooded for so long over West Indian productive enterprise.

It is well worth putting on record the figures supplied to the Committee by Mr. Hogg of the export of sugar from the British West Indies. They exhibit a marked, sustained, and definite increase. They, of course, vary from year to year. There are few crops more variable than the cane crop. It will be well, then, to record the totals for four-year periods, and so eliminate this element of uncertainty, and better fit the figures for general perusal.

EXPORTS OF SUGAR FROM THE WEST INDIES.

| Years. | Totals for 4 years' periods, in tons. |
|---|---|
| 1844–47 | 554,000 |
| 1848–51 | 544,000 |
| 1852–55 | 608,000 |
| 1856–59 | 649,000 |
| 1860–63 | 754,000 |
| 1864–67 | 797,000 |
| 1868–71 | 903,000 |
| 1872–75 | 899,000 |
| 1876–79 | 975,000 |

From 1844 to 1865—for twenty-one years—the actual annual total never reached 200,000. Since 1865—for sixteen years—the annual total has never been below 200,000, except in the two years 1869 and 1872. It will be observed, also, that in the period 1872–75 there is a falling off, slight indeed, but still not an increase. This is worth noticing, in spite of the more than compensating increase in the next period, 1876–79; this latter great increase, it will be remembered, comes immediately after the abolition of Sugar Duties when Bounties were said to be of most effect. That this abnormal decrease was the effect of seasons alone, we know when we see that the crops of 1872 and 1873 were very much below the average (amounting but to 400,000 for the two years); and there is further proof in the fact that for those two years the prices of sugar were, in the words of the Report of the Committee, "abnormally high."

It is well to notice parenthetically, that, though the present condition of the industry of sugar growing in our West Indian colonies is in a condition which enables it to contemplate without anxiety the competition of beet-root in the future, it is in a condition, nevertheless, which is itself capable of vast improvement. Those concerned with the West Indian industries themselves give palpable proof of this in the vast sums annually expended in machinery, and the introduction of improved methods of cultivation and manufacture. In Barbadoes, for instance, sugar land fetches nearly £100 an acre at this day. These prices would not be maintained in a despairing community.

It has been remarked that the sight, not uncommon in Jamaica, of a ruined windmill or watermill is a welcome sight, inasmuch as it tells a tale, not of relapse, but of advance; a tale of the fertilizing introduction of steam power and fresh skill and fresh capital; and, in a similar sense, it is true that of late years the records of estates abandoned, and of estates sold for what they would fetch, are signs, not of demise, but of fresh life. In the days of slavery and of high prices estates were started over large areas; in the course of years most of these became encumbered with jointures and charges. In the days of collapse that ensued, both in regard to the labour question *and* in regard to price, the absentee proprietors of these charges and encumbrances let matters "drift" in the hopes of better times; they looked to the future to solve both the labour and the price troubles. In most cases these estates were owned in groups, and the very favourably situated paid sufficient profit to cover for the time the losses on the badly situated. By degrees that were altogether too slow, estates were one by one put out of cultivation or sold; and it is one great advantage of low prices that they considerably accelerate this salutary process. There were many estates continued

in working that had yielded profits when sugar was at £50, but which had no chance of doing so with sugar at £20. There were many estates that could well yield profits sufficient for one or two incomes, even when prices had so fallen; but such estates only too often remained charged with the supply of the five or six private incomes that had of old easily been yielded by the higher prices. It is, then, a gain to all to find the one class of estate absolutely put out of cultivation, and to find the other sold for what it will fetch; and sold, moreover, to new owners who, no longer burdened with the old charges and jointures, may proceed forthwith to make excellent commercial profit out of the legitimate advantages the West Indies undoubtedly possess over most other countries in this matter of sugar growing.

These high prices also helped maintain among many planters a proud abstention from attempting to remedy the losses and difficulties that had come of the abolition of slavery. There arose, not unnaturally, a bitter class feeling, brooding over the fact that in order to achieve a national object the individual had been made to suffer; there had been an apparent breach of justice, and the injured class sat down on their estates, and when things went wrong, enjoyed an uncouth and baneful satisfaction in proving to the world that the injury done was material. These ideas are not yet completely eradicated, and they are partly to blame for a slowness, apparent most in Jamaica, among planters to improve their cultivation. Already, however, sufficient has been done to prove at once the actual value of these improvements, and spread the knowledge that they are possible. Ploughing, weeding, manuring, and irrigation, have been proved to greatly increase the quantity of cane to the acre. Better weeding, better care, and better handling of the "working oxen," have curtailed largely the expenses of "hauling" or taking the cane to the mill. Tramways, and "wire railways" for ravines, have been introduced with similar effect. The "Usine" system will probably pay in certain districts when introduced. The railway extensions, and new coastwise steamers, will largely relieve many districts of their heavy expenditure in the matter of the carriage of the sugar to the port of shipment. Altogether, there are many prospects of considerably cheapening the present cost of production.

But, after all, the chief pillar of success is the rise of a new class of planters, who shall be free and independent of the overshadowing consignee. It is not only in Jamaica, among West Indian islands, that the planter has been weighted with this "consignee" burden. The cause has been want of capital; the result, that the planter has to hand over his sugar for sale on a system that gives him no say in the choice of markets or the

time of sale. The present drag that this is on the sugar grower is just now apparent in Antigua. Sugar has there been sold for £2 a ton more than was being given for sugar intended for the London market. And the reason is that this extra-priced sugar is destined for the New York market. The planter, who is in the hands of his consignee, has nothing to say as to where *his* sugar is to go; the planter reaps not the benefit; the consignee, who has supplied him in times of pressure, is there to take all profits. Many planters are already emancipating themselves from this villeinage; and in this way alone it is probable a saving of at least £2 a ton might often be effected in the cost of putting West Indian sugar into the market.

It will be seen then, that, so far as fact goes, the West Indian sugar industry is in far better and far healthier plight than it has been before. But we may not on these reasons forget that there are adverse conditions still surrounding this industry which specially affect its statistics. To recognize these is to clear away many false issues that have come to be regarded as absolute truth.

For instance, West Indian planters have not been without their share of the unlucky seasons and the unfavourable climatic influences that usually haunt toilers in the soil. Severe droughts have from time to time greatly curtailed exports from Antigua, Barbadoes, and British Guiana. A similar effect will probably follow on the severe droughts of the present year. The appearance of hurricanes is unhappily not rare in the West Indies; and they create much havoc among the canes, the buildings, and the machinery. Floods, too, come often with terrific violence, as that in St. Kitt's last year, when thirty inches of rain fell in three hours, and when whole acres of canes were swept off bodily—canes, soil, and buildings—into the sea. These climatic influences are the causes at the bottom of the remarkable variations, from year to year, in the output of estates, and even of colonies.

The present condition of sugar affairs is, however, most affected by the fact of the widespread trade depression that had prevailed for so many years in the Western world. And it is specially noticeable that in no trade or industry has this depression been felt less than in this sugar industry. The growing of sugar in the West Indies is one of the few industries that has not shown unmistakable signs of "shrinkage" during this late unprecedental continuance of bad times. Since 1874 other trades have largely curtailed their annual output. Since 1874 the West Indian sugar growers have had nothing to complain of but the fact that they have not *largely increased* their output. If we take the export figures we find a progressive increase, taking one year with another; all that can be advanced is, that the rate of increase has not been so rapid of late. The figures for the *years*

*of depression*, 1876–79, are 249,000, 246,000, 230,000, 249,000. But there are only four individual years in the whole previous thirty-six years in which the export exceeded 230,000 tons. Thus, the production of sugar in the West Indies seems to have more than maintained its ground, when most other industries were not merely stationary but suffering actual shrinkage.

Moreover, these years of depression have undoubtedly been accompanied by a lesser growth in the consumption of sugar than might have proceeded had they been years of plenty. The computed totals of sugar *consumed* in the western world of Europe and North America, were for these years, 1875–78 respectively, 2,250,000, 2,223,000, 2,188,000, 2,418,000. As England is the great sugar market this falling off was specially noticed in England. And in the face of these figures it is in great measure reassuring to see that the West Indian exports so exactly follow suit. It is difficult to see in this anything but the ordinary following of supply on demand.

When these bad times came with these years 1874 and 1875, there was, both in Europe and in the United States, a serious falling-off in the consumption of sugar. It has not yet been noticed that sugar was one of the first commodities to recover itself. But that the industry, as a whole, suffered only temporary shrinkage when depression set in, is clearly set forth in the figures provided by Mr. Martineau and other high authorities on this subject.

But this very recovery—this very fact that the sugar market anticipated by a year the recovery in some other markets, so far as quantity was concerned, is very largely illumined by the corresponding fact of a serious falling-off in price; and this is, perhaps, the one fact that has had most influence on the prospects of sugar growing. As in other industries, so in this, it is *the price* of the raw material that is the main element in the price of the refined article; but there also is the reflex action of the market price obtainable for this latter on the price of the raw material.

Mr. Hogg, Mr. N. Lubbock, and others, have handed in statistics of these prices in various types of sugar, and a knowledge of these figures is absolutely necessary to a true comprehension of the position.

Mr. Hogg registers the following prices of "West India Muscovado" for each year from 1858 to 1878. Mr. Lubbock gives the prices for "Clayed Manilla":—

| Years:— | 1858 | 1859 | 1860 | 1861 | 1862 | 1863 | 1864 | 1865 | 1866 | 1867 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *s. d.* | *s. d.* | *s. d.* | *s. d.* | *s. d.* | *s. d.* | *s. d.* | *s. d.* | *s. d.* | *s. d.* |
| Muscovado ... | 27 10 | 27 7 | 26 11 | 24 3 | 22 2 | 21 6 | 28 11 | 23 8 | 22 2 | 22 5 |
| Clayed Manilla | 25 3 | 24 9 | 25 6 | 22 0 | 20 11 | 20 2 | 25 8 | 21 3 | 19 2 | 20 4 |

| Years (*con.*):— | 1868 | 1869 | 1870 | 1871 | 1872 | 1873 | 1874 | 1875 | 1876 | 1877 | 1878 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *s. d.* | *s. d.* | *s. d.* | *s. d.* | *s. d.* | *s. d.* | *s. d.* | *s. d.* | *s. d.* | *s. d.* | *s. d.* |
| Muscovado ... | 24 1 | 25 10 | 24 1 | 26 3 | 26 11 | 23 2 | 22 4 | 21 7 | 21 8 | 26 5 | 20 6 |
| Clayed Manilla | 21 1 | 21 5 | 19 2 | 21 1 | 22 9 | 19 6 | 18 10 | 18 0 | 18 7 | 22 4 | 17 7 |

A candid examination of these figures as a whole will show that there has been of late years a fall in price. But this fall in price is far smaller than popular report credits. Indeed, if we look to the whole list, there will be a great temptation to regard the fall rather in the character of a temporary fluctuation than an absolute decline. If we take figures "without their context," we may, indeed, prove anything. Mr. Martineau makes the answer (Ques. 6046), "Surely a fall from 25*s.* 10*d.* in 1869 to 21*s.* 7*d.* in 1875 is a very great fall." He omits to add that "Surely the rise in price from 22*s.* 2*d.* in 1866 to 26*s.* 11*d.* in 1872 is a very great rise." It is, at all events, a rise of 4*s.* 9*d.* in six years; while the fall he quotes is a fall of only 4*s.* 3*d.* in six years.

These prices elicit much curious evidence. Thus, Mr. Martineau tells us (Ques. 6028), "Sugar is being consumed at £2 to £3 below its cost price at the present moment." This was on the 25th of July, 1879, when the "Clayed Manilla" was down to the very low level of £18 10*s.* But if we add this £3 to this low price, we are at once driven to assert that for the last twenty years, in only five has sugar been sold above cost price! We are driven, on Mr. Martineau's own showing, to assert the otherwise phenomenal fact, that an industry has survived fifteen years of production of a commodity which never during those fifteen years even once fetched in the market the price of the cost of its own production; for every ton of sugar sold during the whole twenty years there would have accumulated a dead loss of 14*s.*; a loss to sugar-growers in the aggregate of £50,000,000 sterling. This is a serious charge on the wisdom, or rather on the sanity, of sugar planters.

That prices have fluctuated is obvious, and that during the last few years these fluctuations have reached a rather lower level than other years is true. It is difficult to see why this level is not far lower, considering that in these years commercial depression was far more severe than in any other years. But the crux of the whole question is the double fact that the refiners do not object to seeing these prices of the raw materials as low as may be; the growers, on the other hand, only wish to see prices rise. The explanation of the question is the explanation of the conditions that bring about these fluctuations.

It is not to be gainsaid that these prices depend on the conditions of supply and demand. These conditions include the human factors of increase of population, of such disturbing causes as war, for instance, or commercial depressions; the natural factors of kindly or unkindly seasons; and the political factors of peculiar commercial or industrial policies which affect, whether directly, or merely incidentally, the price of such a first article of consumption as sugar.

For instance, during these twenty years the population has increased in England by nearly 10,000,000, and in the United States by 20,000,000, and in Continental States in proportion. The average consumption of sugar per head has increased during the same period from 34 lbs. to 64 lbs. in England, and from 20 lbs. to 40 lbs. in the United States. War, too, has greatly affected sugar, both in supply and price. The great war in the United States affected sugar in the States enormously. The following are the figures of domestic production about that period :—

| 1862 | 1863 | 1864 | 1865 | 1866 | 1867 | 1877. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| tons. | tons. | tons. | tons. | tons. | tons. | tons. |
| 190,000... | 53,000 ... | 28,000 ... | 5,000 ... | 9,000 ... | 23,000 ... | 79,000 |

The Franco-Prussian war greatly affected beet-sugar growing, both during its continuance and afterwards, when the French, among other ways of paying expenses, doubled their sugar duties, and in so doing doubled their bounties. These mere "human" factors are main causes in the overstocking of markets. And they are largely supplemented by the periodical appearance of widespread commercial depression—the resultants of all three classes of factors. Again, the business man concerned with sugar, as in other matters, is not free from the human infirmity of faulty prescience; this working on supposed knowledge of the future that is really impossible, regulates prices to a degree only little acknowledged. This idea of knowing the future is traded upon more eagerly by the human intellect than real knowledge of the present. It is based upon that combination of chance and enormous possible profits which always proves insuperably attractive; and it is, in some measure, a salve to man's ruling vanity when it is wounded by its conscious inability to penetrate the future.

And further, the "natural" factors have an important and great influence on the price of sugar. We have here a crop of proverbial uncertainty; a fact which is readily to be seen by the merest glance at the lists of sugar annually produced on any estate, or in any particular district or country. And it is, perhaps, a main cause of the continued success, not only of refiners, but also of consumers of sugar in England, that the area of their supply is world-wide. Evidence of this was seen in the signal failure of the beet crop in 1876. Sugar at once flowed to England from most unwonted quarters. It may have been that Chinamen and Indians deprived themselves for the time of their sugar; but the English millhand and the English refiner were none the less enabled by their free-trade tariff to thrive on, and to pay for, the contributions of the whole world. To continue such a policy is to enable Englishmen, as consuming producers

in times of severe depression, to obtain one great item of food, as well as of raw material, at favourable prices.

These two classes of causes have, however, in recent investigations, been ignored in favour of one small species of the third genus—the political. And yet it is difficult—eminently difficult—to trace any real effect of any magnitude directly to this particular division. The centre of the argument, at which we have now arrived, is the fact that certain foreign countries give bounties on the export of sugar. We pass, then, to ascertain the real measure of this effect, and the best means for the removal of these bounties.

The battle waged round these bounties may be well likened to some mediæval struggle for a standard, wherein leading knights find themselves suddenly the cynosure of all eyes; and when the real contests and material combats of the rest of the field are forthwith hushed and suspended, as if by mutual consent, in order that all eyes may feast on an intrinsically insignificant incident that has now become the centre and point of all effort. The possession of the standard in itself is of little value—so much wood and linen, or, it may be, silk. So with these bounties; all other arguments seem suspended, and the contest centres itself on a something, which, the more we look into it, the less does it prove to be of material value or influence. As with the military standard, so these bounties are fought over with such fierce excitement that all enquiry is for the time ignored as to the intrinsic value of the bounty itself. Many men rush to the attack with the battle-cry, "Bounties lower prices;" they heed not, neither do they require proof of the measure of this asserted influence, or of the connection of the result with the asserted cause.

The whole influence of these bounties needs to be set out clearly. Many of those interested in the trade have of late years sought to impress the outside public with the idea that bounties are the cause of *all* these ills. The instinct of the outside public has, as yet, refused to credit all this; and it is well, in the interests both of those concerned in the trade as well as of the general consuming public, to seek out the grounds on which this instinctive reasoning is based.

The bounties, in the first place, are supposed greatly to encourage the production of sugar from beet-root. Granting that this be so, it is obvious the cane-grower cannot complain, unless this action lowers prices. From some of the Tables in the Appendix to this Report we can cull most apposite figures, even though we regret that these tables fail to bring results further than the year 1874.

| Years— | 1864 | 1865 | 1866 | 1867 | 1868 | 1869 | 1870 | 1871 | 1872 | 1873 | 1874 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *s. d.* | *s. d.* | *s. d.* | *s. d.* | *s. d.* | *s. d.* | *s. d.* | *s. d.* | *s. d.* | *s. d.* | *s. d.* |
| Prices of cane sugar | 28 11 | 23 8 | 22 2 | 22 5 | 24 1 | 25 10 | 24 1 | 26 3 | 26 11 | 23 2 | 22 4 |
| Hundreds of thousands of tons grown — of beet sugar | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 11 | 11 | 10 |
| Hundreds of thousands of tons grown — of cane sugar | 14 | 14 | 15 | 14 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 18 | 18 | 17 |

We see there is a sustained increase, year by year, in both crops till 1874, in which year there is a slight falling off in both —largest proportionately in the beet crop. We see also that beet increases far faster than cane; and, in the ten years under review, beet, from monopolizing in the first year about 2–9ths of the supply, comes in the last year to monopolize over 3–9ths. But it will be noticed that *prices show no tendency whatever of being affected by the alterations in the proportions of beet and cane supplies.* Commencing at a high figure, prices fall rapidly; but only to rise again nearly to the same height, and then again to fall.

And this relation of price to this beet *v.* cane argument is further illustrated by a table supplied by Mr. Lubbock. In this Mr. Lubbock gives most interesting data in regard to the effect of the detailed growth of the beet crop on detailed prices of cane sugar, and the results are most significant:—

| | 1865 | 1866 | 1867 | 1868 | 1869 | 1870 | 1871 | 1872 | 1873 | 1874 | 1875 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *s. d.* | *s. d.* | *s. d.* | *s. d.* | *s. d.* | *s. d.* | *s. d.* | *s. d.* | *s. d.* | *s. d.* | *s. d.* |
| Price of cane (Trinidad) | 21 6 | 18 8 | 20 10 | 22 5 | 22 11 | 19 8 | 23 4 | 24 10 | 20 1 | 19 7 | 18 4 |
| Beet crop; increase or decrease per cent. over previous year's crop | + 34 | + 22 | + 4 | + 1½ | + 27 | + 11 | − 7 | + 31 | − 3 | − 5 | + 20 |

According to these figures, it would strangely appear, *increase in the price of cane sugar is usually accompanied by increase in the amount of beet produced;* whereas, in two of the only three cases when the crop of beet was less than the previous year, there is a decided fall in price over that of the previous year; and in the remaining case there is a decided rise in price in the following year, though the production of beet showed an increase of no less than 30 per cent. We have seen that the consumption of sugar in the world increased during this same period from 18 to 27; that of these proportions, cane supplied respectively 14 and 17, while beet, supplying 4 in the first instance, came to supply no less than 10 in the latter. Beet has thus monopolized the supply of a great proportion of this increased demand; but the figures have yet to be produced, it seems, which shall prove that this new supply is in direct connection with any definite fall in price. Indeed, in the evidence before Mr. Ritchie's Committee, the West Indian planters, over and over again, assert their confidence in their ability successfully to cope with beet-roo competition, "provided bounties be

done away with," and the two methods be left to unrestricted competition. *It would seem, then, that beet-growing in itself has little to do with this lowering of prices.* The question remains —do the bounties affect these prices; and, if so, to what extent?

When one's own case is good, it is often well to assume, for the sake of argument, the correctness of the evidence brought forward by one's opponent; and in this present case we may even admit, with the most eager opponent of bounties, that a duty of 2*s.* on every sort of sugar imported from bounty-giving countries would effectually "countervail" the effects of this bounty. But we must in that case also make it clear that, as at most only one-third of our sugar supply comes from bounty-giving countries, the actual effect of the bounties, so far as growers are concerned, is not 2*s.*, but only 8*d.* a cwt. Again, we see that if sugar (as was stated in answer to question 6028) at the price of 18*s.* 6*d.*, was being grown 3*s.* below its cost price, bounties, at their best, must be merely partial causes of this effect, even when we allow them the full influence claimed for them by their most ardent opponents. And the advocates of this countervailing duty will have to devise some remedy to correct this larger class of influences, double the effect of the bounties, which, if true and lasting, must absolutely drive all sugar out of cultivation.

But there are other matters in connection with this asserted effect of bounties which merit more attention than they have received. If we look to the condition of the industries in the bounty-giving countries themselves, we find much to countenance Sir L. Mallet's opinion:—

> "Ques. 6344.—I myself greatly doubt whether the effect of this bounty is such as to enable the receivers of the bounty to sell their produce at a very much lower rate than they would be able to sell it without the bounty."

One thing is certain, that even the keen desire to do away with bounties exhibited by English refiners and importers is no whit keener than that shown by Frenchmen, at all events, who are interested in sugar. And these Frenchmen have reason for their keenness. Among others, they complain of the fact that the English refiner can, and the French refiner cannot, avail himself of the Austrian bounty on raw sugar; indeed, French statesmen have already asserted that the bounty given to French refiner may be defended as the duty that *countervails* the advantages reaped by the English refiners in obtaining Austrian bounty-fed raw sugar free of duty.

The French authorities gave valuable evidence before the Committee. M. F. Georges described the position of the industry of growing beet for sugar as "*extremely critical.*" The fabricants,

he declares, "are almost *at the last gasp*, and if they lower the prices of beet the farmers will *entirely leave off growing beet.*" West Indian planters should notice that, even while the dreaded bounty system lasts, prices are now so low that a fall, even fractional, will prevent beet-growing altogether. Prices, so far as beet-competition is concerned, are at their lowest ebb. But the cultivation and manufacture of beet is at its highest perfection. Neither of these assertions can be made of sugar-cane growing in the West Indies.

M. F. Georges also gives evidence to the effect that sugar-beet production in France is even diminishing, and certainly not increasing. West Indian growers should pay attention to question 6074:—

"Ques.—I understand, to summarize your evidence, you believe that Austrian and other bounties, if they continue, will greatly damage the French growers of sugar?"

"Ans.—It will *destroy the French manufactures entirely* in a certain number of years; that is to say, that the productions will be reduced to a certain extent every year. I would add that, if the price of beet were to be lowered, the farmers would not be able to grow it any more."

This means the lapse of 400,000 tons of sugar now grown annually, and whether the French refiners are to continue to refine by importing cane sugar (and probably to abolish import duties on it); or whether France has to buy her sugar elsewhere, —either way cane growing would be largely benefited.

This is, perhaps, a useful example of the complexities and intricacies that come of artificial interference with production. If we abolish the Austrian bounties, French refiners and French growers continue as now; if we do not abolish the Austrian bounties English growers and English refiners both prosper over French.

And another French authority, M. Fouquet, gives it as his opinion: "If all the Powers, Austria, Germany, and Belgium, continue to have bounties, we shall be in a very short time obliged to *leave off entirely making sugar in France.*"

And M. L. de Mot, on being asked—

"'Why should the production fall off so much in France while the home consumption is so large as it is at present,' replied, 'Because of the actual price. We sell under cost price actually; and there is no doubt that, if things are to go on as they are, in two or three years production will diminish. . . . . We expect, if things go on as they are, that, next year at least, probably 40 *factories will be closed.*'"

From Belgium, the Secretary of Legation reports:—"Very small advantages indeed must have been derived by Belgian

refiners from the surpluses (bounties) they obtain, judging from the fact that for the last fifteen years *sugar refining has steadily diminished in Belgium.*" It is not surprising to find Belgium, as a bounty-giving country, eager to abolish bounties; they do her no good, for she imports but little sugar. From the Hague comes the same tale of diminishing exports, in spite of the bounty which exporters can secure by means of the drawback. In Italy there is great dread of bounties; and both Government and Legislature recommend "that no time should be lost by the Government in entering into negotiations with other states interested in the sugar question, with a view to taking measures for guarding against the conversion of drawbacks into bounties." In Germany, as the industries, both of sugar growing and of refining increase, so does the revenue derived from sugar fall off, because incidentally the exports increase and take so much the more in drawbacks. And the German refiners themselves make an interesting complaint. They say, concerning "moist" sugars:—

"Nor can the German refining industry compete in these products with English refiners drawing their supplies of *German raw sugars* from Germany, inasmuch as Germany pays a larger drawback of duty on the export of raw sugar than would be paid proportionally on the export of the refined sugar produced from it." And their report proceeds: "The German refineries buy duty-paid raw sugars..... The German refining industry employs, spread over upwards of 50 establishments, a large capital (3,000,000 florins), invested in buildings fixtures and stock. The *sad results obtained*, on an average from these institutions *during the last few years, threaten this capital with annihilation.*" And again, further on: "The condition of German sugar refineries has been for a long time, not only an unfavourable one, but, indeed, *has declined from year to year.*"

Lastly, we come to Austria. Our Secretary, Mr. Jerningham, reports: "The drawbacks allowed hitherto, instead of remaining that which they were intended, viz., a true return of the excise duties, have in reality proved bounties to the manufacturers; and the history of sugar taxation is that of the struggle of the Government to remedy this." The system of assessment was necessarily at fault, and encouraged fraudulent practices. Matters came to a crisis in 1876, when it was discovered that on the system in vogue, Government paid 947,000 florins in drawbacks on sugar exported, and which has only paid 931,000 florins duty and taxes. Government has consequently interfered in self-defence of its own revenue, and ordained that eventually there is to be paid annually a contribution to the revenue of 10,000,000 florins. This revenue argument is thus one of immense cogency. The Belgian Government have similar experience; they know that some

two million francs more revenue ought and could be obtained from sugar, but that this now finds its way into the pockets of the growers, because of the insuperable difficulties of collection wherever sugar is concerned. Russia is in similar evil plight.

But the success of the Austrian growers and refiners at the expense of their country, has in its course roused and frightened other nations. Thus, M. Jacquemont, speaking on behalf of French sugar manufacturers, after describing these results in Austria, recommends, on behalf of France, "That in all treaties of commerce which may be negotiated, measures be taken to suppress bounties on export generally. If not, we may expect to see our *great agricultural industry succumb in this struggle,* so strangely unequal, which it sustains, not only against rival industries, but against the revenues of the different European States."

And it may be noted incidentally that this action of the Austrian Government will have the effect, not only of almost doing away with the asserted outside effect of the bounty; for, if we judge by the present state of the industry, as pointed out by M. Jacquemont: "If the proportion of the exportation to the total production should diminish, the bounty would increase; if, on the contrary, the proportion should increase to 60 or 70 per cent. of the total production, the bounties would decrease." Thus, the case in Austria is at the present moment eminently favourable to English refiners and growers.

It would thus appear that in one and all the countries that now give bounties there is a strong desire, on the part both of Government and of manufacturers, to abolish any bounties on the exportation of sugar, whether raw or refined. The great duty of England has been to accelerate the realization of this salutary desire.

It is remarkable to trace in the history of the negotiations to put an end to bounties that have already taken place between the Governments interested, that they have invariably originated in the desire of these Governments to remedy defects in their own financial arrangements. The advantage of the sugar industries was merely incidental, and, indeed, only brought to the light of day by the sugar manufacturers and refiners themselves.

It is also remarkable to notice that, in all these countries where bounties are given, the sugar industries are in a precarious condition; refining dwindles where bounties exist, while it is on the increase in England. Growers of beet all the Continent over declare themselves ruined by the bounty-fed competition of each other. It is, therefore, exceedingly remarkable to find so many of the witnesses before the Commission, "interested in sugar," so persistently, in the face of the figures they have themselves

produced, declaring that refining must die out in England. It was shown them that, on their own calculations, the bounties so received annually in England was so many million pounds sterling; that every few years these bounties paid into England as much capital as all that invested in English sugar industries: that thus, even supposing the bounties did destroy the industry, nevertheless they would have paid for both capital and "goodwill" over and over again. And then the argument went further, and the contention that if we allowed these bounties to destroy our industries by the means of lowering of prices, then, in the future—and this is the only threat advanced—dire retribution would come on us as a people in a rapid rise in the price of sugar. Yet surely the very measure of this retribution will be the measure of the possibility of our re-starting our sugar industries, and the war will have to be renewed.

And so with our Colonies. If sugar in all of them were to go out of cultivation to-morrow because of low prices, when these high prices we are threatened with return, it will *pay* again to cultivate. But it is altogether derogatory to the good sense of the British people even to recognize in public print such a petty and short-sighted line of argument, and a line that can only be founded on ignorance of the facts of the case. Sugar is produced at the least *as cheaply* in the British Colonies as anywhere else in the world; and if English sugar estates go out of cultivation, so will nearly all the sugar estates in the world, and what will then become of the price of sugar? To this whole argument the only fit conclusion is the Euclidean Q. E. A.

It is, then, evident that all the countries interested are anxious to do away with these bounties. There are but two methods of procedure desirable. The one is the freeing of sugar from all connection with the Exchequer. This has been accomplished in England; but it is not within the range of "practical politics" that this should be accomplished in many, still less in all, of the States that at present, in spite of themselves, grant bounties.

(Parenthetically, we may note that countervailing duties have been proposed as a remedy. It is difficult, exceedingly difficult, to understand that any man who has any knowledge whatever of political affairs could sanely or seriously propose such a remedy in the present frame of mind of the English public. Arguments have been endless to show the inadequacy of this remedy; countless explanations have been offered of its intrinsic impracticability; its obvious embodiment of Protectionist principles has been declaimed against almost *ad nauseam;* but the one great fact remains, that whatever its inherent merits or demerits, it is a remedy that will not gain the ear of the majority; it is a remedy out of joint with the times, and altogether without the pale of practical politics.)

We are compelled, then, to fall back upon the second and less satisfactory of the two desirable methods—that of manufacturing and refining in bond. Here again we find much happy unanimity arising among the various Governments interested. When this remedy was broached years ago there were many more or less idealistic objections put forward, on the score of the evils of direct government interference in industrial details. Some evils are, however, necessary evils. Taxation itself is one of these; and it is not altogether illogical to infer that the collection of taxes should follow suit in this respect. But even in France refiners themselves have withdrawn their objections, and chiefly by reason of the experience there gained since 1852 by the manufacturing in bond of beet sugar. On this point the authorized evidence of M. Georges is conclusive:—

"Ques. 4047.—In the opinion of the fabricants in France is the refining in bond the only efficient mode of abolishing bounties? Yes; it is the sole one, in their opinion. For ten years past they have been soliciting this measure. At the Trade Congress, at Brussels, they passed a resolution that refining in bond was the only means of abolishing bounties.

"4048.—And you agree with that opinion? Yes, entirely.

"4049.—You manufacture your sugar under supervision, do you not? Yes; the whole of the French raw sugar production is manufactured in bond.

"4050.—Do you find a difficulty in carrying on your manufacture under supervision? Not at all.

"4051.—Do you find that it hinders improvement in machinery and in the mode of production? No; the presence of the officers is an assistance, and in no way an interference.

"4052.—It does not prevent improvements being carried out? In no manner whatever.

"4053.—In fact, you find no difficulty at all? None whatever."

To the same effect is the evidence of M. de Mot:—

"Ques. 4246.—You, as a fabricant, also consider that there is no difficulty whatever in working under supervision? Not at all.

"Do you believe that that is the only method by which bounties can be abolished? Yes."

M. Fouquet puts the matter very clearly in his evidence:—

"Ques. 4160.—And the only system by which bounties can be dispensed with is the system of refining in bond? Evidently, because there is no duty paid on raw sugar going into the refinery; and then, when the refined sugar goes out of the refinery, it goes either into consumption, and then has to pay the duty, or it goes to export, and then, of course, it does not receive anything in the shape of drawback, because no duty is paid when it goes in.

"4161.—You are aware that various objections by refiners have been raised to the system of refinery in bond? The refiners made objections at one time, because they thought that the officers would trouble them in their working, but to-day it is only necessary to see the exact quantity going into the refinery, and to follow the sugar and weigh it when it goes out."

M. Fouquet handed in to the Committee the joint agreement entered into by the refiners and the fabricants of France advocating refining in bond. Already, in Austria, the excise authorities test sugar, supervise in the factories, and examine books. The factory owner is required by law to provide accommodation for these officers. The Austrian Government and the refiners are thus already working without trouble a system of government inspection, in which more interfering than even the refining in bond set up. But after all has been said to show the desirability of refining in bond, there remains the difficult task of realizing the proposal. And the apparent difficulty hinges on the desire or demand that any action in the matter must be action accepted and joined in by all the sugar-growing states. Here again crops up the great difficulty of all general international action—the absence of what in law would be termed the sanction. There is need of a common compelling power.

The decision has now been come to that a Conference of the Powers interested will have no good issue, unless they meet on the understanding that they will create some sanction as a common defence of themselves against those who may elect not to join such a convention as may be agreed upon. It has, therefore, been suggested that the Powers joining such a Conference shall agree beforehand to the insertion of a "Penal Clause."

Of what nature is this clause to be? The French Government maintains that it should impose a specific duty on any sugar imported from the recalcitrant country or countries. It has, indeed, been held that the mere insertion, or even intention to insert such a clause will accomplish the desired effect, and scare all the Powers interested into joining the Convention. For an English Government, however, to assent to such a clause is simply impossible in the present temper of the English people. They will not impose fresh import duties for any other than revenue purposes. The English people are happily well aware of the prosperity and growth that has followed on their definite adoption of free trade principles; and to go back to interferences with trade for industrial purposes is a retrograde step that is happily an impossibility in the England of to-day.

There is another penal clause that is worthy of mention, and that is the declining to receive sugar from the erring State. This

would be a specially powerful weapon in the hands of England. It would encounter many difficulties—such as those that cluster round "certificates of origin";—but both as a threat and as a check it would in all probability have most salutary success. Concerning the principles on which it is founded, it is no doubt an interference with the free course of trade, but we are working for concert with Powers that follow a policy of protection. We do not levy a duty; we do not seek or obtain revenue; there is nothing fiscal in the whole arrangement; it is merely, as it were, joining in the concerted blockade of a nation that is generally felt to be acting contrary to the best interests of all. Such a clause has the merit of assured efficacy, if of nothing else. But it is a measure of warfare and not of peace.

The question remains, what have we left we can trust to in the absence of a penal clause? We have, on the one hand, the welcome fact that all the nations interested are in favour of establishing the manufacture and refining in bond. The history of previous sugar conferences is the history of the elimination of objections to such united action. In 1862 attention was drawn to the fact that the various arrangements of drawbacks and duties on sugar were practically bounties. Each country soon saw the error of its ways, and expressed its intention to do away with bounties. But the one great obstacle was the fact that other countries might continue in their independence. The conference 1862-1863, was occupied in the main on the futile search for some method of exactly measuring percentages of sugar, either raw or refined. The standard of colour was adopted; and the consequent greater exactness certainly reduced the effect of the bounty system. But it was soon seen that colour was no reliable test of strength; not only was it liable to "manipulation," fraudulent and otherwise, but sugars from different countries and of the same strength, are often differently coloured; and again, sugars of the same colour are often of different strengths.

These, and other practical obstacles arose, and gave rise to fresh conferences—each of them a step in the right direction. By the year 1872 a fresh conference was proposed, in which the British delegates were instructed to ask for refining in bond. Nothing came of that conference save a recommendation for further investigation.

The following year, 1873, another conference was held; and at this "saccharimetry" of a highly scientific type was proposed as a method of determining with all-sufficient accuracy the relative percentage of sugar in the raw material. England this time withheld her consent.

The conference in 1875 led to the convention of that year which was to establish refining in bond in France and Holland.

Holland withdrew on the plea of a misunderstanding as to her retention of her liberty at any time to abolish her sugar duties altogether. France then defended herself by establishing Saccharimetry.

Next followed the Paris Conference of 1876. At this conference Saccharimetry was carefully enquired into and declared finally to be a failure. "The conference eventually suspended its sittings without any agreement having been arrrived at, in order to report to the respective governments, with a view to the subsequent resumption of the conference, to which it was proposed to invite Austria, Germany and Italy. This conference was resumed, but the three new States declined to send delegates. Eventually this conference, after the fashion of its predecessors, separated without visible effect.

During this eighteen years of effort much advance was, however, made. The Dutch and the French Governments declared in favour of refining in bond, and the other sugar-producing countries were invited to join. Moreover, the first motion was then made towards discussing bounties on raw as well as on refined sugar. The Governments of Italy and of Austria are in favour of abolishing bounties. These are new developments; and yet there still remains the hard task of prevailing on these various States to carry out in combination what each are individually desirous to see realized.

England comes to a new conference with clean hands. She has taken what is admittedly the very best course; she has suppressed sugar duties altogether. And in her hands she wields the powerful lever of the recorded success attending on this move. Our very sugar refiners, despite the real effects of bad times and low prices, and despite the more suppositious effects of bounties, are doing far better than the refiners of these bounty-protected States. We continue to make use of more and more raw sugar, to consume more and more sugar. But we also export more and more refined sugar; and we also import less and less refined sugar. The very latest figures are those for the first five months of the current year; it is well to put these side by side with those of the last two years:—

| | The first five months in 1879 | 1880 | 1881 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| i. Refined Sugar Imported from the Continent | 723,000 . | 617,000 . | 575,000 | = − | 148,000 tons. |
| ii. " " " " France . | 47,000 . | 31,000 . | 28,000 | = − | 19,000 " |
| iii. " " Exported " England .. | 197,000 . | 167,000 . | 203,000 | = + | 6,000 " |

French refiners in these respects are stationary, and Dutch and Belgian actually retrogressing. Our West Indian producers also continue to increase their output; and these facts give the lie to the supposition that bounty-fed beet-growing is or can be in any way successful in supplanting the cane-growing of the tropics.

It is in these facts that England has her most powerful argument—her one great lever. We could even contemplate the substitution for the troublesome penal clause, in a convention of this example, of the pre-eminent success of England's freed production of sugar, both raw and refined. So may England in years to come, bring the bounty-giving States to see that, while they discover that bounties injure their own native industries, and become a terrible drag on their own exchequers, yet that these bounties are quite incapable of making anything like a disastrous impression on the "Home and Colonial Sugar Industries of this Country," for the reason that these industries in the British Empire are free of the baneful incubus of the bounty system. With these facts in our pockets we may safely face negotiations for a new convention; we may trust, even if with hope rather than with confidence, that other Governments will in due course pay heed to their experience in their own exchequers, and to the unanimous opinions of their own sugar growers and refiners, as to the deleterious influence of the bounty system. And that they will follow the successful lead of England in removing all that in any way directs or restricts industrial energy and deprives it of its essential liberty to follow its natural bent.

---

## Art. V.—The Development of Religion.

THERE is an era in the history of intellect and thought in which the sharp distinction between the real and the ideal is unnoticed, and indeed is undiscovered; in which, what is imagined is assumed to possess equal authority with what is observed, and the products of imagination and perception blend imperceptibly with each other, as the sober colours of the early dawn merge in the brighter tints of the opening day. But though this period is not enriched by the knowledge of those truths which the activity and industry of modern science and philosophy have revealed to the world, it is brightened by the colours with which an active and morbid fancy has gilded nearly every event and fact in the social life of the time, as well as by the element of life and personality with which it has vitalised all the natural phenomena by which early man is surrounded. The baldness and barrenness of actual life are relieved by the number and variety of those spiritual hosts with which the imagination of primitive man has peopled his environment. And though more correct methods of verification and research have discarded as valueless

the assumed truths concerning natural phenomena which satisfied that early age, yet its fancies and speculations relating to the unknown and unknowable have tinged, if not indeed moulded, the opinions of men from that time till the present. So that even now it is only within the realm of verifiable truths, and under the hard teaching of inexorable fact, and no further, that we have been enabled to discard that supernaturalism, the lingering heritage of the ignorance, fears, and fancies of that primitive age.

We say that early man endowed his whole environment with life, ascribed a personality similar to his own, in all its thoughts, feelings, weaknesses, and desires, to whatever came within the range of his experience; to his weapons and utensils, to the animals and plants he knew, to the woods, rivers and mountains of his habitat, and to the celestial bodies that circled over him. But while that wide field of intellectual phenomena characterized by belief in the supernatural presents an intellectual unity, it is broadly divisible into two parts, corresponding to the different emotional forces by which they are respectively vitalised. In the first instance, the emotional factor is fear; and fear related to the supernatural is fetishism: in the other case, the animating emotion is the milder and more civilizing sentiment of reverence, dependence, awe; and reverence related to the supernatural is religion.

Fetishism is the earliest form of spiritual belief, and necessarily precedes religion, as the emotion of fear is an earlier mental development than reverence. Fear is an experience common to man and the lower animals, and is manifested by men in the very lowest stages of existence. It is the principle of personal preservation, is the product of personal exigencies and interests, and is, therefore, a disruptive social force, tending to keep men apart, isolated, and in a state of mutual jealousy and distrust. On the other hand, the emotion of reverence is the exclusive prerogative of our race, is only manifested by civilized races or races gravitating toward civilization, and is peculiarly the product of conditions of life arising out of men living in organized communities or societies. Reverence for superiors in rank, power, services, or worth, is the germ of all natural authority and social subordination; it is the principle of social organization, and binds men together by the tie of allegiance to one common head.

We have, then, in the supernatural beliefs of any age or people, the three factors of an intellectual conception of the spiritual or supernatural, and the two emotional forces of fear and reverence. The strength and importance of supernatural concerns, interests, and opinions will therefore depend, in the first place, upon the

richness and variety of the spiritual conceptions with which the national imagination has endowed its environment. And that is very much the same as saying it will depend upon their intellectual development. For as mental power increases, as more correct habits of observation and inference become the experience of a people, the more will the field relegated to the play of fancy be circumscribed, and the progress of the natural and the known be at the expense of the supernatural and the unknown. To ascribe the operations of nature or the course of events to personal agency is the earliest and most natural disposition of the mind. It is also much the easiest course. To observe, remember, compare and infer, involves an amount of mental attention and labour of which barbarous races are quite incapable. In the second place, the importance of supernatural beliefs will depend upon the extent to which the natural conditions surrounding a people are calculated to stimulate their fears and oppress their courage. As for example, if the physical features of the country are on a large and striking scale, if the climatic laws are subject to extreme and direful variations, and if such visitations as plagues and famines are of frequent and disastrous occurrences. And, in the third place, if the social relations of a race are such as will entail a strong manifestation of dependence upon authority, either from an inherent weakness in the mental capability of the people governed, or from its relation to other contiguous and hostile populations, or from its industrial prosperity depending for its successful development upon a widely spread area of authority, such as great irrigation works, and national needs supplied through distant and physically distinct channels, the growth of supernatural beliefs is especially and powerfully fostered.

Now, all these conditions we find manifested with great permanence and power in the original Indian home of the Aryan races. With such strength, indeed, have these physical and social conditions stamped themselves upon the character and institutions of the Indian peoples, that religion has become their characteristic endowment, and religious conceptions have received among them their widest and fullest, most varied, and most permanent development. In that country religion is the main business of life. The literature is of an almost exclusively religious character. The mythology is singularly rich in the number, variety, and character of the supernatural conceptions with which it is crowded. The most familiar operations of nature are ascribed to Divine agency. The most ordinary experiences of every-day life are prompted and controlled by Divine or demoniacal power. Numerous implements and utensils, many wild and domestic animals, as well as buildings, wells, tanks, and striking natural objects are revered as sacred. A large class among the popu-

lation claim, and are allowed, a sacred character. A great portion of the time of the people is applied to religious devotions, fasts, and festivals; and a considerable portion of their means is also appropriated to the support of the regular officers of religion. It is evident the causes which have resulted in so remarkable and unnatural a development of the intellectual and emotional life of the Indian people must be very powerful, and far from difficult to discover. And, indeed, to persons living in this country, with the mass of information illustrating and pourtraying the character and condition of the Indian races ready to hand, and with that critical faculty begotten from viewing interests with which we have only a distant and impersonal concern, and feelings and hopes with which we have little or no sympathy, a fair estimate of the various natural and intellectual causes conducing to these results is not only a possible but an easy task.

The first cause is, undoubtedly, the comparatively feeble intellectual capacity of the Indian races. In some special mental qualities they exhibit considerable eminence. Their imagination is active and powerful. They exhibit great metaphysical and introspective subtilty. Their speculations concerning many of the deeper problems of existence are bold, rich, and, from a metaphysical point of view, logical and comprehensive. But such mental results are purely contemplative, retrospective and introspective; they are the productions of minds which shrink from a conflict with external nature and surrounding social conditions. They lack the correct observation and firm grasp of energetic minds resolved to assert the supremacy of man's intellect and character over an unfavourable environment. It is the mental activity of an arrested development, and savours of a distant and bygone age. In India, the soil is rich to an extraordinary degree, and that sustenance, which in less favoured countries is only the reward of ardent labour and incessant intellectual activity, is there the privilege of the slightest physical exertion, and the very minimum of mental effort. In India, that constant strain upon the intellect to sustain life, which is the normal experience of European countries, is absent, and is replaced by the refined and subtle speculations of individuals naturally predisposed to intellectual pursuits; and thus, through not being the daily necessity of the many, mental research has become the pastime of the privileged few. The climate, also, is enervating and unfavourable to active physical exertion, and, therefore, to those habits of observation and reflection upon natural phenomena which alike stimulate and give character to the intellect. Ordinary life thus becomes listless, the favourite occupations sedentary, and the mind lies

torpid, in a state of dreamy contemplation and repose, favourable to all kinds of fancies and imaginings. Such conditions, inevitably weakening the physical energies of the people, result in deteriorated mental power, as is amply illustrated in the fate of those military and warlike tribes who periodically burst upon the rich plains of India from their own barren and inhospitable homes, but in a few generations, under the enervating circumstances of their new surroundings, lose the energy and courage by which they had originally effected their conquests, and sink to the level of those whom they had formerly dispossessed.

Another cause, besides that of feeble intellectualism, of the growth and constancy of supernatural conceptions among the Indian people, is the absence of the corrective of intercommunion with rival and differently formed civilizations. To see ourselves as others see us, is an important corrective of national, no less than individual, idiosyncracies. But from this source of improvement India, until recent times, was practically debarred. A large peninsula, with a line of the loftiest and most impassable mountains in the world separating it from the continent of which it forms a part, with the almost inaccessible recesses of these mountain inhabited by fierce and predatory tribes, the communications of India with its neighbours are, in ordinary circumstances difficult, and at all times ephemeral. The great diversity in the physical features of the country, producing with rich profusion such a wide variety of vegetable and animal products, combined with her mineral wealth, renders her nearly self-supporting, and makes her independent of that indebtedness to foreign countries for the gratification of her tastes, or supply of her necessities, the general experience of less favoured countries, and which is the origin, and certainly principal incentive of commercial enterprise and national intercommunication. But even were India less self-supporting than she is, the width of the seas surrounding her shores, the dangerous character of the navigation from unknown rocks and swift currents, the terrible fury of the hurricanes that sweep these latitudes, and the absence of good harbours along great stretches of her coasts, have all tended to make commerce—not at anytime a matter of first importance to her social or physical wants—a very unimportant feature in the life of that great country. This absence of contact with a foreign civilization has been somewhat modified since the military occupation of India by this country, but the period of occupation is too short, and the relation of the conquerors to the great mass of the population so transient and superficial, as to have only to a very limited degree affected the opinions and habits of a few of the upper class of natives, leaving the great body of the people quite unaffected, either in their social institutions or religious opinions. Thus, in

India, the nature of the soil, the climate, and the geographical position are all unfavourable to the development of the intelligence, and the growth of accurate and useful knowledge; while, on the other hand, the national imagination is stimulated, not less by the grandeur and striking character of all the physical features of the country which greet the eye, than by the introspective activity of the mind, debarred from the healthy and corrective influence of an active life. The popular imagination has, therefore, crowded its whole environment with supernatural hosts who, for number, variety, and excessively marked character, surpass any similar mental effort in the world's history.

It is, however, not only intellectual conditions which have brought about these striking results, but the strong emotional development of fear and reverence as well, to which these conceptions have simply given form and expression, and which are equally important factors in determining the extent and character of supernatural beliefs. Examining, first, the conditions of life which affect the development of fear, we notice that in India the physical features of the country, and the operations of Nature, are on such a large scale as to dwarf altogether the importance of man, and produce in his mind a most deleterious consciousness of his own insignificance and helplessness. It is not only that the mountains are lofty and inacessible; the rivers large, swift, and majestic; the sun powerful and scorching; the forests gloomy and haunted-like; but the active forces of nature are numerous, energetic, and destructive. The rain descends in torrents, the wind rises to the wild sweep of the tornado, while the earth trembles under frequent shocks of earthquake. Prolonged droughts, parching the soil, and producing famines, which, in turn, are followed by pestilence, are of periodical occurrence. Epidemics are common and fearfully destructive; and, indeed, all forms of disease in that country run their course with such rapidity as to introduce an additional element into the uncertainty of life. The fields and forests are inhabited by numerous and dangerous beasts and reptiles. Then, in addition to all these depressing circumstances, the various mountain ranges running through the peninsula, and especially the mountain range forming its continental frontier, are occupied by predatory tribes, who burst with unexpected violence upon the plains to harry, murder, and destroy, paralyzing industry and arresting effort. What wonder, then, that the people of India should manifest an abnormal development of fear; that their thoughts should turn from the misery of this life to a possible cessation of consciousness as a happy release; that their ideal of happiness should be absence of misery, and that the morbid activity of an imagination stimulated by fear should crowd the confines of the known,

and people the unknown with spiritual beings, terrible in character and power—the reflex of the terrorism permeating their whole social existence.

The supernaturalism of India is largely influenced by another mental emotion which constitutes the distinction between fetishism and religion, and is that feature in their spiritual life, which, transplanted to Europe, has continued the most marked characteristic of the European form of supernaturalism. It is the emotion of reverence, manifested in the form of veneration, dependence, awe. This is a product of social life, is developed to supply the exigencies of men living in societies, and is only indirectly influenced by their physical environment. And, indeed, it may be almost said to be entirely owing to feeble intellectualism that such a dependence upon authority is generated. For where the intellect is active, and the character strong, there is a personal independence and impatience of authority, a self-confidence and critical faculty developed, which precludes the idea of either dependence upon, or reverence for, authority. But such are not the characteristics of the Indian people. Among them the consciousness of personal inadequacy is so strong that dependence upon superior power or authority is a necessity. And certainly this sense of reverence is, in the circumstances, useful, because the people thus secure that measure of government which results from intelligence and vigour on the part of their rulers, with reverence, dependence, and subordination on the part of the ruled. This feature in the Indian character has extracted even from her frequent conquests a measure of good. Because, when the invaders, strong in the character and intelligence developed in the severe struggle to maintain existence in their own inhospitable homes, had settled among the conquered people, the sentiment of reverence, homage, awe, and dependence of the latter, inevitably turned toward those manifesting so strongly their title to rule, and thus secured for the country a generation or two of prosperity and happiness, as evidenced by the many brilliant reigns of rulers of foreign extraction recorded in Indian history. The enervated courage of the Indian people, and the defenceless character of her large open plains, also fostered this instinct of reverence for authority, as the best means of defence against the numerous warlike tribes by which her mountains are inhabited. For it was only by the unity and subordination of a large population under one common head that a successful front could be presented to those tribes, small in point of numbers, but extremely formidable from their activity and vigour. Even the industrial necessities of India stimulated the same feeling. For her industrial prosperity depends to a very large extent upon extensive irrigation works,

which not only must be formed upon a very extensive scale, but be initiated at a considerable distance from the district to be benefited. In such circumstances only a government of considerable resources, and ruling a large area and population, could attempt successfully to undertake such a task. Dependence upon the assistance, guidance and protection of the governing power is thus an engrained virtue or vice of the Indian population. And the same characteristic is reflected in their religious life. For, instead of asserting their independence and individuality, they prostrate themselves before the supposed power of their deities, invoke their assistance and blessing in the most ordinary duties, endeavour by abject conduct and oblations to appease their anger or invite their interest. Their religious customs and ceremonies imitate the demeanour and conduct of the meanest slaves in the presence of the most powerful and tyrannical of masters. The objects worshipped are the magnified types of the power, brutality, and inconstancy of their temporal rulers, and the devotees themselves but exaggerate the emotions, habits, and postures they have learned to use in the presence, or at the instance, of their secular chiefs.

Such are the causes, physical and social, contributing to make and mould the supernatural beliefs of the Indian people. So powerful are they, that if we attempt to weigh the relative importance of spiritual and secular concerns in the intellectual life of the people, we must accord the balance of interest and influence to be undoubtedly on the side of the former. India presents the maximum development of supernaturalism. It is the source from which modern European nations have inherited their spiritual conceptions. The Aryan races, in their migration westward, carried with them their religious beliefs, not less than those predispositions to organized social life, which only required favourable conditions again to take root and flourish. But, as the spiritualism of India is the result of marked conditions in the environment of the people of that country, so in their new home, and under altered physical and social surroundings, those Aryan beliefs are profoundly modified, and adapted to the new conditions among which those energetic races finally settled themselves.

The most marked difference is the diminished influence of fear in colouring the spiritualistic conceptions of Europe. We miss that abject terrorism on the part of the devotee, those conceptions of mingled diabolic ferocity, arbitrariness and power, characteristic of the Indian divinities. The objects of worship are less the malevolent than the beneficent deities. The deity is not so feared for his malign power as revered for his provident goodness. That change has been brought about by the diminished

influence of the emotion of fear upon European conduct. The European environment is unfavourable to its development. Those striking natural features, present in India, so calculated to inspire awe and create a feeling of conscious helplessness, are absent or greatly modified. Nature is displayed on a smaller scale. The mountains are not so high, the rivers not so large, the forests of lighter and freer growth. The tempests and floods of Europe cannot rival their Eastern prototypes in violence. Earthquakes are comparatively rare. Famines and epidemics are seldom known, and, even then, are of less disastrous effect than among the huddled millions of India. Diseases are of a milder type, and not so sudden in their ultimate result; while ferocious or venomous animals are practically extinct. These circumstances all tend to diminish the activity of the sentiment of fear, and give man greater confidence and courage. The climate of Europe is also very favourable for physical exertion all the year round. The summers are not characterized by such intense heat as to make physical effort painful or impossible; neither are the winters of that extreme rigour, which in other continental areas exclude all but the minimum of out-door exposure. An active life is not only possible but enjoyable, and thus there is generated those habits of observation of nature, and successful adaptation of means to ends, and courageous facing of difficulties it is known can be victoriously encountered, which an active life invariably begets. The European physical environment is thus a corrective of any undue development of fear, and is calculated to stimulate confidence and beget courage.

Neither is that environment, in its earliest known conditions, favourable to the undue development of reverence and dependence. Rather the reverse. It requires a crowded and settled population requiring law and order, authority and efficient government, to generate reverence and beget dependence. But in a barbarous or semi-barbarous condition, with a widely scattered population following field or pastoral pursuits, that sense of dependence upon our fellows is comparatively unfelt; an individual feels a personal consciousness of his own unaided ability to master his circumstances. Indeed, all show of authority is resented, and independence is the most cherished social privilege. The liberty of the early Greek republics was but the retention, in a settled population, and in a civilized state, of that personal independence always enjoyed by the rude tribes of the north and centre of Europe. That abject reverence and dependence then of the peop' of India is present in early Europe in a very much milder form, being represented by the vague attachment of the individual to the elected tribal chief.

Even more marked is the superior intellectualism of the

European races. Such a superiority was to be expected in a population that had pushed its way through such a variety of trying and adverse conditions to such a distance from the ancestral home, and after victoriously dispossessing the aboriginal population. The process of natural selection in such circumstances must have been continuous and severe, and the residue proportionately efficient. The natural environment of the European is peculiarly fitted to secure intellectual improvement. For its climatic conditions are favourable to vigorous and active physical effort, and thus indirectly contribute to healthy mental power. Life cannot be sustained without intellectual exertion, and yet the struggle to live does not present those arduous difficulties which repel the will from attempting an uncongenial, if not hopeless, task. The mind is exercised and strengthened, not exhausted and weakened. Thus, the supernaturalism of early Europe is not only of a milder and more reasonable character, arising from the greater mental calibre of the people, but, from the same cause, the emotions have less influence upon life, through the consciousness of superior power of defence, and through the dissipation of many of those fancies which have only the authority of the imagination and the emotions for their supposed existence.

Thus, when authentic European history opens to view among the miniature republics of ancient Greece, we find displayed a supernaturalism fairly representative of the European religious development. It is logical, greatly free from Oriental extravagances, sometimes assumes forms of wondrous beauty. It no longer dwarfs or excludes secular interests or pursuits; neither does it rest exclusively upon the fears, helplessness, and dependence of the devotees. For the æsthetic sense has its spiritual co-relative. And the emotions of beneficence and rightfulness, the domestic affections, and the consciousness of the dignity of human nature, have all secured a place in the mythology, and stamped themselves upon the spiritualistic conceptions of the Grecian people. The spiritual life of Greece is not only intellectually more logical and reasonable, varied and beautiful, but the emotional forces to which it is related are more numerous, benign and civilising. This gleam of brighter light was, however, only transient. The national history of Greece was crowded upon too limited a stage to be permanent. Her social life was, after all, in its highest development only the culture of a limited class, which adventitious circumstances had elevated above the popular level. And when that class became debauched, when the independence of the country was overthrown, the religious life of Greece approached the original form and character of that of the typical Aryan races.

This religious reaction in Europe became even more marked after the rise and development of the Roman power. At no period in her history does the political and social state of Europe more nearly approach the mingled misery and terrorism of the normal Indian life, than from the period of the full establishment of the imperial power under the Cæsars, until the rise of the middle industrious classes in northern Europe, in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries; and neither at any time was there such a close resemblance between their respective religious beliefs and spiritualistic conceptions. It is impossible adequately to describe the misery, wretchedness and degradation of the general body of the various populations brought under the dominion of the Roman arms: their manhood was swept into the ranks of the Roman legions; their wealth and substance were drafted to fill the coffers and supply the needs of the imperial city, and, without rights, as against the governing class, they were plundered by a succession of hungry officials—eager to amass a fortune during their tenure of office. Meanwhile, the administration, gradually impoverishing the country, lead to the decline of commerce and the decay of agriculture, with their invariably concomitants of famine and plagues. These are the terrible commentaries upon those histories which recount with pride and approval the wealth, genius, military and administrative ability, and grandiose sentiments of a plutocracy fattening upon the misery of the general body of the people. The tribes enclosed within the circle of the Roman lines exchanged personal liberty, martial independence, a pastoral life, and a form of government sitting lightly upon them for a sedentary and agricultural life for which they were unfitted—for loss of individual freedom, and a government that planted its heel upon their necks. Thus, we find developed in Europe the fears, the consciousness of helplessness, the dependence upon authority and power, the personal abasement, the ignorance and intellectual apathy, the weariness of this life, and the looking beyond it for relief, characteristic of another age and country. And accompanying all this there is a corresponding development of supernaturalism. The spiritualistic conceptions have become gross and fearful, supernaturalism pervades the whole social life, ordinary events are arbitrary and under spiritual control, the whole environment is crowded with spiritualistic and malevolent agencies. Men's minds are in a morbid state of fear and expectancy, their character and individuality seem for the time destroyed. Spiritual concerns have wholly superseded secular in interest and importance. This mental and moral lethargy continued the normal condition of Europe until the beginning of the fourteenth century, when a series of new moral and social forces came into

operation, which largely influenced the thoughts, emotions, habits, and institutions of modern Europe.

It is to be observed, however, that though we speak of this great movement as belonging to all Europe, as a matter of fact it is confined almost exclusively to northern Europe, and to those nations which were either never absolutely under the Roman yoke, or were the first to throw it off. The wild and warlike tribes of Germany, the Rhine, and Britain were often defeated by the Roman legions, but they were never conquered. Their spirit of independence and hostility still remained, while their institutions and social habits were but superficially affected by the temporary military occupation of their countries. Even the conquest of Gaul, though militarily complete, was socially superficial; and whenever the military and political decay of the empire began, at once the Gauls reasserted successfully their independence, and proved that their native vigour was unimpaired. Northern Europe, therefore, was not brought within the baleful moral and religious reaction of the populations long under the debasing sway of imperial Rome. And when the causes to which we are about to refer produced the moral and religious revival of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, it was more a continuation of the legitimate European development—of which the reaction under Rome, imperial and ecclesiastical, was an interruption and an abnormal excrescence—than a new departure, and bears the same relation to primitive northern Europe that the political and social life of early Greece bore to the independent and vigorous tribes by which she was surrounded. On the other hand, Italy, Spain, and the whole of the countries embraced within the old Eastern Empire, wherever the system of imperialism had time and opportunity to eat into the heart and mind of the population, were but little, or not at all, affected by this revival. In those countries the strength of the fears, reverence and dependence, generated and fixed in the national character by ages of misrule and individual impotence, is still illustrated by the important part which superstition and religion play in the emotional and intellectual life of their populations. And it is only in recent years, and under the pressure of northern culture and progress, that the bonds impeding the advancement of these countries are being loosened, and that they are joining in the march towards intellectual and moral freedom.

To assert that the unique emotional supernaturalism of modern northern Europe is the result of superior racial development and a favourable environment, though true, is too general a statement to be satisfactory. These characteristic spiritualistic conceptions are marked by a decline in their number,

variety and importance, and they are now animated less by the emotions of fear and reverence than by those of duty and beneficence. An account, then, of European religionism requires an exhibition of the causes contributing to the decline of supernatural conceptions, the circumstances producing a diminution of fear and reverence, and the social forces strengthening and developing the sentiments of duty and beneficence.

Undoubtedly the modifying influence of first importance is the large growth in interest and variety of purely secular concerns during the last four centuries. The number of merely material and physical wants and luxuries have every year largely increased; so also have the facilities for their gratification. Science, art, trade, manufacture, and agriculture, have all made vast strides, devising new processes, developing old resources, and calling into existence new classes and interests. Labour is more needed, more abundant, and better remunerated. Wealth has increased, and is more generally distributed. The number of purely secular concerns which are arousing interest, fixing attention, and crushing spiritual concerns into obscurity and forgetfulness, through sheer lack of time to devote to them, is vastly increased. The question of a future life is all but forgotten in the manifold excitements and growing importance of the present. The number of persons finding life not only bearable, but enjoyable, is vastly greater than even a century ago, and every year the number is being added to. On the other hand, in the same period, the occasions suggesting the idea of supernaturalism are gradually becoming fewer in number, and are brought less vividly before the mind. The universal idea of the interposition of a personal agency in the most common concerns of every-day life, and the most ordinary natural processes, inherited by the European, has become gradually discarded. As science by successive efforts explains the sequence and changes in natural phenomena, so mysterious to ignorance, the idea of personal agency becomes gradually eliminated, and driven further beyond the region of direct observation and experience. And, as it escapes ordinary attention, the idea of a supernaturalism gradually fades from the recollection, and ceases materially to influence conduct. The idea of law, of invariable uniformity under the same conditions of phenomena, at first a discovery, next the belief of the scientific few, is now the tacit assumption of the many. The conception of the universal reign of law, whether compatible with the idea of the co-existence of a co-relative or superior intelligence and will or not, is, at all events, fatal to the hold of such a distant, abstract, and spiritualistic conception upon the minds of persons engaged in secular pursuits, gratified by secular pleasures, and aspiring to secular ambitions and ends. T'

there has been within recent times a constant increase in the number and variety of secular interests and pursuits, and a corresponding decline of opinions and conditions favourable to the stimulation, activity, and growth of supernatural conceptions, which seem to be slowly, but surely, dying out through sheer inanition and want of appropriate nutrition.

This movement is powerfully supported by a distinct and definable change in the emotional development of the northern European nations—a change reflected in the character of the national civilizations and political institutions. The characteristic feature of all the ancient political constitutions with which we are acquainted—with a few transient, and, for our purpose, unimportant exceptions—was national unity secured by fidelity to one common head. The mental emotion which secured this result was the sentiment of reverence; its political co-relative was personal authority; its usual realization the powerful chief or king; and its distinctive advantage in the struggle of existence that social subordination, national unity, and executive efficiency, begotten of national power vested in a single hand. It is the earliest, simplest, and most natural form of government, and though not the best, is at all events the only form possible where the people to be governed are unfit to assume the task themselves. But this reverence for authority, this dependence for guidance and protection upon a superior will, could not be confined exclusively to its proper function of reverence for parents, for superiors in worth or service, and for authority in the state. Its very usefulness and importance fixed it in the national character with an intensity which determined the whole current of the national life. Reverence for inherited customs and beliefs, dependence upon state aid and guidance, became the principle animating trade and commerce, agriculture and manufacture, science and art, religion and literature. Customs, sanctioned by time or high authority, superseded all desire for investigation and experiment. The people revered their leaders; both combined to revere antiquity and inherited institutions. Not what is or should be, but what was, and had been, occupied the interest and attention of the masses, and formed the criterion of opinion. The past was mirrored in the present. Thus was handed down from generation to generation all those fancies and fallacies which had gradually encroached upon the body politic, which warped the social habits, and distorted the religious convictions, and the literary, scientific, and philosophic opinions of ancient peoples. Progress upon such a line of emotional development could, therefore, be very limited indeed. While it secured in its best phases all the advantages of social cohesion, the due administration of law and executive vigour, it was calculated to depress

individual effort, to allay that restless discontent and dissatisfaction with what is, which generates criticism, invites experiment, and prompts to search after novel and improved methods. But in the modern European development progress is secured, not by strengthening the formal organization of the state, but by stimulating independent individual effort. National unity is realized, not so much by the tie of allegiance to one common head, as by the increased number and variety of social and industrial interests. The importance of the influence of the political constitution and state authority upon national or personal welfare is quite dwarfed by the result of those internal economic changes, brought about by personal exertions, in the fields of science, art, and industry. The sense of duty and reciprocal obligation is the animating mental emotion, instead of reverence and dependence. This change has been brought about by the northern populations retaining in civilized life much of that personal independence, and sense of personal dignity, generated in more primitive and barbarous conditions. And this has been rendered possible by the rapid development of the industrial arts, by the expansion of trade and commerce, and the more general diffusion of knowledge, all of which are favourable to the retention of the pristine individual character. The influence of this change in the popular character upon religious development is twofold. In the first place, it tends to diminish the influence of that reverential spirit which fosters religious feelings, and multiplies the objects of religious devotion, while at the same time it removes that halo of sanctity which shields opinions and institutions from the assaults of the critical spirit. It is from the declining influence of the emotion of reverence that the great and growing encroachment of secular interests, and pursuits upon the domain of the supernatural has been mainly effected. And, in the second place, it has imported into religious life, as of equal importance with reverence, the sense of duty and obligation. Nothing is more striking than the change in the tone of the religious writings of the present day compared with those of a few centuries back. In the latter, the power of God is mostly dwelt upon, and the sense of dependence upon Him, and the duty of revering and obeying Him, is constantly appealed to; while in modern writings, the wisdom, providence and beneficence of the Deity are the Divine attributes most attractive to the writers, and the sense of duty and the emotion of love are the sentiments most frequently inculcated.

The sentiment of beneficence and the emotion of love have also in modern Europe attained increased influence upon human conduct, and correspondingly coloured the religious feelings and beliefs. This most salutary development has been greatly aided by the superior knowledge and ability which

recent times has secured. A barbarous age must be a cruel age, because superiority in such circumstances will be one of physical power; and active superiority in physical strength and courage is in general the triumph of power over weakness, coarseness over refinement. But progress in knowledge has not only corrected the popular taste in this matter, changed the current of personal ambition, and elevated the criterion of opinion, but has thereby placed a new and powerful weapon of defence in the hands of those physically weak or emotionally benign. The same advance in knowledge has also elevated war into a science, and necessitated the creation of standing armies; and thus removed the great bulk of the population from the contact and contamination of military interests and ideas. Human life has become more valuable; for wealth and knowledge being the source of power, the units of the population—the productive cause of these—have attained a value and consideration impossible in a military or barbaric age. The greater security awarded life and property, the growth of material comfort, and the necessity of education, have further strengthened the family relationship, and stimulated the development of those kindly feelings upon which that relationship rests; while the interests of commerce and the facilities of international communication have broken down those barriers of prejudice and isolation by which national jealousies and hates have been fomented and perpetuated, and the rising emotions of beneficence and love chilled and arrested in their growth. This evolution of benevolent feeling speedily manifested itself in religion, and shares with duty the favour of modern writers and preachers. So much so, that in the form of religion which has been adopted by Europe, the popular opinion, discarding as valueless nearly all that is distinctive in the teaching of its two great founders, has fastened upon a single feature, or rather phrase, in that religious system as the best expression of its feelings and aspirations, and by adopting the doctrine of love to God and love to man, testifies to the energy and completeness of the latest religious emotional development.

We will now sum up the course of these remarks, The extent of the development of religious belief depends primarily upon the intellectual calibre of a people, and the influence of the emotions of fear and reverence upon their conduct. From causes contained in their physical and social environment the people of India present the maximum development of supernaturalism. In their journey westward, the Aryan races carried with them into Europe their spiritualistic conceptions. There, however, they were toned down by the advantages which

European conditions of life present to intellectual development and the strengthening of character. But under the pressure of Roman domination a reaction took place, and the form of European religion again approached the Asiatic standard in intensity and character. When the advance of civilization at length embraced the virgin ground of northern Europe, the progress of religious development was resumed, and assumed nearly its present form. The region allotted to the supernatural was circumscribed. Secular interests supplanted spiritual in interest and importance. The emotions of fears and reverence retained less influence upon conduct and religion; while, on the other hand, the sentiments of obligation and beneficence, the sense of duty and the feeling of love, attained a more important place in the motives governing human action, and, imported into religion, are now the aspects of it which secure greatest regard and retain most influence.

---

## ART. VI.—GEORGE ELIOT: HER LIFE AND WRITINGS.

*Works of George Eliot.* William Blackwood & Son.

THE sense of loss, as when the light is withdrawn by the sunken sun, or as when the earth lies in the giant shadow of eclipse, was felt by many a heart, not only in English, but in European and American homes, when, at the close of the last year, the tidings were told that the high souled woman to whom, under the name of George Eliot, the world owed a debt of gratitude for lessons of noble thought and revels of mirthful wisdom, was never again to move it with her pathos, instruct it with her *human* science, or delight it "with the invigorating shocks of laughter," and "the irrepressible smiles" which waited on the marvellous sallies of a humour profound as life itself.

A period of sixty years had passed since she had witnessed her first summer. Of the greater part of this period but little is known in detail; the leading incidents have already been chronicled by others; but our readers will be grateful to us for a twice-told tale, and will pardon unavoidable repetition in the case of one, whose literary career, in its earliest promise is associated with the full performance of that promise, in the early days of the present series of the WESTMINSTER REVIEW.

Mary Ann Evans, was born at Griff, near Nuneaton, in the county of Warwick, on the 22nd November, 1819. Her father, a man highly respected for general trustworthiness and business

capacity, began life as a master carpenter, but was afterwards appointed land-agent and surveyor to five estates in the Midland Counties. Mr. Evans was twice married, a son and daughter being the fruit of the first marriage. Mary Ann was the youngest of the three children of the second marriage. Her early years were marked by quiet thoughtful earnestness. At twelve we find her teaching in the Sunday school, in a little cottage near her father's house. When she was about fifteen years of age her mother died. In one of her "Sonnets" she dwells on that mother's tender care and loving gaze, when she prepared her brother and herself by stroking down the tippet and setting the frill for their accustomed ramble "across the homestead to the rookery elms," on the days when they dug earth-nuts, or fished together, or listened to the parting cuckoo as it flew to a fresh spring-time. The more systematic education appropriate to her age separated her from the brother whom she so tenderly loved. The school at which she was now placed was kept by the Misses Franklin, whose careful training she in later years gratefully acknowledged. Among the experiences of her childhood we ought to particularize her first acquaintance with gypsy life; she dreaded, indeed, rather than admired, the mystic race, that still lurked between her and each hidden distance of the road a gypsy, having once startled her at play and blotted the brightness of her sunny hours. As the brother and sister of the "Sonnets" were dim adumbrations of Tom and Maggie Tulliver, the gypsies of those far off days reappear in an improved version in the well-known adventure in the "Mill on the Floss."

The Evans family remained at Griff till Miss Evans was about twenty years of age. The friends who knew her best, in the immediate sequel of her life, have detected in the experiences registered in the "Scenes of Clerical Life," evidences of a memory which drew material from all that she had observed and felt in the prosaic country district where she had spent her childish days. "Several of the scenes," says a Nuneaton resident, "depicted in her works are faithful word-paintings of the surrounding localities; and many of the incidents which she has so graphically described are founded upon events which occurred in that town or its vicinity. Several of the characters pourtrayed by the eminent authoress were evidently suggested by the habits and characteristics of persons living near the home of her girlhood, and the originals are easily recognizable by old inhabitants of the district." The letters which she wrote at this period of her life are said to evince a penetration and insight beyond her years, breathing a spirit of deep religious fervour, not without a strong infusion of evangelical sentiment.

In the interesting letter addressed to her friend, Miss Sara

Hennell* (who, in the wise exercise of a discretionary right, has placed it before us, without suppression or qualification) she thus touches on those buried years:—

"There was hardly any intercourse between my father's family resident in Derbyshire and Staffordshire and our family. Few and far between visits of (to my childish feeling) strange uncles and aunts and cousins from my father's far-off native country, and once a journey of my own, as a little child, with my father and mother, to see my uncle William (a rich builder) in Staffordshire, but *not* my uncle and aunt Samuel—so far as I can recall the dim outline of things—are what I remember of northerly relatives in my childhood.

"But when I was seventeen or more, after my sister was married, and I was mistress of the house, my father took a journey into Derbyshire, in which, visiting my uncle and aunt Samuel, who were very poor, and lived in a humble cottage at Wirksworth, he found my aunt in a very delicate state of health, after a serious illness; and to do her bodily good he persuaded her to return with him, telling her that *I* should very happy to have her with me for a few weeks. I was then strongly under the influence of evangelical belief, and earnestly endeavouring to shape this anomalous English Christian life of ours into some consistency with the Spirit, and simple verbal tenor of the New Testament. I *was* delighted to see my aunt, although I had only heard her spoken of as a strange person, given to a fanatical vehemence of exhortation in private as well as public. I believed that I should find sympathy between us. She was then an old woman—about sixty—and I believe had for a good many years given up preaching. A tiny little woman, with bright small dark eyes, and hair that had been black, I imagine, but was now grey; a pretty woman in her youth, but of a totally different physical type from Dinah. The difference, as you will believe, was not *simply* physical; no difference is. She was a woman of strong natural excitability, which I know from the description I have heard my father and half-sister give, prevented her from the exercise of discretion under the promptings of her zeal. But this vehemence was now subdued by age and sickness; she was very gentle and quiet in her manners—very loving—and what she must have been from the very first, a truly religious soul, in whom the love of God and the love of man were fused together. There was nothing highly distinctive in her religious conversation; I had had much intercourse with pious Dissenters before; the only freshness I found in her talk came from the fact that she had been the greater part of her life a Wesleyan; and though *she left the society when women were no longer allowed to preach*, and joined the new Wesleyans, she retained the character of thought that belongs to the genuine old Wesleyans."

---

* Authoress of "Present Religion" and "Thoughts in Aid of Faith," reviewed in the WESTMINSTER, July 1860. Mr. Grote, in his "Plato," vol. iii. 195, referring to "The Analogy," says, "the soundness of Butler's argument has been acutely discussed in a good pamphlet by Miss Hennell."

This interesting quotation carries us into the dim background of her life; places us among scenes and persons that left impresses on her mind, influencing her thoughts and feelings, and surviving, in changed form, in the ideal world of her books.

Three or four years after the date indicated by herself, Mr. Evans removed from Griff to Foleshill, near Coventry. By this time (1841) her brothers and sisters were all married, and Mary Ann now lived alone with her father. A devoted daughter and excellent manager, she long presided over the household at Foleshill. Ever desirous to administer to her father's comfort or gratification, she accompanied him in his drives during the day, and entertained him in the evening by reading aloud the novels and romances of Walter Scott—works she continued to admire in the maturest years of her life. A passage in "Middlemarch," wherein Caleb Garth (who has borrowed for his own personality traits derived from that of Robert Evans) is described as driving with his little daughter beside him in the gig, embodies an incident which "a tender, filial reminiscence alone suggested to George Eliot."

There was, perhaps, little at first sight, says a decisive authority, in a communication to the *Pall Mall Gazette*, "which betokened genius in that quiet, gentle-mannered girl, with pale, grave face, naturally pensive in expression; and ordinary acquaintances regarded her chiefly for the kindness and sympathy that were never wanting to any. But to those with whom, by some magic affinity, her soul could expand, her expressive grey eyes would light up with intense meaning and humour, and the low, sweet voice, with its peculiar mannerism of speaking . . . . would give utterance to thoughts so rich and rare, that converse with Miss Evans, even in those days, made speech with almost all else seem flat and common."

At Foleshill the real education of "Marian" Evans began. A prodigious memory, with unwearied industry, favoured that rapid acquirement of knowledge, the variety and solidity of which were so remarkable. From the Rev. T. Sheepshanks, then head master of the Coventry Grammar School, she received lessons in Greek and Latin; from Signor Brezzi she acquired French, German and Italian; for her knowledge of Hebrew she was dependent on her own unassisted efforts. The range of her classical studies was comprehensive. By her intimate friends her fine musical sense was duly appreciated. For the instruction which, combined with it, made her, in after years, an exquisite pianoforte player, she was indebted to Mr. Simms, the veteran organist of St. Michael's, Coventry.

Among the friends whom Miss Evans made in that town, none stood so high in her regard, as none showed her such undeviating

kindness, as Mr. and Mrs. Charles Bray, of Rosehill. Mr. Bray, whose philosophical writings were recently (April, 1879) the subject of critical appreciation in this REVIEW, had early turned his attention to political and social problems. "If," says his critic, "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 powers of thought entitle him." Besides being a practical, as well as theoretical philanthropist, Mr. Bray was also a courageous impugner of the dogmas which form the basis of the popular theology. Mrs. Bray shared in this general largeness of thought, while perhaps more in sympathy with the fairer aspects of Christianity, which had so strange a fascination for "the girl with the pale, grave face and singular endowments of mind," who became her lifelong friend, and ever welcome guest*.

Religious discord in a home is not an unusual characteristic of the social life of the present day. Forty, or even twenty years ago, dissent from the orthodox creed was not only regarded as criminal, but was generally unintelligible to the older generation, except as the result of a wicked heart, a weak head, or that universal solution of the problem of theological aberration—Satanic possession. It was in some such crisis that Mr. and Mrs. Bray proved themselves the true friends and wise protectors of the possibly "wayward child," through the counsels which reconcile the rebellious aspirations of youth with the claims of grey authority and reverent tradition.

In the letter addressed to Miss Sara Hennell, and already so freely quoted by us, her gifted correspondent tells her that the interview with her aunt in the Wirksworth cottage was less interesting than that described in a previous extract on a prior occasion, attributing the change apparently to the fact that the visitor was less simply devoted to religious ideas. At a later period, when her Wirksworth relatives came to see her, in their turn, at Foleshill, "there was some pain," for she "had given up the form of Christian belief, and was in a crude state of free-thinking."

About this time—the end of 1841—Miss Evans first met with "An Inquiry Concerning the Origin of Christianity,"† by Charles C. Hennell, the brother of her friends, reading it twice over in close succession, and pronouncing it "the most interesting book she

---

* Mrs. Bray's "Physiology for Schools," now in a fourth edition, is written with a rare intelligibility. In her "Duty to Animals," in general use in schools in the Midland Counties, she teaches humanity to children.

† Translated into German at the instance of Dr. Strauss, and reviewed in Dr. E. Zeller's "Theologische Jahrbücher," vol. i. 1842.

had ever read." In 1842 the more ardent minds of the day, growing more and more estranged from the dominant creed, had their attention arrested by the bold and original solution of the problem presented by the life of Jesus, which Dr. David Strauss had proposed in his earlier "Leben Jesu." Among the persons thus interested were the friends and guests of the late Mr. Joseph Parkes, in earlier days a solicitor of Birmingham, afterwards the legal adviser of the Reform Club, and a zealous "Parliamentary agent" on behalf of the Liberal Party. It was at at the house of this gentleman that a translation of the uncompromising work of Strauss was suggested. The friends there assembled at once agreed to provide the funds requisite for the accomplishment of this literary enterprise. Mr. Hennell, one of the guests, undertook to find a competent interpreter of the German theologian. The task was entrusted to the lady selected by him for this purpose—the daughter of Dr. Brabant, then of Devizes; and by her a moiety of the first volume,* some few pages excepted, from Miss Hennell's pen, was rendered into English. Miss Brabant's marriage to Mr. Hennell took place soon after that lady's introduction to Miss Evans. They had been included in an excursion party, the several members of which, converging at a pre-appointed rendezvous, had crossed in a steamboat from commercial Bristol to Tenby, with its transparent waters and miniature "emerald island." There are but feeble echoes of the stay at Tenby now. One of them whispers faintly of a public ball which was a failure, though graced by the presence of genius then unknown, for Miss Evans danced on the occasion, yet "without the spirit in the feet" which lent an inspiring influence to the rhythmical movements of her noble Fedalma. Another echo reports that while at Tenby the ponderous volumes of Sir Archibald Alison's "History of the French Revolution" were read by her, one after the other, in a swift, latent sort of way—actually read, but with no visible indication of their being read at all.

The Tenby excursion took place in July, 1843, Dr. Brabant joining the party at Swansea. His daughter's marriage was celebrated in the autumn of the same year. With the ready sympathy which was an abiding characteristic of hers, Miss Evans offered to supply for a season the daughter's place to the old father, to whom the marriage of one who had long been his dearest, most congenial, and intelligent companion, was felt as a bereavement.

Dr. Brabant, the friend of Strauss and Paulus in Germany, of Coleridge and Grote in England, had withdrawn early from his

* Part i. c. iv. 33. p. 218, vol. i.

professional career, for leisurely prosecution of his favourite theological studies. "A vigorous self-thinking intellect," as he is styled by the late "historian of Greece," in a private letter, he delighted his youthful guest with his logical eloquence and genial companionship.*

The marriage of Miss Brabant to Mr. Hennell occasioned the transfer of the task which she had commenced to the able and not unwilling hands of Miss Evans. The occupation was not altogether congenial. With the final issue of the argument sustained by Strauss, she had no quarrel, but the undertaking proved to be one of arduous and exhausting toil. In due time, however, the task was completed, and the English "Leben Jesu" was published in 1846 by Mr. John Chapman.

The excellence of the translation was universally admitted. Unfortunately, only a fraction of the sum promised by the twelve original guarantors of the fund was forthcoming. Mr. Joseph Parkes then magnanimously undertook to advance the sum necessary to induce Mr. Chapman to publish the work. Happily, after the sale of the entire impression, the profits were such that that liberal financier had no reason to regret his generous confidence. The sole remuneration which Miss Evans received was the exiguous sum of twenty pounds, and, we believe, twenty-five copies of the book itself. Miss Evans's translation of a kindred work, Feurbach's "Essence of Christianity," was published by Mr. Chapman in 1854, in his "Quarterly Series," intended, as we learn from the prospectus of it, "to consist of works by learned and profound thinkers, embracing the subjects of theology, philosophy, biblical criticism, and the history of opinion." For the translation of this work she received from Mr. Chapman fifty pounds. Unfortunately the work was so slightly appreciated by the British public that the publisher's share in the transaction proved to be a heavy loss.

The study of Feuerbach's subtle speculations may have predisposed her to regard with favour the Positivist Ideal, since its key-note is sounded thus: "Man has his highest being, his God in himself; not as an individual, but in his essential nature—his species.

---

* In the *Spectator*, March, 1878, in a review of "Moore's Literary Remains," reference is made to an article on German Rationalism in the *Edinburgh Review*, 183—"It was admired by the late Dean Milman, who could not be brought to believe that it was by Moore." The fact is, the *original* article was by Dr. Brabant. Recast by Moore, it "abounds in puns and amusing similes." With some intention of reprinting it in a projected work, Moore wrote to Dr. B: "I shall then have great pleasure in acknowledging your excellent exposition of Rationalism which is the best part of it."

A third translation, still unpublished, of the Ethics of Spinoza, was *not* executed during the period of her residence at Foleshill, but in the year 1854. It is to this translation, evidently, that Mr. Lewes refers in his deservedly popular "Life of Goethe." But though a complete version of the "Ethics" was not prepared till the date now specified, Miss Evans had translated, about ten years previously, the first part (" DeDeo ") of Spinoza's great treatise, for the edification of a philosophical friend.

The residence of Miss Evans at Foleshill terminated in 1849, the year of her father's death. At Rosehill, Mr. Bray's house, she then found her recognized and acknowledged home. Soon after the sad event just commemorated she joined Mr. and Mrs. Bray in a continental tour. It was probably in passing through London that Mr. Chapman first saw her on business connected with the publication of the " Leben Jesu." She was then looking very worn and broken, in consequence, as he supposed, of sorrow for her recent loss, and of the great physical suffering superinduced by her too assiduous attendance on her father during his last illness. On the departure of her friends for England, Miss Evans elected to remain in Geneva, and here she lingered till the return of spring. On her arrival in England she resought her Coventry home, and there continued to the following year.

In the household at Rosehill she found "sympathy with her ardent love of knowledge," breathing a free and finer atmosphere of thought, and, as she threw off the excrescences of an artificial theology, attaining higher and broader views of the mysteries of Nature and life. Among the distinguished men who were at various times guests at Mr. Bray's house while Miss Evans was there, either as inmate or occasional visitor, were the American essayist, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Froude, the brilliant historian of the Tudors, George Combe, the phrenologist, and Robert Mackay, whose "Progress of the Intellect," could only be appreciated by the "fit audience" to whom the book appealed. Many a time, says a friend, writing of those days, you might have seen " pacing up and down the lawn, or grouped under an old acacia, men of thought and research, discussing all things on heaven and earth, and listening with marked attention when one gentle woman's voice was heard to utter what they were quite sure had been well-matured before the lips opened. Among such friends the " Marian of Rosehill" made her home till the spring of the year 1851.

In that year the new series of the WESTMINSTER REVIEW was inaugurated under the management of Mr. John Chapman, and by him Miss Evans was induced to remove to London and assist

him in the conduct of this periodical. There are some living who still remember the fortnightly gatherings at Mr. Chapman's house in the Strand, distinguished as they were by the presence of men and women who had risen, or were rising into intellectual eminence. The gentler editor of the WESTMINSTER, we may be sure, was among the greatest in that kingdom of intelligence. It was in this year, and not till this year, that her friendship with our most profound philosophical thinker, Mr. Herbert Spencer, commenced. In the letter addressed by him to the editor of the *Daily News*, Mr. Spencer, in correction of the current report, denies that he "had much to do with her education." When he first became acquainted with her she was, he says, "already distinguished by that breadth of culture and universality of power which have since made her known to all the world."

It may interest our reader to learn that the notice of Carlyle's "Life of Sterling," in the WESTMINSTER REVIEW for January, 1852, was her earliest contribution to our pages. The articles which we can guarantee as undoubtedly from her pen, are "Woman in France: Madame de Sablé," October, 1854; "Evangelical Teaching: Dr. Cumming," October, 1855; "German Wit: Heinrich Heine," January, 1856; "Silly Novels, by Lady Novelists," October, 1856; "The Natural History of German Life, July, 1856, and "Worldliness and other-Worldliness: the Poet Young," January, 1857.

During the time of her residence in London, Miss Evans was the frequent guest of Sir James and Lady Clarke. The authoress of "Deerbrook" also invited her to her house, situated amid the romantic scenery of Ambleside. It appears to have been about the end of 1853 that she ceased to co-operate with Mr. John Chapman in the conduct of the REVIEW.

The most momentous event of her life was now impending. Mr. George Henry Lewes, whose intellectual force, brilliant versatility, and many endearing qualities are acknowledged by all who had the good fortune to be admitted to the privilege of his friendship, had enjoyed numerous opportunities of appreciating the rare excellence of the noble woman whose genius, yet latent, was, ere long, to be known to all the world.

To the earlier married life of Mr. Lewes we shall make but a passing reference. It had a decisive and irreversible close. Of the circumstances which led to the union of the co-inheritors, though with unequal claims, of an enduring renown, we have nothing to record. That union was from the first regarded by themselves as a true marriage—as an alliance of a sacred kind, having a binding and permanent character. When the fact of the union was first made known to a few intimate friends, it was

accompanied with the assurance that its permanence was already irrevocably decreed.

The marriage of true hearts, for a quarter of a century has demonstrated the sincerity of the intention. "The social sanction," said Mr. Lewes once in our hearing, "is always desirable." There are cases in which it is not always to be had.

Such a ratification of the sacrament of affection was regarded as a sufficient warrant, under the circumstances of the case, for entrance on the most sacred engagement of life. There was with her no misgiving, no hesitation, no looking back, no regret; but always the unostentatious assertion of quiet, matronly dignity, the almost queenly expression and unconscious affirmation of the "Divine right" of the wedded wife. We have heard her own oral testimony to the enduring happiness of this union, and can, as privileged witnesses, corroborate it.

As a necessary element in this happiness she practically included the enjoyment inseparable from the spontaneous reciprocation of home affection, meeting with an almost maternal love the filial devotion of Mr. Lewes's sons, proffering all tender service in illness, giving and receiving all friendly confidence in her own hour of sorrowful bereavement, and crowning with a final act of generous love and forethought, the acceptance of parental responsibilities, in the affectionate distribution of property, the visible result of years of the intellectual toil whose invisible issues are endless.

To the influence which Mr. Lewes, through his wise persuasion and persistent encouragement, wielded over the mind of the gifted woman, whom he henceforth regarded as his wife, we are indebted for the conquest of that extreme distrust of her powers which rendered her so strangely sceptical of their existence. It was towards the close of the year 1856 that the first independent demonstration of this victory was afforded us, for in the autumn of that year Mr. Lewes, himself a contributor to *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, forwarded to the editor, as the work of an anonymous friend, the tale entitled "The Sad Fortunes of Amos Barton"; the remaining scenes of "Clerical Life," being then unwritten. At first the criticism passed on the story had a disheartening effect on the author. Learning this, Mr. John Blackwood, the editor, generously offered to accept "Amos" at once, at the same time expressing a hope that he should be able to approve of the contributions to follow, as "Amos gave indications of great freshness of style." By the author of the appreciative paper in *Blackwood* (February, 1881) we are told how, as successive instalments of the manuscript were received, the editor's conception of the power, and even genius, of his new contributor steadily increased. "Amos Barton" occupied the

first place in the magazine for January, 1857, and was completed in the following number. The "Scenes of Clerical Life" appeared month by month until they ended with "Janet's Repentance" in the November of that year.

The authorship of "Clerical Scenes" was the subject of much speculation and conjecture. The editor of *Blackwood*, arguing from the scientific illustrations which the work contained, and similarity of handwriting, was inclined to assign it to Professor Owen. By others, Lord Lytton, whose Caxton novels were at this time soliciting the suffrages of the public, was supposed to have ventured into a fresh field of literary fiction. Dickens, when the series was completed, addressed the anonymous author a letter of generous appreciation very gratifying to her.* In 1858 the tales appeared in a collective reprint. So great was the success of the work that the editor was able, before the end of the first month of the new year, to assure Mr. Lewes: "George Eliot had fairly achieved a literary reputation among judges, and the public must follow, although it may take time." With prophetic discernment Mr. Blackwood pronounced her progress *sure*, if not so quick as he could wish.

The early experiences of religious life which she had stored up, while at Nuneaton, are reproduced in these "Scenes," though always, of course, with a difference. Deeply impressed with a sense of the invisible soul of goodness dwelling in the old narrow creeds, and still retaining some belief in the Divine word of her childhood, the authoress, with strong, fresh artist power combining with her *human* feelings, wrote out from her heart what she had seen, heard and felt, and, individualizing and yet transforming it, through her creative force substantiated and localized it in the ' Scenes of Clerical Life." The only foreign influence that we can trace in them is that of Thackeray, chiefly in his confidential whisper of satirical reflection, and, perhaps, though in a scarce appreciable degree, that of Miss Austen. The penetrating glances that George Eliot throws into the foibles and affectations, the pretensions and assumed superiorities of the men and women we meet with in ordinary life, is like that of a moral detective; yet it rarely scathes, as does that of Thackeray; but has rather the omniscience of an enlightened love; but a love that with all its enlightenment tolerates no imposition. In the "Sorrows of Amos Barton" the characters are drawn with a few bold touches. Amos is not an heroic personage, but superlatively middling. He has no refinement, no culture; but though, too like one of thos "mongrel, ungainly dogs who are nobody's pets,"

* For all these particulars we are indebted to the writer of the Article "George Eliot," in *Blackwood's Magazine*, Feb. 1881.

he is not grudged his sweet wife, the lovely Milly. With the serpentine wisdom for which he gave himself credit, "he preached Low-Church doctrine—as evangelical as anything to be heard in the Independent Chapel, and he made a High Church assertion of ecclesiastical powers and functions," absolutely certain that the "Dissenters would feel that the parson was too many for them." The selfish, unscrupulous Countess Czerlaski, who quietly quarters herself on the establishment of a poor curate, is the pungent antithesis of the gentle, helpful, uncomplaining Milly, who "did not take all her love from the earth when she died, but left some of it in Patty's heart."

All this pathos is repeated in "Mr. Gilfily's Love Story," where the bright Italian life and nature are represented, though in eclipse, in contrast with the knots and ruggedness of our English world. The selfish trifling of Captain Wybrow, and the self-affirming conventionalism of Miss Asher, are admirably contrasted with the devoted, silent affection of the open-eyed, loving Maynard Gilfily, and the passionate despair and abandonment, the repentance and recovery, and sweet, sad acquiescent love of Caterina Sarti, "the soul that, born anew to music, was born anew to love."

In "Janet's Repentance," the concluding tale of "The Scenes," the characters of the blustering, drunken husband, with his hollow morality and vulgar blatant theology, and of the wife, with her spontaneous tendencies to good, and her temporary retrocession to evil, under the terror awakened by the frightful excesses and frantic violence of the drink, maddened tyrant, are depicted with the skill and power which belong to ample knowledge of life. The scene in which the furious sot beats the poor trembling delinquent, and turns her out, scantily draped, into the cold, bleak, windy night, to wander in the streets, or to find refuge where she could, has a tragic pathos in it. The death of Dempster, with all its delirious horror, appears in surprising vividness before us; the description of Janet's mental condition, after that appalling scene, when she reflected that the man once so tenderly loved had gone for ever, that "her husband would never put her hand to his lips again, and recall the days when they sat on the grass together, and he laid scarlet poppies on her black hair and called her his gypsy queen:" the restoration of Janet to physical and spiritual health; the conquest of that acquired bias to evil, under the consolatory and encouraging teaching of the narrow-minded, but earnest-purposed curate of Salem Chapel, are so many illustrations of a pathos often very exquisite, of imaginative power of a high order, and of mental talents and qualities capable of still nobler performance. Indeed, all the characteristic properties of George Eliot's literary genius appear

in these volumes, including her flashing wit and laughing humour, and that intense, self-identifying imagination, which enabled her to interpret, appropriate and picture to us, the life of shepherds, and field labourers, and handicraftsmen; to call up before us the old and buried social existence in remote towns and villages, when coaches were absolute realities, and nasal clerks and top-booted parsons had claims to some sort of friendly recognition. All these old quaintnesses and odd rusticities, even to the "anthem in which the key-bugles always ran away at a great pace, while the bassoon every now and then boomed a flying shot after them," are lovingly noted in the village comedy of George Eliot, as they are described with a more elaborate care in her larger and greater stories. The love of children and babies; the grace accorded to dogs and the other poor brutes, who are, in some sense, our fellow creatures; the appreciation of all varieties of human character; the parsons, and doctors, and Dissenting ministers; the Pilgrims, Pratts, Jeromes, Bairds, Pughs, and Tryans, of remote country life, are already conspicuous in these tales. Here we find that strong sympathy with human suffering and human limitation, which is distinctive of her ethical creed. Here, also, we note the author's strong spiritual tendencies, while yet struggling with old forms of faith. Anxious to recognize the importance of an idea or self-subordinating principle, she detects it, even under the shabby guise of a Congregational dogmatism or a phraseological evangelicalism, where "folly often mistakes itself for wisdom, ignorance gives itself airs of knowledge, and selfishness, turning its eyes upwards, calls itself religion." Here, too, we find the initial proclamation of a favourite doctrine—that even in the lives of commonplace people there are sublime promptings; that poetry, pathos, tragedy and comedy may be seen lying in the experience of a human soul that looks out through dull grey eyes, and that speaks in a voice of quite ordinary tones. Here, too, we may remark her cheerful acceptance of a fragmentary goodness, her wise contentment with heroes who have done some genuine work, though the rest be barren theory or blank prejudice. Here, too, we find the separate clauses of her humanitarian creed: "Religion is kindness. The first condition of human goodness is something to love; the second, something to reverence." Above all, we find in this, her earliest work, though in its less peremptory form, the expression of the doctrine, which is the first article in the creed of George Eliot—the old Pagan doctrine, though interfused with Christian sentiment, of the Nemesis or Retributive spirit that regulates the world. "We reap what we sow; but Nature has love over and above that justice, and gives us shadow and blossom and fruit that spring from no planting of ours." We may crown our

critical estimate of "Scenes of Clerical Life" with the remark that in them lies the substance of the thought, the promise of the power afterwards so splendidly exhibited in the greater works of the woman who was henceforth to be known to the world under "the euphonious and impressive designation of George Eliot." *

The "Scenes of Clerical Life" were scarcely completed in the magazine form than a new tale, "Adam Bede," was commenced. In the spring of 1858 the greater part of the second volume was sent to *Blackwood* from Munich, where George Eliot then was. Her residence on the Continent closed with the brilliant days of August in that year. An extract from a letter addressed to the daughter of an old friend gives an interesting outline of some incidents of travel :—

"Next . . . . comes a message from . . . . whom do you think? From Strauss, whom I saw for a quarter of an hour the day before we left Munich; some agreeable chance sending him hither for a short visit. He inquired with much interest about you, as well as about Dr. Brabant, and desired me to give his kindest greetings to both. Dr. Brabant will be pleased to hear that Strauss looks much more placid and healthy than he did some years ago—not happy, perhaps, but as if he were contented to bear sorrow. He is busy now with the life of Klopstock, about whom he has collected some new facts, or shadows of facts.

"We stayed three months at Munich, chiefly for the sake of the people we found there, for the climate is afflicting, and the galleries always shut, except just at the time when we could not go out to see them. Then we had a delicious journey to Salzburg, and from thence through the Salz Kammergut to Vienna, from Vienna to Prague, and from Prague to Dresden, where we spent our last six weeks in quiet work and quiet worship of the Madonna."

Mr. Blackwood at once appreciated the merits of the new tale forwarded from Munich, and in the last week of January, 1859, "Adam Bede" was published. The place of "Adam Bede" among the great classical novels of the world is assured. All the characteristic qualities of the writer's genius, foreshadowed in the previous series, now appeared in all their splendid maturity. The large conception, the vivid colouring, the earnest purpose, the austere and noble ethic, the marvellous humour, the ample culture, the delicate selective and creative talent of the new novelist, all testified to the truth of Thackeray's prophecy, that a star of the first magnitude would soon appear above the literary horizon. In one of the confidential digressions of the book she renounces altogether the notion of writing in the lofty style of a

---

* *Blackwood*, Feb. 1881.

conventional ideal, and declares that she feels "obliged to creep servilely after nature and fact;" that she aspires to give no more than a faithful account of men and things as they have mirrored themselves in her mind. To this laborious fidelity of observation, and realizing felicity of report, we are indebted for the life-like delineation which gives to the places and persons of this story, that visible and tangible existence, which in an old Anacreontic poem is ascribed to the Rhodian painter, who to the coloured shadow on his canvas was said to have given breath, and speech, and motion. The *scenery* of the world within is as startlingly true and as strangely minute and magically impressive as that of the world without. The one seems to reflect the other. The geography of Hayslope revealed the true locality of the district: the village of Snowfield was identified with its corresponding village. The dialect of the people who lived and died in Loamshire tallied with that of the Midland County which suggested it. Their individualizing reality is shown in the discriminative contrast between the two brothers; the practical, scheming, somewhat secular Adam, and the visionary, brooding, absent-minded Seth. The portrait, too, of Mr. Irwine, the rector of Hayslope, with his scholarship and gentlemanly refinements, his love of ease and practical charitableness, is a miniature, as real in conception, as it is delicate in execution. The constructive art of the novelist is most noticeable in two of her best creations, the sweet, unselfish, saintly Dinah, with her earnest activities, and self-subordinating compliances, and the vain, light-headed worldly Hetty, with her indescribable witch-like beauty, and her simple, confiding, winning gentleness. The passage which describes Hetty's "peculiar form of worship," her fanciful night toilet, and self-admiring contemplation of her beauty, with the warning contrast in the adjoining room, where Dinah watches with a mind full of anxious presages, before she seeks and finds her lovely "peacock" friend, with cheeks flushed and eyes glistening from the imaginary drama, is one of the most subtly conceived and singularly beautiful individual scenes in all prose fiction. The tragedy which has so appalling a development, the flight of Hetty from home, the pining in despair, the agony in the field, the præternatural disfigurement of the beautiful features, where all tho rounded prettiness—the love and belief in love utterly gone—still remained, like the wondrous Medusa face, with the passionate, passionless lips, show how near the writer approached to the great secret springs, where human thought and feeling are lost in the inexplicable mystery of a paralyzing sorrow, a remorseful shame, and a wrecked and wasted life.

But, turning from the shadow to the sun, where in modern fiction shall we find more of the exhilarating surprise that is the

offspring of wit, or humour more profoundly, yet more laughingly wise, than are to be found in the pages of "Adam Bede?" Where, out of those pages, shall we find fitting counterparts to the immortal Mrs. Poyser, and her fellow-immortal, the amiable cynic, Bartle Massey. The humour of Scott never pierces into the heart of things, as does that of George Eliot; the humour of Dickens, glorious in its frolicsome extravagance, is clownish and superficial, and cannot be compared with the "ideal comedy,"—to use Shelley's expression—which we find in the prose drama of George Eliot.

In some minor respects "Adam Bede" is less satisfactory. Arthur Donithornre is less real, less realizable than we could wish. As a man of the world, we have heard it objected, he would not have allowed Hetty to have remained unaided and unprotected in her trouble. He would have foreseen it, and made due provision for the days of darkness. The Reprieval episode is an artificial and mechanical contrivance; the violent conflict of Adam with Arthur is an offence to art; and the commonplace, sensible marriage of Adam with Dinah is a disappointing close to the career of the sweet Methodist saint. The spiritual element, the religious "time-vesture," of Adam Bede, is Christian, as in the "Scenes of Clerical Life;" Christian, too, in so fervid a sense of the word, that the prominent character of it is that of a feverish, hectic, though still very beautiful supernaturalism. With Methodism the writer, in 1859, could have only the sympathy which belongs to all human beings who can see the soul of goodness in things—we will not say evil, but not absolutely good—and, above all, to the artist whose duty it is to describe life as it is, to depict all religious aspects, whether those of Greek or Roman polytheism, or those of mediæval Catholicism, or of the Society of Friends, or of modern Methodism. The ability to recover the past moods and impressions of a religious life which was once our own, and out of which we have passed, and to represent them vividly, lay in the nature of George Eliot. Her extreme susceptibilities as a woman and artist, permitted her to reanimate and temporarily appropriate that, of which, as the Latin poet says, she had once been a part. Whether the popular religion, with its paradoxes of hate and love, of terror and delight, is not too near us to reconcile us entirely to this artistic treatment, admits of question.

The sentiment of "Adam Bede" is profoundly human and universal in its humanity. The lovableness and sublime mystery to be found in every mortal mixture of earth's mould, from prophets and heroes down to old women scraping carrots with their work-worn hands, and heavy clowns taking holiday in dingy pothouses, are recognized throughout. The tragic, choral strain of moral piety, which is heard, like the "ear-piercing fife," through

the grander music of the fateful drama enacted in all her novels, rings with deadly resonance through that of "Adam Bede." "Consequences," says the High Muse here, as in "Romola," "are unpitying;" and consequences are hardly ever confined to ourselves. "There is no sort of wrong deed of which a man can bear the punishment alone."

We pause here to insert an explanation, and record an incident. The Explanation relates to the personal experiences of the great novelist, and their possible influence on the creation of her characters, notably of Dinah and Hetty, as well as on her local representatives in "Adam Bede." In a letter bearing the signature of W. C. Owen, and written soon after the death of George Eliot, we are told that in Coldwell Street, Wirksworth, there lives a Mrs. Walker, cousin of George Eliot, and daughter of the veritable Dinah Morris; that Mrs. Walker has in her possession a portrait of Dinah, with other relics; and that in the Wesleyan chapel in that town is placed a tablet, erected by numerous friends to the memory of Elizabeth Evans, known to the world as Dinah Bede, and of Samuel Evans, her husband, both members of the Methodist community. Mr. Owen's letter received an elucidatory notice, at the instance of early friends of George Eliot, in a letter from Mr. Herbert Draper, which appeared in a contemporary journal. In it Mr. Draper announced the intended publication of a letter—the letter, in fact, from which we have already quoted—"with a view to show the extent to which the dead aunt, Mrs. Evans, of Wirksworth, suggested Dinah." This letter, as we have seen, was addressed (in 1859) to Miss Sara Hennell, by the authoress of "Adam Bede," "prompted to write it by the feeling that in future years 'Adam Bede,' and all that concerns it, may have become a dim portion of the past." A passage from this letter contains the Explanation :—

"As to my aunt's conversation, it is a fact that the only two themes of any interest I remember in our lonely sittings and walks, are her telling me one sunny afternoon how she had, with another pious woman, visited an unhappy girl in prison, stayed with her all night, and gone with her to execution; and one or two accounts of supposed miracles, in which she believed, among the rest, *the face with the crown of thorns in the glass.* In her account of the prison scenes I remember no word she uttered. I only remember her tone and manner, and the deep feeling I had under the recital. Of the girl she knew nothing, I believe, or told me nothing, but that she was a common, coarse girl, convicted of child-murder. The incident lay on my mind, for years on years, as a dead germ, apparently, till time had made my mind a nidus, in which it could fructify; it then turned out to be the germ of 'Adam Bede.'

"I saw my aunt twice after this. Once I spent a day and night

with my father in the Wirksworth cottage, sleeping with my aunt, I remember. Our interview was less interesting than on the former time. And once again she came with my uncle to see me when father and I were living at Foleshill; *then* there was some pain, for I had given up the form of Christian belief, and was in a crude state of free-thinking. She stayed about three or four days, I think. This is all I remember distinctly, as matter I could write down, of my dear aunt, whom I really loved. You see how she suggested Dinah; but it is not possible you should see as I do how entirely her individuality differed from Dinah. How curious it seems to me that people should think Dinah's sermon, prayers, and speeches were *copied*, when they were written with hot tears, as they surged up in my own mind!

"As to to my indebtedness to facts of local and personal history of a small kind, connected with Staffordshire and Derbyshire, you may imagine of what kind that is, when I tell you that I never remained in either of these counties more than a few days together, and of only two such visits have I more than a shadowy, interrupted recollection. The details, which I knew as facts, and have made use of for my picture, were gathered from such imperfect allusion and narrative as I heard from my father, in his occasional talk about old times.

"As to my aunt's children or grandchildren saying, if they *did* say, that Dinah is a good portrait of my aunt—that is simply the vague and easily satisfied notion imperfectly instructed people always have of portraits. It is not surprising that simple men and women, without pretension to enlightened discrimination, should think a generic resemblance constitutes a portrait, when we see the great public so accustomed to be delighted with *mis*representation of life and character, which they accept as representations, that they 'are scandalized when art makes a nearer approach to truth.'"

The Incident is a circumstance not very creditable to human nature, and only deserving of commemoration as the antecedent event which withdrew the veil from the hitherto hidden figure of George Eliot. The faithful portraiture of character in "Clerical Scenes" had already produced a persuasion in the neighbourhood of Nuneaton that the author was, if not a native of the place, at least intimately acquainted with the country and people. A broken-down gentleman of the name of Liggens, who had celebrated his early youth by squandering a fortune at Cambridge, one day, like Lord Byron, awoke and found himself famous. While the "Scenes" were in course of publication in *Blackwood*, an Isle of Man paper revealed to the world that Liggens was the author. Mr. Liggens's initial denial of the pleasant impeachment was withdrawn, when the success of a new story offered an irresistible inducement to that part of human nature that does not lean to virtue's side. Mr. H. Anders, the rector of Kirkby, a man certainly too clever by half, affirmed in the *Times* that Mr.

Joseph Liggens of Nuneaton, Warwickshire, was the author of "Clerical Scenes," adding, that "he and the characters he paints are as familiar there as the twin spires of Coventry." This bold assertion elicited a reply from George Eliot, in which she retorted that the Rev. H. Anders has, "with questionable delicacy, and unquestionable inaccuracy, assured the world through the columns of the *Times* that the author of 'Clerical Scenes' and 'Adam Bede' was Mr. Joseph Liggens, of Nuneaton. I beg distinctly to deny that statement. I declare on my honour that that gentleman never saw a line of these works until they were printed, nor had he any knowledge of them whatever."

The protest against "prying discourtesy" with which the letter closed was not effective; even the indignant denial of Mr. Liggens's claim did not convince a credulous circle of sympathetic dupes. Mr. Liggens had by this time got the better of his "natural modesty." It is said that this singular claimant not only consented to receive subscriptions from the charitably disposed, but actually produced a drawer of manuscripts which he pretended were the original copy of the novel. The general curiosity was now more insatiable than ever. At length the secret was discovered. Before the publication of the "Mill on the Floss," the masque of anonymity was withdrawn, and George Eliot was found to be none other than the young girl with the pale, grave face, who in earlier days had sat under the old acacia at Rosehill, and who, in writing to Miss Hennell, had signed herself, "Your loving Marian."

In the beginning of April (it seems presumptuous to correct *Blackwood;* but we are certain that it was not "in the end of April)" appeared the "Mill on the Floss," an appropriate and "curiosity-exciting title" for which we are indebted to the editor of *Maga,* in his most poetical hour; the original title of the work being "Sister Maggie." While we protest against the error of seeing substance where there is only shadow, there is, undoubtedly, a personal element in this book, which makes it additionally attractive to the more sympathetic readers of the volumes. The characters of Tom and Maggie are complementary opposites. Tom is practical, utilitarian, decided and energetic; and, while rigidly upright, narrow-minded and prejudiced. As a boy he had more than the usual share of boys' justice in him—"the justice that desires to hurt culprits as much as they deserve to be hurt, and is troubled with no doubts concerning the exact amount of their deserts." A high sense of personal honour and family pride, and the postponement of all considerations to the sovereign aim of winning or retaining a good name, an implacability, arising out of a mistaken sense of duty, are his dis-

tinguishing traits. He is also sternly realistic, treating his sister's fairy tales and romances with invariable disrespect. In Maggie's nature the craving for affection, the want of being loved, was the strongest need. To her prosaic brother she was very tenderly attached, though somewhat tried by the severe scoldings which Tom, with a strong sense of his masculine superiority administered when Maggie's misdemeanours invited them. Imaginative, impulsive, with a musical nature vibrating to all that is beautiful and heroic, Maggie has those tragical elements in her character which make life a perpetual struggle; and, ostensibly, an ultimate failure. The circumstances of her childish existence are admirably pourtrayed. The great attic, where she fretted out her ill-humours; the fretish-doll which she used to punish for her misfortunes, driving an occasional nail into its head, when it personated Aunt Gleg, or some other natural enemy, with a luxurious reminiscence of Jael in the old Bible similarly avenging herself on Sisera; her visits to the mill, in whose great spaces she loved to linger, enjoying the dim, delicious awe of its resolute din, till her black hair was powdered to a soft whiteness that made her dark eyes flash with new fire; her sorrow over her *brown* complexion, and superabundant locks that wouldn't curl; her desperate attempt to run away from her own shadow, make herself Queen of the Gypsies, and forget all her troubles in the noble work of ruling and regenerating that wandering race with whom she fancied she had some special affinities; her affections and ambitions; all the bitter grief of her young heart over her wounded love or unrecognized merit—all these traits and incidents of Maggie's early years are presented with such marvellous force and fidelity, as to more than justify the admiring panegyric of the accomplished critic who first praised in our hearing this exquisite picture of child-life. We confess that the womanhood of Maggie saddened and disappointed us. We had expected a nobler issue of all this rich, luxuriant promise. Yet, notwithstanding Maggie's decline and fall, we hardly dare justify our primary judgment. Such is our rude mortal lot, such are the workings of those inexplicable forces which make us what we are, that the finest and most spiritual natures have often in them the prophecy and antecedent of a rebellious outbreak or a moral deterioration. If it is difficult to forgive Maggie for a temporary perversion, where the temptation does not in our eyes possess any of that fascinating splendour that excuses sin; we can, at least, reverence the noble repentance and sublime self-renunciation, which crown her, as restored heretic and returning martyr, after her ignoble lapse, and in the else irrevocable failure of her life.

"The Mill on the Floss" has not the concentration nor the

satisfying unity of Adam Bede. But there is an equally affluent portraiture of character : the description of boy-life is almost as surprising, though less profoundly touching and spell-binding than that of Maggie's childhood. Tom Tulliver, Philip Wakem, Bob Jakin, with his dog Mumps, have all an undeniable right to their existence. The humorous wisdom scattered over the book is scarcely inferior to that of "Adam Bede." The sayings and doings of Mr. Dodson, Mr. Tulliver, the Glegs and Pullets, and the philosophical appreciation of Luke, the head-miller, who opposes Maggie's sanguine prediction of the better behaviour of the Prodigal Son, with the remark—" Eh, miss, he'd be no great shakes, I doubt ; let's feyther do what he would for him"—are all utterances of that natural comedy of life which may be found on the roadside and the meadow, in the farmhouse, the cottage and the mill. The Dorlcote mill, the venerable town of St. Oggs, with red-fluted roofs and broad warehouse gables ; the Dodson sisters, whose religion consisted in revering whatever was customary and respectable ; the sweet-natured, fairy-like cousin Lucy ; the legal and clerical persons who play their part in the drama, all exhibit the same keenness of observation, and the same delicate executive force which distinguish the earlier tale.

The story, however, has its flaws or defects. The minutely registered circumstance in the Dodson life is apt to weary the impatient or romantic reader. The assault which Mr. Tulliver commits in his bull-headed frenzy on the prostrate person of the unoffending lawyer, and the somewhat sensational catastrophe with which the tragedy closes, are the chief blemishes of this powerful and impressive tale, which has for its ethical teaching the same old doctrine of Nemesis, or the retributive order of the world, rehearsed, however, with a loftier application since it produces " the inevitable suffering, whether of martyrs or victims, which belongs to every historical advance of mankind."

In Mr. John Blackwood George Eliot recognized a judicious critic and trustworthy counsellor. " He judged well of writing, she says; "because he had learned to judge well of men and things, not merely through quickness of observation and insight, but with the illumination of a heart in the right place." In intervals of comparative leisure she showed her regard for the editor whose moral judgment she so valued, and the interest which she took in the magazine in which her earliest essays in fiction had found a welcome, by occasional brief contributions. We anticipate, when we say that the " Address to Working Men, by Felix Holt," taught wise lessons to the artisan class in January, 1868. "The Lifted Veil," published anonymously in the July number of *Blackwood*, 1860, was generally approved, and drew expressions

of admiration, we are told, from the late Lord Lytton.* In the following year her most finished—we do not say her greatest book—was given to the world—"Silas Marner, the Weaver of Raveloe."

The perfection of this work lies in the fine proportion and symmetry resulting from the harmonious co-adaptation of its component parts. All superfluous, disturbing irrelevant matter is carefully excluded. There are no flaws, or gaps; no didactic or episodical prominences, to interfere with the continuity of narrative, or to block out or obscure the light which the imagination sheds over the world that it has created. And as the unity is complete, as the effectiveness is sustained, the sense of a satisfying whole is realized. There is in it a recurrent simplicity, like the endless returning progression in an antique urn, where the silent forms are ever moving with unchanging but unwearying repetition. The characters are created, not in accordance with mechanical law, or as the common phase is, from without to within, but in accordance with the laws of poetic biology, from within to without. They have grown with a natural growth, like the trees and flowers; and demonstrate with their presence the justifying fatality of their birth. There is the action of the same law of moral and artistic necessity manifested in place as in person. The people are fitted to the country, are the natural products of the soil; and the correspondence between the material scenery, and the mental configuration, is a witness to the unity and genuineness of the creative impulse. Primitive English life has never been painted with such simple truth and unpretending philosophy as in "Silas Marner." The lingering echoes of the old demon worship among the grey-haired peasantry; the obscure religious life which has gone on in the alleys of our towns; the conviction of the poor confused hero of the story that the religion of his adopted country was unknown to the pious folk he had once lived with—as in the early ages of the world it was believed that each territory was inhabited and ruled by its own divinities; the sorrows that spring from false ideas for which no man is culpable; and, above all, the great sorrow of minds unhinged from their old faith and love, are all noted here, with such wisdom and grace, that the significance of the thought is often veiled by the modest beauty of the expression. The most elaborate portrait in the book is that of Godfrey Cass, the worshipper of Favourable Chance, the mighty creator of success with *him;* as the Evil principle which he deprecated, was "the orderly sequence by which the seed brings forth a crop after its kind." The bewildering grief of Silas, and all his sad fortunes, are

* *Blackwood*, Feb. 1881.

touchingly recorded. The picture of little Effie, with the soft yellow rings round her head, as if there were gold on the floor in front of his hearth, as if his own lost treasure were mysteriously restored, is exquisitely imagined. The minor characters are all sketched with a true, steady hand. Dolly Winthrop, with her tender heart and her genial stoicism, delights us with her unconsciously humorous piety; and the parish clerk, the farrier, the butcher, and the landlord, with their talk at the "Rainbow," are worthy to rank next to the homelier creations of the Sovereign Wit, whose name has lent an immortality to that sister inn, the "Mermaid."

Before the completion of "Adam Bede," George Eliot had discerned the rich promise that lay in the Age of Savonarola as a subject for a grand historical fiction. "Romola," so was the new romance entitled, was published in monthly parts, in successive numbers of the *Cornhill Magazine*, from the summer season of 1862 to that of 1863 inclusive. Mr. Lewes, in a letter dated July 5, 1862, 16, Blandford Square, answering an obvious remark of ours, observed: "My main object in persuading her to consent to serial publication, was not the unheard of magnificence of the offer, but the advantage to such a work of being read slowly and deliberately, instead of being galloped through in three volumes. I think it quite unique, and so will the public when it gets over the first feeling of surprise and disappointment at the book not being English, and like its predecessor." A few months later (December 18) he wrote again: "Marian lives entirely in the fifteenth century, and is much cheered every now and then by hearing indirectly how her book is appreciated by the higher class of minds, and some of the highest; though it is not, and cannot be, popular. In Florence we hear they are wild with delight and surprise at such a work being executed by a foreigner, as if an Italian had ever done anything of the kind." Something of the kind had been attempted, and not altogether without success, by Manzoni, in his "Promessi Sposi." In contrast with "Romola," however, the Italian tale may be pronounced a secondary and heterogeneous performance: and Mr. Lewes's jet of affectionate indignation is justified by the essential correctness of his implied denial of Italian priority.

"Romola" has been called the greatest of George Eliot's works. It is certainly the most ambitious. It is the most rich in culture; it is the most daring in effort. It is the most Miltonic. In it, she, too, endeavours in some sense to achieve what was never yet attempted in prose or rhyme, An English woman, she has selected an exotic subject; she has revived the Florentine past; the age of restored scholarship, of grand ambition, of religious revivalism, of glorious projects, of splendid

hopes. The great city; the long valley of the Arno, with its grey, low-tufted luxuriance; the steep height of Fiesole, with its crown of monastic walls and cypresses; the great dome, with its large curves; Giotto's bell-tower, with its distant hint of rich colour; the graceful, spired Badia and the long dark mass of Santa Croce;—all spring up before us with that ideal palpableness which belongs to high poetic creation alone. The wits and scholars and statesmen, the new Charlemagne, the expected Saviour from France, the inspired teacher and prophet Savonarola, the politic Machiavelli,—all pass before us. The pictures of life are elaborate, minute, and conscientiously executed, but are also, we think, wanting in spontaneous expression, in movement, and flexibility. In fact they are studies—not inspirations. Savonarola is drawn with psychological truthfulness and tragic pathos. But the character wants mass; it does not profoundly impress or interest us. Bardo, the blind scholar, is a Rembrandt-like sketch, but he comes like a shadow, and so departs; Baldassara crosses us, from time to time, like a dreadful preternatural and latent form of malignant evil, threatening to break out, as indeed he does, into a material and visible vengeance; but his final act of vindictive violence in a not very probable crisis rather revolts than impresses us. Romola is the incarnation of nobleness, and is no less stately in soul than she is in body. She, with the conspicuous emphasis of habitual action, still demonstrates "that life to be the highest which is a conscious voluntary sacrifice." In her devotion to her father, to Tito, to the poor and pestilence-stricken villagers, to Tessa, and the children which are her husband's but not hers, she realizes the angelical ideal of humanity, without losing the majesty and Madonna-like sweetness of true womanhood. Still, with all this feminine loveliness, she is somewhat passionless and didactic. It must also be conceded that the circle of ideas in which she moves is that of the nineteenth rather than of the fifteenth century. The same remark, though in a less degree, applies to Tito Melema. Tito is, however, a more successful delineation than Romola. Indeed, we know not if there is any character in the novels of George Eliot which is more subtly devised or more consistently developed. His serpentine beauty, his winning graciousness, his æsthetic refinement, his masculine energy of intellect, his insinuating affectionateness, with his selfish love of pleasure and his cowardly recoil from pain, his subdolous serenity and treacherous calm, as of a faithless summer sea, make up a being that at once fascinates and repels, that invites love, but turns our love into loathing almost before we have given it. The traitor look, that made the artist who beheld it in the shop select him as the true model for the Greek Sinon, deceiving old

Priam, impresses itself on the memory, and pursues and haunts us through all the successive scenes of the tragic story. What shall we say of Tessa, the child-wife, yet no wife—the sweet fool-baby with her maladroit fingers weaving flowers not very cleverly, and never ceasing to be "astonished at the wisdom of her children;" but that she is very charming in her ignorant innocence: a pretty, pastoral figure, "exquisitely knit" with the delicate dexterity needful for such idyllic creatures? In this great fiction, which has something of Roman majesty about it, the exuberant humour which laughed out in the novels that preceded it appears to keep silence before the ethical grandeur with which the doctrine of the dreadful vitality of deeds, and their indestructible life, both in and out of consciousness, is enforced and illustrated.

In the spring of 1865, Mr. Lewes became the editor of the new periodical, the *Fortnightly Review*, and its first number was enriched with a brief essay on "The Influence of Rationalism," a review of Mr. Lecky's deservedly popular work, from the pen of George Eliot. In the summer of that year Mr. and Mrs. Lewes, who had removed from Blandford Square to the Priory—a residence which will long be associated with the traditions of her genius—once more sought a change of scene in Continental travel, returning at the end of August, or beginning of September, after a tour in Normandy, Brittany, and Touraine. Early in the following year "Felix Holt" was published, about three years after the publication of "Romola."

In this novel the authoress returns to the centre of her spells. She again carries us with her in the country, and paints for us fresh pictures of Provincial Life. The clerical element again appears, but its principal representative is no longer an evangelical curate, or an amiable but somewhat secular rector. The Reverend Rufus Lyon, "the singular looking apostle of the meeting in Skippers Lane,"* is recommended to us by the curious traits of character which he exhibits. As an Independent minister, he is interesting, because, with his religious and studious fervour, his restless intellect and passion for argumentative conquest, his unworldliness, simplicity, and oddity of manner and appearance, he unites great personal ambition, a sensitive and beautiful face, and has interwoven in the web of his prosaic and commonplace life, "golden threads of mystery and romance, rare in the life of any man." His daughter Esther, with an inborn sense of ladyhood, a self-complacency, feminine vanity and daintiness in dress, manner and disposition, but with a fine intelligence, felicitous wit and essential nobility of nature

* In a southern seaport town; later, of Malthouse Yard, Treby Magna.

under all these graceful superficialities, is also a happy creation. Felix Holt, the hero of the tale, the model Radical, notwithstanding his sincerity, honesty, self-denying industry, and mental promise, has for us no particular attraction. His determination to renounce the pursuit of wealth, to be an honest demagogue, who instead of flattering will censure the people, deserves all praise. The general character of Felix is constructed in harmony with the ideal workman of Auguste Comte. Asserting the claims, not of patrician, but of proletary blood—the blood of a line of handicraftsmen—he vindicates "the lot of the handicraftsmen as a good lot," offering excellent opportunities for the development of all the best functions of his nature; but he does not effectively illustrate this admirable lesson. There is, at any rate, a miscarriage in his career, a miscalculation, an hour of folly, which leads to a somewhat lame and impotent conclusion. Felix is a typical conception, with all the reality in it that the genius of his creator could infuse, but still only a typical conception. We question, too, whether, as the Radical workman of 1832, he is not also an anachronism. The trial scene, in which the hero is the prisoner at the bar, has two really fine passages in it—the sympathetic, spontaneous utterance of the Independent minister, and the earnest and self-forgetting, yet self-restraining passion which impels Esther to volunteer and give her evidence in vindication of the unlucky Felix. In humorous talk and witty repartee this novel is less affluent than "Adam Bede," the "Mill on the Floss," or "Silas Marner." The opening chapter offers, perhaps, the very finest picture of rural scenery and remote country life to be found even in the works of George Eliot. One great defect in the book is the absence of that preliminary information which is necessary for the clear understanding of the antecedent action; another defect is the unreasonable multiplication of fortuitous concurrences, the mechanical aggregation of actors and incidents for the final close of the Transome Mystery, so long, so successfully concealed, notwithstanding the whispers of suspicion and the conspiracy of circumstance. In this, as in all other tales of George Eliot, we note how she points to the tragic mark of kinship in the one brief life to the far stretching life that went before, and to the life that is to come after—we recognize her detection of the "inherited sorrow" that is the progeny of "old paralytic vice"

Between "Felix Holt" and "Middlemarch" was interposed an interval of five years; between "Middlemarch" and "Deronda" the same quinquennial period elapsed. In "Romola," George Eliot reached perhaps her highest "heaven of Invention." For four great flights she had soared steadily and loftily upwards. In "Felix Holt" her descent began and ended. For neither

"Middlemarch" nor "Deronda" exhibit any fresh evidences of decline.

A provincial epic, a kind of village panorama, "Middlemarch" commands a wider view of the human horizon than any of her previous works. Of all her novels it is that which is richest in personal portraiture—that which presents the greatest variety of life. It is a kind of biographical labyrinth, which is not perplexing, because there are no intricacies of plot. The story constructs itself with little or no effort, adding on successive accretions of incident with a kind of self-organizing art, recalling the process by which the chain-coral secretes and builds up its stone house, erecting, in succession, compartment after compartment, forming a delicate masonry, which yet has power to withstand the force of water and stress of winds, and thus becomes an apt symbol of that more spiritual architecture with which genius defies the stormy vicissitudes of devastating time.

On the other hand, the self-unfolding unity of composition is too monotonous to be effective, the construction too colossal for satisfying survey. The narrative, again, is curiously wanting in plot interest; the drama is marked by no concentration of purpose, and the general inefficiency of action is so conspicuous, that we are half inclined to interpret it as an intended reflection on the futility and unprofitableness of life. But how marvellous, after all deductions, is the creative ingenuity which has produced a Casaubon, a sort of one-eyed literary Cyclops, groping in hopeless, helpless confusion, in the bewildering fog of his own obsolete pedantry; a Rosamond, "practising behaviour to her shadow," making herself, from morning till night, her own standard of perfect ladyhood, with her unusual talent for a large, precise rendering of noble music, her refined manners, her appropriate and decorous cleverness, her worldly arts and aims, and her heartless, imperturbable self-complacency; a Dorothea, with her Quixotic misplaced admiration, her devotion to vague, unverified ideals, with her lofty aspirations and her pitiable descent to disappointing realities, fretting under the torture she cannot escape; wise in counsel, and magnanimous in conduct where others are concerned, yet exemplifying, through her determining acts, "the mixed results of young and noble impulse, struggling amidst the conditions of an imperfect social state, in which great feelings will often take the aspect of error, and great faith the aspect of illusion." The character of Lydgate, with his professional ambitions and "foiled potentialities" of genius; that of Farebrother, the generous-natured, wisely-speaking, though not always wisely-acting, vicar; the imprudent Caleb Garth, with his chivalrous devotion to work; of his daughter Mary, with her daylight honesty of nature, and her quaint, sarcastic impulsiveness; and,

above all, that of Bulstrode, the sanctimonious banker, with his tragical self-delusion, and that crowning deception with which he attempted to cajole himself into the belief that he was not a guilty man, while the secret self within declared his guilt—all testify that the observing faculty and constructive talent of the artist are still active and vigorous. The rich variety of moral and intellectual life, as exhibited in the less important personages—Mr. Brooke, Sir James Chetham, Ned Viney, Peter Featherston, Trumbull, Mrs. Waule and Mrs. Cadwallader—makes a stroll through such a portrait gallery an illustration of our journey through life, where "we insignificant people are preparing the lives of many Dorotheas, some of which may present a far sadder sacrifice than that of the Dorothea whose story we know."

"Middlemarch" is not without occasional glimpses of that sunlight on the water which we name humour; though far less genially luminous than that of the earlier novels. In "Deronda" the loving humorous laugh is heard no more. At best we find only the sparkling epigram and aphoristic sarcasm. The scientific phraseology, which appears to have been always a characteristic of the style of George Eliot, is more frequent and far-fetched; the structure of the sentences more elaborate and artificial. If less witty, the pages are fragrant with wise and weighty reflections. The old burthen is there, but with a variation. For the intelligible Nemesis of "Adam Bede," or the "Mill on the Floss," we have a daunting, intimidating sense of latent, inexplicable wrong, with oracular announcements of possibilities of sin and retribution, which evade foresight and baffle interpretation. The heroine, who is first introduced as a "Nereid in sea-green robes and silver ornaments," attracts but perplexes us. She is, and apparently is meant to be, a moral enigma and psychological puzzle. Her beauty fascinates us with its witch-like charm: with the provocative set of her head, the singular lustre of her brown eyes, the musical ring of her laugh. It is a sort of Lamia beauty. She has a splendid figure and a royal carriage, with a surpassing charm in her attitudes and movements. An ethical paradox—she is selfish and even cruel; often indifferent to the pain she causes, and yet not without a certain kind of affectionateness. Her ambition is commonplace, yet she cares only for what is unusual—for distinctions, pleasures, activities, which others do not share. With all these unpromising qualities she unites an extraordinary depth of feeling, indicating capability of moral improvement. Occasional visitations of remorse, vague fears in solitude, strange fits of spiritual dread unconnected with the religion taught her, or with any known relations, and having their physical correspondence in pallid lips, dilated eyes, prostration of form and concealment of face, are expressions of this

nameless fear, this terror of the invisible. The cardinal aberration of Gwendolen lies in her marriage to Mr. Grandcourt, and a deliberate exclusion of the prior claims of Mrs. Glasher; though we very much doubt whether so exalted a personage as this territorial magnate, had Gwendolen not stood in the way, would have admitted those claims, and have made the compromised lady his wife. Gwendolen's purgatorial experiences in married life under her rigorous taskmaster; her crime, which, however, was only a criminal desire, a murderous thought; her remorse, which aggravates her guilt by misrepresenting the desire as an act; the consequent awakening of a new life, and her resolve to dedicate her powers to the promotion of the welfare of others, are among the incidents external and internal which make up the interest of this singularly fascinating paradoxical personality. The portrait of the self-regarding, self-sufficing, supercilious, Satanic Grandcourt, is one that we fail to appreciate; but the lavish admiration of others will compensate for our deficiency. On the other hand, we applaud that of the German musician Klesmer, as vividly conceived and boldly delineated.

Deronda is the elaborate result of a vast expenditure of analytic power; but he is too much of a lay-figure, too like the officious Mentor in the insufferable "Telemaque." He exhibits some emotion, however, in the scenes in which the Princess Halm-Eberstein is introduced. The recoil of this lady from the artificialities and limiting humiliation of her race is natural, and this protest was perhaps, intended as an admission that Judaism has its weak and repulsive phases. Mordecai, a kind of impalpable enthusiast, is a fair enough type of the visionaries who indulge in dreams of restored nationality. He is acceptable to us, moreover, as an incarnation of the purely ideal; a representative of the romantic, which George Eliot so sparingly recognizes in her fictions. Mordecai has been erroneously identified with the Jew Cohen, some account of whom was given by Mr. Lewes many years ago in *The Fortnightly Review.* But not only did Mr. Lewes repeatedly confute this hypothesis, but George Eliot herself, in her letter to Mr. Myers (Jan. 18, 1879). reiterates this confutation, declaring that Cohen resembled Spinoza, the *antithesis* to her conception of Mordecai; thus finally disposing of the notion that this visionary being was suggested by a corresponding reality.

The study of Jewish family life, in the Cohen household in the novel, fails to enlist our sympathies. Deronda's devotion to a lost cause, the restoration of a political existence to the Jewish people, is beautiful to us only as all aspiration after what is great and noble is beautiful. One of the imperial nations of the world, with a sublime and pathetic history, and a grand literature of

story, song and prophecy—when intelligibly interpreted—the Hebrew race deserves the estimate which has been formed of it by its eloquent champion. George Eliot's reclamation, too, is only too well justified when she complains that "the European world has long been used to consider the Jews as altogether exceptional," to the disregard of "the rules of justice and mercy which are based on human likeness;" but, in her noble defence of this people in "The modern Hep! Hep! Hep!"* does she not dwell too exclusively on the degradation and persecution to which they have been subjected? Infamously treated as the Jews have often been, we must not forget that their history, since the establishment of the Christian religion, has its bright as well as its dark side. To convince ourselves that it is so, we have only to recall the splendour of the Israelites in Babylonia, under the Prince of the Captivity; their commercial prosperity throughout the dominions of Charlemagne; the court they received from the princes and nobles of Europe in the ninth, and their power, magnificence and extensive traffic in Spain in the succeeding century. It was the theological fanaticism and popular superstition, the avarice of monarchs, and the war-passion of nobles, which, in a later day, led to the odious acts of confiscation, persecution and cruelty, with which the Jews are justly entitled to reproach Christians. With the substitution of the religion of humanity, which George Eliot so persistently proclaims, for an effete Mosaism and a moribund Christianity, may we not venture to predict that the future of the Jewish people will ultimately be blended with that of the various nations among which they are domiciled, on the basis of a common civil and political equality?

The volume in which we find the essay on the character and fortunes of the Jewish race, purporting to be the production of Theophrastus Such, records the "Impressions" of that avowedly impartial spectator in seventeen other essays. These miniature dissertations are characterized by an extraordinary penetrative sagacity, and an almost cynical keenness of observation. In her assumed character of a modern "Theophrastus," George Eliot reproduces the mental physiognomy of typical men and women,—Merman, Grampus, Lentulus, Mixtus, Ganymede, Scintilla, and Vorticella—with an accuracy of imitative delineation which attests the piercing and detective sharpness of her moral insight. Professing to share in their weaknesses, and the better to interpret them because she shares in them, she exposes with curious felicity their labyrinthine self-delusions, notes the inconsistencies in their zealous adhesions, and smiles at their helpless endeavours after action in a rashly-chosen part. The most delightful, the

* In Germany, in the Middle Ages, the Jews were massacred at the cry of "Hep! Hep!" the initials of the words "Hierosolyma est perdita."

most lovable essay in the volume is "Looking Backward," a beautiful and touching retrospect, with delicate, tiny picturings of pastoral scenes, and pleasant glimpses of far off vanished days. The most valuable of these essays, because of its opportune protest against a growing evil, and the corresponding indispensableness of its advice, is that on "Debasing the Moral Currency." In this apposite remonstrance, while allowing wit and humour to play harmlessly and beneficently round "the changing facets of egoism, absurdity and vice," Theophrastus discountenances "the screaming laughter," the offspring of a buffoonery which "degrades all historic beauty, majesty, and pathos." In the essay called "The Watch-dog of Knowledge," the weak self-protecting egoism which always guards itself against being surprised into an admission of ignorance, and pretends, at least in a negative sort of way, to the possession of universal information, is most amusingly exposed. There is nothing, indeed, more humorous in any of the essays than the sketch of the respectable factotum, Pummel, the "horrid example" of this omniscient ignorance:—

"I have a sort of valet and factotum, an excellent, respectable servant, whose spelling is so unvitiated by non-phonetic superfluities that he writes 'night' as 'nit.' One day, looking over his accounts, I said to him jocosely, 'You are in the latest fashion with your spelling, Pummel; most people spell night with a gh between the *i* and the *t*, but the greatest scholars now spell it as you do.' 'So, I suppose, Sir,' says Pummel, 'I've seen it with a *gh*, but I've noways give into that myself . . . .

". . . . I've taken to asking him hard questions, and as I expected, he never admits his own inability to answer them without representing it as common to the human race. 'What is the cause of the tides, Pummel?' 'Well, Sir, nobody rightly knows. Many gives their opinion; but if I was to give mine it 'ud be different.'"

In wit of the antithetic kind the volume abounds; nor is it without a welcome proportion of pleasant humour. It is principally remarkable, however, for wise comment and urbanely sarcastic observation on the vanities, foibles, and futilities of men. It is not a book that is likely to be acceptable to the literary world, because it is a mirror wherein different individualities will see themselves too faithfully reflected; because, in short, the skilful analyst of human nature has inevitably gone counter to the politic sentiment of the American satirical poet:—

> "I'm willin' a man should go tollable strong
> Ag'in wrong in the abstract, for that kind of wrong
> Is ollers unpop'lar an' never gits pitied,
> Because its a crime no one never committed;
> But he mus'nt be hard on partickler sins,
> Coz then he'll be kickin' the people's own shins."

Pre-eminent in the domain of prose composition, George Eliot, in the flowering summer of her fame, and in the splendid redundancy of her creative power, determined to essay fresh conquests in the untravelled realms of poetic romance.

"The genius of poetry," says the youthful Keats, "must work out its own salvation in a man. It cannot be matured by law and precept, but by sensation and watchfulness;" and elsewhere he adds: "if poetry comes not as naturally as leaves to the tree, it had better not come at all." In contravention of this canon laid down by a poet, George Eliot's poetry did *not* come naturally; it was *not* the result of sensation and watchfulness; it *was* matured by law and precept. . We will not add that it would be better if it had never come at all.

The "Spanish Gypsy," as re-written in 1867 or 1868, after a visit to Spain in the former year, is, in any case, a remarkable poem. The subject is impressive: the spirit which informs it severely tragical. The early reminiscences of gypsy life noted in the "Sonnet," and developed in the "Mill on the Floss," appear to have made an indelible impression on her receptive mind. The formation of a tribe of wandering Pariahs into a distinct nationality has a parallel in the picture of the Jewish Future in "Theophrastus Such." With the patriotic, inflexible enthusiasm of Zarca, who is *all* gypsy, and who aspires only to realize this dream of independent nationality for "vagabonds quick as the serpent, loving as the hound, and beautiful as disinherited gods," the nature of his daughter Fedalma, with "the gipsy" half exorcised though her Spanish education, yet incapable, under the fierce appeals of her nobler self, of deserting her father in the great struggle which was approaching, comes into fatal collision. Duke Silva—her betrothed—romantic, chivalrous, and naturally honourable, but utterly overpowered by his passion for Fedalma, breaks with all the traditions, associations, and attractions of his birth and rank, only to find that his sacrifice or apostacy recoils on those to whom he was most sacredly attached, and whom he was most stringently bound to defend. With these conditions are united all the elements of a tragical conflict; love and duty, patriotic aspiration and personal predilection; the prejudices of birth, position, party ties, warring with the claims of affection, authority, and tradition. The situation, thus tragical in itself, is made more so by its identification with a kind of fate which controls all the persons of the drama. This fate lies in the collective invisible life, the power of nameless antecedents, the transmitted, wavering influences and separating incidents which have been bequeathed to the present by the past, and which thus introduce irrevocable discord into all the individual lives. In the characters of Zarca,

Silva, Fedalma, Isidor, we discover the same talent for analytic exhibition of qualities and motives so apparent in the personal constructions of the novels of George Eliot. Yet they are all more or less indefinite and shadowy; all more or less deficient in that distinctive reality which enables us to see them in the full daylight of a realizing imagination. Descriptive force: curious, if not always successful embodiment of scientific truth; felicitous presentation of thoughts and sentiments pregnant with moral grandeur; oracular utterances, musical with the golden ring of beautifully disposed words; truthful observation, and profound reflection, give almost endless variety to the poem. But, regarded as a whole, it is wanting in dramatic concentration, passionate intensity, life-like reality; is without exciting progress in action, and has no satisfying close. The form, combining narrative with dialogue, is disturbing, and even dislocating. The versification, wonderful as the result of study, fails to content an ear that can discriminate between spontaneous singing and mechanical tunefulness. The diction, often forcible as the expression of an analytical process of thought, is rather picturesque oratory which challenges attention, than the melodious poetic utterance which persuades and charms soul and sense.

Of the minor poems, the "Legend of Jubal" is the most impressive. The scene, in particular, where youths and maidens sing in concert the praises of Jubal, "the father of all such as handle the harp and organ;" and the wandering inventor, responding to what he deems a sympathetic call, rushes before them to the "glittering space" and cries "I am Jubal—I made the lyre," only to find his claim rejected, his identity denied, and himself treated as an impostor and outcast—is finely conceived, and has in it a tragical truth which is profoundly felt. In "Agatha" the picture of Catholic life is simple and pleasing, while the musical enthusiasm and aspiration of Armgart, and her involuntary but submissive renunciation, are pathetically contrasted; and, as serving to remind us of George Eliot's own gifts of melody and to attest her sympathy with an art she loved, are additionally impressive. "How Lisa loved the king," suggested by the bright pages of Boccaccio, has also an adventitious interest, as the last of her contributions that appeared in *Blackwood*. Though not published till 1869, it was written six years before, and is probably the earliest of her recorded poetical productions, though she wrote in verse at a much earlier period. "The Minor Prophet" has a peculiar attraction for us. It affords direct evidence of her belief in a higher future for mankind, and yet of her inability, through attachment to the dear familiar forms of the past, to dissociate herself from even its *humorous* pieties, though in the very hour of "high prophetic vision." The well-known hymn

which Positivism recites as its clearest and most beautiful religious expression, is a fitting close to a unique volume of verse. "Theophrastus Such" was not published till May, 1879. It was, however, composed prior to the sad and unexpected event which occurred on November 30 of the preceding year—the death of Mr. George Henry Lewes.

Mr. Lewes's health, perhaps never very vigorous, was not gravely affected during his customary sojourn in the pleasant rural seclusion of Witly, near Haslemere, where he spent the summer of 1878. On his return to London in the autumn of that year, a severe cold, the prelude to an illness of a more complicated character, confined him to the house, and after about a fortnight's suffering, this brilliant and accomplished thinker, succumbed with quiet fortitude to the great Destroyer. Over the sorrow and desolation, aggravated by severe physical derangement, which fell on her who had to sustain this heavy trial, we drop the veil of a reverential silence.

It was not till the 6th of May in the following year that we once more saw George Eliot. The "George Henry Lewes Studentship" then occupied her thoughts. The studentship was founded by her for the lasting remembrance of one whose literary talent, philosophical studies, and scientific researches, entitled him to a commemoration beyond the limits of a private and sacred sorrow. The value of the studentship is slightly under £200 a year. It is observable that persons of both sexes are admissible as candidates. Its object is to promote the prosecution of original researches in physiology, the science which Mr. Lewes, who was originally intended for the medical profession, had during many years of his life cultivated with patient toil and watchful observation. This particular form of endowment was chosen by her, because she thought it the most appropriate mode of transmitting the memory of one whom she mourned with the grief "with which the stranger intermeddleth not."

With the revival of crushed energies and the awakening of new hopes the literary career of George Eliot, had life been prolonged, might have been, and probably would have been, triumphantly resumed. To speculate on her literary future, however, were superfluous. Her life was *not* prolonged. The magical circle of fiction was closed. The "Impressions of Theophrastus Such" were to have no kindred successor.

In our separate notices of George Eliot's writings we have given such prominence to the various characteristics of her art that we need do little more than recapitulate them here. 1. Over all English—may we not say over all novelists, Goethe excepted—George Eliot is supreme in culture. With the literature of modern languages, French, German, Italian, and Spanish,

she was more or less intimately acquainted. Her classical attainments command respect. Homer, the Greek Tragedians, the Latin poets, including Terence, Plautus, Phædrus, the speculating Plato and the gossiping Suetonius, were all known to her. That her scholarship was profound, or even exact, we do not aver. It was sufficient for all literary purposes. In "Romola," the paraphrase of a passage in "Æschylus" is purposely free. In "Theophrastus Such," her ascription of the narrative of Socrates' death to the "Apologia," instead of the "Phædo," is the consequence of a momentary confusion. Her study of the classics was comprehensive, if not strictly accurate. With the different systems of philosophy, including that of Spinoza, of whose "Ethics" she has left a translation, she was competently acquainted. In German theology—as witness her translations of Strauss and Feuerbach—she was a proficient. Of "Die Menschenoffer der alten Hebräer," by Dr. F. W. Ghillany, we have heard her speak words of disapproval. Kuenen's "History of Israel," on the other hand, she commended both for its general merit and for its reverential spirit. The sciences, of course, she had never mastered, but she was at least a diligent reader of scientific books, taking great interest in all the branches of physics, including astronomy in that category.

This culture, so rich, so multifarious, if it has sometimes marred the purity and effectiveness of her art, has often given a suggestive variety to her thought. To her art, however, she carefully subordinated her philosophy, her science, her learning, and her theology. Whatever else she was, she was, like Goethe, above all, an artist. The artist temperament, the artist faculty, predominate in her; her negative convictions, her "advanced views," are all scrupulously repressed; though the lynx eye of a Catholic critic detected an "extreme orthodoxy and dangerous Positivism underlying all she taught." To us, at any rate, this heresy in solution was not discoverable in her earlier novels; and to us, with all our admiration for her genius, the result was not entirely satisfactory. Knowing well her negative opinions, knowing that she had abandoned all theological dogma, we could not bring ourselves to feel absolute contentment in a mere artistic identification with the theology of the Chapel or the Church. Convinced that a new life was coming into the world; that science was sitting on her throne creating all things new; thoroughly sympathising with the onward movement in religion, politics and philosophy, holding that art ought to be "the mirror of the shadow which futurity casts upon the present," we were disappointed at finding that while justice, and, perhaps, more than justice, was done to the sanctities of the Church, the Meeting House, and the old Catholic Faith, the claims of the new creed,

of the new life, were not directly recognized at all. We willingly concede that the main region of art should be life as it is, or life as it has been; but if the religious fervour of Methodism could supply fitting matter for poetic representation, why was not the earnest unbelief of a Strauss, the devout enthusiasm of a Theist like Mr. Francis Newman, or of a pantheist—if he was a pantheist, like Shelley—to receive some recognition from art? A poet, such as Leopardi, in our days; a philosopher, such as the god-intoxicated Spinoza, in earlier days—could they not furnish suggestions and intimations from which a genius like that of George Eliot might appropriate valuable material for new portraiture? That whatever was sweet and fair and gracious in the old religions should be mirrored in her art, was reasonable enough; but why were not the favourable aspects of the new faith to be represented at all? For at first we could find nothing but an unqualified eulogy on the beliefs of the past. To us her art seemed partial; and we found little to help us in sounding our fathomless way through perilous seas. In Goethe, Shelley, George Sand, we had encountered hearts that palpitated to our own. In George Eliot we found the artist, the monitress, but not the prophetess; others drew instruction, consolation, inspiration from her pages. In some cases the difference of view was intelligible enough. The young and the ardent, escaping from the trammels of a contracting creed, discovered in the broader teaching of these novels a new version of Christianity, new readings of old lessons, and they supposed the existence of a greater dogmatic sympathy between themselves and the authoress than was warranted by fact, and were delighted and instructed accordingly. What we have finally discovered in her was a refined morality, in general harmony with that of Auguste Comte, with whose writings we had been familiar long before the publication of the earliest of her works. Besides this acceptance of a religion of humanity, we have found, in her teaching, the enforcement of the doctrine of consequences, more richly illustrated, more variously applied, more scientifically stated than ever it was before. This awe of the Divine Nemesis—though, to use her own words, it has taken a more positive form under Christianity—was felt by religious Pagans; and, as divested of its poetical drapery, it constitutes the very basis of scientific morality, we were less forcibly impressed by it than those whose minds were more acutely perceptive, because less systematically indoctrinated than our own.

Another moral characteristic of her writings is the preeminently tragical, not to say pessimist, aspect of her representations of life. "The waste of force, the inevitableness of mistake," the sorrowful frustration of human endeavour, are phases in our

common mortality, which, it has been rightly said, throw a shadow over the exquisite world which her genius has created. There is much truth in the conception which depicts the destiny of mankind in hues of gloom and darkness. Nature, if we will personify her, is, from our limited point of view at least, maleficent as well as beneficent. But is human life so essentially sombre, human endeavour so characteristically impotent for good, as the moral of her noble fiction suggests? Take the leading personages in the imaginary drama of the works of George Eliot:—Hetty, Arthur, Maggie, Tito, Savonarola, Dorothea, Godfrey, Gwendolen, Fedalma—many of them with fair promise of good, all of them with some mental or physical attractiveness, yet all alike predestined to error, some to moral shipwreck, some to tragical defeat, some to disappointing condescensions; Dinah even, our sweet saintly Methodist, abandoning her mission, a decree of the Conference having suppressed the voice of the Eternal Spirit. Too terribly true is this sad portraiture of, human struggle and suffering, of "human hopes defeated and o'erthrown." We admit its truth. But is all the truth there? Has not our poor planet given us many a noble statesman, many a man who was a king in deeds as well as in name, many a successful cultivator of science as of song, many a "happy warrior," many a sweet soul working—and with success too—for the welfare of others, many as pure and noble in mind, and as prosperous in essential fact, as a Mazzini, a John Stuart Mill, or as George Eliot herself?

With this true, though partial representation of life, this tragedy of her art, is associated another and contrasting characteristic—the laughing humour, the dazzling wit, which, somewhat in Shakespeare's high fashion, when Shakespeare is at his best, completes her ideal of a work of art, by the super-addition of the comedy of life.

In culture, then, we may say that George Eliot excels all English novelists. In the power of imaging impressive situations, in portraiture of character, in pathos, in descriptive force, in mastery of language—delicate, apt, lucid, carefully elaborated diction—she ranks with the highest prose writers of her school. In wit and humour she has no superiors, unless they be Lucian, Sterne, Swift, Rabelais, Voltaire.

If the world, as it is and has been, is painted by her in sombre colours it cannot be too emphatically stated that she did not hold the philosophy of Leopardi or Schopenhauer. She was not, and could n[illegible] be an optimist, in the usual sense of the word; but she was certainly no pessimist. She believed, we should say, with Fichte, in the moral order of the world; and we have heard her speak with approval of the truth that underlies the now familiar expression of Mr. Matthew Arnold: "The Eternal,

not ourselves, that makes for righteousness." Discarding, as it were, the two antithetical epithets, optimist and pessimist, she one day suggested the word Meliorist, as an appropriate term to designate the hope of those who believe in the gradual improvement of the world. In "Romola" she sees in the Campanile of Giotto "a prophetic symbol, telling that human life must somehow, and at some time, shape itself into accord with that pure aspiring beauty." In the "Minor Prophet" she avows:—

> "I, too, rest in faith
> That man's perfection is the crowning flower
> Towards which the urgent sap in life's great tree
> Is pressing—seen in puny blossoms now,
> But on the world's great morrows to expand,
> With broadest petal and with deepest glow."

She was not, however, very sanguine of the rapid realization of this "perfection" through external agencies. Her thought, as nearly as we can recall it, was that the support and consolation which so many need, will be found in human sympathy and compassion and their practical issues, rather than in the improvement of external conditions, within the limits of appreciable time. Speaking once of the immense misery of the world, she referred to the passionate cry of the sufferer of Uz, as the only adequate expression of irrestrainable emotion in the hour of overpowering calamity: "Have pity upon me, have pity upon me, O ye my friends!" (Job xi. 5.)

An intense sympathy with all sentient emotion—men, women, children, animals—with all forms of thought, all varieties of belief not without some trace of good or beauty in them, carried to the verge beyond which acquiescence would be insincerity, was a prominent quality in her affluent nature, as noticeable in her life as it is conspicuous in her writings. Her heart, as Mr. Mill so beautifully says of the ideal poet, opened itself freely and largely to the love of all that is lovable, to pity of all that is pitiable; every cry of suffering humanity struck a responsive chord in her breast; whoever carried nobly his own share of the general burthen of human life, or generally helped to lighten that of others, was sure of her homage.* Nor did she find the human sphere too small for her. Like Goethe, rather, she inclined to the opinion that, in a certain sense, man was made for the little; and she spoke with something of quiet scorn of those for whose "magnificent intellect, this world of all of us" is not sufficiently ample; of those gentlemen, as she wittily expresses it in "Felix Holt," "who have no particular talent for the finite, but a general sense that the infinite is the right thing for them."

* See "Dissertations and Discussions," vol. i. p. 296.

This purely secular theory of life—this virtual protest against *other-worldliness*—to use an expression of her own—appears to many limiting. It does not satisfy; it does not edify them. The question, however, is not, Is it pleasing? but, Is it true? Her reply, we believe, would have been affirmative The related question, What was the religion of George Eliot? requires further elucidation here.

In 1852 an article by Dr. James Martineau, entitled "Christian Ethics," appeared in the WESTMINSTER REVIEW, embodying, as we have reason to believe, though perhaps not without reservations, the opinions which she then held to be true. We may fairly infer, then, that at that time she shared the conviction that "Christian Ethics, proposing as an end within their reach the ascent of the soul to a divine life, and, as the means, a simple surrender to its own highest intimations, have melted away the interval between earthly and heavenly natures, not by humanizing God, but by consecrating man. In treating the lower desires of sense and self as the streams that intercept the tender reverences, as the pure air that transmits the light of lights, they have struck the deepest truth of human consciousness." In an article of her own, entitled "Evangelical Teaching," she admits the value of the true theistic conception; of the idea of God, as possessing "all those attributes which we recognize to be moral in humanity," of the efficacy of a "sense of His presence intensifying all noble feeling and encouraging all noble effort, on the same principle that human sympathy is found a source of strength." This admission very powerfully impressed us in the earlier years of her authorship; but when, at a later period, we attempted in conversation to vindicate our own attenuated form of faith—if faith that could be called, which was rather a survival of difficulties—her somewhat discomforting response affirmed the practical sufficiency of the purely human ideal. Her answer to the teleological argument was, "The explanation is contained in a nutshell." With Kant, though not in his words, she contended that the reflecting reason brings design into the world, and then admires a wonder created by itself. An apology for theism grounded on the distinction between the god of the people and the god of the philosophers, she rejected, with the observation that the latter conception was the less reasonable of the two; glancing, probably at the common deistical notion of a sort of Dieu Faineant, who, having made a world like a clock, sits aloft, seeing it go. Pantheism was even less acceptable to her than theism. Its "moral indifference" revolted her. Between theism and pantheism she had long oscillated. In 1871, perhaps much earlier, the oscillation had ceased. The statement, therefore, of

Professor Beesly, in his impressive "Annual Address," that she had "cast away every shred of theology and metaphysics," must be accepted as scrupulously accurate.

Her religion was, unquestionably, the religion of humanity. If the scientific form of the conception emanating from Auguste Comte nowhere appears in her works, we find occasional approximations to it; as when, interconnecting the past, the future, and the present, she says, in the beautiful Paper called "Looking Backward," "All reverence and gratitude for the worthy dead, on whose labours we have entered; all care for the future generations for whose lot we are preparing; but some affection and fairness for those who are doing the actual work of the world." Making the faithful discharge of duty the primary consideration, she deprecated the "light abandonment of ties, whether inherited or voluntary, because they have ceased to be pleasing, and insisted on the sanctity attaching to all close relations, pre-eminently to the closest ("Romola").

In her religion, however, there was, we suspect, an element of mysticism—a phase of mental life with which we have strong sympathy. This mysticism, indeed, is not a theological, but an æsthetic mysticism; the offspring of the emotion which the sense of the unspeakable beauty, the illimitable splendour, the infinite play of force in the nameless external reality we call the Cosmos, awakens in responsive minds. The rapturous outburst of religious feeling in the garden scene in "Faust" was greeted by her as an admirable expression of this glow of the soul—this burning and profound emotion. To any attempt to ascertain an objective correspondent, to define the feeling, she was opposed, on the ground that to define would be to limit. In "Adam Bede" she clothes this sentiment in language of great beauty:—

"Our caresses, our tender words, our still rapture under the influence of autumn sunsets or calm majestic statues, or Beethoven symphonies, all bring with them the consciousness that they are mere waves and ripples in an unfathomable ocean of love and beauty. Our emotion in its keenest moment passes from expression into silence, our love at its highest flood rushes beyond its object and loses itself in the sense of divine mystery."

The exercise of the imagination in idealizing our standard of excellence was recognized by her (the artist) no less than by Mill, the philosopher. "Even our illusions," she says, "do not lose their value when we discern them to be illusions. They feed the ideal Better; and, in loving them still, we strengthen the precious habit of loving something not visibly, tangibly existent, but a spiritual product of our visible, tangible selves."

With the religious creed of George Eliot her philosophical

faith is intimately connected. Was she a Positivist, and to what extent? Assured many years ago that her views on this subject were closely coincident with those of Mr. Lewes, we inferred then, and see no reason to doubt now, that she acknowledged the cardinal principles of the Positive philosophy, as expounded in certain luminous and attractive pages in the "History of Philosophy." Turning to the chapter in which Mr. Lewes discusses the system of Auguste Comte, we find that George Eliot was less hostile to the "Politique Positive" than Mr. Lewes had been, for he confesses that his antagonistic attitude had changed, since he had learned from the remark of one very dear to him, "to regard it as an Utopia, presenting hypotheses rather than doctrines —suggestions for future inquiries rather than dogmas for adepts." Her religious ideal was certainly that of humanity; and "the noble poem" on Subjective Immortality is, as Professor Beesly observes in his suggestive and eloquent address,* a very clear and beautiful expression of one of the most distinctive doctrines of Positivism. Her subscription to Positivist objects, especially to the fund of the Central Organization presided over by M. Laffitte, is also instanced by Mr. Beesly as a proof of her sympathy towards Positivism, as an organization or discipline. It is, at any rate, a proof of her sympathy with the Positivist movement generally.

On the other hand, her apologetic representation of the "Politique" as an *Utopia* evinces that she did not admit the cogency of its reasoning, or regard the entire social reconstruction of Comte as demonstrably valid. Her dissatisfaction with some of his speculations, as expressed to ourselves in the spring of 1880, was very decided. In reading, not long before her death, "The General View of Positivism," in the carefully executed version of Dr. Bridges, while frequently expressing assent, she as frequently, perhaps, expressed dissent; on one occasion remarking, "I cannot submit my intellect or my soul to the guidance of Comte." All membership with the Positivist community she steadily rejected. That a philosophy, originally so catholic as that of Comte, should assume a sectarian character, was a contingency she foreboded and deprecated.

In answering the question, Was George Eliot a Positivist? we must not forget that the implications attached to the term are not always accurately determined. If only an absolute disciple of Comte is entitled to be considered a Positivist, then assuredly George Eliot was not a Positivist. If Mr. Lewes, and Mr. Mill, and Miss Martineau were not Positivists, then

* "Some Public Aspects of Positivism." By Edward Spencer Beesly, Professor of History in University College. London: Reeves & Turner.

undoubtedly George Eliot was not a Positivist. We may cite another instance of non-inclusiveness.

"One who, a quarter of a century ago, considered himself a Positivist, but does so no longer," still frankly admits, in a valuable discourse on this subject,* "that humanity is the true, the real, the demonstrable providence of living man; and that any higher providence of humanity, though possible, and never denied by Positivists, has at least not been demonstrated." It would appear, then, that the admission of the demonstrable truth of the religious ideal of Positivism (not necessarily excluding other ideals) does not, of itself, constitute a man a Positivist.

On the whole, perhaps, we may best avoid ambiguities, and approximate most nearly to the truth if, in describing George Eliot's Positivism, we say with Professor Beesly, who speaks from an acquaintance of eighteen years: "Her powerful intellect had accepted the leading of Auguste Comte, and she looked forward to the reorganization of belief on the lines which he had laid down." With this acceptance, however, which we take to have been very general, she maintained an independent and even protesting attitude. Nay, our own conviction is, that to bring Comte's system into correspondence with her ideal of philosophical truth, not only modification but revision, not only the rejection of old matter, but the absorption of new, would be indispensable.

Of George Eliot's politics, in the restricted sense of the term, we have but little to say. Political conversation was not encouraged at the Priory. The "Address to Working Men," by Felix Holt, contributed in January, 1868, to *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, contains most unexceptionable doctrine; our old Radical friend inveighing against ignorance, the parent of vice and misery; censuring the neglect of parental duties, and the assumption of a sort of *à priori* claim to moral superiority on the part of the working-men. The Address contains also an acknowledgment of the action of "an outside wisdom which lies in the supreme unalterable nature of things," of principles destined to shape the future for the labouring classes, and also of the claims and duties of the endowed classes, in their inheritance from the past—the precious material without which no worthy noble future can be moulded. This is a conception quite in harmony with Positive doctrine; but we miss in "The Address" the grand contention of the political philosopher—

* Auguste Comte's "Religion of Humanity." By Alexander J. Ellis, B.A., F.R.S., &c., President of the Philological Society. Trübner & Co.

"The ideally best form of government is vested in the entire aggregate of the community."*

A loftier political faith than that of the hour; a philosophical spirit too expansive to admit the idea of systematized completeness; a familiarity with literature, poetry, scientific result, and artistic detail, were characteristics of the commanding intellect which instructed or delighted those who were admitted to the Sunday receptions at the Priory—receptions at which science, philosophy, poetry, art, and practical life, had all their eminent representatives. We can add little to what has been already said of her sympathy, her toleration, her breadth of thought, her unostentatious, unpedantic, and winningly feminine bearing.

Her portrait has already been sketched in words. Shall we repeat the attempt? George Eliot was of the middle height, the head large, the brow ample, the lower face massive; the eyes grey, lighting up from time to time with a sympathetic glow; the countenance sensitive, spiritual, with "mind and music breathing" from it; the general demeanour composed and gracious; her utterance fluent and finished, but somewhat measured; her voice clear and melodious, moving evenly, as it were, in a monotone, though now and then rising, with a sort of quiet eagerness, into a higher note.

Her figure will be recalled by friends, in after years, in association with her characteristic costume—the close-fitting flow of her robe, the head, with a luxuriant mass of light-brown hair hanging low on both sides, and draped with rich Point or Valenciennes lace.

Many years ago, when in Rome, standing before the bust of the "Mediæval Revivalist" on the Pincian Hill, we often observed what we have only lately learned has been the subject of frequent remark, her wonderful personal resemblance to Savonarola. Perhaps, as the writer in *Blackwood* suggests, this resemblance may have influenced her, though only in some very secondary degree, in her choice of the great Dominican as the hero of her "Romola." We must now hasten to a close.

With the "Impressions of Theophrastus Such" ended the literary career of George Eliot. In the spring of the new year her life of companionless desolation terminated. Our ideal of conduct is often prescribed by the artificial conscience of society, or the exotic sentiment of a philosophical circle, which a healthier humanity, with little respect for conventional fictions, treats with placid disregard. Old ties are not forgotten because new ties are formed. A great sorrow sometimes finds consolation in the renewal of affection, in the sense of external support, in the

* Mill's "Representative Government."

interchange of sympathy; and to noble, yet sensitive natures, persistent effort for self-recovery, for victory over the grief that saps the mind and wastes the physical powers, is as obvious and imperative a duty as the real or fancied obligation of perpetual widowhood. Individual character, guided by distinctive circumstance, must decide such points of practical casuistry for itself.

On the 6th of May, 1880, the lady who had so long borne the name of Mrs. Lewes, became the wife of Mr. John Walter Cross. The family of Mr. Cross had long resided at Weybridge, where they were frequently visited by their friends from the Priory. The acquaintance, which began in 1867, gradually ripened into an enduring and cordial intimacy. The unselfish devotion, sympathetic appreciation, and practical efficiencies of Mr. Cross announced him as one possessing the gifts and qualities best fitted to create, as well as receive, happiness. The happiness, alas! which they promised to secure was only for one brief season realized. A few months of delightful companionship, passed partly in foreign travel, partly in the retirement of an English country home, was all the inexorable order of the world allotted. On their return to England, Mr. and Mrs. Cross—their rural seclusion over—settled in their new home (4, Cheyne Walk), henceforth memorable among the dwellings which derive an interest from association with departed greatness; for there George Eliot spent her last days—there George Eliot died.

Her health, which at one time had been gravely disturbed, seemed now fairly re-established. The flattering appearance, however, was belied by the unexpected sequel. On Friday, the 17th of December, 1880, she was present at the performance of the "Agamemnon" by the undergraduates of Balliol College. On the following day she attended the Saturday popular concert at St. James's Hall. On Sunday, following her old usage at the Priory, she received her friends at her house in Cheyne Walk. On Monday a slight affection of the larynx called for medical treatment. On Wednesday the pericardium was found to be seriously affected. Before midnight George Eliot passed calmly and painlessly away.

The burial took place on the 29th of December, at the Cemetery, Highgate. The service, in accordance with the precedent which the ceremony observed at Mr. Lewes's funeral supplied, was conducted by Dr. Sadleir, the well-known Unitarian minister, who in a kindly and considerate, if too theological, an address, recognized the value of her literary services, introducing a citation from her Positivist hymn, "O, may I join the choir invisible," and pronouncing hers "one of the few, the immortal names that were not born to die." The coffin, strewed over with lilies and camellias, was borne to a grave in the unconsecrated part of the

cemetery, adjoining that of George Henry Lewes. The presence of men renowned for poetic genius, scientific attainment, and philosophical achievement, or whose political and military reputation gave them an undoubted social pre-eminence; the attendance of numerous friends, distinguished and undistinguished; the continued accession to this more sympathetic escort of a multitude of condolers to whom she was known only through her works, showed how deep and how general was the impression which her rare and beautiful intellect had created in the minds of a contemporary generation. The sympathetic sorrow of men worthy one day to join with her the choir invisible, is a signal evidence of the greatness of the woman to whom they paid the tribute of their grief.

The inscription on the coffin must not be omitted:—

GEORGE ELIOT
Born 22nd Nov. 1820.* Died 22nd Dec. 1880.
Quella fonte
Che spande di parlar si largo fiume.

It was well said of her who possessed the great gift of flowing speech which the Italian poet thus celebrates, by one whose unpremeditated verse sounds a true and manly note, that—

"Not among the tricksy mimes,
Who glitter out a glowworm's hour and fade,
Fame sets this large-orbed glory of our times;
Who whilst good store of lesser lights are laid
In our King's Sepulchre, makes royal ground
Of that green Northern graveyard's simplest mound."

* 1819. The date 1820 on the coffin is wrong.

# INDIA AND OUR COLONIAL EMPIRE.

---

*INDIA.*—Two great political measures have been carried out in India, and important proposals of land reform are under discussion by the Bengal press. Our army has withdrawn from Afghanistan; the State of Mysore has been replaced under Native Rule; and the diatribes of the *Hindu Patriot* on the Rent Law Commission have reached number thirty-nine of a weekly series. The evacuation of Kandahar is a result of British policy rather than an affair of Indian administration; and it was so fully discussed by the English newspapers that it must be dismissed here with a very few words. But now that the dispute has been settled by the actual march of events, three considerations begin to grow clear to dispassionate minds. From the military point of view, the weight of opinion seems to have been that the occupation of Kandahar would have strengthened our frontier. From the political point of view the advantages were doubtful. From the financial point of view, the burdens would have been serious. The second Afghan war will not figure as a brilliant episode in the history of Indian rule. But it sufficed to avenge the insults which brought it on, and to obliterate that deeply-rooted tradition of a fatality attending the British arms beyond the passes, which the gross mismanagement of the first Afghan war, under Lord Auckland, had left behind. The lesson of the first Afghan occupation in 1838-42 was, that an enterprise commenced amid vain-glorious insolence, and conducted with senile incapacity, ended, as it ought to end, in our chastisement and disgrace. The teaching of the second Afghan war is, that fortune follows the same conditions on the Kabul river as on the Sutlej; that our Indian armies, European and native, have only to be well led in order to conquer on either side of the Sulaiman; and that, if we place a fool in command, the chances are that he will be soundly beaten.

The withdrawal of our army cannot, however, cancel our engagements to friendly chiefs, or absolve us of the responsibilities which we have in some districts undertaken on behalf of the people. The Pishin territory has been for two years under British rule. The Viceroy declares that, "Since the beginning of 1879 our dealings with the settled population of the Pishin valley have been upon the understanding that the territory had been assigned for an indefinite period to the British Government." Our political officers have levied the revenue through their own agents, organized their own police, and administered the country. The affairs of life and of trade now rest

upon the basis of British rule. Without the safeguards of that rule merchants would not have risked their capital, or indeed their persons, in enterprises started during the past two years in Pishin. We are glad to observe, therefore, that Lord Ripon has directed the attention of his political officers to the responsibilities which our acceptance of the practical duties of government has entailed. We trust that, before the British influence is wholly withdrawn, such arrangements will be made as may avert any charge of bad faith to the Pishin chiefs and people.

The replacement of Mysore under Native Rule was carried out at the end of March. The young Mahárájá was invested with much pomp in his duties as a reigning prince. Five millions of people, who, during exactly fifty years, had been governed by British officers, were handed back to the dynasty whose oppressions, in the last generation, had compelled Lord William Bentinck to assume charge of the State. The story of that dynasty is a typical one in India. The Court annalists trace its prehistoric glories to the Sanskrit epic poems. They identify Mysore with the kingdom of Sugriva, by whose aid Ráma conquered Ceylon. At a much later period, but still two centuries before Christ, the Buddhist missionaries began their beneficent task as civilizers in those remote highlands. But the present dynasty, although deriving a lustre from local chronicles with a background of three thousand years, only rose into independent rulers after 1565. They were one of several Hindu chiefs who then stood forth from the ruins of the great kingdom of Vijayanagar, and who stoutly maintained their individuality against the Muhammedan powers of Southern India. About a hundred years ago the famous Haidar Ali usurped the Mysore sovereignty. But his dynasty was brief as it was brilliant. His successor, Tipu Sultan, deliberately measured his strength with the British, and perished at Seringapatam. The kingdom which the father and son had unscrupulously built up out of the plunder of forty years, was distributed in 1799 between its former owners and the East India Company. Lord Cornwallis reinstated the Hindu dynasty of Mysore. During eleven years an able Brahman regent governed on behalf of the minor Rájá. But in 1810 the young prince was personally invested with the sovereignty, and began a course of degrading private vices and callous public misrule. The story of the next twenty years is one of the saddest even in the annals of Indian States. Every ancient form of injustice, oppression, and cruelty was practised, and new ones were invented. The Rájá quickly squandered the treasures which had been accumulated by the Brahman regent, and government in Mysore became an organized system of pillage. No industry could save the cultivator from ruin; the poor man cried and there was none to deliver

him. At length Lord William Bentinck determined that this outrage on humanity should no longer go on under the sanction of British treaties. We had practically created the means of misrule by re-establishing the Mysore dynasty in 1799. We were responsible to the peasantry for the native rulers whom we had set over them. Lord William Bentinck declined to annex the country, but he resolved, in 1831, that it should be administered in the name of the Rájá, and in the interests of the people.

The task was at first entrusted to two British Commissioners, but this arrangement proved embarrassing, and Sir Mark Cubbon was appointed to the sole charge of Mysore. He ruled with distinguished ability from 1834 to 1861. Meanwhile population had increased, trade had enormously developed, and the necessity for a more exact administration had made itself felt. In 1861, therefore, the local government was remodelled, and the administrative body, or Mysore Commission, was remodelled upon the basis on which it remained until last March. The main feature in the new system was the larger employment of skilled European officers, with a view to bringing the standard of efficiency near to that attained in the provinces of British India. Under this system Mysore has rapidly prospered. Security to person and property is the philosopher's stone in government, and turns everything to gold. But the increase of wealth in India means an increase of population, with a harder struggle for life among the poorer classes. The famine of 1878 told heavily upon Mysore, and has thrown a shadow over the last years of half a century of good work. The old Rájá had died in 1868, and his adopted son was recognized as his successor. This child was placed under the most careful tuition, European and Native, and has grown up into a promising young man. Some time ago he atttained his legal majority, and on the 28th March, the State of Mysore, with a population equal to one and half times that of Scotland, was formally made over to his keeping. He has got a kingdom; the question is what will he do with it.

There are several reasons for hoping that he will use his opportunity in a noble spirit. In the first place he has had good teachers, and he seems to be of a docile and trustworthy nature. He rides well, plays cricket, and enters on his high position with a larger stock of knowledge than most English boys take with them from a public school. In the second place, there has now been a continuous tradition of honest government in Mysore for half a century; and during the last twenty years the State has been as well administered as most British Provinces. Such a tradition is powerful for good. In the third place, care has been taken to prevent any break in the continuity of that tradition. The young Mahárájá enters on his duties surrounded by tried counsellors

and administrators. The British Government has lent to His Highness the most experienced officers of the late Mysore Commission, men who know the country well, and who will insist on seeing right done as long as they remain in it. A European Deputy Commissioner will be provided by the Mahárájá for Hassan District, where there are a number of European coffee-planters. But the administration, while deriving its brain power for a time from the higher English officials now left behind, will be conducted by Native agency in all its departments. Never did an Indian prince assume the reins of government under better auspices. We hope that Mysore is destined to exhibit that combination of English vigour of purpose, with native economy in detail, which should be aimed at alike in the British Provinces and in the Feudatory States, and which would realize the ideal of Indian administration.

The evacuation of Kandahar, and the restoration of Native Rule in Mysore, are the two political events of the past quarter. But a social measure has been under discussion during the same period which will affect a population ten times more numerous than the inhabitants of those two provinces put together. What Mr. Gladstone desires to do for the Irish tenant, the Indian Government is endeavouring to accomplish for the sixty-five millions of Bengal. For the misery and sedition of Ireland, and for the patient but ever-intensifying struggle for life in the over-crowded parts of Bengal, the same remedy has been proposed. That remedy is tenant-right. Whether it will cure the disease remains to be seen. But it is a noteworthy feature of our time, that the very last device which would have occurred to any British Government in the last century, is now the one adopted alike by statesmen in England and by administrators in India. Nor is the opposition to the measure the less noteworthy in both countries. If anything can be predicted of the work of this session, it is that Mr. Gladstone will pass his Irish Land Bill. On the other hand, it appears that the intentions of the Bengal Government on behalf of the peasantry have been frustrated, or at any rate have received a severe check from the proprietary body which the British authorities in the last century created. The Bengal landowners were the product of Lord Cornwallis's legislation in 1793. They now constitute the most powerful political body in India; they are represented by an Association which speaks with courage, unanimity, and eloquence; and they can command the support of an influential Native Press. We doubt if there is any representative body in Ireland which could bring the same weight of public opinion to bear upon a Ministry which the associated landholders bring to bear upon the Government of Bengal. For the Irish members of the House of Commons are divided into two

camps; while the Land League, by defying the law, loses its claims on those who would otherwise be glad to listen to its arguments. The associated Bengal landholders represent rights which we ourselves have created; they never lose their temper; and they never cease to urge their demands.

These demands are almost necessarily in conflict with tenant-right. It is clear that if by legislation we limit the rent below the rates which it would reach, if left to economic laws, somebody loses the difference. If we give new rights in the soil to the peasant, we must do so at the expense of the old rights of the landlord. This should not be lost sight of. Private privileges may have to yield to a great public necessity: *salus reipublicae suprema lex.* But land-reformers, whether in Ireland or in Bengal, should not forget that in doing right to the many they may be inflicting wrong on the few; nor should they refuse to listen to pleas which may be urged in favour of moderation or delay. In the case of the Irish people, unfortunately, our own blunders and their crimes render a calm decision on the merits of the case almost impossible at present. The Ministry must carry through its Land Bill—and carry it through promptly—even at the risk of injustice to individuals. In Bengal, although there may be equal need for action, there is no necessity for hurrying on measures until the facts are completely ascertained. Land reform in Ireland is the result of a sudden and general awakening to the fact that England has there neglected her duty. Land reform in Bengal is a gradual development, in which we sometimes make mistakes, and sometimes receive checks, but which proceeds on well-ascertained lines, and which has an assured future, as it has an historical past. The object of land reform in Ireland is to create a better state of things by conferring new rights on the tillers of the soil. The object of land reform in Bengal is to gather up into a body of substantive law the ill-defined, but ancient, privileges of the people.

The procedure in Bengal was a slow and searching one. By the Land Law of 1793 the State divested itself of most of its rights as landlord, and created a proprietary body. At the same time it reserved the rights of the peasant, although it did not define them. During the next half-century the new proprietary body grew in strength and intelligence. It could enter our courts of law with a legislative status; the tenants could only plead a vague reservation of their rights. The result was, that during the last days of the East India Company, the landlords were devouring the people, and Bengal was sinking into a rack-rented province. The very blessings of British rule had been turned into curses for the tiller of the soil. Under the native government, war, pestilence, and famine did their work unchecked.

There was more land than there were people to till it. The competition was among the landlords for tenants, not among the tenants for land. Under such conditions every cultivator was welcome to remain as long as he pleased upon his holding; and so far from enhancement of rent being practicable, landlords competed with each other to attract husbandmen to their estates by offering land at lower rates. One of the most common cases with which our early officers had to deal with in Bengal, was the charge against a proprietor of thus "enticing away" a neighbour's tenants. The peace and security of British rule have reversed this condition of things. The sword is no longer allowed to play its Malthusian part in the rural economy of India. Pestilence no sooner breaks out than it is encountered by an army of doctors and an ammunition train of cinchona alkaloids. Even famine, which in the last century was submissively accepted as a visitation of God, is being slowly brought under the control of man. The result is an enormous increase of the population. So far as can be ascertained the inhabitants of Bengal have increased threefold during the last hundred years. The actual area of the land stands still, and the surplus population has either to fall back on inferior soils, or to crowd each other within the old margin of tillage. Both these processes have taken place; and both processes lead, by the operation of economic laws, to a rise in rent. The landlords were perfectly within their right in availing themselves of this unearned increment. But the Government could not stand by and see sixty-five millions of peasants ruined. It therefore stepped in, by a legislative enactment, to arrest the natural increase of rent in Bengal.

The result was the Land Law of 1859. This great measure endeavoured to define the rights of the cultivators; those rights which the legislation of 1793 had only "reserved." The Land Code of 1793 had created a proprietary body at the cost of the ancient claims of the State: the Land Code of 1859 consolidated tenant-right at the expense of the proprietary body. But during the past twenty-two years population has again rapidly increased in Bengal, and the Government has again found it necessary to check by legislation the tendency of rents to rise in an overcrowded province. In 1879 it appointed a Commission to inquire into the state of rural Bengal, and to suggest further reforms on the basis of the ancient rights of the people. Such an inquest deals not chiefly, as in Ireland, with theoretical remedies for the future, but with the ascertainment of actual land-customs in the past. The Commissioners, working from this basis, came to the conclusion that a substantial tenant-right existed throughout Bengal. Instead of restricting this right to cultivators of at least twelve years standing, which was the limit fixed by the Land Law of 1859, they extended

tenant-right to all cultivators who had held their land for three years; that is, practically to the whole cultivating body in Bengal. They proposed to protect all such husbandmen against enhancement of rent, by stringent clauses for compensation for improvements and compensation for disturbance. The protection which the previous Land Law of 1859 had given to cultivators of twelve years' standing they proposed to consolidate into a saleable and heritable right. They desired, in short, to create for the Bengal husbandman a legal status similar to the practical privileges which he enjoyed under Native Rule, of holding his land as long as he pleased; by means of clauses restricting the landlord's power to enhance his rent. But those privileges during Native Rule were the natural results of under-population. The fundamental conditions of the country have completely changed, and customs which were the natural products of the former state of things can now be maintained only by legislative interference with the operation of economic laws.

The Bengal landholders have not been slow to perceive the weak points in the Rent Commissioners' Report, and in the draft enactment which it submitted. They have organized an opposition, so intelligent, and so persistent, as to arrest, for the time, the progress of the measure. The leading native newspaper in Bengal began a series of articles against the proposed change in July, 1880, and went on week after week pulling to pieces the individual clauses. The series concluded with the thirty-ninth number in May, 1881; by which time it was understood that the Commissioners' scheme would be revised and modified before being accepted by the Government. The journal in question is not by any means a blind supporter of official authority, and it is interesting to note the account which it gives of how a large measure is discussed in Bengal. "No measure of Government," says the *Hindu Patriot* of May 9, "has of late years attracted so much public attention. It has been discussed throughout the country, and representations have poured in upon Government from all quartors. The discussion which has followed the proposed Rent Bill is in marked contrast to what took place when the Rent Bill of 1859 was passed. That Bill sounded the first tocsin of revolution in the rent-law of Bengal; but it was lost amid the din and turmoil which filled the country in consequence of the Mutiny. The only representation of any note then submitted to Government came from the British Indian Association; but even that vigilant body did not then show sufficient activity in the matter. It contented itself with submitting a memorial to the Legislative Council. It did not then take any steps, as it has done on the present occasion, to organize public opinion on the subject. The times were out of joint, and political agitation was naturally

at a standstill; but the times have since changed. The Government has now become more alive to public opinion than ever. The Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal has invited expression of public opinion from all quarters. He asked district officers, both executive and judicial, to express their opinion on the Bill. He invited the public associations to discuss the Bill. He appealed to the leading men in the districts to consider the Bill. He then offered every facility in the way of discussion. He caused the Bill, and the Report of the Commission, to be translated into Bengali, Urdu, and Hindi, and the translations to be extensively circulated. He went further, and deputed the Secretary to the Government of Bengal to tap the great centres of Mofussil opinion. Thus ample opportunity has been given to the public for a thorough discussion of the Bill." The task of land-reform, as thus quietly and firmly conducted by the Indian authorities, contrasts favourably with the British policy of neglect and spasms in Ireland.

The necessity of dealing with the land question in Bengal still remains. In a country without emigration, and with an ever-increasing pressure of the people on the soil, the law of supply and demand, if applied unchecked to rents, delivers over the whole peasantry to the landlords. The proprietary body which we created in the last century for the benefit of the Province might thus become a main factor in its ruin. This is not a difficulty which can be solved by good government; for the better we govern the country, the more the people will increase. It can only be solved by accepting the conclusion that as the British rulers in the last century created proprietary rights by the curtailment of its own, with a view to the prosperity of the people; so in the present century those rulers must, with the same view, curtail the proprietary rights which they themselves created. On the one hand, the Government should not shut its eyes to the fact that it is, by legislative enactments, interfering with economic laws, to the detriment of the proprietary body. But, on the other hand, the Bengal landholders should remember that their rights are of a far more recent growth than those of the Irish landholders; and that it is in order to avert misery like that which has befallen the Irish people, and ruin like that which has been indirectly entailed on the Irish landlords, that the Bengal Government now desires a timely reform. One thing is clear from Mr. Gladstone's Land Bill—namely, that if the British Parliament once takes up the idea that land reform is necessary to prevent the rack-renting of the Bengal peasantry, it will not allow any recent growth of proprietary rights to stand in its way.

The silver question continues to attract the anxious attention of the Indian press. The remedies of the bi-metallists, and of other theorists

in Europe, do not touch the fundamental cause of the evil. The value of silver, in which all Indian property is represented, has fallen enormously, as expressed in gold, because the demand for silver throughout the world has diminished, while the supply has been doubled. The bi-metallists and currency doctors would increase the demand; but not to an extent which would carry off the increased supply. The three chief sources of silver may be ranged under three groups: first, the mines in the United States; second, those in Mexico and South America; third, those in Russia. If we put aside the first group—namely, the United States—we find that the produce of the other two has fallen by about one million sterling a year from its former level—namely, from a little over eight millions in 1857, to about seven millions in 1878. But, unfortunately for India, we cannot exclude the first group. For the United States now produce as much silver as all the rest of the world put together. In 1857 they yielded less than £100,000; their yield has since risen to over nine millions in a single year. Apart from the demonitization of silver, and from the flooding of the European market with the disused German coin, the produce of silver has doubled within the past quarter of a century. It is beginning to be seen in the East, that the price of silver is falling, as expressed in the staples of Asia, for the same reasons, although more slowly, than it fell as expressed in gold values. We have now to consume about fifteen millions sterling of silver in place of about seven and a-half millions of silver: the demand for the metal for coinage has at the same time decreased; the demand for the arts and manufactures has but slowly augmented; and the price of silver has accordingly fallen, so as to raise the world's demand to the level of the increased supply. Holders of Indian stocks, or of investments represented by a silver currency, should keep in mind this fundamental fact.

The report on last year's fiasco in the military budget has been placed before the public. The results arrived at are twofold. First, that the blunder resulted, not from the system, but from the carelessness, or over-work of the military accountants, during a sudden strain on their department. Second, that such blunders might be averted in the future by an audit or review of the accounts, conducted by the India Office in London. It seems doubtful, however, whether the advantage to be derived from such a review would not be counterbalanced by the drawbacks connected with it.

Two deaths have occurred which cannot be passed over without notice. The Mahárájá of Nepal died in May, after a reign of thirty-four years. His able counsellor, Jang Bahadur, had been the ruling spirit during this long period; a daughter of the great Minister married the heir-apparent, and is now Queen of Nepal. The same week brought

news of the death of the Right Hon. W. P. Adam, Governor of Madras. Mr. Adam's services as whip of the Liberal party during its seven years of depression have been fully recognized. But the excellent work which he did in Bombay as Lord Elphinstone's private secretary, from 1853 to 1858, is not so well known. Mr. Adam had in him the making of a great Indian governor; courteous, firm, prompt, beloved—a man of action rather than of speech. Mrs. Adam was a sister of the brilliant young civilian, John Wyllie, whose early death was so deeply deplored, and whose essays on "Masterly Inactivity" supplied watchwords to both the Conservative and the Liberal party in their Indian frontier policy.

---

## THE COLONIES.

This spring has witnessed great strides taken in England by Colonial interests. They have now arrived at a development which necessitates their self-assertion as existing and important factors in the national life. Those in England connected with the Colonies have lately developed a tendency to band together in visible and tangible form for special Colonial purposes. It is true the Royal Colonial Institute has been for some time in its present flourishing condition of steady and large growth. But, in addition to this important institution, there is now proposed a "Colonial Club" for London; and it is well worth while to dwell upon the list of promoters, and notice what a long array of names—most of them titled—all of them well-known—guarantees this movement to afford club facilities in London for those connected with or interested in the Colonies. Again, the South African Relief Association, supported by many of the leaders of English society, affords ample proof that the heart of the nation beats in sympathy with the struggles of Englishmen in their distant oversea homes.

More materially important is the recent movement inaugurated by colonists to bind closer together the trade relations of the various portions of the empire. Delegates from the chambers of commerce of each of the larger Colonies have held conferences in London. They have been supported and assisted by many men in England interested in the work, and their meetings presided over by the Chairman of the English Associated Chambers of Commerce. The result is the establishment of "The British and Colonial Union," whose immediate aim and purpose is to uphold the idea "that it is a matter of the utmost importance for the promotion of the commercial interests of the British Empire, and the preservation of its unity and integrity, to draw closer the trade

relations between its various component parts." This is not so surprising when we remember that our Colonies already do a trade with us nearly equal to that we do with Europe; and that as yet, so quietly and suddenly has this colonial growth come upon us, we have done nothing whatever to regulate this trade, or secure for it freedom from the restrictions or trammels that may fall upon it from extrinsic causes. But now, in times when our manufacturers are straining every nerve to keep a hold on the market they have, and eagerly looking around for any new market; and when our colonists are looking hopefully for markets in Europe for their surplus of goods and raw materials, then comes upon the nation the grand opportunity, the grand duty of organizing the trade relations of its whole empire, so that this natural interchange of products may be afforded the best opportunities of unhampered progress. It is our colonial outlook that should give us the highest guarantees for future prosperity. If we neglect this outlook the fault is our own.

This movement, which has resulted in the formation of "The British and Colonial Union," is specially remarkable as being due entirely to colonial initiative. This marks a new departure in the commercial policy of the empire. It is the first move in Imperial policy that has had its birth outside these islands. The first step was taken, with great patriotism, by the Canadian Dominion Board of Trade. The Canadians decided it was best for them to draw closer the trade relations between themselves and the rest of the empire, rather than become swamped in the United States. Their Board of trade communicated with all other Colonial and English Boards of Trade, and the result has been most significant and most successful. Lord Kimberley has informed this Union of the wise and timely resolution of the Government that in making treaties with foreign powers which affect the Colonies the Colonies shall be duly consulted.

*Canada* still maintains her high tariff. But we have had recently fresh assertions from her public men that this tariff is designedly in favour of England as opposed to the United States; and that the proof of this is seen in the recorded fact that, since the putting on of this tariff, importations of English goods have increased, while importations of United States goods have decreased. The Canadians are naturally jubilant to see their revenue continue to grow. And special attention has been called to the fact that the Customs revenue shows no signs of falling off. But this latter feature must be taken together with the fact that the whole community is, just now, not only enjoying remarkable prosperity, but also full of unmeasured hope and confidence. Enterprise and energy in the opening up of the new

interior have in the last two years exhibited unparalleled development. We hear of seven and eight shillings a day being offered to labourers to proceed to this interior. There is also to be noticed the counter-evidence of the increased cost of living that has come about. In every trade wage-earners are demanding and obtaining higher wages. From the conductors on the Inter-Colonial Railway to the cab drivers of Toronto and the "humpers" in the various ports—all are demanding higher wages; and demanding with a general success which tells of higher cost of living.

Amidst all this hopeful prosperity it is most noteworthy to find a military spirit surviving in Canada, which will, no doubt, have a very powerful and beneficial effect on the national growth. The "Active Militia" is not only well organized and willing, but also extremely popular. A "six foot" regiment is to be raised in Toronto. A Service monthly, *The Canadian Military Review*, is one of the latest results of all this military enthusiasm. The Dominion Government, imbued with these ideas, has undertaken and completed extensive defence works at Esquimault, the most important naval station on the Pacific coast.

The Dominion, in all this prosperity, is naturally absorbing emigrants as fast as they can arrive—many find it difficult to reach their destinations, so great is the demand for them *en route*. Nevertheless, the migration from Europe continues steadily to fill up the West and North-West. At the same time the Eastern or Atlantic provinces continue to attract many. In Newfoundland there will shortly be more work done in the way of colonization. The Company that is to construct the new Railway, 350 miles in length, is to receive payment in land to the extent of nearly two million acres. This large area will thus be vigorously opened up; and already there are most encouraging reports to hand as to its mineral and farming resources. Its nearness to Europe will not be without effect: and for the prophesied meat trade this feature is all important. Fresh enterprize from the old country is already at work securing areas of good grazing land near Halifax, in Nova Scotia—on which to gather good cattle ready for shipment.

There is a feature about this emigration from Europe across the Atlantic that is too often overlooked. We are apt to speak as if it was nearly all from these Islands. As a matter of fact two-thirds at the least is from Scandinavia and Germany. The policy of Protection in this latter country fails altogether to give employment to the people. Latterly there has been a large migration from Ireland. This will greatly relieve the congested populations of some districts; and even if it denude others of their manhood, as some maintain, there is no doubt that this manhood has come to be out of time with its Irish

surroundings; the soil and the climate refuse to agree with the bodily or mental disposition; and one great hope for such districts is that a new population may arise in them with traditions and character more in keeping with the necessities nature fixes on the locality.

A step of much importance has now been taken towards the settlement of the fishery dispute with the United States. England has paid down £15,000 in final and friendly settlement of all claims of citizens of the United States for past damages in this matter. This sets both parties again on a friendly footing It is highly desirable that the past should now be forgotten, and the future alone dealt with. It ought to be possible to enter into new arrangements that shall not be liable to varied interpretation. The present dispute hangs on the interpretation of certain words used in the treaty at present subsisting. The treaty gives Americans the right to fish in British waters "in common with British subjects." The American plea is that Americans negotiated to enjoy the right British subjects enjoyed at the time Americans agreed to the treaty, and that the rights they thus acquired are not subject to colonial or municipal regulations—as, for instance, that prohibiting fishing on Sundays—which have been introduced subsequently to the making of the treaty. The English opinion has inclined to the view that the rights conceded were those enjoyed from time to time by British subjects, subject to all legal modifications. The sole effectual solution of the difficulty is the making a new *compact.* This involves the mutual rescission of the fishery clauses, and the substitution of other words which shall be incapable of misinterpretation. The ideas must be couched in terms based on an expressed mutual desire to preserve and improve the fisheries. This is the real object of the compact, and with the experience we now possess it would be possible, by the insertion of some such words as "subject to such legal regulations as may be in force from time to time," to come to a definite arrangement describing incontestably the united desires of the two nations.

The question of most prominence in the *West Indies*, has been that of the provision and maintenance of telegraphic communication. The West India and Panama Telegraph Company are asking definitely for increased subsidies; and in the same breath they are asking leave to do less work. The company bases its demands on the local and special difficulties of maintaining ocean cables; and they seem to have justification for this plea in the many breakdowns that occur. So far, however, their demands have not met with much success. The only large colony that has acquiesced is Trinidad, and the force is taken out of this instance by the fact that this acquiescence is altogether

conditional on the acquiescence of the other big Colonies. Of these Demerara and Barbadoes have already said no. The real state of the case seems to be that the present system of telegraphic communication does not pay: it falls far short of being self-supporting. The colonial authorities see this, and are little inclined to burden themselves with the support of an undertaking that cannot stand on its own legs. A remedy for this state of things to be effectual must be drastic. New cables and new routes are probably necessary; and it is not unlikely that the opening of the Panama Canal, set down for the year 1888, may encourage fresh enterprise in this direction. How far the Imperial Government, in its own interests, may see fit to assist is not known. In the House of Commons recently, Lord F. Cavendish pointed out that telegraphic communication with South Africa, established by Government, in time of necessity, along the east coast of Africa, had provided such valuable facilities for trade along that coast that increased trade had largely discounted the amount of the subsidy previously necessary for the ensuring a line of mail steamers along that route. The benefit of cable communication is undeniable. In the West Indies some means will eventually be discovered for working cables that shall be self-supporting, after the fashion of cables in other parts of the world. The remedy will probably be found in the laying of entirely new cables along entirely new routes, on a scheme which shall give duplicate main lines.

The self-reforming Barbadians are working well with their new Executive Committee. There is already prospect of an Act to invest the Governor and the Executive Committee with the power to raise loans for public works, an important constitutional step from out of the trammels of the old assembly *régime*. Governor Robinson, under under whose guidance these changes have been undertaken, still finds material for his energetic inquiries into public departments. The investigation into the expenditure involved in dredging the small inner harbour, reveals a very great expenditure of money for very small results. We note with satisfaction that the able energy of the Governor had caused him to be confirmed in his appointment, which previously was but temporary.

The drought that has been looming over the Windward and Leeward Islands, and over Trinidad and British Guiana, has at last broken, but only in the latter Colony, and then only just in time to save the sugar crops. There will thus be, this year, a serious falling off in the total output. It will be well if we do not find this attributed to those mysterious influences "the Bounties."

In Jamaica there seems to be a slight temporary check in growth. But the opening up of much needed communication with America

continues unabated. The Governor is considering the desire of many for an enlarging of the Council. When the pseudo-parliamentary system, by the doom of signal failure, was put an end to at the time of the Morant Bay troubles, the present Council was formed in substitute. But now that all things in the island have settled down into a new order, evidence is accumulating of a desire among the more educated to busy themselves again with the political concerns of the community. It seems probable that this legitimate and useful desire will be realized in the near future.

The question of Chinese immigration is more prominent than ever in Australia at the present. At the late Conference of these various Colonies in Sydney, strong united action was taken in the matter by the six self-governing Colonies. A memorial was adopted and forwarded to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, deprecating action taken by the Crown Colony of *Western Australia* in the matter of the Government introduction of Chinese labourers. This action is declared to be "highly prejudicial to the best interests of Her Majesty's free and loyal subjects in this part of the world." And good cause is shown in support of this plea in the geographical contiguity of a nation "numbering more than 400,000,000, whose language, laws, religion and habits of life are alien to those of Her Majesty's subjects in Australia." It is certain that when Western Australia developes into a self-governing Colony such action will be no longer possible. This Colony will then follow the free action of the other Australian Colonies, and make Chinamen recoup the evils of their presence by a heavy poll-tax on entry. If we take into consideration all the facts of the case as they affect the British Colonies—the sentimental, the political, the moral and the economic aspects—we shall come to the conclusion that Chines should be admitted to all Colonies where European labour is impossible —that is, to all Colonies in the tropics; but that to all other Colonies the Chinamen should only be admitted subject to the English interests and English aspirations of the community. This conclusion is verifying itself by results. In all our Colonies wherein European labour is possible (saving only the undeveloped Western Australia), self-government prevails, and in all these the ingress of Chinamen is carefully watched, and checked if necessary. Australians have some ground for the fear that, should severe famine prevail in China, it is possible wholesale Chinese migration to fertile Australia might actually jeopardize English supremacy.

By the last returns, it is found that the area under wheat in Australia has been doubled in the last ten years; and that it now nearly equals that under wheat in the British Isles. But the total output is

only one-third that of the United Kingdom; and of this there is not one-half available for export. *South Australia* figures first among the wheat-growing Colonies; but even there wheat can only be grown for the English market at prices that would amply remunerate English growers. Australian farmers are, indeed, devoting themselves, so far as export is concerned, more to the manufacture of preserved products. Milk-condensing is being undertaken in the Mount Gambier district. The wine industry is progressing fast. The steadily increasing trade with India will probably assist this, as Australian light wines should there find an appropriate market. Calcutta alone imported last year £100,000 worth of Italian wines; and these much resemble Australian in character, though inferior in body and power.

The elections in South Australia are now over, and have elicited proof of a decided change in public opinion. The general verdict has been in favour of new men. In the filling up of the six "rotation" vacancies in the Council four new men were chosen, and leading and able veterans found themselves unexpectedly relegated to private life. We alluded, last quarter, to the calm temper of the public mind in view of the elections; this calmness it seems had a purpose. In the new assembly nearly one-half of the members are new men. These unlooked-for results are, no doubt, partly due to a mistaken confidence on the part of many of the old members that this calm meant acquiescence in the old *régime*. The failure of Mr. Cavanagh and Sir William Milne, was no doubt partly due to the fact that they imagined themselves secure, and took no pains to improve what they deemed an impregnable position.

*Victoria* is once again busy with its own reform. The new feature of this latest attempt is the actual agreement in technical details between the Council and the Assembly. It remains to be seen what will be the virtual effect of this the first Reform Bill that has managed to make its way through both Houses. The basis of this Bill is the somewhat anomalous fact that by the Victoria Constitution Act (§ 35) "It shall be lawful for the Legislature by any act or acts to define the privileges, immunities, and powers of either Council or Assembly, provided that they shall not exceed those held, exercised, and enjoyed by the Commons House of Parliament." The Council, or Upper House, as well as Mr. Berry's Assembly, or Lower House, have now decided to go great lengths towards reforming the Council into a popular rival to the Assembly. That is the tendency of this new bill. The results will be of much moment, and it is at the least problematical whether such a measure will tend to abolish the "dead locks" between the two Houses. The tendency of the present measure is to lower the qualification of electors to the Council from £50, to

£10 annual value; and that of candidates from £250 to £100. The number of members is increased from 30 to 42, and the number of electors from 32,000 to 108,000. The result will be remarkable in more ways than one. There will be produced a dual Parliament, comprised of two nearly co-ordinate Houses. The constituents of the one House will be the 100,000 citizens, who own property to the amount of say £500, *plus* some 80,000 citizens who vote on the manhood suffrage qualification alone The constituents of the other House will be the first-class over again, without the addition of those who have no property qualification. The result will be two Houses of Commons; this is the latest creation of Victorians themselves, and must be accepted as a sample of the best work their political ability can create.

The Delegates at the Monetary Conference at Paris will do well to notice that, not only in India, but also in Australia, the prospects of gold mining are more hopeful than they have been for years. New fields are opening out on the northern coasts, and even in such old-established centres as New South Wales rich diggings have been lately discovered. Mining enterprise has at last roused *Tasmania* from the monotonous lethargy of its existence. Gold and tin are being mined in increasing quantities; and the success of these operations is attracting capital and population to a degree that is infusing unwonted life into this quiet and hitherto sober community.

The gold-diggers in the new and rich Temora diggings in *New South Wales* await more rain, for there is no water in supply, and without water the miner is powerless in this class of diggings. But throughout the Colony mining of all sorts is in a prosperous way just now. Indeed the whole Colony is exhibiting marvellous development and growth. Population is increasing fast, and the revenue is "bounding" upwards. A sign of this prosperity is the fact that the Australasian Steam Navigation Company of Sydney is now expending £200,000 on four new steamers to be built in England, according to the most approved ideas. In the late discussion in England as to the responsibility of the Imperial govenment in regard to colonial "public debts," the usual fallacy reappeared, that their so-called "debts" are debts in the ordinary acceptation of the term; that they are "money owed." It would be well were some new term adopted actually descriptive of the fact that these so-called debts are really investments of private money in public undertakings. The "National Debt" of New South Wales amounts to £15,000,000. But of this no less than £12,000,000 is invested in her railways. In England we do not speak of the £700,000,000 capital invested in railways as "debt."

The export of fresh meat to England has now assumed the stage

when results are spoken of in hundreds of tons. It is probable this trade will rival in some measure that of the United States, from the fact that to Australia—and more especially to those wise Colonies which, like New South Wales, keep their tariffs low—there is an ever-increasing transport of English goods; carriers thus obtain both outward and homeward cargoes, a *sine quâ non* of low freights. The United States, by their prohibitive tariff, do all they can to prevent this natural compensation; and it is only the temporary excess of emigration from Europe to America that for the moment allows of freight both ways. It is noticeable, however, that European foods—as, for instance, turbot, soles, and other non-Australian fish—brought from Europe in ice, meet with ready and remunerative sale in Australia.

*Queensland* is in the stage of occupying her wilder territories. Flocks and herds are being pushed out into the wilderness, to make of it pasture grounds of equal fame to those of other portions of Australia. At the very heels of these pioneer squatters, are treading the railway surveyors. Two trunk lines will soon be undertaken; the one pushing through to the north coast at the Gulf of Carpentaria, with prospective extensions even to Port Darwin, the great northern port of Australia; the second line proposed is that which, commencing at Roma, in the centre of Queensland, will push to the west and south, and connect with New South Wales and South Australia. The system of paying for these railways by land grants is in much favour, and it is a system which pays railway enterprise out of the profits of the enterprise. The enhanced value the land acquires by the presence of the railway is the value granted by Government as payment for the making of the railway. Much English capital is now being invested in Queensland. The Duke of Manchester, who has recently visited the Colony, is said to be contemplating large investments in Queensland squatting.

*New Zealand* is busy with the development of its resources. It has now been definitely ascertained that there is much petroleum, of the very best quality, within the confines of the colony. Capital and labour are already committing themselves to the development of this new and profitable resource. The financial outlook is better than it has been for years; there is marked increase in both exports and imports; and the revenue at last shows signs of permanently equalling the expenditure. From New Zealand we have reports similar to those from all the Australian Colonies of the highly successful Easter musters of the loyal defence forces. Sham fights, camps, electric lighting, and mining, shooting contests and parades prevailed throughout all these Colonies at Easter. It is becoming the mark of an

English community every Easter to proclaim to the world its determination to maintain good organization for self-defence.

The presence of Europeans in the Pacific is breeding the expected amount of trouble, and the consequent argument as to arrangements necessary. The British interests centre in *Fiji*, and that Colony is being developed by English capital. It seems that the native population, despite all care and fair dealing, is for the present diminishing in numbers. A stringent ordinance has been put in force, forbidding any native to possess or handle intoxicating liquors; it seems, however, tolerably certain that though such paternal despotism may delay, yet it cannot prevent the doom that seems to settle on all Pacific races that come in contact with those of European blood. As in Australia, so in Polynesia, it is not so much the actual whisky and vice as the total change of life that creates such ravages among the natives. Civilization kills them off. When the roaming hunter and fisherman changes his ways, and takes to wages and labour and holidays, his nature and constitution give way under the uncongenial strain; and the race dies out.

In the Western Pacific just now Europeans are advancing fast. From New Zealand there is proposed another systematic scheme for colonizing the west of New Guinea. South-sea labourers are now a recognized institution. The missionaries are now more active than ever. Their converts among the natives of Polynesia have just remitted no less than £1,500, as a contribution to the Sydney Bible Society. And with all this increasing white aggression, it is only natural to hear of increased conflicts between the two races. These all arise in territories outside of our actual jurisdiction, and while on the one hand, they often result from the "filibustering," or high-handed behaviour of white men under the guise of trade or labour-organizing, or even missionary enterprise—all these attacks are not always by way of reprisal for injury done; for in many of them plunder of vessels (sometimes treacherously wrecked), and also the savage instincts of war and bloodshed and murder for murder's sake, have been proved to be the actual motives.

The remedy for this state of things is at present in the hands of the British High Commissioner and the British navy. But it is obvious that vessels sailing under foreign flags, are exempt from such supervision; nor, indeed, is it possible for these forces always to prevent or remedy acts of aggression on or by British vessels. The one great practical remedy for the introduction of order and justice in these seas, would be the inauguration of a large English mercantile firm or company, which would by its size and influence and power concentrate in its own hands the whole mercantile interests of these islands. Not

only would the venture prove commercially profitable, but the dealings of the whites with the natives would be placed at once above the dangerous necessities and temptations of isolated private enterprises; and of the opportunities these latter afford for native attack or plunder. There is a great trade to be done in these islands, and English manufacturers might make many a worse investment than in an attempt to organize this market on a large scale. In the meantime a High Commissioner will be required, of special ability and energy, to grasp the whole position, and of special impartiality, so that extreme views may balanced one against another as evidence, but none of them allowed undue influence in shaping the policy adopted.

The course affairs have taken in *Cape Colony* is matter for grave thought. The Sprigg Ministry has resigned. Mr. Scanlen has succeeded with a ministry that finds itself compelled to carry on the policy of its predecessors, specially in regard to the Basutos. Writers of the alarmist school, profess to see in recent political actions, a tendency towards the realization of the "Africa for the Africander's" theory. There is no doubt but that our allowing the Transvaal Boers to come to terms before we had taught them our supremacy in the field, has enabled strange ideas as to the supposed weakness of the English nation to assume a prominence that ought to have been impossible. It is to be hoped this movement is temporary only, and much exaggerated; if not, there is coming an evil day on Europeans in South Africa. One of the new ministers, Mr. Hofmeyer, allowed the newspaper of which he is editor, just before peace was arranged with the Basutos, to advocate the idea that the burghers called out to fight in Basutoland should only fight for loot. "But the Imperial Government will not consent to the looting of the Basutos and the confiscation of their land; therefore, that Government must be got rid of." And the supporters of this independent attempt to do away with that English support which has always been so readily granted, and which has proved of such inestimable value, demand also, "that readjustment must include the reduction of her Majesty the Queen from the substantial rank of sovereign to the shadowy position of suzerain." This hit at recent transactions in the Transvaal, marks well the consuming pride which has fallen on some since the Imperial Government failed by force of arms to re-assert the violated authority of the Queen. Mr. Gladstone will, no doubt, consider carefully the effects of his policy. The renunciation of the English connection would lead to two wars—the one between the now over-confident Boer party and the still loyal English party; the other an internecine struggle between the colonists and the natives. The blood of all the

victims of these struggles would assuredly rest on the heads of those who first of all set up, and then declined to maintain the Queen's authority over large districts and populous communities.

The Basutos have not failed to note what is going on around them. After what they consider their successful campaign, they are cunning enough to feel they have some reason to suppose that they are invincible so long as Imperial aid is not brought against them directly. They openly consider the English to have been beaten by them in war. Mr. Solomon, in the Cape Parliament, proposed a very wise motion: "That it is desirable that the Government of the country beyond the Kei and the Orange Rivers should be in the hands of the Imperial Government; and, in consideration of the advantage to the country, this House agrees to pay a reasonable and fair sum towards the Imperial expenses." But the good effects likely to follow on the transference of administration to where it ought most properly to be, have been sacrificed to the political exigencies of the moment. The motion was lost on a division. However, the Basutos, it is true, have just now come to terms, and if the local authorities can preserve the peace for some years, it seems probable that a better condition of affairs may be instituted, and above all that gradually some steps may be taken towards disarmament. But Masupha has refused to join his brother chiefs; and now bids open defiance in the historic mountain stronghold of Thaba Bosigo.

It is to be hoped that this squall of dissatisfaction will blow over, for the Cape Colony is, otherwise, just entering on an era of prosperity. The House of Assembly has adopted a scheme for the extension of the Railway System, which involves the expenditure of some five millions sterling. This system will complete the connection by railway between Cape Town, the Diamond Fields, and the Eastern provinces. These facilities of communication will greatly assist commercial and industrial progress. Our export manufacturers should take note of this betimes, and make the Imperial Government feel that the supremacy of the British nation—which means the supremacy of British trade in South Africa—is something still worth retaining.

The mineral wealth of *Griqualand West* is developing new characteristics. Coal and gold are now both reported in workable quantities. A province that already yields annually several million pounds worth of mineral wealth, is a province that must be of value to the nation that owns it, as an outlet for national energy, as a field for national capital, and as a market for national manufacturers.

For the present, the chief interest centres in the prospect of the *Transvaal* settlement.. The Commission is busy prosecuting the in-

vestigations that must of necessity precede its decision. Though these are not made in public, the Commission has already had occasion to act publicly, especially in regard to forcing the Boers to carry out their part of the arrangement, made when peace was proclaimed. The Queen's authority is being gradually re-established for the time being. The course of the whole question remains as yet unsolved; no one knows authoritatively the rival strength of the two parties in the Transvaal—the loyal and the disloyal. Appearances point to the fact that the party of Boers disloyal in principle is a small party, but a party of considerable power for insurrection purposes, by reason of its unscrupulousness, and its power to attract to its ranks all the reckless blood of the wilderness. There is more and more cause to regret that we did not march a sufficient force against Laing's Nek. It is well known that the highest authorities on the spot were of opinion that in such case the Boer forces would have melted away; but even had they made a stand, their defeat would have at once quieted the spirit of turbulence throughout South Africa; and an era of peace, and ease, and prosperity would have set in in strange contrast to that we may look for now.

The recent arrival in England of a deputation from loyal Transvaales, both Boer and English, aptly marks the fact that in relinquishing sovereignty in the Transvaal, the British Government deserts those who have gone or lived there on the often-repeated and plighted word of that Government that the country would remain British. This deputation, presenting a petition to Parliament, and bringing forward this breach of faith, will deal the present Government a blow, the severity of which that Government will do well to anticipate, if possible, by some action in defence of the rights of the people it was compelled apparently to abandon. The deputation asks for "the fullest and most material compensation for all losses and damages and depreciation in the value of the property and businesses, caused by the war, and the peace which followed it, which has been concluded without the concurrence and against the wishes of your petitioners." English electors will certainly pay sympathetic heed to this appeal for English treatment. As the case stands at present, the petitioners have suffered because the English Government has decided, in order to avoid bloodshed, to abstain from suppressing by force of arms those who had by force of arms overthrown the authority of the Queen, and in so doing, materially injured loyal and peaceable subjects of the Queen. To the English mind, this dereliction of duty on the part of Government seems liable to the legal penalties of any other breach of contract. If ever compensation for disturbance were justifiable and legal, it is in this case.

# Contemporary Literature.

## THEOLOGY.

THE subject of Dr. Cairns' Cunningham Lecture for 1880 is a part of the great history of the conflict between Christianity and Unbelief—the history, namely of the unbelief of the Eighteenth Century.[1] The work opens with a preliminary dissertation on the three principal contrasts between the unbelief of the first four centuries and that of the present time. In the earlier period Christianity claimed the proud title of Religious Liberty; whereas that title is now claimed by unbelief. Formerly unbelief was allied to polytheism, it is now separated from all positive religions. Unbelief then acknowledged the Christian books; now it denies them. The first contrast is a necessary consequence of the gradual progress of intellectual inquiry: the same remark applies to the second; the third requires some qualification before we can admit its truth. Modern unbelief does not deny the genuineness or authenticity of *all* the Christian books of the New Testament; and ancient unbelief was too uncritical and indifferent to care much who wrote the gospels or epistles; while ancient belief could not attain complete assurance as to the authority of some of the latter documents. Dr. Cairns surprises us when he affirms the strength of the external evidence for the genuineness of the book of Daniel. There have been clergymen of the English Church, and probably still are, who are of a very different opinion. But Dr. Cairns not only accepts Daniel as genuine, but maintains "the full inspiration of the Christian record;" a position which in these days of profound Biblical criticism is quite unintelligible. Besides the historical object which Dr. Cairns has in view, he has the additional object of discrediting the school of unbelief; and this he attempts to do by showing the intellectual inconsistencies, vacillations, contradictions, and the moral aberrations of unbelievers. It may be replied that criticism being progressive, the rationalistic, mythical, and "Tendency" interpretations are natural enough, and that it would be easy to match the shortcomings of unbelievers by a catalogue of the shortcomings of Christians. It is hardly fair to charge on unbelief all the horrors of the French Revolution, while there are innumerable horrors which may as justly be charged on Christianity. Dr. Cairns is of opinion that in the controversy of the Nineteenth Century, or the last quarter of it, the victory lies with belief. Christianity, he says, has not only survived but overcome. Christianity, has certainly survived,

---

[1] "Unbelief in the Eighteenth Century, as contrasted with its earlier and later History." Being the Cunningham Lecture for 1880. By John Cairns, D.D. Edinburgh: Adam & Charles Black. 1881.

but has it overcome? Dr. Cairns, we fear, is sleeping on enchanted ground. We, at least, cannot blind ourselves to the growing indications of the spread of unbelief. With our limited space, discussion, except of the most general kind, is out of the question. We content ourselves with denying the tenability of Dr. Cairns' conclusions on Biblical criticism, miracles, &c. In itself the work before us is not unattractive, and contains excellent matter; it gives also an interesting, if not quite satisfactory, review of the speculations of the English deists, the French encyclopædists, and the German rationalists. The concluding chapter on Strauss, Renan, and Mill, is, in our opinion, inadequate and unconvincing.

"The divine *plectrum* itself, descending from heaven, makes use of holy men as a harp or lyre, to reveal to us the knowledge of divine and heavenly things." With this declaration of an ancient father, not only Dr. Cairns, but Dr. Harman[3], and his colleagues would, we presume, be in close agreement. Dr. Harman, however, while protesting against lax views of inspiration, finds the theory of verbal inspiration very inconvenient, and would, therefore, be unable to accept Justin Martyr's "musical instrument" hypothesis of divine influence without considerable qualification. He also makes some concessions calculated to alarm the rigidly orthodox and irredeemably ignorant. Thus, he decides that the translation in the English version of Job xix. 26, is not supported by the original Hebrew; and, in opposition to the opinion of some men who are very far from ignorant, he considers that the doctrine of the soul's immortality and future retribution are nowhere taught in this book. Again, the section in St. John's Gospel (chapters vii. 53, viii. 11), containing the account of the woman taken in adultery, formed, Dr. Harman confesses, no part of the original Gospel of St. John. The same remark applies to the story of the angel troubling the pool (ch. v. 3, 4) in the same Gospel. Dr. Harman also rejects ch. xxi. 24, 25 of the appendix to *St. John*. In the *First Epistle* ascribed to that Apostle he gives up the genuineness of chap. v. 7, 8—the famous text of the three heavenly witnesses. The Apocalypse he regards as the genuine production of the son of Zebedee, and, rather to our surprise, does not object to identify Nero, who was expected to reappear upon the stage of the Roman world with "the beast that was and is not;" even preferring to interpret the "number" of that Apocalyptic monster, not as Irenæus does, who proposes the word *Lateinos*, but as Fritzsche, Benary, Hitzig, Reuss, Stuart and Mangold interpret it, who believe that the beast is meant for Nero, the letters of whose name and title in Hebrew characters—Kesar Neron—make up the required number—666. These are the principal, if not sole, deviations from the old orthodox way of thinking of the Bible and its inspiration. The author refuses to surrender the obsolete view of those who believe in the historical unity of the *Prophecies of Isaiah* or to admit the Maccabæan origin of *Daniel*. Nay, he vindicates the Mosaic

[3] "Library of Theological and Biblical Literature." Edited by George R. Crooks. Introduction to the Study of the Holy Scriptures. Vol. I. of the Library. By Henry M. Harman, D.D., and John F. Hurst, D.D. New York. 1880.

authorship of the Pentateuch with a great display of perverse, and, as we think, exploded learning, depending in great part on the incredible distortions of the antediluvian Hengstenberg. Dr. Harman, too, seems a little in arrear with his etymological and historical learning: *Koresh* (the sun) has no longer an indisputable claim to be the etymon of Cyrus. The origin of that name is rather to be referred to the Elamitish *Kur = mountain*. The statement that Mahomet wrote down his system in the Koran during the period of twenty-three years, the last half of which was spent in numerous wars, is grossly incorrect. It is doubtful if Mahomet could read or write; and it is certain that he did not write down his system in the Koran in twenty-three years.

To the religion of the Crescent we oppose the religion of the Cross. That religion is best represented in the doctrine of the great expiatory Sacrifice, and Mr. Oxenham's historical review of "The Catholic Doctrine of the Atonement," conducted, as it is, with ample knowledge, temper, and scholarship, will interest and instruct alike the members of his own church and the adherents of the various Protestant communities.[3] The scope of the essay, originally published in 1865, is not controversial but historical. It is designed, the author explains, to trace through the patristic, scholastic, and later periods of theology, the Catholic doctrine of the Atonement of the Son of God, comparing it also with the principal Reformed systems, to some of which the author ventures to think that the antipathy felt by many not irreligious minds towards the whole idea of Atonement is in great measure due. If we rightly understand his theory, the Christian revelation, though fully apprehended from the first for all necessary ends, has grown on the consciousness of the Church, so that, what was at first a rudimentary idea, in which the doctrine was invisibly enveloped, attained, in its ultimate development, to full dogmatic significance. St. Paul, for instance, had spoken of the fire that should try every man's work; in this expression lay the germ of purgatory; but it was very long before the full significance of his words came to be apprehended. To us, on many grounds, this theory appears unsatisfactory. It is precarious, and, as we think, incapable of verification. This, however, is not the present question. In consonance with this theory of development the doctrine of the Atonement was not fully appreciated in the earlier centuries. Existing implicitly, it had no explicit existence. Accordingly, we are told (p. 181) that the form which the doctrine of the Atonement assumed for nearly a thousand years in the Church—the form on which the Fathers had grounded the necessity of the Atonement, was that of a debt paid to Satan by the death of Christ; that this theory, enunciated by Irenæus and systematized by Origen, was first expressly and unreservedly condemned by Anselm in his Treatise "Cui Deus Homo;" that Abelard placed the ultimate ground of the Atonement, not in the

[3] "The Catholic Doctrine of the Atonement: An Historical Review, with an Introduction on the Principle of Theological Development." By Henry Nutcombe Oxenham, M.A., late Scholar of Balliol College, Oxford. Third edition. London: W. H. Allen & Co. 1881.

nature of God, but of man, who required such a revelation of divine charity to recall him from sin; that St. Bernard fell back on the older opinion, which both Abelard and Anselm had rejected, of the claim of Satan, to whom, in virtue of God's permitting him to have rights, the price was paid. Thomas Aquinas, again, advocated the idea of a vicarious sacrifice; but much of the Thomist and the whole of the Anselmic view of satisfaction was contradicted by Duns Scotus. These speculations, including the curious notion of Origen that Satan was deceived, and deceived by God; or of Gregory the Great, that the Evil One was caught by the offered bait, as a fish on the hook; or of Isidore of Seville, that he was entangled as it were in a net like a bird; or of Peter Lombard, that the cross was a mouse-trap baited with the blood of Christ—are interesting, as showing the whimsical aberrations of the human mind, and the close, though unintentional approximation of piety to profanity. They are not, however, Catholic conceptions. The debtor and creditor hypothesis, though it prevailed for a thousand years in the Church, was displaced by the new doctrine of the Atonement as set forth in the Tridentine Catechism. In its authorized development the doctrine includes four distinctive points: (1) Deliverance from sin and its penalty; (2) Rescue from the tyranny of the devil; (3) Reconciliation to the Father; and (4) Opening of the kingdom of heaven. Its efficacy lies in its being a full and entire satisfaction offered to the first person in the Trinity, as a complete sacrifice to God; a redemption from our vain conversation, and an example of patience, humility, charity, and other Christian virtues. It is remarkable that the eminent Nonconformist, Baxter, in Mr. Oxenham's opinion, approached very closely to the Tridentine doctrine of justification. Besides the interesting statement of the main argument, the volume before us contains attractive matter to the theological student, and some scarcely to be expected admissions, such as that of the once universal belief in the Church of the millennial reign of Christ on earth, founded on an expectation of his speedy return, and the participation of the Apostles in this belief, and the evidence of that participation in their writings.

Anglican Theology is defended and illustrated by the Rev. Joseph Miller, in his "Historical and Speculative Expositions of the Thirty-nine Articles."[4] Mr. Miller is by no means disposed to undervalue the work done by his predecessors in the same field, but he has undertaken his somewhat arduous task from a conviction that previous expositions of the Articles were adapted to an age of theological thought which is fast passing away, and that it is highly expedient that young men in their doctrinal studies should be quite abreast of modern speculation. The volume is not without merit from the point of view of the author; but his speculations are to us as obsolete as the works of his predecessors are to him. The sections on the

---

[4] "The Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England: An Historical and Speculative Exposition." By the Rev. Joseph Miller, D.D., Curate of Trinity Church, Hope, Hanley. Vol. III. Part Second of the Stoicheiology Articles seventh and eighth. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1881.

Athanasian Creed, particularly that on the theories of its authorship, will be read with interest by all who care for the subject. The term *Stoicheiology* for "First Principles of Christian Doctrines" strikes us as being somewhat pedantic. The articles examined and elucidated in the present volume of Mr. Miller's work are the seventh and eighth only.

Our next book—"The Christian's Plea against Modern Unbelief," is of a much more general character.[5] It has been prepared by Mr. Redford at the request of the Christian Evidence Society, and exhibits precisely those qualities which we might expect to find in the forensic treatment of the question by a well-read and courteous opponent, pledged beforehand to vindicate the Divine authority of the Christian religion. It is rarely that more gratifying testimony is borne to the character or services of men who reject revelation than Mr. Redford bears to the merits of Strauss, or rather of his "Leben Jesu," which he describes as marked by great acuteness, learning, patience of research, and an exquisite refinement of style; or of F. C. Baur, whom he eulogizes in the language of Dr. Christlieb, as "after the death of Neander, the most notable historian of the Church and her doctrines, not only in Germany, but in the world." Mr. Redford begins his work with a summary of the fundamental truths of the Christian religion, and a review of the history of unbelief as embodied in direct assaults upon Christianity. Allowing him his point of view, we can let Mr. Redford's "Introduction" pass with occasional correction or reservation. In the second part of his work, "Theism," he marshals and investigates the various theistic arguments with some discrimination, but without doing justice to the counter-arguments urged against the belief in a personal God. In the third part of his treatise, "Revelation," he traverses ground which quakes beneath his feet. On miracles, inspiration, and prophecy he can do little more than repeat what has been often said, and, in our opinion, often refuted. Sometimes the assertion made is curiously qualified, as, when he says the Acts of the Apostles would be "written much under the supervision of St. Paul"; sometimes it is rendered valueless by the terms in which it is couched, as when he says of inspiration "there *may have been* a supernatural impression on the mind—a vision, a voice," &c.; or "*perhaps* a suggestion of actual words which were remembered or recorded." The alleged guarantee for the books of the New Testament—Apostolic sanction—is surely not forthcoming. That the statement that the Gospels were composed by the men whose names they bear "can be well supported," evinces great hardihood of assertion. The attempts of the writer to claim antiquity for the Babylonian Isaiah, by alleged references to the temple worship (c. xliii. 22-28), shew an imperfect comprehension of the context. The pleading throughout is one-sided, and can only convince those who desire to be convinced. The "argument from history" requires constant rectification. On

[5] "The Christian's Plea against Modern Unbelief: A Handbook of Christian Evidence." By R. A. Redford, M.A., LL.B., Professor of Systematic Theology and Apologetics, New College, London. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1881.

the whole, "The Christian Plea" may be regarded as a respectable re-statement, from the old orthodox point of view, very slightly qualified, of the ordinary evidence adducible in favour of the "Christian Revelation."

Mr. Redford is quite certain that God has given us a revelation of Himself in a book. Mr. M. J. Savage cannot accept this statement as true. In his examination of some fundamental theistic problems, which he entitles "Belief in God," he solves entirely to his own satisfaction the enigma connected with the existence, the knowledge, the consciousness, personality and goodness of God, and tenders replies to such puzzling questions as "Why does not God reveal Himself? Shall we worship God? Shall we pray to God?"[6] The essay is written in an emotional, eager frame of mind, and in rather rapturous language. His brother, Mr. W. H. Savage, has added an address on the intellectual basis of faith, which professes to be a cogent demonstration of theism, but which is, in reality, only a pretext for the theistic hypothesis, leaving the verification of theism, and the difficulties with which it is beset, just where it was before.

"The Logic of Christian Evidences,"[7] like "Belief in God," is the production of an American author. A favourite device with recent defenders of the faith is to quote concessions, or apparent concessions, from authoritative writers such as Mr. Herbert Spencer, John Stuart Mill, or Professor Huxley, as if there were any decisive validity in admissions which do not materially affect the main argument, and which leave the negative view of those who make them unaltered. The supernatural or miraculous is not recognized by any of these distinguished authors. Mr. Mill held to the last that "whatever is contradictory to a complete induction is incredible"; that, "to those who do not already believe in supernatural agencies, no miracle can prove their existence." Having vindicated miraculous agency against "infidel assaults," and demonstrated, as he supposes, the personality, wisdom and benevolence of the Creator, Mr. Wright defends supernatural intervention in the case of the Christian religion, describes the power and character of that religion, maintains the genuineness of the New Testament writings; and concludes that the evidence in favour of the Divine origin of Christianity is as satisfactory as the nature of the case will allow. It was hardly worth Mr. Wright's while to discuss the theory of "imposture" or "forgery," which even Canon Farrar allows connotes more than it ought to do as applied to the writers of the first two centuries. Great nobility of character is quite compatible with enthusiasm, and even self-delusion. The belief in the millennium and immediate advent of Christ, which we have seen was prevalent among the early Christians, and is attested in the writings of the Apostles, surely indicates that those who entertained such expectations were both enthusiastic and self-deluded.

---

[6] "Belief in God," &c. By M. J. Savage; to which is added "An Address on the Intellectual Basis of Faith." By W. H. Savage. London: Trübner & Co. 1881.

[7] "The Logic of Christian Evidences." By G. Frederick Wright, Andover, U.S. London: Richard Dickinson. 1881.

If any book in the world testifies to the enthusiasm of its author, it is the Apocalypse of St. John;[8] but then it must, we allow, be interpreted as the "natural man," not as the "psychical man" interprets it. The natural man refers it to the past, to the expected return of Nero, and the restless anticipation of the final Christian advent, and regards it as an interesting record of the eschatology of the first century. The "psychical man," represented by Mr. H. Browne, the author of "John's Apocalypse," literally translated and spiritually interpreted, identifies the mystical Babylon with papal Rome. If the first wild beast is the Papacy, the second wild beast is the Protestant State Church. The investment of Jerusalem by Gog and Magog is interpreted of the doings of "scientific men, the Gog and Magog of the present day, who boast of social progress and so called civilization, telling us that the day of Christianity is over." The Apocalypse ends with a vision of the Heavenly Jerusalem. The Holy City is a cube; according to Mr. Browne, it measures 1,379 miles in length, breadth, and height; a city certainly not adapted to the structure or habits of the natural man, and therefore, we presume, admirably suited to those of the psychical man.

There are, doubtless, resemblances between the religion of Christ and the religion of Buddha,[9] but the religion in which God is all in all must be essentially unlike the religion which in its origin, as has been thought, ignored the existence of a God or Gods. We have before us a volume of translations of very interesting ancient documents—the "Dhammapada,"a collection of verses—and the "Sutta-Nipâta,a collection of discourses, both alike canonical books of the Buddhists. The "Dhammapada," meaning (1), footsteps of religion, (2), sentences of religion, is translated from the Pâli by Professor Max Müller, who in an introductory investigation has given us chronological determinations, with the reasoning on which they are based, and which entitles them to provisional acceptance, or at least to respectful consideration. The one historical landmark in Indian chronology which can be regarded as fixed, is furnished by the coronation of Asoka, the grandson of Kandagutta, the contemporary of Alexander the Great. From data, which we omit, Professor Max Müller, calculating backwards, fixes the death of Buddha to the year B.C. 477. His birth he places in the year B.C. 557. For confirmation of his view on this point, he refers us to Dr. Bühler's essay on the "Three new Edicts of Asoka;" inscriptions, which, if indeed written by Asoka, supply a date which can scarcely "mean anything but 256 years after Buddha's Nirvana." The next subject elucidated is the date of the Buddhist canon. It is ascertained that King Valtagamoni (B.C. 88-76), ordered the sacred canon to be reduced to writing. "Buddhagosa, a learned, and in some respects a critical scholar, living in the beginning of the fifth century A.D., asserts

[8] "John's Apocalypse, &c." By H. Browne, M.A., M.D., Consulting Physician to the Manchester Royal Infirmary. London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co. 1881.

[9] "The Sacred Books of the East." Translated by various Oriental scholars and edited by F. Max Müller. Vol. X. Part I. "The Dhammapada." By F. Max Müller. "Sutta-Nipata." By V. Fausboll. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1881.

that the canon which he had before him was the same as that fixed by the first council." (B.C. 477). The "Suttapitaka," which includes the "Dhammapada,"existed almost certainly as we have it before the Council of Vesali, B.C. 377. The "Sutta-Nipâta," translated from the Pâli, by M. V. Fausböll, is also apart ot the same division of the canon, and of course equally ancient. The characteristics of these sentences and discourses are piety, resignation, asceticism, victory over the world and over the senses. In the "Dhammapada" we read of the gods, the "bright gods," of "bliss in this world and the next." A few men only, it is said, go to heaven, like birds escaped from the net. Taking these expressions literally, the Buddhist canon seems to recognize at least the existence of the gods, who are described as bright, and as feeding on happiness; and of a state or place, apparently another world, called heaven. Yet, if we turn from the verses of the "Dhammapada" to the discourses of the "Sutta-Nipâta" it is difficult to resist the impression that the gods have little more than an official existence, while the posthumous bliss to which the saints of Buddhism attain appears to be simply annihilation. Nibbâna, or Nirvana, is first, a state attainable in this life—a state of wandering "houselessness," of indifference to philosophy itself, freedom from desire, from passion; it is peace, tranquility, stillness as of deep water. This is the subjective Nirvana. Objectively, says M. Fausböll, it is emancipation from body and matter; it is the destruction of the elements of existence, the abandonment of the body, "that we may never again exist." It is, as we understand it, an escape from the everlasting renewal of life, the perpetual transmigration of souls, the liability to suffer in an endless succession of horrible hells. The wise, who are disgusted with the prospect of future existence, who have destroyed the seminal principle of that existence, go out like a lamp. As a flame blown about by the violence of the wind goes out, a Muni, or Buddhist sage, disappears, and cannot even be reckoned as existing. Nirvana is attained by the conquest of desire, by the cessation of consciousness—"Exert thyself then, O Dhotaka," so said Bhagavat—"being wise and thoughtful in this world, let one having listened to my utterance, learn his own extinction."

Turning from the sacred books of the Buddhist to those of the Christian, we may fairly congratulate ourselves on a Revised Version of the New Testament,[10] which, if it does not satisfy us, must at least be regarded as a creditable approximation to a satisfactory interpretation of the original. In our opinion no translation can be satisfactory which is not based on a thorough revision of the Greek text; and though we have virtually an amended text before us, represented in the Oxford[11] and Cambridge[12] editions of the Greek Testament, pur-

[10] "The New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Translated out of the Greek; being the version set forth A.D. 1611, compared with the most ancient authorities, and revised A.D. 1881." Printed for the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. Cambridge: University Press. 1881.

[11] Η ΚΑΙΝΗ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ. "The Greek Testament: with the readings adopted by the Revisers of the Authorized Version." Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1881.

[12] "The New Testament: in the original Greek," according to the text followed in

posely printed as companion volumes to the "Revised Version," we cannot accept it as a finally complete and continuous text. A revision of the Greek Text by Dr. Westcott and Dr. Hort[13] has claims to this character of continuity and completeness which that of the new Oxford and Cambridge texts hardly pretends to have. In a text which rejects so much as spurious that is recognized in our Authorized Translation, we question whether a maturer criticism should have included the last verse of St. John's Gospel, or Luke xxii. 19, 20, or Luke xxiv. 51, 52 (*and carried up into heaven, and they worshipped him*); or Acts xx. 4 (*as far as Asia*). The bracketed passage in St. John's Gospel (the woman taken in adultery) cannot be vindicated as genuine; nor the concluding verses of St. Mark's Gospel, which are retained, though with an excluding interval after the eighth verse, and an ingenuous marginal note. The new renderings, as a rule, may be commended. Occasionally, however, they are diffuse and vague, deficient in force and cadence, and even inferior to those which they supplant. Compare the prolixity of the Revised Version, Matt. xiii. 37–39, with the emphatic brevity of the old translation—"the last farthing" with "the uttermost farthing"; "with but little persuasion thou wouldst feign make me a Christian"; "peace among men with whom he is well pleased"; and 1 Corinthians xii. "love" for "charity." However defensible some of these renderings may be, and in the last case almost necessary, exception may be taken to them as clumsy or inharmonious. The milk-and-water theology of the present day, which never mentions hell to ears polite, and objects to the devil as a personal acquaintance, takes offence at an irreproachable rendering in the Lord's Prayer, "Deliver us from the Evil One," though it may find his "fiery darts" in Eph. vi. 16, and his personality in Matt. xiii. 19, and 1 John ii. 13, 14, as the Wicked or Evil One. This laudable correctness is not always preserved, however, as in St. John iii. 3, where the true rendering "born from above" is banished to the margin in disregard of New Testament usage. In John viii. 35, "he is a liar and the father thereof" is part of the English text, and the more natural translation, "his father also is a liar" (in the Gnostic systems the Demiourgos was held to be the father of the Devil) is also remanded to the margin. So, again, Phil. ii. 6. ἁρπαγμος (Authorized Version, *robbery*) is translated a *prize*; the proper meaning, "a thing to be grasped at," being placed in the margin, and the true import of the verse being thus somewhat obscured. On the other hand, the Revisers can hardly be charged with timidity, if we consider the great number of passages or clauses which they have discarded. In the Lord's Prayer, Matt. vi. 13, they have omitted the Doxology—omitted, we may remark, in the Catholic text of Cardinal Maic, and we believe in

---

the Authorized Version; together with the variations adopted in the Revised Version." Edited for the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press. By F.H. A. Scrivener, M.A., D.C.L., LL.D., Prebendary of Exeter, and Vicar of Hendon. Cambridge: University Press. 1881.

[13] "The New Testament, in the original Greek." The text edited by Brooke Foss Westcott, D.D., and Fenton John Anthony Hort, D.D. Text. Cambridge and London: Macmillan & Co. 1881.

all Catholic texts; in the corresponding passages, St. Luke xi. they have omitted "which art in heaven, thy will be done as in heaven so on earth" and "deliver us from evil." In St. Matthew they have omitted—xvii. 21, xviii. 2, xix. 17, xxiii. 14. In St. Mark they have omitted wholly or in part—ix. 49, x. 44-46, xi. 26, xv. 39 (alluding to the cry of Jesus). In St. Luke—i. 28, the Virgin is no longer "blessed among women;" in ix. 54, 55, 56, the precedent of Elias is omitted, with the remonstrance of Jesus, "Ye know not what spirit ye are of," and the declaration of the purpose for which He came. In Luke xvii. 36, the "Two men in the field," &c., disappear; and in xxiii. 17, "For of necessity he must release unto them," &c., is not to be found. In St. John i. "Bethany" is substituted for "Bethabara;" and in v. 3, 4, the moving of the water and the angel that troubled it are eliminated from the text; while in the note on vii. 53, viii. 11 (the bracketed passage), we are told "most of the ancient authorities omit it, and those which contain it vary much from each other." In Acts viii. 37, Philip's reply and the Eunuch's confession of faith are not placed in the text, &c.; xxviii. 29, "the Jews departed," is also discarded. In 1 Timothy, iii. 16, the word "God," applied to Christ, is withdrawn, and the true reading, "He who" (ὃς for Θεὸς) substituted. "Was there ever such an instance," asked Lord Macaulay, "of the blinding power of bigotry, as the fact that some men, who were not absolute fools, continued after reading Porson and Turton, to believe in the authenticity of the text of the three witnesses?" Our Revisers, as if taking Macaulay's hint, have effaced "heaven and earth," and expunged the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, from 1 John v. 7, 8.

In the correction of erroneous or inadequate translations, the Revisers have done excellent service. We need no longer *strain at* a *gnat*, since we are allowed to strain *out* a gnat. Judas has no longer a *bishopric*, but an office; St. Paul now writes to the Galatians, not "a large letter," but "in large letters," with possible reference to an infirmity of vision; not Jesus, but Joshua, was unable to give the people rest (Heb. iv. 8): and the inaccurate, unseamanlike renderings of the Greek nautical terms, in the narrative of St. Paul's shipwreck, are, except in one or two instances, replaced by appropriate and preferable terms. In conclusion, the Reviser's New Testament is a real gain; it more faithfully and intelligently interprets the original Greek; and the Nonconformist ministers, no less than the State Church Clergy, who have cooperated in this Revision, may be commended for their taste, judgment, scholarship and intrepidity, even though their performance cannot be regarded as final, or otherwise than largely corrigible.

The "Liber Veritatum," or "Dictionarium Theologicum," by Thomas Gascoigne, ordained priest in 1427, is described by Mr. J. E. Thorold Rogers as a collection of passages illustrating a number of words in alphabetical order.[14] The manuscript belongs to Lincoln

---

[14] "Loci e libro Veritatum." Passages selected from Gascoigne's "Theological Dictionary": Illustrating the condition of Church and State 1403-1458. With an Introduction by James E. Thorold Rogers, M.P. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1881.

College, Oxford, and is interesting as being nearly the last book written in the familiar Latin of the Middle Ages. It has, however, a higher interest, from the light which the historical record interwoven with the theological comment, sheds on the darkest period of the social and political history of England, on mediæval finance, the Cade insurrection, &c. Gascoigne has much to say, too, on the relation of the English establishment to the Pope and the Papal Court; the government of the national Church, the life of the parochial clergy, and the influence of the religious orders. The cardinal, and other Court officials, appear to have been "little better than a band of brigands, pillaged Europe, and especially England," forging and altering bulls at their pleasure, while the bishops purchased their elevation by Court intrigue, simony and bribes. The story which Gascoigne tells of De la Bere, Bishop of St. David's, points, Mr. Rogers says, to the existence of a married clergy in South Wales. Zealous for reform of life, and having the fear of hell before their eyes, the rectors, vicars and priests of Wales who had "concubines" with them in their houses about the year 1452, prayed their bishop that they might be separated from them, that thus they might never have an opportunity of sinning with the ladies, nor the ladies of sinning with them. The bishop's reply is edifying: "I get yearly a noble or more from each of many priests for his concubine, and the sum which comes to my purse makes annually 400 marks, and I will not have them separated from you" (pp. 35-36). The services of the Church, however, no less than its abuses, are noted by Mr. Rogers in his valuable introduction. To the industry and learning of the members of the older orders of monks is due the revival of civilization; "after the aristocracy and Cæsarian of Rome had removed ancient culture." The chronicles of the abbeys, as is well known, are the principal materials for the annals of England. "In the days of violence the abbeys were nearly the only refuge; in the days of ignorance they were the only schools. Many a thriving English town owes its existence to the fostering care of the monks." The manuscript from which Mr. Thorold Rogers has taken his "selected Passages," consists of two folio volumes of 680 and 692 pages respectively. The extracts seem to be made with care and discrimination. With the introduction, chronological table, and index, they form a valuable contribution to the history of life and manners in the fifteenth century; illustrating also the condition of Church and State during the first half of that century.

We can only briefly acknowledge Herr Fischer's new edition of Bunsen's "Gesang und Gebet-buch," [15] a goodly selection of hymns and prayers intended for domestic and congregational use; a curious reprint of several books of the old Testament,[16] specified below, from

---

[15] "Dr. Christ. Karl Josias Freih. Von Bunsen's Allgemeines Evangelisches Gesang und Gebet-buch zum kirchen-und Hausgebrauch." In Völlig neuer Bearbeitung von Albert Fischer. Williams & Norgate. 1881.

[16] "The Books of Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Solomon, according to the Wycliffite Version; made by Nicholas de Hereford about A.D.

the later of the two Wycliffite versions formerly edited by the Rev. Josiah Forshall and Sir Frederic Madden; an amazing volume of "Shaker Theology,"[17] by Elder H. L. Eads; and another volume, scarcely less amazing, on "Swedenborg's Writings and Catholic Teaching,"[18] by the Rev. Augustus Clissold, in reply to a series of articles on "The Old Church Porch," by the Vicar of Frome, Selwood.

---

## PHILOSOPHY.

FEW books of the quarter appertaining to this section deserve a heartier welcome than Mr. Owen's two goodly volumes on the Skeptics. Reliable works on the history of abstract thought are not, as a rule, attractive reading, save to the scattered few whom a German would reckon in the ranks of the *Zunftphilosophen.* But Mr. Owen's volumes[1] are at once entertaining and profound, and, in our opinion, mark a distinct advance in the method of presenting the perennial themes of intellectual interest to the generally-educated public. A small party of friends, consisting of a retired physician, a liberal-minded rector, a barrister with philosophical tastes, and one or two ladies, agree to meet during the winter months to study, in proper order, the chief developments of the skeptical temperament, or spirit of universal examination. At the commencement of each *séance* there is usually a little suggestive intellectual skirmishing, then the doctor (who is the Corypheus of the party) reads a paper, whereupon discussion follows, serving to make clear doubtful points, and to exhibit the relation of the modern mind to the older speculation. In this way all the advantages, without the drawbacks, of the stock-histories, are gained. The *papers* present the results of thorough and ripe scholarship. In these summaries the author shows himself a careful and well-read student; and we believe more information will be gleaned from his pages than from many of the current manuals. A common defect of the orthodox histories is the limited nature of the criticism, the historian either weighing all opinions by the standard of some favourite system, or aiming at impartiality by an uncritical presentation of opposed doctrines. In the present instance the presentation, though always faithful, is never colourless, while the criticism loses none of its incisiveness by being put into the mouths of certain embodiments of the tendencies of contemporary thought. It should be

---

1381, and revised by John Purvey about A.D. 1388." Formerly edited, &c., and now reprinted. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1881.

[17] "Shaker Sermons: Scripto-Rational, containing the substance of Shaker Theology, together with replies and criticisms, logically and clearly set forth." By H. L. Eads, Bishop of South Union, Ky. London: Trubner & Co.

[18] "Swedenborg's Writings and Catholic Teaching," &c., &c. Third edition. By Rev. Augustus Clissold, M.A. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1881.

[1] "Evenings with the Skeptics; or, Free Discussion on Free-Thinkers." By John Owen, Rector of East Anstey, Devon. Vol. I.—Pre-Christian Skepticism. Vol. II.—Christian Skepticism. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1881.

added that the word "skeptic" is restored to its wider signification, being used as equivalent to universal truth-seeker. The connotation being lessened, there is danger that the denotation may become too wide for the discrimination of a class of well-marked thinkers; but, notwithstanding the alternating tendency of many minds to fixed belief or doubt, the author's observation is sufficiently true that "probably few remarkable intellects have ever existed as to which it would be impossible to determine whether their bent, their native unbiassed propensity, was dogmatic or skeptical." The effect of the enlarged definition, however, is to render the total exclusion of any genuine thinker a matter of considerable difficulty; but this will be found to be no disadvantage, as a history of skepticism without a margin of dubious dogmatists would suffer by lack of continuity. An unusual and interesting feature of the book is the digression on Hindu and Hebraic skepticism, interpolated between the last of the Greeks and the fathers of mediæval philosophy.

Father Harper continues his ponderous work on "Scholastic Metaphysics"[2] in a large octavo volume of 750 pages, treating (Book IV.) of the *Principles* and (Book V.) of the *Causes of Being.* Outside the Catholic seminaries the work, we suspect, is likely to have few appreciative readers. Speaking as of those hopelessly beguiled by the neologisms of modern science we must confess that the second volume seems to us even more an anachronism than the first. To this two exceptions should be made—a criticism of Hamilton's treatment of the laws of thought, and an examination of Kant's synthetical *à priori* judgments. On the former head our author displays his acuteness to good purpose, and though it evidently goes against the grain to be compelled to be so severe to a thinker who was clearly more imbued with the spirit of Scholasticism than most Protestant metaphysicians of the present century, the unsatisfactory character of the Edinburgh professor's treatment of the laws is well shown.

"Thus, in his 'Logic,' he tells us, as we have seen, that 'the law of Identity and the law of Contradiction are co-ordinate and reciprocally relative, and neither can be echoed as second from the other as first. Yet, in his 'Metaphysics,' he assures us that the principle of contradiction is 'the highest of all logical laws; in other words, the supreme law of thought;' and then, again, in a fragment already referred to, pronounces that 'it is partial, not thorough-going . . . . and is, therefore, all too narrow in its application as a universal criterion or instrument of judgment.'"

Kant naturally most effectively bars the return of a would-be Scholastic. Descartes, and even Hume, may possibly be slipped-by, but the firmly-planted sentinel of Königsberg is not to be so easily evaded. Accordingly, Kant must be demolished. To this task about forty pages are devoted, a small number out of the whole work, considering the magnitude of the task, and of these a considerable portion is devoted to simple exposition. The difference is narrowed to a very small compass. "We deny that sènsile perception is

[2] "The Metaphysics of the School." By Thomas Harper, S.J. Vol. II. London: Macmillan & Co. 1881.

intuitive, and we confidently affirm that the understanding is intuitive."[1] There is no attempt to review the dialectic of the Reason, the author's energies being expended on the Æsthetic and the Analytic. What argument there is seems to be purely rhetorical in its force. Kant has no criterion of certainty, for the only objectivity he teaches is an objectivity *within* the mind. Now the objectivity desiderated "by the general voice of mankind in all ages" is an objectivity at once outside the mind and yet bare to individual apprehension, *ergo* the School which is ready with its rational perception of the essential is justified in its pretensions. We suspect, notwithstanding the craving of the popular appetite and Father Harper's labours, the cautious Kantian will still think "that all *à priori* demonstration, as understood by the School, is a useless piece of child's play."

The founder of the Critical philosophy possesses a sufficiently able champion in Professor Watson,[3] of the Queen's University, of Kingston, Canada; thus adding another to the numerous proofs of recent date that the father of modern German idealism is studied within the area of the British dominions with a zeal fully equalling that exhibited by the professors of his own country. The object of the present volume is distinguished from its English predecessors in being, not an exposition or a criticism of the works on the transcendental reason, but a criticism of the critics, and, moreover, British critics. Thus, Mr. Balfour, Mr. Sedgwick, G. H. Lewes, Dr. Stirling, and Mr. Herbert Spencer, are all reviewed in their relation to Kant; and in this way the reader is brought very vividly to see the fundamental difference between Kant's conception of the problems of philosophy and that of a few representative men who have sought to emancipate themselves more or less from the narrow limits of English empiricism. The reader will probably turn with most interest to the criticism of Lewes and Spencer, who are here contrasted, however strangely, as representatives of "Empiricism," with "Critical Idealism." The fundamental error of Lewes was the confusion of psychology and metaphysics; and it is not difficult to show that Spencer's "Unknowable" is merely "*Being in itself out of all relation.*" We are not sure, however, that on both these points Kant was as clear as he might have been.

The acute author of the "Logic of Chance" has just published another work[4] which will still further raise his reputation as one of the most accomplished of living logicians. Mr. Venn betrays in his new work an acqaintance with a special department of literature, equalled by few of his contemporaries. Ever since Boole published his "Investigation of the Laws of Thought," there has been a steady tendency to widen the foundations of the science of pure logic; and

---

[3] "Kant and his English Critics; a Comparison of Critical and Empirical Philosophy." By John Watson, M.A., LL.D., Professor of Moral Philosophy in Queen's University, Kingston, Canada. Glasgow: James Maclehose. 1881.

[4] "Symbolic Logic." By John Venn, M.A. London: Macmillan & Co. 1881.

younger students at least, despite the weight of hostile authority, cannot have doubted that a great change was in progress in the treatment of a science officially proclaimed as the one branch of knowledge which had sprung at once into perfection from the creative brain of Aristotle. English students, however, will learn from Mr. Venn's pages that mathematical logic does not date from Boole's first logical essay; that we must recede to the often disparaged Leibnitzian-Wolfian era if we would find the first attempt to bring the two abstract sciences into close relation. Mr. Venn's work, it should be said, is strictly confined to pure symbolic logic. The author resists all temptation to stray into the pleasant path of applied logic, his book being in this respect more related to Boole's great treatise than to any subsequent work with equal pretensions. Although occupying so much common ground, Mr. Venn's criticism of Professor Jevons is usually unfavourable. He will not allow the professor's treatment to be entitled to the rank of a "system," holding that the latter, in striving to dispense with the aid of mathematical representations, has missed the chance of developing a complete science of symbolic logic.

If readiness to discourse on any conceivable topic were sufficient to constitute a man a philosopher, the Rev. Joseph Cook would deservedly occupy a high place among the intellectual *élite*. His "Boston Monday Lectures"[5] though grouped under a modest number of headings —"Biology," "Orthodoxy," "Conscience," "Transcendentalism," "Marriage," "Heredity," "Labour," "Miracles," "Socialism," "Spiritualism"—furnish pretty confident conclusions on all the great questions which have occupied the busy mind of man. It seems that it is the custom of this versatile gentleman to be a weekly oracle to the light-seeking people of Boston, the oracle preparing itself by assimilating "the results of the freshest German, English, and American scholarships, on the more important and difficult topics concerning the relation of Religion and Science." The rapid pace of this critical giant, we at once confess, leaves us so far behind that we are inevitably placed in the attitude of mere admirers from afar. "It is important," says the Boston lecturer, "that the pulpit should show that it is not afraid of these topics; and you will notice that, in this lectureship, the theme of evolution is not skipped." Not skipped! No, indeed, it is walked round, run round, examined right, examined left, reviewed and counter-reviewed, and finally comprehended in the considerable space of eighteen pages! Here is a nineteenth-century Transfiguration Scene. "I look up to the highest summits of science, and I reverence fervently, I hope, all that is established by the scientific world; but when I lift my gaze to the very uppermost pinnacles of the mount of established truth, I find standing there, not Häckel, not Spencer, but Helmholtz of Berlin, and Wundt of Heidelberg, and Hermann Lotze, of Göttingen, physiologists as well as metaphysicians all; and they, as free investigators of the relations between matter and

[5] "The Boston Monday Lectures." By Rev. Joseph Cook. Two volumes. London: Richard D. Dickinson. 1881.

mind, are all on their knees before a living God." There is a semblance of impartiality about much of the writing in these volumes that might deceive the reader dipping casually into the book; but it is only necessary to read a single lecture right through to discern that this show of fairness is all seeming. Even where the tone is measured, there is a palpable straining after a foregone conclusion, and the thank-God that the writer is not as those publicans, the heretics, is sufficiently audible. At times, as when social freedom is in debate, all disguise is thrown aside, and the irreclaimable spirit of theological bigotry displays itself in all its hideous cruelty.

"This volume[6] is an attempt to present, for the first time, Berkeley's philosophic thought in its organic unity. The thought is unfolded in connection with the results of later philosophical endeavours, including those of chief scientific and theological interest at the present day." The attempt must be pronounced highly successful, and the present volume is unquestionably the best yet issued of the series of "Philosophical Classics for English Readers." Professor Fraser marks three distinctive periods in Berkeley's career: the first, from 1685–1713, rendered conspicuous by the exposition of the doctrines of visual and universal Immaterialism; the second, from 1713–34, largely taken up with the author's wanderings and social schemes; and lastly, the period from 1734–53, wherein the author outgrew his earlier nominalism, and tended unmistakably towards a revived Platonic Idealism. In a closing chapter the author endeavours to indicate the relation of Berkeleyism to the various movements of recent philosophy. All the most remarkable tendencies of recent thought he finds is germ in our eighteenth century idealist. The analytic and negative phenomenalism of the youthful Berkeley is represented in John Stuart Mill. The appeals to common sense and faith of his mature manhood foreshadow the sober Scotch philosophy, and the transcendental 'Siris' prefigures developed Kantism. His biographer plainly leans to the middle phase. Positivism or Agnosticism affirms too little, and Gnosticism or Hegelianism too much, for our critic. "A Faith-Philosophy," such as that of Jacobi, seems to him to offer a standpoint where reason should rest and be thankful. This attitude of repose and conviction is only attainable through the practical reason. "The universe consists of persons or conscious moral agents, and also of phenomenal things which are in a process of continuous creation; and the things seem to be made for and regulated by the persons."

The "general reader" must be beginning by this time to get pretty well acquainted with the "Doctrine of Positivism," for popular expositions by zealous disciples have been sufficiently copious of late years Dr. Kaines' "Seven Lectures[7]" appear to be a fairly good introduction to Comte's system. The "Law of the Three Stages," the

---

[6] "Berkeley." By A. Campbell Fraser, LL.D., Professor of Logic and Metaphysics in the University of Edinburgh. William Blackwood & Sons. 1881.

[7] "Seven Lectures on the Doctrine of Positivism," delivered at the Positivist School, Chapel Street, Lamb's Conduit Street, in May, June, and July, 1879. By J. Kaines, D.Sc. London: Reeves & Turner. 1880.

"Hierarchy of the Sciences," the relation of the social organism to the science of life in general, are presented in these lectures popularly and clearly. It must by this time be sufficiently understood that the doctrine of Comte is merely Anthropologism. The world is Man, and Man is the world. Nothing more nor less can be meant by the plea for a subjective in lieu of an objective synthesis. It behoves the profounder disciples, however, to draw out the metaphysical implication of this conception. We have not seen the faintest trace of an endeavour to approach this question. Comte himself, it is well known, had a profound contempt for metaphysics; his disciples, however, must learn to be wiser than their master, for speculative analysis will not be evaded by the loudest calls to a life of active duty.

Judge Biddle's work, entitled "Elements of Knowledge,"[8] consists of a series of aphorisms on such topics as philosophy, government, morals, religion, &c. Each chapter is divided into "sections," the introduction occupying, on an average, about one-fourth of a page. Those who are partial to this oracular style of writing may find pleasure in reading a book of this description, but the majority of readers will probably find it tedious in the extreme. We fail to see any justification for this addition to semi-philosophical literature either in its matter or manner.

The "Student's Dream"[9] is a slight but well-meant performance, written apparently by a youthful admirer of Part I. of Mr. Herbert Spencer's "First Principles." Indeed, it bears unmistakable evidence of being directly inspired by Chapter V. of that prelude to the Synthetic Philosophy. The "Dream" is neither particularly wonderful nor witty, and the best thing in the "Appendix" is probably the sentence, "The power of religion does not lie in its interpretation of the universe, but in the fact that it represents the chief need of man, an aspiration for a higher life"—a sentiment that can hardly be novel, even in the Far West.

A late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, must be singularly ignorant of the philosophical literature of his nation if he imagines his brief and feeble essay to be needed for the enlightenment of his benighted fellow-countrymen.[10] The essay is in fact nothing but a string of commonplaces. It needs, for instance, no ghost come from the grave to tell us this: "It is not too much to say that the occurrence of all the wonderful phenomena which we perceive in the universe might be produced by power and intelligence, if we suppose the series of constantly increasing power and wisdom to be prolonged without limit."

Mr. Vicajee's paper,[11] read before the Student's Literary and

---

[8] "Elements of Knowledge." By Horace P. Biddle. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1881.

[9] "The Student's Dream." Published for the Author. Chicago: 1881. London: Trübner & Co.

[10] "Materialism, Ancient and Modern." By a late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. London: Macmillan & Co. 1881.

[11] "Antoine Arnauld; His Place in the History of Logic. By Framjee R. Vicajee. Bombay: 1881.

Scientific Society, Bombay, is a painstaking attempt to assign the writer of the Port Royal logic his proper place in the history of logic. The writer is well-read in recent logical literature. Without disrespect to the subject of the eulogy we may be permitted to wonder whether the gentleman referred to will recognize himself in the following description:—"The translation was made more than thirty years ago, when the great author of the 'New Analytic' was in the beginning of his career, and probably was then engaged in gaining materials for that knowledge which laid the foundation of his future greatness."

Professor Balfour Stewart, in an able paper read before the Victoria Institute,[12] contends for the hypothesis of a spiritual in place of a physical production of the universe. He endeavours to make clear the distinction between the two theories by the example of the construction and navigation of a steamship. The chief importance may be assigned either to the engine or the passengers. In a physically-produced universe, the faultless working of the engine will be all in all, and the passengers must take their chance; in the other case imperfections may be allowed in the machinery so long as the interests of the passengers do not suffer. Now, looked at from the mechanical point of view, the perceived universe is a very faulty machine; not only is the (apparent) welfare of the terrestrial denizens often sacrificed, but the solar system, to say nothing of other portions of the Cosmos, presents the spectacle of a vast expenditure of energy subserving no visible purpose. The physical hypothesis thus failing, why not imagine that the universe is constructed solely with a view of serving as a scaffolding for supporting the intelligent beings who are set to work to carry out a concealed design? Such amount of law and order will be necessary in this material frame-work as prevents intellectual confusion in finite intelligences; but that being secured, it is by no means necessary that the machine should be faultlessly constructed. For a comprehension of the author's drift in detail the reader must be referred to the paper itself.

A very interesting sketch of the history of economic science precedes Mr. Macleod's detailed treatment of the laws of economics.[13] According to Mr. Macleod, after many oscillations, the students of Political Economy are reverting to the standpoint of Aristotle, who defined wealth as "all things whose value is measured in money." Political Economy (better economics) is the science of exchangeable quantities. Only with such a definition is it possible to give to the large body of truths at present passing under the designation of "political economy" the character of a coherent and consistent science. Mr. Macleod is never weary of repeating that economic science is impossible unless we agree to recognzise three economic quantities, material products, services, and rights. The Physiocrates limited their

---

12 "The Visible Universe; Is it a Physical or a Spiritual Production?" By Balfour Stewart, LL.D., F.R.S. Victoria Institute. 1881.

13 "The Elements of Economics." By Henry Dunning Macleod, M.A. In Two Volumes. Vol. I. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1881.

consideration to the first of these quantities. Adam Smith enlarged the science so as to cover the second group, but only recently has the third quantity been properly taken account of. Hence, for the first time Economics has become possible as a science. It has one fundamental conception, that of Exchange; and, like Astronomy, all the variable phenomena are amenable to one grand law. This first volume deals with pure economics, the laws of value and the theory of credit. The style is admirably clear, and the recapitulation of important points so opportunely introduced that the work is really a model of a student's text-book. Indeed, the volume is in striking contrast with those usually put in the hands of students, having the same coherence and precision of statement as are found in a good mathematical manual, but which are usually so sadly lacking in works on the moral sciences.

Mr. Sully's new work[14] will be welcomed as a well-conceived attempt to supply an often-felt want in psychological literature, viz., an account of those deviations from the normal type of perception and thought, which are far more common than the classical text-books would lead any one to suppose. Mr. Sully has given a wide extension to the term "illusion," stretching its signification so as to cover all operations of the mind where belief is either engendered in the absence of outward reality, or is not strictly conformable to the judgment of a theoretically perfect observer. Mr. Sully shows clearly enough how very rarely the mind is a simple mirror of reality; how, both in its highest and its lowest regions, the tendency is almost overpowering to mingle with the actual presentation an ingredient of imagination, which either perverts or enlarges the content of positive experience. The ordinary reader, we suspect, will be most interested by the chapter on "Dreams," which supplies a very considerable amount of suggestive knowledge and reflection, arranged in a very pleasing manner, on a subject which has hitherto been most strangely neglected. The volume forms one of the excellent International Scientific Series, and will add to the already considerable reputation of the author as a subtle analyst of the more intricate phenomena of the human mind.

Professor Calderwood's lectures cover a wide field.[15] After some preliminary remarks on the present relations of religion and science, he considers the latest opinions as to the physical constitution of the universe, then proceeds to review the leading theories with regard to the origin and evolution of life. In Section viii. he estimates man's place in nature, and closes with a discussion of the proper light in which miracle and prayer should be regarded. It must be admitted that Professor Calderwood is a candid writer. His multifarious studies seem to have fostered a spirit of eclecticism which forbids his being decidedly unjust to men whose cast of mind is widely different from

[14] "Illusions; A Psychological Study." By James Sully, author of "Sensation and Intuition," "Pessimism," &c. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1881.

[15] "The Relations of Science and Religion." The Morse Lecture, 1880, connected with the Union Theological Seminary, New York. By Henry Calderwood, LL.D., Professor of Moral Philosophy, University, Edinburgh. London: Macmillan & Co. 1881.

his own. Professor Calderwood sees no reason why scientists and theologians should not now meet in mutual amity, the old battle-grounds being by common consent abandoned. Indeed, it would seem that in the Morse Lecturer's view theology and science cannot ever come into genuine conflict, inasmuch as the theologian may accept all the results of advancing knowledge, and interpret the scientific man's inability to comprehend miracle and prayer as a simple confession that the evidence for these supernatural mysteries lies outside the sphere of positive research. The position may be sound, but in the case of miracle at least it would perhaps be well to estimate the evidence for its reality before expending words on its theoretical legitimacy. We have not seen any evidence, however, of the inclusion of historical criticism among the professor's accomplishments.

We have received a pamphlet from Mr. Massey, entitled "A Preface to his Book of the Beginnings," chiefly in answer to animadversions in the *Pall Mall Gazette.*[16] To be intelligible the "Preface" must be read in connection with the book referred to.

---

## POLITICS, SOCIOLOGY, VOYAGES, AND TRAVELS.

MR. HENRY GEORGE, whose remarkable Essay on Progress and Poverty we noticed in our last number, has given practical shape to the conclusions of that work in a pamphlet on the Irish Land Question.[1] His appeal is addressed to the Land League, but he is not afraid to oppose the most cherished prejudices of Irish Nationalists. Mr. George is of opinion that the connection between England and Ireland is natural and even necessary; that there is no special injustice in the Irish land laws; and that the remedies which have been and are being applied can do little to remove distress and discontent. He points out very clearly that peasant proprietorship and the three F's will only transfer the power of the landlords to a larger, but still limited, class of owners: the mass of the people will be left landless and hopeless, till their leaders accept the programme of State-socialism, and declare open war against all private property in land. To this conclusion Mr. George is led by the familiar line of anti-Malthusian argument. Every child born in Ireland has an inalienable right to live. This "right" is constituted by the mere fact of birth, and is therefore vested in every child, however improvident its parents may be. Man cannot live without land, therefore, every child must have access to a fair share of the land, and no individual should have the power to exclude another from his share in the common inheritance. Mr. George tries to make out a distinction between land and other kinds of property; but his argument does not dispose of

---

[16] A Preface to, with Extracts from, "A Book of the Beginnings." By Gerald Massey.

[1] "The Irish Land Question." By Henry George. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1881.

the fact that in civilised communities capital is as much a necessary of life as land. You do not give effect to a man's "right to live" by planting him on a bare piece of ground; he must have seed, tools, shelter, and subsistence before his labour can produce anything. If the right to labour and to live is admitted without qualification, private property in capital is indefensible, and the "combination of labour and capital against landlordism" proposed by Mr. George becomes an absurdity. To put a short case: A owns a field, B a spade, and C a quantity of potatoes. They lend their respective properties to D, who has nothing but his right to live. D tills the field, eats half the potatoes, sows the other half, and appropriates the crop. He pays B for the spade and C for the potatoes. But to A he says, "I could not have lived without your land; your demand to be paid for the use of it is a fraud on society and me, and I will give you nothing." If B and C combine with D against A, D will very soon discover that a man with a right to live cannot fairly be required to pay for his spade and his seed-potatoes. Mr. George may justly deny the existence of *absolute* property in land: proprietary rights, of whatever kind, are defensible only in so far as they answer a social purpose. Property in land benefits society by stimulating individuals to devote capital and energy to its cultivation, by enforcing economy and industry on all who would live by agriculture. Communities which recognize such property are more productive and more progressive than those in which individual property is unknown. Mr. George seems to forget that State communism has existed, and still exists in various quarters of the world, and that it has never succeeded in extinguishing poverty except where, as in the ancient empire of Peru, the poor man has been made the slave of an efficient despotism. It is, therefore, quite unscientific to single out property in land as the one cause of deficient production and unjust distribution, and Mr. George's dogmatic statement that "wages go down as rent goes up" is directly contrary to the facts. Rents are higher in England than elsewhere, but our working population is better paid and better fed than the peasants of Russia or Madras. The Socialist view of the law of wages ignores the existence of prudential motives by which the supply of labour is limited wherever there is a high standard of living among labouring people. If Mr. George's view of the facts is incomplete, his view of the future is still more vague and unsatisfactory. He thinks that all men should be equally free to become tenants under the State; but he does not tell us how land is to be allotted, how conflicting claims to the same land are to be decided, how long tenancy is to last, how the State rent is to be fixed, what covenants for good husbandry are to be contained in the State lease. He speaks of "agents and deputy-agents" of the State who are to collect the rent; but we are not told how these officials are to be paid, and how the community is to protect itself against bureaucracy and jobbery which might prove far more costly than landlordism. To abolish private property in land or in capital would be a work of infinite detail, not to be accomplished by passing a few abstract resolutions. The one

definite proposal to which Mr. George commits himself is the familiar scheme of taxing land up to the full value of the rent. Suppose this were done in Ireland; how would the change affect the individual peasant? He would pay his rent, as at present; he would be relieved of his taxes, which are next to nothing. He would lose the assistance of his landlord, and of the landlord's capital; the methods and products of his husbandry would continue as they are. On the other hand, he would gain such benefits as the State in its bounty might confer on him—benefits which would be small or great according to the measure of the virtue of public officials. Mr. George believes that the State could turn Ireland into a Paradise by a sudden and wholesale rearrangement of society. If this belief is once thoroughly implanted in the Irish mind it will do more than any political or religious agitation to check the efforts of rational reformers.

Writers of Mr. George's school generally assume that the landlord, and especially the Irish landlord, has no share in the cultivation of the soil. Mr. Finlay Dun's letters, reprinted from the *Times*,[1] contain a large body of evidence which cannot be reconciled with this theory. We hear so much at present of bad landlords that this book, which is almost entirely concerned with good landlords, has a peculiar value for all who wish to see both sides of the case fairly stated. Mr. Dun confines himself almost entirely to the methodical statement of facts, and the estates which he describes may be taken as typical of the state of Ireland generally. Most of the owners whom he enumerates reside on their lands, and spend a fair proportion of their rental in improvements. Rents seem to average from 10 to 20 per cent. over the Government valuation, completed thirty years ago. There is no universal rule as to increase of rent; but it is interesting to note that the increase of agricultural rents for the period 1857–75 stands thus: England 21 per cent., Scotland 26 per cent., Ireland 6 per cent. The prices obtained for tenant right prove conclusively that rack-rents are almost unknown. Free sale, subject to the landlord's right to refuse a proposed tenant, prevails in Ulster and in the South; elsewhere, the tenant is usually permitted to bequeath his holding, or to nominate his successor. Free sale means, of course, a material addition to the burdens of an incoming tenant, and many improving landlords would be glad to exclude it altogether; but it does not appear that many landlords have actually bought up the tenant-right. The tendency of recent legislation is to extend tenant-right, and to limit landlord right; and we must be prepared to find that such legislation will to a certain extent check agricultural improvement. Irish tenants are not, as a rule, enterprising or progressive. There is too much reason to fear that a generation of peasant proprietorship would not improve the estates of the London Companies. These much-abused bodies have been making strenuous efforts to justify their ownership by dealing directly with their tenants, and by spending half their rental in improvements of various kinds. The

[1] "Landlords and Tenants in Ireland." By Finlay Dun. London: Longmans & Co. 1881.

Irish Society spends the whole of its income in Ireland. We recommend Mr. Dun's book to the careful perusal of those reformers who think that the welfare of Ireland may best be promoted by the total abolition of landlordism.

In spite of the facts collected by Mr. Dun, Mr. J. P. Doyle[3] is thoroughly convinced that the landlords neither have done, nor will do, their duty by the land and people of Ireland. He therefore proposes that the English Government should buy out the present owners, break up the large pasture farms, and let the land in small holdings at moderate rents. But this settlement of the Land Question would not be enough to restore prosperity to the country, unless it is followed up by a very large expenditure in public works. There must be a complete system of narrow-guage railways, supplementing and partly superseding the lines now in use; a network of good farm roads; steam navigation on the canals; improved harbours along the coasts; fisheries and reclamation works should be stimulated by liberal loans. If these measures were vigorously pushed forward Mr. Doyle assures us, on his credit as an engineer and Indian official of experience, that a flood-tide of prosperity would cover the whole island; distress and discontent would vanish; and the harp of Tara would swell its most triumphant melody once more. We have read this book with pleasure and with profit; for Mr. Doyle is not one of those projectors who deal in vague generalities, and take no account of ways and means. He has examined the ground, and worked out the details of his scheme as carefully as if he expected to be asked to carry it out himself. The total of the expenditure to which he asks our consent is 160 millions sterling, of which all but three millions would be repaid with interest if the proposed works should prove successful. But the question which Mr. Doyle's English readers will be sure to ask is this: Why must these vast works be undertaken by the Government? Is Irish capital totally indifferent to the attraction of 4 per cent.? We shall perhaps be told that Ireland has no capital, or that capital is frightened out of the country by lawless agitation. But these stereotyped complaints are not supported by the facts. Irish banks hold large sums on deposit at 1 per cent.; the debentures of Irish railways are seldom below par; and a supporter of the League told us not long ago that the tenants were sending their savings abroad for want of secure investments at home. Nothing is wanted but the spirit of industrial combination to turn Irish capital into profitable channels. Where people are hopelessly unable to do their public works for themselves, it may be the duty of Government to come to their aid. But Mr. Doyle's Indian training should have taught him that no despotism, however efficient, can confer lasting prosperity on a country of undeveloped resources. This truth has often been illustrated in the history of Ireland. We have spent and lent a good deal of money in that country with but little result. Government does not know, and cannot find out what is really wanted;

[3] "Old Ireland Improved and made New Ireland." By John P. Doyle, C.E. London: W. Ridgway. 1881.

Government cannot manage its works economically; and wherever Government money is going people leave their work to squabble over Parliamentary grants. There is but little hope of progress for a country where ambition always points in the direction of a Government situation or a Parliamentary grant; where the agitator always holds the mendicant hat in one hand while he brandishes the revolutionary pistol in the other. We do not deny that a wise Government can do much for the assistance and guidance of private enterprise; but we fear that Mr. Doyle's 160 millions, if he could get them, would purchase a far from satisfactory prosperity at a considerable sacrifice of independence.

We have at the present time an opportunity of observing, not only in Ireland, but in all parts of the world, how easily the new fallacies of State-socialism fit in with the old fallacies of Protection. Experienced politicians have been heard to say that one of the first measures of an Irish Republic would be the enactment of a protective tariff; and the rusty weapons of Lord George Bentinck are taken up by ardent champions of the rights of labour. Among these champions we have now to reckon Mr. David Buchanan,[4] an active member of the Parliament of New South Wales. A thorough democrat and friend of humanity, Mr. Buchanan thinks that Australian produce should not go to feed the working men of Europe so long as there are working men unemployed in Sydney. He is therefore prepared to tax sheep farmers, and other persons who can compete with Europe, for the benefit of machine hands and others who cannot. There will be "wholesome competition" within the colony sufficient to keep the price of machine-made goods within reasonable limits. It is highly amusing to note how Mr. Buchanan, who denounces exchange between Australia and Europe as a process resulting in mere loss to the younger country, is quite able to see the advantages of exchange between one part of Australia and another. If Bathurst makes £500,000 worth of stockings to exchange for the same value in Maitland gloves, both parties gain by the operation (p. 55). But if the Bathurst people adopt Mr. Buchanan's principles, they will say, "Why should we send our stockings to cover Maitland feet, while honest men go barefoot in our own streets? We will set our unemployed to glove-making, and so keep stockings and gloves both in our own town. As for Maitland, we care not what becomes of it, or how many of its people go without stockings." Protection is only one of many subjects which have been touched and adorned by Mr. Buchanan's eloquence. This little volume contains a defence of death punishments, a plea for divorce, disquisitions on Burns and Shakespeare, and two headlong attacks on Archbishop Vaughan. It appears that Dr. Vaughan has been trying to inflame the passions of the Catholic mob against the education law of New South Wales. Mr. Buchanan objects to the use of inflammatory language; he contents himself with saying that the Archbishop is a "mitred

---

[4] "Specimens of Australian Oratory." By David Buchanan. Sydney: Lee & Ross. 1881.

mountebank," who has the "barefaced insolence" to utter an "infamous libel—a scandalous and wicked lie," and to support this libel with arguments which can only be described as "surpliced lunacy." We have not space to do full justice to these flowers of rhetoric; but we ought to say that these speeches, deficient as they are in logic and in literary finish, are vigorous and amusing, and throw light on some interesting phases of colonial politics.

Mr. Statham's book about South Africa[5] possesses the rare merit of being thoroughly readable. His descriptions of scenery and people are vivid and picturesque, and he is inspired throughout by an earnest belief in the better possibilities of colonial life. He unrolls before us such a panorama of sunshine, pure air, grey pinewoods and green plains, patriarchal Dutchmen and stout-hearted Englishmen, that the imaginative reader feels impelled to seek out Mr. Donald Currie's office without a moment's delay. But the object of Mr. Statham's book is political rather than descriptive. He wishes to impress upon us the terrible magnitude of the blunders we have made in governing this land of promise, and to show us how we may avoid such blunders in future. We are asked to begin by discarding altogether the received notion that the Boer native policy is less enlightened than our own. But we cannot say that Mr. Statham succeeds in exploding this notion so completely as he seems to suppose. He takes no notice of such significant facts as the insertion of a clause repudiating all equality between black and white in the constitution of the South African Republic; he does not account for the sparseness of native population in the Free State as compared with its embarrassing density in Natal. Great as our faults have been, the principles and general practice of our Government in South Africa have been more favourable to the natives than the Old Testament politics of the Boers, and our statesmen, from Lord Charles Somerset to Lord Kimberley, have never gone so far wrong as when they set themselves to please the Dutch party in the Colonies. The Boers have many fine qualities, but they are very ignorant and very self-willed. Mr. Statham admits that they have a "prejudice against direct taxation," and it is much to be feared that the prejudice extends to all direct assertion of authority by any Government whatever. Confidence in the Boers is, in our author's opinion, the first step towards wisdom; the next step is, unlimited contempt for the Colonial Office. The curse of South Africa is not the Boer, nor the raw native, nor the refined native, nor the missionary, nor the cattle-sickness, but Downing Street. It is Downing Street that lays inferior rails on the Natal railways, refuses its sanction to the most reasonable colonial undertakings, alternates between unwise neglect and equally unwise indulgence in its treatment of the natives, and confides its influence to the hands of men like Mr. Froude and Sir W. Lanyon. Lord Carnarvon and Lord Kimberley seem to stand equally low in the scale of Mr. Statham's esteem. We are not concerned to deny that mis-

[5] "Blacks, Boers, and British. A Three-cornered Problem." By F. R. Statham. London: Macmillan & Co. 1881.

takes and abuses are inseparable from our present system of colonial government; but we do not see what is gained by this wholesale denunciation. It is not suggested that we should leave Africa to the Africander; the Colonial Office, with all its faults, protects the natives and the English merchants from the uncontrolled supremacy of Boer ideas. But if the Colonial Office is always wrong, the sooner we withdraw the better. There are one or two points in Mr. Statham's argument where he ought to have given his evidence more particularly. At p. 211 he makes a series of charges against the Englishmen who advised the annexation of the Transvaal; at p. 231 he gives a damaging account of Sir W. Lanyon's conduct at Pretoria. It is to be hoped that these charges will be submitted for the investigation of the Royal Commission now sitting.

Miss Gordon Cumming's letters from Fiji[6] prove that there is at least one corner of the earth where the blessings of annexation are properly appreciated. The assertion of British authority in the Fijian islands used to figure among the crimes of Lord Beaconsfield's Government, but it is now pretty well known that we dispossessed, not the natives and their chiefs, but a set of rascal whites who were plundering and demoralizing the inhabitants. It is not probable that European immigration will interfere to any great extent with the Fijian's enjoyment of his own country. English planters have suffered much from uncertain seasons, and from the difficulty of living in a climate where houses must be rebuilt every eight years, and among people whose national motto is *malua*—"by-and-bye." Much credit is due to the Wesleyan missionaries, who prepared the way for civilization by undermining the bad old customs of the islands and by planting some 900 churches and 1,400 schools among the people. So great has been the success of the missions that Miss Gordon Cumming thought the Fijians the most devout people, for Christians, she had ever seen. Not even the annual appearance of the *Balolo* (shoals of edible sea-worms) will tempt the native Methodist to go fishing on a Sunday. Some skill has been shown in adapting old customs of an innocent nature to Christian purposes. Songs and dances are made profitable for teaching, for school inspection, for the collection of subscriptions. Missionary meetings are enlivened by elaborate ballets, infinitely more artistic than the extravagances of French and Italian opera. The figures of the *méké*, and the intricate original designs of Fijian pottery and wood-carving, give evidence of a really remarkable faculty. Civilization is not favourable to the development of native art. Miss Gordon Cumming notes with regret that Manchester cotton takes the place of the pretty native cloth; Birmingham jewellery is preferred to the ancestral style of ornament; an ugly blunderbuss is a better weapon than the graceful spears and decorated war-clubs of the ancients. It is consoling to observe that the blunderbusses are now, for the most part, merely theatrical properties. The power of the chiefs is maintained and utilized for the purposes of the English

---

[6] "At Home in Fiji." By C. F. Gordon Cumming. London: W. Blackwood & Sons. 1881.

Government, but they are restrained from fighting, and the chief motive which used to impel them to slaughter has disappeared with the suppression of cannibalism. The work of civilization only began in 1835 with the arrival of the missionaries; and among the elders of the Wesleyan churches there are still some who cherish pleasant memories of the taste of "long pig." When we consider the progress that has been made in less than fifty years, and the marked financial success of Sir Arthur Gordon's Governorship, we may well look with hope to the future of our new Colony. As a member of Sir Arthur's household, Miss Gordon Cumming had every opportunity of acquiring information about the islands and their inhabitants. Her book is pleasantly written, and well illustrated from her own sketches.

While Sir Arthur Gordon was putting the laws and finances of Fiji in order, another member of the same indomitable clan was struggling with a still harder task in the southern provinces of Egypt. Dr. Birkbeck Hill has compiled, from Colonel Gordon's letters, a book[7] which will have a singular attraction for all who can understand a good man's victorious struggle with difficulties. No lengthy descriptions could give a clearer picture of life on the upper Nile than some of the hasty jottings in this journal. A single touch gives you a picture of a hippopotamus herd, "their fat sides gleaming in the moonlight," or a drove of elephants, "each with a white bird on its back," or the turbid river, with its leagues of "sudd"—the barrier of water-weeds through which no steamer can forcé its way. The earlier part of Colonel Gordon's work lay in the Equatorial Province. He had to lay out a line of posts, through an indescribably difficult country, as far as the Lakes; to break the power of the slave-drivers; and to make his province pay the expense of its own government. Three years of hard work made it plain to Colonel Gordon that nothing could be done at the Equator so long as the Soudan was governed on Egyptian principles, by officials who protected and profited by the slave trade. He demanded and obtained the governorship of the Soudan, where he remained till last year. During his six years of African command he went through labours which would certainly have killed any ordinary man. His staff was composed of Englishmen, who succumbed to the climate in quick succession, and of Arabs who could not be trusted to do anything except when their chief was at hand to supply them with brains and courage. The three rules which Colonel Gordon impresses on those who would keep their health in the tropics are strict temperance, constant employment, and perfect submission to the will of God. Like the Puritans, he unites a wonderful practical sagacity with an almost fatalist submission to the Divine will; but he is an open-eyed nineteenth century Puritan, who distrusts all parsons, and has no belief in what is called the "religious world." Take him for all in all, we should have to go far to find the match of this Colonel of Engineers, with his fiery energy, his chivalrous pity for the weak, his hatred of selfish inefficiency, and his lofty contempt

---

[7] "Colonel Gordon in Central Africa, 1874–1879." Edited by G. Birkbeck Hill, D.C.L. London; De la Rue & Co. 1881.

for money and for "pinchbeck honours." After doing all that one man could do in the Soudan, Colonel Gordon was compelled to leave his work unfinished. He is, indeed, of opinion that the slave trade cannot be completely suppressed until the frontier of Egypt is extended to the borders of the tribes from which the slaves are taken, and fortified by a line of posts. Such an extension could not be made to pay, and will not be attempted in the present state of Egyptian politics and finances. Colonel Gordon's outspoken remarks on the Egyptian Council of Ministers, and on Eastern principles of government generally, may be of considerable use to students of the Eastern Question.

Dr. Bullock's book about Africa[8] is not a record of personal experience, but a compilation from the works of many explorers. He has endeavoured, not altogether without success, to condense, for the benefit of ordinary readers, the social observations scattered through many volumes. We are sorry to remark that a gentleman who appears to be the author of several text-books has yet to learn the elementary rules of English composition. Dr. Bullock's use of the relative pronouns and adverbs is eccentric in the extreme. "The Maories, where are seen changes for the better, who, according to their own well-preserved traditions, emigrated," &c. This is a fair specimen of his favourite constructions. Another fault, which somewhat impairs the value of this little book, is the author's habit of dogmatizing. Dr. Bullock believes in the Biblical account of the origin of the human race; he thinks that negroes and white men are descended from the same ancestors, and that the negroes have sunk to their present condition from a higher primitive state. But the fact that he holds these opinions does not give him authority to dispose of Lubbock and Tylor in one off-hand sentence, or to speak of Burton in a tone of easy, not to say contemptuous, patronage.

Readers who take up Lady Anne Blunt's "Pilgrimage to Nejd"[9] with but a vague notion of the direction in which they are to be carried, may perhaps be pleased to discover that great authorities have not quite finally decided where and what Nejd is. It is a district of Arabia, lying to the south of the Great Nefud or desert, and it includes (according to Mr. Blunt) the city of Hail, which is the seat of the Emir Mahommed ibn Rashid, the leading chief and breeder of horses among the Arabs of to-day. Starting from Damascus in the end of 1878, Mr. and Lady Anne Blunt travelled through the prosperous country of the Hauran Druses (since brought within the circle of Turkish misrule by the enterprise of Midhat) and along the Wady Sirhan to Jof, which lies in an oasis on the edge of the desert. They crossed the Great Nefud, of which Lady Anne gives a description more matter-of-fact, and, to our thinking, more completely credible and satisfactory, than Mr. Palgrave's well-known masterpiece of word-painting. The desert of crimson sand is not wholly bare and desolate,

---

[8] "Wild Africa, the Benighted Continent of To-day." By T. Austin Bullock, LL.D. London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co.

[9] "A Pilgrimage to Nejd," &c. By Lady Anne Blunt. London: John Murray. 1881.

but tufted over with vegetation; its surface is marked all over with mounds of the lighter sand, and with strangely uniform lines of hoof-shaped hollows, called *fuljes*. These hollows are always the same; and the edge of the Nefud, where it meets the stony plain which surrounds and underlies it, retains the same sharply-definite line from season to season. Hail is not an imposing city; and the first view of the Emir's famous stables is disappointing. It is only when the horses are in motion that their fine breeding becomes apparent. The Emir himself seems to be the ideal Bedouin. He acquired his power by a series of crimes; but he exercises it in a paternal and beneficent manner, thanks probably to the fact that European money-lenders have not ventured into Central Arabia. Leaving Hail by the ordinary Haj route from Mecca, in company with a train of Persian pilgrims, Mr. and Lady Anne Blunt proceeded to Bagdad, and thence by the Tigris Valley to Bushire. Such a journey could not be performed without troubles and adventures; but courage, and thorough knowledge of Arab ways, brought them safe through all the dangers of the way. Lady Anne's journal is written in an agreeable style, free from all affectation; and Mr. Blunt's historical and geographical notes add considerably to the value of the book.

We have received a number of documents bearing on the politics and administration of the kingdom of Italy. Of these, the most important is the extensive Report[10] of the Commission appointed by the Chamber of Deputies to consider the whole question of electoral reform. Signor Mancini was President of this Commission, and Signor Zanardelli reporter; and the inquiry embraced not only the electoral laws of Italy, but the legislation of other countries, and the theories of eminent publicists of all nations. It is not necessary to offer elaborate proof of the necessity of some change. Italy contains 28½ million inhabitants, and only 628,000 voters; and the percentage of voters to inhabitants is in France 26·90, in Germany 20·63, in the United Kingdom 8·80, in Italy 2·21. Some extreme democrats are ready to pass at once from this extremely restricted electorate to universal suffrage; but the Commission thinks it desirable to limit the extension of the franchise by a variety of educational and other qualifications. The principle of female suffrage is rejected on the ground that the social duties of men and women are essentially different. *Scrutin de liste* is recommended, as favouring the emancipation of the voter from parochial influences. We regret to observe that supposed difficulties of detail have prevented the Commission from reporting in favour of proportional representation, though a partial attempt is made to give effect to the rights of local minorities. On the basis of this Report, and of the tables and documents annexed to it, the Chamber is now debating the question of reform.

The "Statistical Annual,"[11] published by the Ministry of Commerce and Agriculture, presents a picture of the economic condition of the country, and of its progress since the unification of Italy. There is

---

[10] "Relazione della Commissione Mancini." Presentata, 21 Dicembre, 1880.
[11] "Annuario Statistico Italiano." Roma. 1881.

much to encourage Italian patriotism in the retrospect; commerce has taken a new departure; education has been improving steadily, if not so rapidly as could be wished; the power and resources of the kingdom have continued to increase. At the same time, it is plain that Italy has had to pay her footing on taking her place among the Powers. Military expenditure threatens to occupy far too large a space in her budget; and the bureaucratic organization which is overspreading the country, is costly out of all proportion to the benefits it confers. This state of things is due in large measure to the ignorance and apathy of the people, especially in the country districts; and we may hope to see officialism more effectively controlled when education is more general, and electoral rights more extended. Meantime, the effects of the new financial *régime* may be studied in detail in these two volumes of local accounts and statistics.[12] At the end of 1878 the total of provincial and communal debts exceeded 843 millions of lire; the total being made up by the provinces and by 3,693 of the 8,289 communes of which the kingdom is composed. These figures are rather alarming, especially in view of the fact that Italy is not a wealthy country.

The new volumes of the *Annali Statistici*[13] are marked by the same excellence of workmanship which we have previously had occasion to acknowledge. Among the notices of foreign books, will be found careful abstracts of the treatises of Mr. Brassey and Professor Levi. We observe, by the way, that Professor Garaglio has been misled by a popular English error as to the meaning of "Domesday Book." One of the essays from the *Annali*, separately reprinted, is Professor Bodio's essay on Italian Charities[14], a subject which the legislature is expected to take up at an early date.

We cannot hope, within the limits of this section, to do anything like adequate justice to "The Imperial Gazetteer of India,"[15] compiled and digested under the masterly supervision of Dr. Hunter. Twelve years have elapsed since Lord Mayo's Government sanctioned the scheme of a statistical survey which was to cover an area equal to that of Europe, less Russia. The draft scheme alone is a marvel of skill and knowledge, but when we endeavour to realize the difficulty of filling in so vast an outline, we are filled with amazement by the completeness and accuracy of Dr. Hunter's work. He has had to lay down rules for the uniform rendering of names and phrases out of many languages; to verify all kinds of topographical, financial and statistical calculations; to sift immense masses of historical and archæological evidence; to enter into the details of a thousand industries, and to appreciate with legal exactness the powers and duties of a various host of authorities. In these labours he has been assisted by many able hands; but the success of the undertaking depended entirely on the manner in which the services of his subordinates and

---

[12] "Statistica dei Debiti Communali, Bilanci Communali." Roma. 1880.
[13] "Annali di Statistica." Serie 2a. Voll. 21-24. Roma. 1881.
[14] "Le Opere Pie in Italia." L. Bodio. Roma. 1881.
[15] "The Imperial Gazetteer of India." W. W. Hunter, LL.D., C.I.E., Director-General of Statistics to the Government of India. London: Trübner & Co. 1881.

collaborators were turned to account by the Director-General. It was not always easy to impose uniformity of method on provincial and local authorities without impairing their independence; prejudices and jealousies might arise in the minds of those who commanded the sources of information in regard to native states, or French and Portuguese dependencies; viceroys and secretaries of state change with the times, and a hastily conceived order from head-quarters might interfere at any moment with the consistent development of Dr. Hunter's plans. Great scholars are not expected to possess the political talents required to overcome such difficulties as these; it is, therefore, not a compliment, but an act of justice, to acknowledge that the personal gifts of the Director-General were indispensable to the accomplishment of his great design.

The "Statistical Survey," which is to be completed in the course of this year, will be contained in 100 volumes, or 360,000 printed pages. Under 15 provincial headings, and 240 district headings, it sets out in minute detail every fact which the responsible administrator ought to know. Its primary design is to assist those who are responsible for the government of our Indian fellow-subjects; it is, therefore, a book for specialists. The "Gazetteer," on the other hand, is for the use of members Parliament and others who are conscious of the responsibility which rests upon the people of England in their relations with the people of India. In our last number we quoted from "England's Work in India" a sentence which will bear repetition; "The responsibility for India has passed into the hands of Parliament, and through Parliament to the electoral body of Great Britain. They must realize, that if through ignorance or indifference, they fail to discharge that responsibility, they are acting as bad citizens. They must, therefore, set themselves to learn more about India." Here, then, is a text-book, in nine volumes, from which a diligent student may acquire a full measure of the information we need. Zeal for the welfare of India abounds among us; but our zeal is not always according to knowledge. Mr. Bright, for instance, has done good service in calling the attention of the democracy to Indian affairs; but Mr. Bright's facts have too often gone down under the criticism of hard-hearted experts. Systematic use of these volumes may save the reformers of the future from similar misfortunes.

One of the preliminary difficulties of the undertaking was the selection of the places to which articles were to be devoted. Those finally selected are about 8,000 in number. The article "India" presents, in 515 pages, and 10 appended tables, a comprehensive summary of the natural features, history, arts, industries, institutions, and religions of the country as a whole. Provinces under independent governments are treated with equal elaboration; "Bengal," for example, occupies 38 pages. The details of historical events are given under the name of the place where they occurred. Each of the 240 districts into which British India is divided is carefully described, and a very large proportion of the articles are devoted to those smaller territorial units, such as the Oudh *pargana* and the Bengal *zemindari*,

which have retained their identity and cherished their peculiar traditions under many imperial rulers. In describing these smaller divisions, Dr. Hunter has been able to turn to account many items of historical evidence which were deemed unsuitable for use in the Statistical Survey. There could be no more instructive reading for those who wish to deepen and widen their knowledge of Indian history than these minute accounts of parishes and villages. The success of Mughal or English invaders is a small matter to the Indian peasant, compared with the petty farming and petty trade, the local feuds and friendships, which make up a round of life which has not varied for thousands of years. Nor is it only the historian or the sociologist who will profit by the collection of these details; they are also of the utmost importance to the administrator. In arts and manufactures, in the educational department, and in several departments of law, English institutions are most successful in India when they found themselves on native ideas and traditions. The sudden introduction of new ways produces in the minds of unprogressive people bewilderment and panic; and if we would avoid such explosions as that of 1857 we must be content to treat what we regard as the diseases and weaknesses of Eastern society by what doctors call the "expectant method"—interfering, except in case of necessity, only at those points where our subjects are willing to receive our help.

It was wisely determined that the scope of the "Gazetteer" should not be confined to the limits of India. Neighbouring States are succinctly described, and articles are devoted to frontier positions of importance, such as Kandahar and Herat. In summarizing the history of these debatable regions, the compiler has to make his way over the smouldering embers of long-standing controversies. Dr. Hunter has picked his steps with great care. We have not noticed any passage in the "Gazetteer" to which reasonable objection could be taken from either side of politics. After turning over these volumes in search of information on various obscure and controverted questions, we have found nothing to criticize. We can only express our gratitude to all who have had a share in their composition, and especially to Dr. Hunter, and our hope that the benefits conferred on India by the publication of "The Imperial Gazetteer" may be in proportion to the merits of the work.

Mr. Felkin's report on the educational institutions of Chemnitz[16] sets before us in a very intelligible form the advantage enjoyed by German working men, as compared with their English rivals, in the matter of technical training. An English town of 90,000 inhabitants would be considered extravagant if it spent on education £145,000 of its own money, besides £95,000 Parliamentary grants. Of the respectable total, £240,000, spent on the schools of Chemnitz, nearly £88,000 is devoted to scientific and practical teaching, more or less directly adapted to promote the efficiency of local manufactures. The foresight of those who advised this expenditure has been justified by

---

[16] "Technical Education in a Saxon Town." By H. M. Felkin. London: Kegan Paul & Co. 1881.

the result. Chemnitz gloves have beaten the Nottingham article out of the market; and if we cannot take a lesson from our Saxon kinsmen, our lace and hosiery trade will share the fate of the glove trade. The City and Guilds of London Institute, to which we owe Mr. Felkin's report, has not been founded too soon; our great capitalists and corporations must see that a special effort is required, even to recover the ground which we have already lost.

The one point in which German state-aided education breaks down is religion. No attempt is made to keep pace with the advance of thought and knowledge; Lutheranism is taught in a dogmatic, mechanical fashion; neither teachers nor taught are interested in this part of the work. Professor Siciliani's lecture[17] proves that complaints in regard to the quality of religious teaching are not confined to Germany. Rejecting as impossible the complete separation of Church and State, the Professor gives the formula of liberty, as he understands it. Separation in so far as the Church is dogmatic, subordination of Church to State, in so far as the Church is an organ of society for the development of the religious sense.

We had occasion to notice, not long ago, Miss Shirreff's exposition of Kindergarten methods. In collaboration with three other ladies, members of the London Froebel Society, Miss Shirreff has published a volume of Essays,[18] dealing with various aspects of infant school work. Without committing ourselves to the universal applicability of Kindergarten methods, we can sincerely express approval of the common sense and active sympathy with child-nature displayed by these ladies. Dr. Frances Hoggen's paper on the Physical Education of Girls is particularly good.

Dr. Letourneau[19] is one of the school of writers who are now labouring to apply to Social Science the methods by which the laws of physical nature have been discovered and verified. Rejecting the idealistic or metaphysical conception of political philosophy, he sets himself to collect and arrange the facts which bear on the origin of social life and the habits of primitive communities. His book contains a large number of valuable observations, extracted from many books, and arranged with considerable skill. Dr. Letourneau professes to base his enquiries upon Ethnography, but when he comes to describe primitive institutions, he is apt to forget distinctions of race, and to take his illustrations as they come, from Esquimaux or New Caledonians, as the case may be. It is not possible to cover so large a field without being occasionally incomplete. It would be difficult to gather from the chapter on property any adequate notion of the comparative advantages and disadvantages of communism and individualism; and a similar remark might be made on some other chapters. But, taken as a whole, and regarded as an introduction to the study of Sociology, Dr. Letourneau's book is readable and instructive.

[17] "L'Insegnamente Religioso ai Bambini." Da Pietro Siciliani. Bologna: N. Zanichelli. 1881.

[18] "Essays on the Kindergarten." London: Sonnenschein & Allen. 1881.

[19] "Sociology based upon Ethnography." By Dr. Charles Letourneau. Translated by Henry M. Trollope. London: Chapman & Hall. 1881.

Mr. Frisby[20] is a disciple of Mr. Hare's, but he thinks that no practical politician will ever agree to alter our whole electoral system by one measure. He proposes, therefore, a plan which embodies the principle of proportional representation, while leaving the existing constituencies untouched. Let each voter have one vote, and let the 658 largest groups of voters be represented, whether they are majorities or minorities. This plan will cause every seat to be contested, because every minority may hope either to poll enough votes to obtain a member of its own, or to prevent the majority from polling the required quota. There would be many small constituencies where neither majority nor minority could hope to poll the quota; but these small bodies could petition to be thrown in with neighbouring divisions. Mr. Frisby proves from the Scottish Parliamentary election returns, and from the Liverpool municipal returns, that his plan would be much fairer than the present system; but we are not sure that the practical politicians will understand Mr. Frisby any better than they have understood Mr. Hare.

We have to acknowledge the new editions of Messrs. Silvers' Handbooks[21] to Australia and South Africa, which seem to deserve the confidence reposed in them by the public; the new editions of pamphlets by Mr. Kinnear[22] and Mr. Fox,[23] which we have already had occasion to notice; the plan for the census of Budapest,[24] prepared with great care by Mr. Joseph Körösi; the Annual Report of the Children's Aid Society of New York;[25] and the Report of the Minister of Education for the Province of Ontario for the year 1879.[26] Mr. Rimmer's volume on "Our Old Country Towns,"[27] is pleasantly written and well illustrated. M. Dragomanov[28] defends the Socialists from complicity in the crimes of the Russian Revolutionary party, and throws a good deal of light on the political issues at stake between the Revolution and the Imperial Government. Mr. Mulhall's "Balance Sheet"[29] displays on a smaller scale the same qualities which have secured a high reputation for his larger work on the "Progress of the World." He

---

[20] "A Practical Scheme of Fair Representation." By Alfred Frisby, B.A. Leicester. 1881.

[21] "Handbook to Australia, New Zealand, and the Fiji Islands." Third Edition. And "Handbook to South Africa." Third Edition. London: S. W. Silver & Co. 1880.

[22] "Ireland." By J. B. Kinnear. Second Edition. London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1881.

[23] "Reports on the Condition of the Peasantry of Mayo." By J. A. Fox. Third Edition. Dublin. 1881.

[24] "Dépouillement du Recensement de la Ville de Budapest. Par Joseph Körösi. Budapest: Maurice Rath. 1881.

[25] "Twenty-Eighth Annual Report of the Children's Aid Society." New York. 1880.

[26] "Report of the Minister of Education for the Province of Ontario for the year 1879." Toronto: C. B. Robinson. 1881.

[27] "Our Old Country Towns." By Alfred Rimmer. London: Chatto & Windus. 1881.

[28] "Le Tyrannicide en Russie." Par M. Dragomanov. Genève. 1881.

[29] "Balance Sheet of the World for Ten Years." By M. G. Mulhall, F.S.S., London: E. Stanford. 1881.

has submitted the statistics of production and distribution for the years 1870-80 to a careful examination, the results of which are exhibited in tables of figures, and in an ingenious series of coloured diagrams. We may, perhaps, suggest that Mr. Mulhall's tables would be even more valuable than they are if he would indicate the sources from which they are derived, distinguishing between figures which represent ascertainable facts, and those which represent estimates.

Lieutenant-Colonel Browne[30] is well entitled to be heard on any question concerning the relations between India and Afghanistan. His exposition of the difficulties attending the completion and maintenance of a Sakkur-Kandahar railway is very striking; and his argument in favour of retaining Pisheen and abandoning Kandahar is well worth attention in the present position of affairs.

---

## SCIENCE.

NOT only sportsmen, but everyone interested in fire-arms, will welcome Mr. Greener's book on the gun.[1] It is a remarkably complete monograph of the subject, and although necessarily dealing a good deal with technical matters, is replete with interest from beginning to end. Three distinct subjects are embraced in the scope of the volume; first, a history of ancient arms; secondly, an account of the construction, differences, and advantages of modern firearms; and thirdly, a considerable mass of shooting notes, giving an account of the habits of the chief kinds of game, and the conditions under which it may be taken in our own and foreign countries. From whatever point of view it is regarded the work is full of well condensed and trustworthy information; not exhaustive, but quite as full as sportsman, inventor, or general reader is likely to require. The illustrations, which number 342, are all excellent; many which illustrate the earlier weapons, especially those of Germany and France, will be new to the English reader. A chapter on cannon brings under notice a number of extraordinary old pieces, many of them breech-loading. The old portable firearms are also indicated by a few singular weapons like the arquebus, the English "holy-water sprinkle," and other arms mentioned in history, but not often drawn. Among the subjects discussed are breech-loading rifles, penetration of rifle bullets, sporting and central fire-guns, proof of gun-barrels, cartridges, hammerless guns, a description of gun-making and choke-boring, with an account of various gun trials since 1858. The volume concludes with two indexes—the first relates to firearms; the second to the shooting notes.

William Denton is an American lecturer, who, having said his say

---

30 "The Retention of Candahar, and the Defence of the North-West Frontier." By Lieut.-Col. James Browne, R.E., C.S.I. London. 1880.

1 "The Gun and its Development; with Notes on Shooting." By W. W. Greener. Illustrated. Cassell, Petter, Galpin & Co., London, Paris and New York.

for twenty-five years, is now writing out his views on the origin of man.[3] The introduction, or preface, would lead one to suppose that the book has grown into existence in consequence of a discussion which took place between the author and the President of the United States as far back as twenty-two years ago. The subject of this debate affirmed by the author was that man, animals, and vegetables are the product of spontaneous generation and progressive development, and there is no evidence that there was any direct creative act on this planet. The fact of Mr. Garfield having been called to the first place in his country seems to have brought back to Mr. Denton's memory the twenty speeches which were given on the memorable occasion of the debate, and roused him up to a sense of their importance to the well-being of his fellows which nothing else had been able to demonstrate in the intervening years. The author believes that he completely annihilated the President; and hence, since his antagonist has attained to eminence, it follows that Mr. Denton should at least be somewhat augmented in importance. The volume consists of two parts, treating of man's natural origin and of his spiritual origin. The reader may avoid the author's illustrations, or he will be astonished to find under the latter subject pictures of various fossil plants, shells, the axolotl, a mastiff of the time of Nebuchadnezzar, the Hottentot Venus, not to mention such familiar things as the Neanderthal skull. If it should be difficult to see anything very spiritual in all these things, we may state that the author affirms that there are a number of pointers which indicate man's spiritual and divine origin. One of these is called the manward progress of our planet; in the opening sentence of this article it is observed, "in the development of the earth there has been a progress towards humanity from the start till he appeared, of whom the mute prophets of all ages have borne witness." The author then describes his visit to a cloth factory, and just as you expect to be introduced to "the mute prophets," if not to the appearance to which they have borne witness, the author takes you into his confidence with the following statement: "as Geology enables me to look at the earth, I see it to be a great factory for making men out of granite." But after making the acquaintance of other pointers called the race development of animals, organic distribution, persistency of type, we begin to give up the pursuit of the spiritual origin in despair, especially when another pointer assures us that phrenology, as taught by Dr. J. R. Buchanan, is as much a true science as geology taught by Sir Charles Lyell, and can be much more readily demonstrated. And the author can do no more than assert the existence of spiritual faculties when he comes to the end of his story, on the basis of the achievements of somnambulists and clairvoyants. When you reach this conclusion it is difficult to see why you were ever introduced to the eohippus, sundry species of paradoxides, and Nebuchadnezzar's mastiff, and the very material subjects which do not seem, in our judgment, to point so clearly to the Divine origin of man

[3] "Is Darwin Right? or, the Origin of Man. By William Denton. Wellesley, Mass.: Denton Publishing Company.

as to a remarkable mental condition of the author. The first part of the book will prove interesting to any one who finds profit in the second part, but it is not a work that we can recommend, except as a literary curiosity.

Under the title "Note Book of an Amateur Geologist," Mr. John Edward Lee has published a singular volume, giving memoranda and sketches, made for his own pleasure, since the year 1829.[3] In the preface he states his belief that, after deducting all probable errors and faults consequent on the growth of the science, there will still remain enough of interest in the sketches and sections to justify their publication. The volume opens with a note on the state of science in England when these notes were commenced in 1824, and the author speaks with warm admiration of the influence of the late Professor John Phillips, in fostering a love for geology by his public lectures, and by his labours in connection with the British Association. Then begins an explanation of the 209 plates, which form the larger part of the work. These plates are mostly rough lithographs, exact copies of what the author has seen in his travels in this country as well as in various parts of Europe. It is impossible to give an analysis of the whole of these memoranda, but several of them are of undoubted interest, and will be valued as contributions to a knowledge of the subjects to which they relate. But the work has another aspect in disclosing to beginners the sort of notes which a student makes when he examines the phenomena of rock structure. As might have been expected, the author reproduces an excellent little paper on the Geology of Nettleton Hill, in Lincolnshire, published as far back as 1837, in which a good deal was done to clear up the structure of the Lincolnshire Wolds. Similarly, other Papers of about the same date find a place in his garnering up of the author's geological experiences ; among them is a note on the armour of a new Saurian reptile found in Sandown Bay, which appears to belong to the remarkable armoured genus subsequently named polacanthus. There are studies of the glaciers of Switzerland, the upheaved shell beds of Sweden, the volcanoes of Italy, and the Eifel, and various phenomena of coast scenery, chiefly from the western parts of our own island and the coast of Antrim. We cannot but think that the interest and usefulness of the volume, such as it is, would have been greatly augmented if the author had arranged his materials in some sort of scientific order. As it is there is no classification, and in the absence of an index it is impossible to tell what the book contains without looking through the whole of the plates. This circumstance alone will limit the use of the volume to a small circle of readers.

Professor Alleyne Nicholson has issued a sumptuous volume, on a group of Palæozoic corals, belonging to the genus Monticulipora and its allies.[4] This very difficult assemblage of fossils has hitherto been

[3] "Note-book of an Amateur Geologist." By John Edward Lee, F.G.S. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1881.

[4] "On the Structure and Affinities of the Genus Monticulipora and its Sub-genera. With Critical descriptions of Illustrative Species." By H. Alleyne Nicholson, M.D. F.R.S.E., Professor of Natural History in the University of St. Andrews. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood & Sons. 1881.

comparatively neglected in this country, because it can only be profitably studied by means of microscopic slices which display the internal structure of the coralites of which the specimens consist, external characters being generally of little value in determining either the generic or specific relations of the specimens, which are more or less embedded in the rock. It is a new feature in scientific literature to find a monograph so minute, and necessarily appealing exclusively to palæontologists, published in a form so luxurious. It is divided into ten chapters. The first gives a history of the views which have been held, with regard to the relation of the fossils of which the author writes, by his predecessors; the second chapter describes the structure of Monticulipora, and compares it with the forms with which it is most nearly related; the third chapter discusses the mode of growth and zoological affinities of the genus. On the latter point the author discusses the question whether the fossils really belong to the Bryozoa or to the Cœlenterata, stating that he is disposed to regard them as an ancient group of Alcyonaria. The fourth chapter examines their relation to allied fossils; and in the subsequent chapters the subdivisions of the genus and its chief species are described and figured. The figures are beautifully clear woodcuts, drawn from the microscopic slides prepared by the author, and number about fifty; and these are supplemented by six carefully drawn plates. It is a work of great labour, research, and palæontological skill, and as an important contribution to science will be welcomed by all students of corals and their allies.

Professor Core has prepared a little volume of 130 pages of questions on Balfour Stewart's "Lessons in Elementary Physics," to which Professor Stewart furnishes a short preface.[5] Where the questions admit of numerical answers these results are given at the end of the book. The questions appear to be excellent, and there can be no doubt but that they may be useful alike to students and teachers. All books of this kind are open to the objection that they foster the tendency to reduce teaching to an examination standard. There is reason, however, to believe that the examination test, far from being fostered by the cultivators of learning, or even public teachers, is forced upon educational institutions by the comparatively illiterate, who suppose that the maximum advantages of learning are thus to be secured. It would perhaps be almost as correct to say that only the minimum of advantages are obtained when examinations are kept constantly before the pupil as more important than knowledge; for, besides the circumstance that examinations tend to repress all individuality, to discourage all reading beyond the routine limits, they give an artificial appearance of power to students whose faculties ill fit them for being classified by this test. In the pursuit of science the necessity for accuracy in elementary work may, however, appear to justify such assistance as is offered in this volume; but the scientific imagination will inevitably suffer from a training not calculated to develop it; and it is not improbable that

[5] "Questions on Stewart's Lessons in Elementary Physics." By T. H. Core. London: Macmillan & Co. 1881.

the diffusion of science by such means in the present day may rather tend to lessen the number of its cultivators in the future.

Mr. Broadhurst's "Musical Acoustics" is stated to be written partly for the use of students preparing for musical examinations—acoustics being required by the Universities of Cambridge and London.[6] The other purpose of the book is an effort to inform cultured readers concerning the causes of musical phenomena in which they take interest. The chief subjects treated of in the seventeen chapters are the sensation and external cause of sound and its transmission, wave motion, and the application to sound of the wave theory. Chapters are devoted to the elements of a musical sound, to resonance, analysis of compound sounds, and Helmholtz's theory of musical quality. Other chapters take up the motions of sounding strings, sounding columns of air, and the human voice; beats, consonance and dissonance, scales and temperaments, and systems of pitch notation. The work has no pretension to originality, and the author enumerates the chief writers to whom he is under obligations, often quoting from them—in fact, the scissors have contributed, in a very undisguised way, to the building up of the volume. There are various appendices, which deal with more or less technical subjects in the same convenient method of bodily extraction from other publications. The work concludes with a few examination questions on the several chapters. There are certain woodcut illustrations, mostly rough, which assist the text. As a compilation it will be useful to those who have no time to consult the original authors whose works are here borrowed from.

Dr. Aveling's "Natural Philosophy,"[7] though written professedly for a special examination, is an admirable little book, well fitted to initiate young students in the subject. Its primary object is an endeavour after more than ordinary clearness, and throughout the author aids the student by working examples for him; therefore, instead of being a simple exposition of the science, it combines with enunciation of its leading truths the sort of assistance usually afforded by oral teaching. In this respect it meets a want. The short introduction is an exhortation to readers upon the right way of using the book, so as to master it—much as a professor might give in an introductory lecture—insisting on the necessity for analysis and writing out from memory what has been learned. This is the old-fashioned method of professorial teaching. The author claims to have so arranged his matter as to show the dependence of ideas and principles upon each other, and he certainly has succeeded in removing difficulties by his method of exposition. One appendix contains solutions to exercises given in various parts of the text; and a second appendix gives a

[6] "The Student's Helmholtz: Musical Acoustics; or, the Phenomena of Sound as connected with Music." By John Broadhurst. With more than one hundred Illustrations. London: William Reeves. 1881.

[7] "Natural Philosophy for London University Matriculation." By Edward B. Aveling, D.Sc. Dealing with all the required subjects, and containing over one-hundred-and-fifty examples worked out in full, and some Hundreds of Exercises for Solution by the Student. London: W. Stewart & Co. Edinburgh: J. Menzies & Co.

number of questions covering the field of work, each with its numerical answer.

Clairant's "Elements of Geometry"[8] is divided into four parts. The first treats of the means which it was most natural to employ for the measurement of land, because it was on this foundation that the science of geometry was constructed. This part is divided into seventy-five sections which relate to triangles, angles, and various rectilinear figures. The second part consists of twenty-eight sections on the geometrical method of comparing rectilinear figures, chiefly utilizing the ideas of Euclid. The third part is on the measurement and properties of circular figures; and the fourth part relates to the measurement of solids and their surfaces. The treatment of the subject is logical, simple and interesting; and although there may not be in it the mental training afforded by Euclid's geometry, it is thoroughly scientific, and the translator has rendered excellent service by bringing the work under the notice of English readers.

Mr. Samuel Wood is a practical gardener; as enthusiastic about gardening as though it were the prime object for which the world came into existence. His useful guide for the amateur gardener,[9] if somewhat peculiar in its style, is thoroughly suggestive of one who writes from familiarity with the things referred to. The book is divided into four parts, which are entitled — construction of the garden; economical arrangement of the flower garden; ornamental and carpet garden, fernery, &c., and destruction of insect pests; and general work in the flower garden. The first chapter begins with the situation and shape of gardens. Determined to stimulate every one to garden, the author urges that in towns where villas are so built as to overlook each other, trees like the lime, acacia, and many others, may be used to form a screen. Having discussed the mode of growing screens of roses, the lawn, and the best kinds of shrubs come under notice. Then the more beautiful flowering shrubs are indicated, and a chapter is given to the miniature rosary; and here, and throughout the book, some idea is given of cost of the flowers recommended. Then the various kinds of plants to be grown are described in detail as to management, in such a way as to suit the wants of the small gardener. The same compact, practical quality extends throughout the little work, even to the destruction of insects and description of garden tools. The volume contains a few woodcuts illustrating garden tools, insects, and a few points in the arrangement of the garden.

"Plant Life" is a little series of popular papers explaining elementary botanical ideas with the aid of 156 figures.[10] If it be regarded as open

8 "Elements of Geometry." By Alexis Claude Clairant. Translated by J. Kaines, D.Sc. London: C. Kegan Paul. 1881.

9 "The Ladies Multum-in-Parvo Flower Garden and Amateur's Complete Guide." With Illustrations. By Samuel Wood. London: Crosby, Lockwood & Co. 1881.

10 "Plant Life. Popular Papers on the Phenomena of Botany." With 148 Illustrations drawn by the Author, and engraved by W. M. R. Quick. London: Marshall, Japp & Co. 1881.

to criticism, it is on the ground that too little is told about subjects of interest; but since it is dedicated to the members of the Lambeth Field Club, by a past-President, it can only be supposed that the author has considered the wants and capacities of the readers for whom he specially writes. The volume rather treats the subject from the point of view of popular interest than in any special scientific way, devoting chapters to microscopic plants, plant structure, fertilization of flowers, predatory plants, plants with flowers or leaves of remarkable form, the folk-lore of plants, astrological ideas about plants. There are also chapters on ferns, mosses and lichens, horsetails and stone-wort, fungi and algæ. The figures are mostly clear, and the text gives evidence of some reading in frequent quotations from popular writers.

Under the title, "Scientific Instruction for Travellers," the Italian Minister of Agriculture, Industry and Commerce has published a series of essays on the scientific questions which may engage the traveller's attention in the several branches of the natural history sciences.[11] The editor, Signor Issel, in a short introduction, explains the mode of growth of the present work, many of the articles having been originally published in the *Rivista Marittima*, in 1874 and 1875. The sciences treated of are, astronomy, meteorology, geography and topography, exploration of the deep sea, geology and palæontology, anthropology and ethnology, zoology, botany and mineralogy. The articles are arranged in the foregoing order, and are of very different value, the editor's contribution on geology and palæontology appearing to us one of the least important, since, from the technical character of the science, it must have required for adequate treatment illustrations which the scheme of the work did not permit. The editor also contributes an article on mineralogy. This work cannot but be acceptable, not only to travellers, but to tourists, sailors, and all who appreciate natural phenomena and wish to have some scientific acquaintance with subjects upon which their observations would be valuable.

Much has been written upon the subject of sight, but Professor Joseph Le Conte makes good his claim to add to this kind of literature.[12] His book is a model of clear exposition, rich in information, and abounding in views or modes of exposition which are more or less novel. After a short introduction on the relation of the senses to general sensibility, and the different relations of the senses to their environment, the first part of the book, which treats of monocular vision, commences with an account of the structure of the eye, terse and admirably clear. Then, having got the instrument, its use is

[11] "Ministero di Agricoltura, Industria e Commercio. Instruzioni Scientifiche pei Viaggiatori raccolte da Arturo Issel in collaborazione dei Signori Giovanni Celoria, Michele-Stefano di Rossi, Raffaello Gestro, Enrico Giglioli, Guido Grassi, Angiolo Manzoni, Antonio Piccone, Gustavo Uzzielli e Arturo Zannetti." Roma: Tipografia Eredi Botta. 1881.

[12] "Sight: an Exposition of the Principles of Monocular and Binocular Vision." By Joseph Le Conte, LL.D., Professor of Geology and Natural History in the University of California. With numerous Illustrations. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1881.

demonstrated in the formation of the image. The eye is considered as an optical instrument; he then points out its defects, such as short-sightedness, long-sightedness, and the sight of old age. The fourth chapter explains the phenomena of monocular vision, entering into a consideration of the function of the rods and cones of the retina, but less fully than in the better works on physiology published in this country. The second part of the book is devoted to binocular vision, and discusses judgment of distance, size and form, binocular perspective, double images, and the superposition of images. The third part is on disputed points in binocular vision. This latter part is to some extent original in character. The bright interesting tone of the exposition is never lost, and the subject is kept so free from technicality that, whatever may be the differences of opinion concerning certain theories discussed, the work must be accepted as a useful contribution to scientific literature.

In teaching zoology practically, familiarity with the animals is necessarily implied; and when we turn to the pages of a "Zoological Atlas,"[13] we naturally expect representations of the animals and their ways of life; but though Mr. McAlpine, it is true, gives figures of the skate, cod, salamander, pigeon, tortoise, we should scarcely regard familiarity with the forms of these animals alone as constituting much claim to zoological knowledge. The work, which consists of twenty-four plates exemplifying the chief points of structure in the several vertebrate types, should rather have been named an atlas of the elements of comparative anatomy. The subject is somewhat unequally treated. Five plates are given to the structure of the skate, and four to the cod, while only one plate is given to the amphibia, represented by the common European salamander. The tortoise is illustrated in three plates, the pigeon in four, and the last seven are given to the rabbit. The figures are, for the most part, slightly shaded outlines, which are clearly drawn and coloured, so as to make the several organs distinct. Many of the figures are somewhat diagrammatic, and the outlines are not always strictly accurate. In some cases—as, for example, in the anatomy of the tortoise—several of the figures are obviously wrong; but as the work is only designed as an aid to dissection, and to indicate to the student the names of the organs and parts of the body which the knife exposes, these shortcomings will probably not interfere greatly with the usefulness of a series of plates which supply a want, and will assist many beginners in founding their knowledge of animal structure upon a first-hand acquaintance with animal form. We trust that the work may, in some future issue, have the plates redrawn, so as to remove the many obvious defects, and to extend the work a little.

The Report of Mr. Blandford on the Administration of the Meteorological Department of India[14] opens with a review of the work done

[13] "Zoological Atlas (Including Comparative Anatomy), with Practical Directions and Explanatory Text." For the use of Students. 231 coloured Figures and Diagrams. By D. M'Alpine, F.C.S. Vertebrata. Edinburgh and London: W. & A. K. Johnston. 1881.

[14] "Report on the Administration of the Meteorological Department of the Government of India, 1879-80." Government Central Press.

during the last five years, and the author dilates upon the establishment of observatories, the measures taken to ensure accuracy and uniformity, the work of first-class observatories, measures for the supervision of observatories, and the discussion and publication of work. Then follows an account of the administration of the year 1879–80, and a list of presents to the library. Appendices include extracts from the reports of the meteorological officers of the several Indian Governments, all showing that the excellent work done in previous years is fully sustained and undergoing constant improvement.

The meteorological observations made at Calcutta, Lucknow, Lahore, Nagpur, Bombay, and Madras, which have hitherto formed an appendix to the annual reports on the meteorology of India, have been issued separately in a folio volume of 167 pages, prefaced by ten pages of description of the stations, and observations on the instruments used.[15]

The report on the Meteorology of India for 1878 is similar in character to that of the previous year.[16] It, however, includes the register taken during part of the year at Quetta, on the plateau of Balúchistan, and some observations taken in the Kurram Valley, and in parts of Afghanistan, and at Katmandu. The reporter discusses the probable relations of atmospheric pressure to sun-spots, and remarks that the cyclical oscillation, which corresponds to the sun-spot period, has its reciprocal phase in Western Siberia and in European Russia; but that in the year 1877, the excess of pressure was as pronounced at the Russian stations as at any Indian stations. The author believes that the evidence that solar heat increases and decreases with the spots of the photosphere is much stronger than the evidence in favour of the opposite view, and he has this year commenced to make observations to determine the numerical value of the variation. The report includes a map of India, showing the positions of the various observatories, and twelve smaller charts for the months of the year, showing the temperature, pressure, and wind direction, much in the same way as it is indicated in the charts printed in the *Times*, except that the isotherms are given in red, and the isobars in blue. Other plates show the variation of mean pressure in various parts of India, and the seventh plate gives the pressure of barometer, direction of wind, and locality of rainfall on four days in January. As usual, the bulk of the book consists of an abstract of meteorological registers, and the observations at the six observatories for 1878.

---

[15] "Meteorological Observations Recorded at Six Stations in India in the year 1879." Corrected and Reduced. Published by Order of the Viceroy and Governor-General of India, under the direction of Henry F. Blandford, F.R.S. Calcutta: Office of the Superintendent of Government Printing. 1881.

[16] "Report on the Meteorology of India in 1878." By H. F. Blandford, F.R.S. Fourth Year. Calcutta: Office of the Superintendent of Government Printing. 1880.

## HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

MR. FREEMAN gives us at last the complete body of his "Historical Geography of Europe."[1] But though in his preface the author distinctly confines himself to geography, to the tracing the alterations of the territorial limits of States, it is not surprising to find that, in the sequel, history usurps the place of geography. It is not surprising to find a mind so constituted as is that of Mr. Freeman, turning with a will to the internal affairs of nations, and to the somewhat forced introduction of certain political views for which the author has become famous. The excision of a few digressions into these side issues would render this work a more complete and more concise account of a great and important subject. Mr. Freeman regrets "that it has been found needful to bind the maps separately from the text." It would have been well had the volume of text followed more closely the concise and impersonal character of this volume of maps. Much benefit would accrue if people generally could be induced to impress on their minds this series of maps, with their distinct colourings of frontier alterations. These give prominence to a fact only too often ignored, that boundaries always have fluctuated, and always will, from generation to generation. It is possible that the antagonistic enthusiasm, and destructive bloodshed, which are now the inseparable accompaniments of any change of boundary, might in some degree be mitigated in effect, by the clear knowledge that in human history territorial divisions are the subjects of inevitable and perpetual change. The volume of the text is not so satisfactory, because of these political and personal digressions, which, though they add piquancy and spice, yet vitiate the simple and wholesome fare requisite in an educational and standard work. For instance, it is beside our purpose to learn that, in Mr. Freeman's opinion, a certain "Imperial, Royal, and Apostolic Government, filched" the proofs of some maps he was sending for correction to a friend in Ragusa. There is obvious improbability involved in the "filching" for political purposes, by the Government of a mighty Empire, of the proofs of maps, which would anyhow be published by an author, and in a far-off foreign country. It is neither history nor geography to hit at the Austrian Government. But the work is strangely disappointing in the science or philosophy of its treatment. For instance, the author attempts the formation of two classes of names—the geographical and the political. To the former class he consigns Gaul and Britain, and to the latter England and France. His explanation is that the one class "means certain parts of the earth's surface, which do not alter their meaning; and the other, the extent of country occupied at any particular time by a particular nation." But he soon has to explain that, after all, these

[1] "The Historical Geography of Europe." By E. A. Freeman, D.C.L. Two Volumes. London: Longmans, Green & Co.

boundaries are in reality, and in both classes, mere matter of date. In short, "historical" would be a far more appropriate title for his first class than "geographical," for, as he shows distinctly, names and boundaries change with the political allegiance of the people, and not with the physical barriers of Nature. If we would show Gaul on our maps we must give maps of Europe at a particular period. Mr. Freeman himself describes how "England" itself was once located on the continent of Europe. And when he proceeds to describe in this book America, Africa, and even Australia, he excuses himself on the plea that Europe has extended thither. The scientific treatment fails, too, in necessary comprehensiveness. Thus, to speak of Gaul as "the land which joins together Central and Southern Europe," may be necessary to a view which describes Europe as divided into three portions by the Pyrenees and the Alps—but to do so is to ignore altogether the historical routes between Central and Southern Europe, by the way of Pannonia and the head of the Adriatic. We have further evidence of this blemish in the command yet retained over Mr. Freeman's mind by the old-world "classical" theory. He still adopts the Greek and Roman view; he speaks as if China and India and Egypt had come forth from the realms of outer darkness, only after civilization had had its birth in the Eastern end of the Mediterranean; he ignores the material civilization attained by Phœnicia until it has to be dismissed in the brief record that it was overthrown or absorbed by Roman power. In the author's general view of European ethnology we find the same narrowness of treatment. He tells us the population of Europe has always been more homogeneous than that of any other great division of the world—as Asia, for instance. This is strange argument in what should be a philosophic treatise on geography. We in Europe have adopted these arbitrary divisions of the world, and with "insular" pride, it seems, we omit to notice that the three other divisions are each of them four or five times the size of Europe, and proportionately less likely to have homogeneous populations. The forced introduction of unnecessary personal bias is much to be regretted. Mr. Freeman well and learnedly describes the occupation of Europe by succeeding waves of immigrants. Each successive wave he adopts unhesitatingly as an addition to the population of Europe. And the last wave he describes is that of "Turanians." This wave gave Europe the Magyars and the Bulgarians. These Mr. Freeman allows to remain as constituent elements of European nationality. Among these waves have come Heathens of all denominations, Jews, Christians and Saracens. But among the Turanians came the Turks, and Mr. Freeman at once makes an uncalled-for and altogether illogical exception. He at once calls them "alien still on Aryan and Christian ground . . . . kept up by the constant incorporation of European renegades." Mr. Freeman allows the Celts to come down upon and to dispossess the Basques and the Finns; he allows the Teutons to exterminate the Celts; he allows the Slaves to thrust aside the Teutons; and the Turanians to establish themselves in Eastern Europe. Successive waves of aliens in race and religion Mr. Freeman acknowledges to

be legitimate additions to the European population, until he comes to the word Turk, and then he lets drop philosophy and allows personal politics to usurp its place. Mr. Freeman himself might have seen in the valuable series of maps he gives of South-Eastern Europe, how these Turks spread far and fast, and how, for nearly 500 years they have held sway over European territory; and that this presumptive tenure is sufficient historical proof that in one way or another the "unspeakable Turk" made himself a power in Europe, a constituent element in the life of Europe far more permanent than many others, whose ephemeral existence Mr. Freeman unduly enlarges upon. Mr. Freeman avows his ambition to forward the "great work which is giving back the lands of the Eastern Rome to their own people." But Mr. Freeman throughout proves conclusively, that though we may point out the lands of Eastern Rome, yet the people of Eastern Rome have disappeared centuries ago and for ever. Their lands support altogether different races of men. If the Turks are "alien Turanians" so are the Bulgarians, and so, for the matter of that, are a moiety of the coming Austrians. In alluding to these defects at some length, we do so because the preponderating excellencies of the book will inevitably make their own weight felt. There is, for instance, much of suggestive value in these days in the remarks on Ecclesiastical Geography, and the incidental proof there afforded, of the influence of religion on the history and politics of a people. The book is, in short, a most valuable history of Europe. Its study will enlarge the public view of political growths. But it is rather a geographical history than an historical geography.

An Educational work, yet more comprehensive in its scope, is the English edition of Swinton's "Outlines of the World's History."[3] This work is conceived in the modern spirit of affording pupils what they can assimilate with pleasure in a history which shall be a history of peoples rather than of Courts and of persons. The "prefatory note" tells us, with true American point, that the book is "very attractive and interesting, as well as instructive, reading." This is matter for private judgment; we have found the book merely a concise reproduction of the usual and well-known arguments and details of its subject-matter. Condensed into 500 pages, the history of the world must necessarily be a more or less bewildering mass of allusions. And the chief use of such a history is to allow the student of any one age or movement to recognize at a glance its relation to the whole. The author has what may be properly termed a Chinese pride in his own race. "It is of interest to know that the race to which we belong, the Aryan, has always played the leading part in the great drama of the world's progress." Blinded by this idea the old scholastic "scheme" is retained—we have the Oriental monarchies, Greece, Rome, and Mediæval Europe suavely set out before us. There is scant allusion indeed to the Hindoos; but there is none whatever to a portion of the world far larger and far more populated than Europe.

---

[3] "Outlines of the World's History." By William Swinton. Illustrated. London: Blackie & Son.

China is omitted altogether, and the developments in civilization in Africa and America, which were "discovered" by the Aryan Portuguese and Spaniards to have attained so advanced a stage, are merely mentioned as if they were chance phenomena belonging in history to some other world. The "Norsemen," too, are described as "rude-handed pirates"—who delighted in blood—at a period when in Iceland they were the sole literary nation of Europe and the sole guardians of those principles of representative government of which the United States would be the first to recognize the value. This history is thus conceived in a spirit decidedly behind the times. In recent years there has been a remarkable movement towards according the Norsemen their proper place in history. Scandinavian and English authors have led the van in investigations which have taught the world how much of value to the historian the Norsemen have placed on record. Sir George Dasent, Mr. Freeman, and others have been active in these investigations, and in applying the results to European history.

Normandy itself has now been aroused to a consciousness of its connection with Scandinavia, and the Society of Antiquarians of Normandy publishes a French translation of the first or introductory part of Johannes Steenstrup's history of the Norsemen in the ninth century.[3] There are some valuable suggestions in this introductory portion which are specially valuable because of the clear and distinct manner in which they are enunciated. This work will, it is hoped, arouse emulation in Normandy itself, where there yet remains in customs and relics so much that will substantiate or enlarge our present knowledge of the Norse dispensation.

This newborn investigation of the early history of Western Europe is receiving due attention in Scotland. Mr. Anderson, the curator of the National Museum of the Antiquaries of Scotland, has done well to publish in book form six lectures on the material relics of the Early Christian period in Scotland and Ireland.[4] The public thus come to possess a record, in full technical detail, and copiously illustrated by carefully executed drawings, of what Mr. Anderson would call a type of culture or civilization. The first lecture is, however, of mere general interest, and is a statement well worthy of perusal, as to the scope and intent of archæology; and of the "national" duty of each age to collect, preserve, and transmit all material evidence it can of previous ages. The remaining lectures are of signal interest, and provide an ample store of evidence as to the strange civilization once existing in the North and West of these islands; a civilization far advanced in the artistic, as well as in the utilitarian, treatment of its surroundings, at a period when it is commonly supposed North-Western Europe was steeped in savagery and

---

[3] "Études Préliminaires pour servir à L'Histoire des Normands." Par Johannes Steenstrup. Paris: Honoré Champion.

[4] "Scotland in Early Christian Times." By Joseph Anderson. David Douglas, Edinburgh.

barbarism. Of a truth, the more we learn of the actual records of previous ages, the less we see to boast of in our own self-asserted advance.

Dr. Brewer has written a history of Germany;[5] but, in his attempt to be popular, the author has sacrificed many things essential in an historian. The very first sentence in the preface, "No history can be compared in interest to that of Germany," prejudices the instructed reader against the judicial calmness and even the historical knowledge of the author. The preface is indeed typical of the book. It is a great array of facts and dates, and allusions culled from every country and every age; true literary balance is destroyed by an over ambitious style, whose chief end seems to be the display of the wide-based learning of the author. The book, as a whole, is too much dominated by references and allusions to other nations and to other systems. The "interest" in the history of Germany is chiefly maintained from the histories of other countries. When the time arrives for an account of the slaves in the German feudal system, we find a concise description of the Roman slave. Henry IV. proceeds as a suppliant to Pope Gregory, at Canosa. Dr. Brewer's imagination transforms Canosa into Cannæ, Gregory into Hannibal, and Henry IV. into the Romans. It is impossible to see the reason. In the one case there is a nation overthrown in battle by a foreign invader; in the other a prince of a distant country coming as a humble suppliant to his spiritual father. So strangely gratuitous and empty an analogy is altogether out of place. But this mania for analogies leads Dr. Brewer to perpetual breaches of the literary as well as the historical canon. We find numerous Biblical and common-place allusions and expressions strangely out of place in sober history. Of a German king it is written: "His legs were encased in high military boots, well-soled, but guiltless of Day and Martin's brilliant blacking." The account of the battle of Zorndorf is another signal instance. "From morn to noon they fought; from noon to night—trasing, raising, loyning, staggering, panting, bleeding; now butting like rams, now goring each other like wild boars; now grovelling on the ground, hurtling together." Close upon this there follows an account, equally strange, of the slaughter at Hochkirchen. "Crash went volley after volley, belching out flame and smoke, whish! whir! crash! boom! without intermission. Nothing could be seen, but the rattle was sharp and crisp. . . . The sun rose. . . . like a candle in a horn lantern; . . . . 3,000 rank-and-file strewed that fatal field, like broken glass." Of the boyish ambition of Otho III. to become a second Romulus, it is said: "Happily this hair-brained scheme fell into limbo, or brain lumber, from the death of Otho." We do not expect in a history to meet with such a passage as that in which Dr. Brewer describes the baseless nature of Prussia's quarrel with Austria. This passage includes in one continuous tale the stories of Demosthenes and the ass shadow, the coat tails of Donnybrook Fair, the boots of Bombastes Furioso (which it is explained is a

---

[5] "The History of Germany." By the Rev. Dr. C. Brewer. De la Rue & Co.

plagiarism on Ariosto), and the biting the thumb fight in Romeo and Juliet. It is impossible in reading this book not to be vexed at the frequency of these solecisms. "Screwed his courage to the sticking-place;" "Count Bismarck said in his sleeve;" "a people peeled and exhausted;" "descended on the spindle side"—are samples from a list that is strangely long. We have at some length dwelt upon these failings, because in other respects the book is of considerable merit. It is indeed unsatisfactory to find the old system of division by reigns adhered to, as it places in undue prominence facts of no importance. Valuable space is cumbered with such useless remarks as that, "no event of importance occurred in this reign." But there is an admirable attempt made to put the chief story in big print, and the details in smaller type. It may perhaps be regretted that the difference between the two types used is not more marked. Another excellent idea is the giving a phonetic rendering of many proper names—as, for instance, "Hugues Capet (U. Cap-pay)." The headings to the various reigns are admirable examples of historical analysis. As a whole this history, to make it of sound value, requires very considerable pruning. The reduction in quantity would be very welcome, altogether apart from the ensuing improvement in quality.

We turn from this history of a living nation to Professor Rawlinson's history of the dead Egyptian nation.[6] Here we have the rounded whole of the life and work of a nation whose history has now been unearthed by our recent advances in all that pertains to the interpretation of what, until they be interpreted, are prehistoric records. Professor Rawlinson has now added Eygpt to take rank with Rome and Greece, and the Oriental Monarchies among great nations that have lived, and worked, and died, and also transmitted to us an account of their life and works. It is perhaps needless to remark that in these two volumes Professor Rawlinson gives a complete picture of ancient Egypt, founded on the most recent and most successful investigations. The first volume deals with the "constants" of Egyptian life—the land, the natural products, and the people, with their character, their language, and their achievements in agriculture, and in the arts and sciences. The second volume gives a succinct history of the Egypt of antiquity, and of its remarkable civilization, at once self-contained and powerful. Professor Rawlinson has done his generation a great and good work in providing this succinct summary of the results of all that toil and scientific enterprise that has been devoted to "Egyptology;" and those who study these volumes will derive much knowledge of special application to the present day. The chapter on agriculture, for instance, is of much pertinence to the question of land tenure and agricultural prosperity.

Mrs. Oliphant's "Makers of Florence"[7] has now reached its third edition. This is certain proof that this admirable book has met a

[6] "History of Ancient Egypt." By Professor George Rawlinson. Two Volumes. Longmans, Green & Co.

[7] "The Makers of Florence." By Mrs. Oliphant. London: Macmillan & Co.

public want. It does indeed deal with that province in the history of Florence, in "the life and meaning" of the age when Florence was a State and a nation, which is necessarily left comparatively untouched by the historians and chroniclers, who trace the entangled achievements of warriors and statesmen, and gives us the tale of the political and commercial struggles and ambitions which have placed Florence in the front rank of historical States. Mrs. Oliphant gives us, under the cover of "short swallow flights of biographical essay," a picture of that intellectual side to Florentine history which has, after all, left the most palpable monument, and the most tangible relics, which make Florence what it is to-day to those who go there. The poetry, the paintings, the sculpture, and the architecture, are the abiding monuments of the intellectual energy Mrs. Oliphant here describes; and, in these days, no one visiting Florence can better prepare for a just appreciation of the temper and spirit of the place than by studying Mrs. Oliphant's capital treatise.

"About the Jews" is a book that should achieve deserved popularity.[8] In style and capacity it is intended for the elder among the young; but Mrs. Magnus' work has a value for others who have grown out of the age usually devoted to education. We have here sketched for us the history of a nation whose history is usually omitted in educational schemata—and of a nation that throughout has had very great influence on the history of all other nations. The nation so treated is the nation of the Jews—a nation preserving its distinct nationality for 2000 years—through most of that period without any territorial foothold whatever. The Jewish nation is a power to this day; and the history of this nation tells clearly, what we, in this age, are apt too often to ignore, of the supremacy in politics of religion. The one political bond of the Jewish nation is the religious bond, and it has preserved that nation for 2000 years in irrepressible vitality—no nation has come forth so frequently from the furnace of extermination, radiant again in full vitality. Assyria, Rome, the Saracens, and all the rulers of Christendom, have each, in their turn, exercised a paramount power of extermination. And yet, in Mrs. Magnus' words, throughout these centuries "the little Jewish thread glances hither and thither in the tangled web of events." The secret of this persistent survival, no less than of those recurring attempts at extermination, is the fact that this Jewish thread was a thread of gold. Throughout these centuries the Jews have, as it were, fascinated money—money goes to Jews by some irresistible attraction. Mrs. Magnus notes this fact but does not explain it. She, however, shows well how the Jews preserved, by their religious polity, learning and temperance, both of mind and body, through ages when ignorance and ambition and animal enjoyment ruled in most lands. Again, there may be much [illegible] the fact that the Jews, in their individual as in their national capacity, never become permanent landowners, save for purposes of investment. Most practically they await the new earthly

---

[8] "About the Jews since Bible Times." By Mrs. Magnus. C. Kegan Paul & Co.

Jerusalem, and with the consequence that in most civilized communities they are, as they always have been, among the wealthiest in the land. In dealing with the genesis and growth of Christianity, Mrs. Magnus, of course, gives the unconvinced Jewish view—but this is given moderately and quietly—and is a portion of her work containing much that is valuably suggestive. The authoress is equally suggestive on the subject of slavery and usury; and her appeal in defence of failings in Jewish character or morality, on the score of their being but the forced results of long-drawn persecution and oppression, merits the close attention of every thinking man.

The difficulties incident to the attempt to write history before its time, before the actors in the drama have merged their personality in death, bring us personal controversies on the Crimean war and on the Mutiny, which, though possibly of interest to some future historians, anxious to make conscientious examination of every detail, serve at the present moment but to revive personalities that are mere waste of energy and time so far as the public is concerned. General Shower attempts, in a pamphlet,[9] to remedy the omission in Colonel Malleson's account of the Mutiny of various details redounding to General Shower's credit. In this pamphlet is included Colonel Malleson's reply, to the effect that some of these details do not redound to the General's credit, and that others are omitted because Colonel Malleson was "writing a history of the period and not a biography of individuals."

Somewhat similar is the renewal of the controversy on the "pressed hay" scandal in the Crimean war.[10] It may be of value to future chroniclers to have all these troublesome details put on record—but the public will find little of present value in their perusal. It is, however, possible in Dr. W. H. Russell's pamphlet to derive information of value as to the use of newspaper correspondents on fields of battle. It is certain Dr. Russell himself accomplished great good in drawing much-needed attention to the state of the army in the Crimea—and he successfully refutes the charge that in so doing he incidentally "conveyed information to the enemy." It is hardly necessary to add that Dr. Russell is vigorous on the point of Mr. Kinglake's one-sided view of things—and makes out a very strong case against Mr. Kinglake's strange partiality for Lord Raglan, and consequent blindness to the merits and even to the deeds of all who in any way crossed Lord Raglan's path.

The Crimean Commission has also seen fit to publish evidence "with reference to certain misstatements in Mr. Kinglake's sixth vol."[11] Even in the preface Sir J. McNiell convicts Mr. Kinglake of ignorance of the records and papers with which he deals, and which he even quotes. The other of the two Crimean Commissioners—Colonel Tulloch—then proceeds in an introduction, a detailed criticism of its report, and an

---

9 "Julian History." A Correspondence between Colonel Malleson and General Shower. Reeves & Turner.

10 "The Crimea, 1856." By W. H. Russell, LL.D. W. Ridgway.

11 "The Crimean Commission;" "The Chelsea Board and Mr. Kinglake." By Colonel Sir A. Tulloch. Harrison, Pall Mall.

appendix of facts, to show that the well-known Chelsea Board was altogether unable to disestablish the evidence and contention of the Commissioners, to the effect that the loss "of an army" of 12,000 men in the Crimea; by sickness and exposure, was due to mismanagement in the Crimea; and the Commissioners have the satisfaction of knowing that, practically, their report was accepted by the nation, and the whole system of supply reorganized.

A "Century of Dishonour" is remarkable as one of those unintentional protests that seem just now accumulating to the detriment of the reputation of the Republican form of government.[12] We have been recently witnessing general newspaper allusion to the fact that Republican France has accomplished an act of swift aggression and war that would have been a godsend to the wildest Radical keen to expose the crimes and ambitions of a despotic Napoleon. And in this book we have, by an American, a detailed indictment of the Republican Government of the United States, for oppressing and grievously wronging inhabitants of her own territories. According to the showing of this book, the systematic policy pursued towards the Indians by a great Republic is one that we should have expected from a Nero or a Council of Thirty. The indictment not only rests on the counts of continued breach of faith, and of permitted cruelty and outrage, and of non-recognition of these Indian inhabitants as in any way citizens or "men and brothers," but it proceeds to the charge of waste of the public moneys. We are told no less than £100,000,000 sterling has now been spent by a nation now numbering 50,000,000 in warring with a body of savages in the aggregate never exceeding 300,000. Among other causes of this strange state of affairs is set down the fact that until General Grant assumed the direction of affairs the "Indian Department" was the one great hunting-ground of the carpet-baggers. Throughout the book there are pointed allusions to the far different success of the treatment of the Indians by the English in Canada. The reasons given are the facts that the Indians there are "subjects of the Queen"—they enjoy *rights* which are denied to Indians further South, because the citizenship of the United States is too uniform and inelastic to allow of their admission within its pale. The book abounds in details, and is inspired by the sympathetic sex of its authoress. Even as an extreme statement it will do good by attracting public attention to one great scandal of American administration.

The death of Major Upton occurred while this work on the Arabian horse in its own home was actually in the press.[13] The book will be welcomed by the many men who, understanding horses, are nowadays advocating a fresh supply of Arab blood into England. The book is divided into three parts—of these the first is devoted to an entertaining, but not specially novel, description of journeying in the East. The second is devoted to the Arab and to Arabia. We have an elaborate account of the descent and tribal characteristics of the

[12] "A Century of Dishonour." By H. H. London: Chatto & Windus.
[13] "The Desert of Arabia." By the late Major R. D. Upton. C. Kegan Paul & Co.

Arabians, formed greatly on a Biblical basis. The author's experience in visiting the Badaween in his desert home presents a useful picture of the surroundings of the Arab horse. The third part deals with the Arab horse itself in a thorough and able manner; and to any who have a desire to obtain Arab blood this latter portion of the book will prove of the greatest value.

Lord Clyde wrote, in his will, "It may possibly become the opinion of my trustees that some short memoir should be drawn up. If this should appear to them to be absolutely necessary and indispensable, then it should be limited as much as possible to the modest recital of the services of an old soldier." Now, after a lapse of seventeen years, his trustees have determined to publish this memoir.[14] The work is admirably done, and the result of high value. In one sense the work is strictly "a modest recital of the services of an old soldier." But the soldier died full of well-earned honours, as well as full of years, and the mere recital of these long, meritorious, and appreciated services, told no matter with what modesty, is in itself a fit monument of a great man, and a memoir of the highest value to those that come after. Lord Clyde's epitaph tells us, "By his own deserts, through fifty years of arduous service, he rose to the rank of field-marshal and the peerage;" and the unvarnished tale of such a life is intrinsically of high value.

For young officers especially there are few books could be studied with greater advantage. There is abundant professional information to be gained throughout in regard to all the details of warfare; and the plans of engagements are of special value to the student of tactics. This biography should be, in addition, an encouraging and a bracing study. Lord Clyde had no brilliant powers, no special interest or influence. He underwent many disappointments, and endured long years of weary waiting. The secret of his after success was his steady utilization of every chance and opportunity to perfect himself in his profession. In the words of his biographer, "Possessing solid abilities, and in the enjoyment of a robust constitution, with which he never tampered, he devoted himself from the first hour of his entering into the service to the study of his profession." It was thus that he was enabled when the opportunity came to profit by it. The student here has a most encouraging example of what can be accomplished by unaided and legitimate professional work. Had Colin Campbell not prepared himself on every point no opportunities and chances could afterwards have made him Lord Clyde.

This biography is also full of lessons of wider present importance in regard to the great question of army organization. Colin Campbell earned for himself in India the soubriquet "Old Kubadar," or "Old be very careful." But by being careful—careful of the lives of his men; careful of giving the enemy no advantage; careful always to afford his own men the opportunity of displaying their special superiorities; careful always to deprive the enemy of the chance of utilizing *his* superiorities—he obtained sound and lasting success in all his

[14] "The Life of Colin Campbell, Lord Clyde." By Lieut.-Gen. Shadwell, C.B. Two vols. William Blackwood.

campaigns. Throughout this life we trace ample grounds for the strong opinions held by Lord Clyde as to the indispensable value of old soldiers, specially as a leaven among the young. And these opinions were developed and confirmed from a practical experience of battle fields that has been rarely equalled. The "Kuberder" spirit in leaders, and this steadying influence of the old hands among the rank-and-file, has been conspicuously absent in those cases of reverse to which the British army has been no stranger in late years. This biography may be studied with profit by generals as well as by subalterns.

It has become evident that so prominent a figure in his generation as the late Master of Trinity could not, in passing from our midst, but leave a void that by general desire must, in some degree, be filled by the public—recording not only of Dr. Whewell's works, but of his personality. Mrs. Stair Douglas, in this volume,[15] has performed ably the latter half of the task so marked out by public opinion; and the authoress has done wisely and well in giving, to use her own words, "a portrait of William Whewell . . . drawn by his own hands and to be read,—

> "'In those fall'n leaves which kept their green
> The noble letters of the dead.'"

But Mrs. Douglas has done more than frame in print the self-drawn portrait to be recognized in these full and well arranged selections from Dr. Whewell's correspondence. She has linked them one to another by clear and appropriate details; and the result is an altogether satisfactory and connected portrait of the development of a mind which, from first to last, exhibited great singularity, no less than great power. The earliest letters of Dr. Whewell, impregnated probably by the stilted style of that "age of epistolary correspondence," are tainted considerably by what would, in these more open days, be termed conceit, and even priggishness. He writes, himself not seventeen years of age, to his little brother of eight years—"As you now are in the habit of writing verses a good deal I hope you will excuse a few remarks I would make. Your subject, I perceive, is generally of a religious nature. I do not know whether I dare venture to find fault on that head. . . . You have considerable abilities (I hope this will not make you vain), I would therefore have you employ them. I would have you to strive to get a habit of writing prose easily and well." And this from a boy of sixteen to a child of eight. Much later, he writes to his father: "I have found now a little time to felicitate myself upon my good fortune in getting the English Prize Poem." But even in these earlier letters there are passages and touches clearly indicative of power, and even suggestive of genius. That these should keep company with a curious vanity, and with this stilted style, is to be attributed to the fact that the young Whewell was suddenly pushed up to Trinity from his carpenter's bench in his father's shop. Others recognized his promising intellectual ability, but in himself he had

[15] "The Life of William Whewell, D.D." By Mrs. Stair Douglas. C. Kegan Paul & Co.

none of the early associations that mould the consciousness of ability and the character of those whose education continues in the beaten track of the social position to which they were born. The young Whewell was, from early years, "taken up" as a prodigy by his social superiors .It would have been strange, indeed, had there been in him power or desire to hush up the assertion of conscious ability. He was lifted above his parents and his surroundings, and he did not scruple to allow his higher position to colour his language. But, as the novelty of his position wears off, his letters soon become admirable, and their deep humour of a most entertaining character. We can trace clearly at once the good points and the defects of his personality. His genial, yet forcible, nature stands defined in every letter; there is an abiding belief in self, together with an abiding ambition to know all things—an ambition very considerably realised. These combinations created a character always ready to assert itself as the superior of all around. But what might have been superiority in the aggregate was clearly not superiority in the instances. Whewell knew more about all things, but less about each than other men. In his own sphere each authority was a better man than Whewell; "second wrangler and second Smith's Prizeman," Whewell was second in all he undertook. In each province others were first, but Whewell was second in all. For this reason he stood out among his fellows, and in his generation and his day achieved great prominence; but for this same reason, in other generations and other days, Whewell's influence will have gone, while his contemporaries who were content to be first, each in his own province, will still remain—known and accepted as abiding authorities.

Professor Meiklejohn publishes a valuable and entertaining life of a valuable and entertaining man.[16] Readers of this life have a sure treat in store for them in the humour and learned irony in which is told the tale of the life-work of the inventor of the Madras, or Monitorial system of teaching. Dr. Andrew Bell was a typical Scotchman—with a typical Scotch education—with a typical Scotch career. The shrewdness of the learning he acquired in his native country was utilized in other lands, and left a penniless beginner the possessor at his death of property counted in hundreds of thousands of pounds. Schoolmaster and tutor in America and in India, Dr. Bell gradually developed, by the teachings of experience, an idea of education which has since blossomed into the National Society. We trace the spirit of a master-hand in all his works. Even while Dr. Bell was relegated to the "country living" of Swanage, he vigorously promoted in his parish education on his new scheme. He also introduced vaccination so early as 1774, with signal success and popularity. "His large fiery friendly nature had an infection in it few could resist." In the interesting account here given of the development of the Madras system, few episodes are more characteristic of its founder than the "fraternal" squabbles between this and the rival Lancasteria system. To the very last Dr. Bell devoted his own every energy, and

[16] "Dr. Andrew Bell." By J. M. D. Meiklejohn. W. Blackwood & Sons.

all his wealth, to the promulgation of his grand idea that the best way to learn is to teach; that students should be the instructors one of another; and that all schools—seeing that each pupil has some one talent at the least—must be so regulated that each pupil may find the opportunities proper to his special talent. This biography is the record of a useful and a successful life, and will amply repay perusal.

There is much of present interest in this account of the life and work of the new President, which gives a clear and succinct account of what it is that ought to commend, and in this instance has commended, a man for the post of President of the United States.[17] We must, however, read between the lines, for the book is, as the enthusiastic author tells us, "a eulogy, because the essential facts of President Garfield's life cannot be otherwise truthfully recorded." The very first point that strikes an Englishman is the trouble taken to set forth an honourable pedigree back to a Garfield of 1635, and, beyond him, to a Saxon origin. This truly English custom is markedly reviving in the States; it seems to have been discovered that men are not all equal, but that they are in great measure the product of their ancestors. The future President was a "large-brained, aggressive boy . . . . robust and strong, and phenomenally precocious, both physically and mentally." His thirst for knowledge and reading overcame his desire for the physical enjoyments of a sea life—and from his mother's log-hut he attended schools and universities. The venerable Mark Hopkins was Head of Williams College when the young Garfield first appeared there; and afterwards he wrote, "Garfield was not *sent* to College, he *came*." The future President had health and great talent, and a consequent ability, as well as eager desire, to make the best of both. His local interest so grew, that at the age of twenty-eight he was elected a Senator of his State. He became a leading local character in the political discussions that preceded the great war. When the war broke out he joined the army, and his intellectual ability at once raised him to the highest positions; but in the midst of this rapid rise in the army he left the front to "represent the army" in Congress, and assist in the vital task of organizing the superior resources of the North. In the settling of the country after the war he did good and valuable work, more especially in the province of finance, where his views were consistent and sound, through a period when the wildest ideas gained currency and acceptance. We read "During all his service in the army he carried a volume of Horace in his pocket." This unexpected trait in this age is one that marks the intellectual vigour of a man, who, by his own worth, has risen to direct, for a time, the destinies of his nation, with more than usual promise of good success.

This biography of the President of the United States ends with the remark, "The new Executive illustrates, in his own attainment, and career, the priceless value of the freedom of opportunity which is the heritage of youth and manhood, under 'a government of the people, by the people, for the people.'" If we substitute Lord Beaconsfield

[17] "The Life of J. A. Garfield." By Capt. F. H. Mason. Trübner & Co.

for "new Executive," we shall see that in the old monarchy similar freedom of opportunity yet subsists.[18] There is a point that public opinion in England and in America has not yet grasped in regard to Lord Beaconsfield's career; this point is the illustration that career affords of the opportunities in England for a man starting with peculiar talents, enemies rather than friends, lack of money, and in the very teeth of those interests, social and "landed," which are popularly supposed to control despotically all English life, and winning his way, by dint of the possession of appropriate talent, to the supreme government of the realm. And this freedom of opportunity leads to more in England than it leads to in the United States, for it leads to greater permanence in influence. Beaconsfield, so long as he fairly represented English public opinion, remained in power. Garfield retires necessarily at the end of four years, and his personal influence *must* again retire to a lower level of power. The freedom of opportunity is more developed in England than in the United States; and it is so because in England institutions have more guarantee of stability. In the States the popular institutions live on in dread that the forces that constituted them may, unless jealously checked, constitute others in their place.

It is probable that among the many accounts of Lord Beaconsfield's life and work, this epitomized account, which appeared in the *Times*, furnishes the most unbiassed and correct record. It is the work of a thoroughly able mind, that had not only all the advantages of years of contact with that of Lord Beaconsfield, but belonged also to the opposing party in politics. In years to come—when personalities have calmed down, and the career of Lord Beaconsfield becomes history, by the fact of the death of all contemporaries—the verdict will probably be that of the *Times*—"an example of successful industry and determination that should encourage every one who looks to work and progress as the rule and end of life." His opponents may have considered him often mistaken and ill-advised; they would scarcely have been opponents had they not done so. The *Times* warns them to remember, in regard to Lord Beaconsfield's "rapid conversion," that "a subtle power of self-deception was at work that kept his acts and conscience in honest harmony." This seems a verdict in thorough and charitable accord with facts.

The *Standard* publishes "a record of what occurred from the day on which Lord Beaconsfield became seriously ill to the day on which he was buried;"[19] reprinted from the columns of the *Standard*. This will prove a useful historical record, though the value of such records in these days is a diminishing value, for we of this generation are given to recording so well and so minutely every passing event that the historian of the future will find his task that of a précis writer rather than a task of research and compilation. This book, however, has a very present value. It gives, in the first place, the *Standard's* memoir of Lord Beaconsfield's life. In the next place, it gives a summarized account of

[18] "A Memoir of Lord Beaconsfield." From the *Times*. Longmans, Green & Co.

[19] "Memorials of Lord Beaconsfield." From the *Standard*. Macmillan & Co.

the last illness. The third chapter is devoted to a valuable collection of the estimates, of the foreign press and of leading Englishmen, of the loss the nation had sustained. A detailed account of the funeral occupies chapter four. The fifth chapter contains the will, and the sixth and last chapter sundry personal details. In an appendix, which would have figured better as a chapter, is given all that was said and done in Parliament in connection with the demise of the late leader of the House of Commons.

Sir E. B. Hamley re-publishes, in book form, an essay which first appeared many years ago in *Blackwood.*[20] It is an essay which should not be passed over by those who are desirous of forming their own judgment on Carlyle. This essay purports to deal with the "main idea that lies at the root of all Carlyle's works." This main idea is that of the Vestures that clothe the Divine idea of the World, the appearances which shroud reality, and which are, as a matter of fact, the only externals man actually takes cognizance of. The author points out how Carlyle saw that the latest vesture, the latest "suit of clothes with which the world was invested," was worn out; that the society system of the present shows ample signs that the time has come for it to be consigned to the "museums" in which are to be found the world's former vestures—paganism, monkery, and chivalry. The main body of this essay is a suggestive critique of "The History of Frederick." The author analyzes Carlyle's motives and style with marked ability, and has given us a most important contribution towards a true comprehension of Carlyle's place both as a philosopher and as an historian.

It might seem remarkable that the public should continue to pay for new lives of men whose lives have been published more than once. It is presumable, however, that Mr. Morley's venture in "English Men of Letters"[21] meets with adequate public support, for it continues its progress in the issue of capital monographs on our leading literary men. It is necessary, however, to take exception to this life of Dryden. There is a falling off in literary merit evident even in the opening pages. Among others we may instance the sentence, "If we leave out of sight a few visits to his father-in-law's seat at Charlton, and elsewhere, London and twenty miles of the Nene valley, exhaust the list of his residences." This careless construction implies that his father-in-law's seat might have been much elsewhere, and that London and twenty miles of the Nene valley make up an intelligible list of residences. Such literary blemishes are by no means rare, or we should refrain from drawing attention to them. Almost in the next sentence we have, "not grand, or epic, or tragical." Epic may be superior to epical, but, if so, the true literary canon requires tragic and not tragical. Again, there is little elegance in the phrase, "his only trait in the sporting way." There is little literary finish in such a sentence as, "giving good views of the magnificent woods of Lilford, which, however, are new comers, comparatively speaking." The

[20] "Thomas Carlyle." By General Sir E. B. Hamley. William Blackwood.
[21] "English Men of Letters.—Dryden." By G. Saintsbury. Macmillan & Co.

Dunsinane legend is not commonplace natural history. Similar literary carelessness appears in the sentence immediately following: "the residence, in the late days of the seventeenth century, of Dryden's favourite cousins, and frequently his own." Which are the late days of a century? Grammar compels us to ask why Dryden's favourite cousins should be called only "frequently his own." These blemishes are all taken from pages 3 and 4; we mention them in evidence of our surprise that in so essentially literary an undertaking there should be the very least ground for the suspicion even of literary blemish. We can only allude in brief to such solecisms as "the motto *as to* Spartam natus es," "badnesses," "extricative," "the big-bow-wow manner," "pot-boiling adaption," and a long passage about sauce for the goose and the gander, applied to the religious writings of Dryden and Cardinal Newman.

This life is, however, a most conscientious undertaking; and we may pardon on this score the fact that it errs on the side of excess. It is far too "full." The very mass of its details and allusions rather confuse than enlighten a reader, who, in such a series, looks for brevity, clearness, and a judicial summing up, rather than for the mass of evidence and the lengthy arguments of special pleading. The work is decidedly partial, and, as such, in a measure, self-contradictory. The author endeavours to rehabilitate Dryden's private character; his chief "point" in this defence is that our personal knowledge of Dryden is confined entirely to a handful of anecdotes, and is altogether "vague and shadowy." The author is indignant that Mr. J. R. Green should follow previous authorities to the conclusion that Dryden was a libertine, and his wife "yet more dissolute than himself." But the author tells us we cannot know, or rather that all we can know was, that Dryden was the exact reflex of his age, and that his age was an age of "shameless coarseness in language and mannners—of unparalleled self-seeking and dishonesty," and so forth. Mr. Saintsbury succeeds somewhat better in his attempt to rehabilitate Dryden's political character. He brings forward many plausible facts and arguments to extenuate Dryden's changing from Parliamentarian to Royalist, and from Churchman to Roman Catholic. But, even so, the chief argument is that what inspired Dryden was, as we should put it in these days, the journalist spirit, and that "a sense that he was about to be on the winning side," led him to change his religion. Mr. Saintsbury has, however, consulted neither good taste nor expediency in going out of his way to attack Lord Macaulay. Mr. Saintsbury allows that, on good proof of actual facts, Lord Macaulay "challenges the sincerity of Dryden," for actually, as matter of history, changing his religious and his political creeds. And Mr. Saintsbury's only attempt at defence of Dryden has nothing whatever to do with Dryden, but is an altogether gratuitous and petty hypothesis, altogether groundless and unwarranted by any facts or results. The author fails to see that to abuse Macaulay is not to defend Dryden—all the author can say is—"If there had been an equal opening when Lord Macaulay was a young man for

distinction and profit as a Tory . . . . is it quite so certain that he would have been a glory of the Whigs?" We are sorry thus to have to point out the shortcomings of a book in this capital series; but these faults of partiality and literary roughness may be easily remedied in future editions, to the great relief of the over-fulness of the book.

The author of this life of Edgar Quinet endeavours to record the history of the development of the character and thoughts of a remarkable man.[22] We cannot follow the author so far as to assert that "Edgar Quinet was one of the greatest, purest, most far-seeing minds of the age." But this history of a great mind is none the less useful that the great mind had its defects. Quinet was the third in a triplet of "philosophical historians." It is remarkable of the triplet that the eldest, Vico, died the year the second Herder, was born; and that in the year in which Herder died was born the last of the three, Edgar Quinet. But there was more than the mere mantle of philosophical history fell on Quinet; he developed as well the poetical or imaginative bias of his predecessors, and he developed in far greater intensity a purely personal or subjective view of all he dealt with. In the preface to this life it is justly remarked: "it is the peculiarity of Edgar Quinet's philosophy that he found the whole history of humanity in his own soul." Quinet is essentially sentimental and subjective; he is, therefore, the more interesting to many minds. And to those who have a similar religious bias his writings are enthralling. But Victor Cousin, at one of his first interviews, told him true: "You are made to shine in imagination." From his own subjective point of view Quinet thinks and writes. But Quinet was eminently a Christian; free, indeed, of allegiance to any particular church or creed—a very cosmopolitan of Christendom; but he saw Christianity in every movement of history. The Christian era becomes to him what Rome has been to other historians—the centre into which all previous history concentrates, and the centre from which all subsequent history radiates.

This life brings out well this side of Quinet's character; and it is a bias which adds much of genial interest for those who ponder on or expound the problems of Christianity. His biographer is inspired by the same principles, and there is little wonder that he fails to see that the universal philosophy of history and this "personal" and individual account of it developed in Edgar Quinet, are by no means identical.

This translation is put before the world, not as a life of a political character, but as a sample of Heinrich Heine's method, humour and style.[23] The result is altogether happy, and this slight biography abounds with suggestive and eminently clever passages. Heine's peculiar and sardonic humour is well exemplified. One of the best among these passages is his lament for comfortable rest: "I am weary, and long for repose. . . . . In Germany it is impossible. Every

---

[22] "Edgar Quinet." By Richard Heath. Trübner & Co.

[23] "Ludwig Börne." By H. Heine. Translated by T. S. Egan. London: Newman & Co.

moment a policeman would be coming and shaking me *to see if I was really asleep*. . . . . Say to the north-east: Eh, the ice-bears are now more dangerous than ever since they have become civilized and wear white-kid gloves. Or shall I once more to that devilish England? . . . . To live there they ought to give one money into the bargain, and, instead of that, to stay in England costs double as much as in any other place. Never again to that vile land where the machines act like men and the men like machines. . . . . Or shall I to America, that stupendous prison-house of liberty . . . . where the most revolting of all tyrants, the mob, exercises its rough dominion. . . . . There all men are equal—equal ruffians." Those who find time to study this small book will see cause to thank Mr. Egan for having afforded them so easy an insight into so entertaining and so interesting an author.

Mr. Underhill does well to give the world this life of a typical Baptist missionary,[24] "full of joy at the self-imposed duty of crossing the wide sea to impart to the infatuated slaves of sin and Satan the glorious Gospel of the blessed God." But it is more than this, in that it gives an account of the way in which Jamaica, which was the field of these missionary labours, passed through from slavery to freedom. This account is, of course, from the missionary's point of view; but it commences in the slave days, and gives a curious picture of the policy of panic that was necessarily adopted by the white inhabitants at the time of emancipation. The progress of Jamaica after the abolition of slavery is, of course, evident, but the whole missionary treatment is one of hope and not of achievement. The negroes came only too willingly to "worship" and to school; but there is a lamentable absence of moral, or even intellectual results. We read perpetually of the rapid march of conversion, but the new faith does not seem to create new men, or new minds, or new morals. A vigorous State education has now followed; and the return of material prosperity to Jamaica in recent years promises, with the aid of this education, to transform the young generations, and to sever altogether the bonds of remembrance and tradition that yet bind the older generations, both white and black, to the many evil influences of a state of things that has, in its dread reality, long passed away.

Among autobiographies, we have here a book well worth reading, for those who would study the mind and temperament that is the outcome of our present civilization in a certain class of life.[25] Mark Rutherford, the son of "an ordinary well-to-do shopkeeper," in a small country town, becomes a dissenting minister; meets what men call a Freethinker, and becomes bound up with this new acquaintance for the rest of his life, in a struggle of argument and conviction in the province of the principles of religion. There is much honest self-questioning,

---

[24] "The Life of the Rev. J. M. Phillipps. By E. B. Underhill. London: Yates & Alexander.

[25] "The Autobiography of Mark Rutherford." By Reuben Shapcott. Trübner & Co.

and much able discussion of the numerous questions in this province, that puzzle so many of the present generation.

Another autobiography of a different stamp is this of Dr. Gheist.[26] It is one of the few books published with its pages ready cut, and in so far has a claim to favourable notice. But it is an autobiography in which imagination struggles with experience for supremacy. It is professedly a record of the life and opinions of an aged country doctor, and it maintains this character throughout. Its literary polish falls far short of its literary ambition; the ideas enunciated are of very mediocre scientific value. The book abounds with moralizings and platitudes of a somewhat tame order. There are many disquisitions on modern innovations, on spiritualism, on lady doctors, and on the education of children. But there is throughout much striving after epigrammatic effect which leads the author into absurd extremes. We are told, for instance, in a disquisition on "the subtle psychical union between the horse and his rider"—"how easy it is to make a horse stop by simply willing him to do so!" Again, in a passage delineating his various types of patients—rhetorical necessities lead our author to describe his "hind patients" as "low and brutal in nature—the lowest in the scale of humanity." These are strong terms to apply to English labourers. The book, however, presents us with a very true picture of a certain type of man—who, figuring in the lower walks of a profession, is ambitious, by a somewhat burlesque exhibition of what he deems to be science and learning, of proving himself above his position. The book may prove interesting to his inferiors in mental calibre and in information.

Mr. Stirling has done well in giving the world a record of his fifty years of exceptional experience in theatrical matters.[27] The book is a model of abbreviation; and what there is lacking in literary pretension is amply made up for by the welcome absence of all padding and unnecessary verbiage. These chatty recollections brim over with interesting details of fact. We read with some regret of the period when amateurs had to pay the varying market price for the privilege of playing any special character; our author himself, in his first appearance, "paid seventeen good shillings for the privilege of enacting an innocent ostler wrongfully accused of murder." This work is not one to be read at a sitting; in such case there would be much monotony and sameness in the close-packed succession of similar anecdotes. Thus, half the first volume gives the successive experiences of lessees of Drury Lane Theatre. And in every case there is the monotonous finale of heavy loss. There are curious instances of the petty sums paid originally for good plays. Douglas Jerrold received only £50 for "Black Eyed Susan," though that play put thousands into the pockets of those who first presented it to the public. Much is told of the fickle but all important taste of audiences. The introduction of a pasteboard horse into one play saved the venture from ruin; and the man-monkey, Gouffé, "paid" better than all legitimate playing. The brief biographies of Drury Lane actors and actresses,

[26] "Autobiography of Dr. Gheist." Edinburgh: E. & S. Livingstone.
[27] "Old Drury Lane." By Edward Stirling. Chatto & Windus.

from 1619 to 1880, which occupy the first half of the second volume, are full of entertainment, and disappointing only because of their brevity. The latter half of this second volume is a collection well termed "theatrical varieties," containing many anecdotes and historical items of much value or humour.

---

## BELLES LETTRES.

IN "Sunrise" Mr. Black has attempted a task which would seem, at the first blush, to be somewhat at variance with his powers as a novelist.[1] The reading world has grown so much to associate him with delicate descriptions of Highland scenery, with variegated and many-coloured passages of pictorial art, devoted to Scotch lochs and moors and heather-covered hills, which serve as a background to pleasant love affairs, that the idea of a work by him devoted to Nihilism, to secret societies, and the like, is not a little startling. He has, however, managed his materials admirably. How far Mr. Black is in the counsels of the secret societies that agitate Europe it is impossible for us to guess; but it must be admitted that his Nihilists, his Camorrists, and the rest of his conspirators, are like real human beings, not the mere wooden conspirators and stuffed plotters that too often figure in the three volume novel. Whether it is really likely that a young Englishman like Mr. Black's hero could get mixed up in such a secret society as that described in "Sunrise," and could bend his mind to the committal of an act of assassination, it is not necessary to attempt to estimate. It is sufficient for our purpose to know that Mr. Black has chosen to make his hero act like this, and in doing so he has made his action appear possible and real. If there is anything of disappointment about Mr. Black's book, it will be a pleasant disappointment to find that the author has handled what might seem uncongenial topics with remarkable skill and success.

It is natural to consider a novel of Mr. Anthony Trollope's after one of Mr. Black's, for the two authors are rivals in popularity. Mr. Anthony Trollope would almost seem to write his novels as Goldoni did his comedies.[2] The great master of the Italian realistic comedy would begin one of his plays without any knowledge of how it was to continue, building up the plot as he went on writing out brilliant scenes and dialogues. So, Mr. Trollope would seem to start off more or less on chance, without any distinct determination beforehand as to the fate of his several characters. Whether this be or be not the method of Mr. Trollope's workmanship, his novels have at least somewhat this appearance, and the very fact gives to them that curious air of reality which they so distinctly possess. Mr. Trollope is like Balzac, at least in the way in which he lends to his characters a real human interest,

---

[1] "Sunrise." By William Black. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1881.

[2] "Doctor Wortle's School." By Anthony Trollope. London: Chapman & Hall. 1881.

and gives them the appearance of being actual men and women, and not mere literary puppets. And though he lacks, of course, all the profundity of thought and breadth of imagination which make the great French novelist famous, he has in some measure the same quality of painting from life, which entitles him to be considered as an accomplished exponent of English social life and character. In his new book, "Doctor Wortle's School," Mr. Trollope has presented us with a group of figures which, in any less accomplished hands, would be almost sure to fail to attract and interest. There is nothing about the worthy doctor and his wife, nor his daughter and her wooer, Lord Carstairs, nor in his assistant, Mr. Peacocke, and the woman who is and is not his wife, to greatly attract the ordinary novel reader. But Mr. Trollope endows them with a true vitality, with a distinct reality, which compels us to follow their fortunes with interest, and to take some concern in their actions and their speech, as we should if we had lived with them and sympathized with their troubles. It is told of Mr. Trollope that he considers his own method of art to be purely mechanical, and that he has declared that he could teach easily any one to write as good books as his own in a short space of time. If this is so, we sincerely hope that Mr. Trollope will instruct some able pupil in the secret of the method which in his hands has produced such good work. If Mr. Trollope's novels are not of the highest order of art, they are singularly valuable and faithful pictures of some portions of the age they delineate.

If Mr. Black's novel was agreeably disappointing, Mr. Payn's novel, "From Exile,"[3] on the other hand, is disagreeably disappointing, because we have been led to expect from this novelist really good work, and "From Exile" is a most unworkmanlike performance. Mr. Payn has taken the story of the Tichborne claimant as the basis of his romance, but, strangely enough, he has not succeeded in making it half as romantic, nor one quarter as interesting, as that celebrated case itself was. The whole basis of the novel is so unlikely, and the treatment, except in rare instances, so incomplete, that it is quite surprising to think that it is by an author so habitually brilliant as Mr. Payn. Mr. Payn has written a great many books, but he has hitherto been almost invariably good. His facility was very different from the kind of quick producing power which characterized the voluminous inanities of Mr. Edmund Yates, or the sensationalisms of Miss Braddon. We look for better work from Mr. Payn next time to compensate for the disappointment this volume has given us.

But if "From Exile" is a specimen of imperfect workmanship, there is some decidedly good work in Mr. Hickman's "From Poverty to Wealth."[4] His readers will follow the career of Paul Lorraine with his theories about bricks, his fortunes and his misfortunes, with great interest, and rejoice in his final happiness. The character of "The Sluggard" is an exceedingly good study; and even the "tall, gaunt,

[3] "From Exile." By James Payn. London: Chatto & Windus. 1881.
[4] "From Poverty to Wealth." By W. T. Hickman. London: Chapman & Hall. 1881.

curate, with his ill-made village coat," who has figured in so many a novel, is made to assume a certain freshness in Mr. Hickman's pages.

Miss Thackeray's new work is, in spite of its strangely unpleasing title, a very interesting volume of stories.[5] The peculiar grace which belongs to all Miss Thackeray's writings is never better displayed than in such short stories as compose the volume which bears the somewhat unmeaning name of "Miss Williamson's Divagations." The stories themselves are slight enough—mere threads of fiction on which to string the pretty pearls of Miss Thackeray's sweet ideas and tender thoughts and graceful turns of phrase, but they answer their purpose well enough. There is a story of love playing at cross purposes which ends happily enough in a box at a theatre where "Romeo and Juliet" is being performed, affording a pretty contrast between the fortunate love on the one side of the footlights, and the unhappy passion presented on the other. Then there is a ghost story which, as far as its supernatural element is concerned, must be pronounced but poor enough, and there is of course a story about an old French town, and a tale in which Miss Williamson herself figures as heroine. No one of the stories leaves much to be carried away by the memory, nothing, that is to say, beyond a pleasant recollection of agreeable ideas and delicate language. It is a book that no one who has read will regret having read, or will lose much in not having read. It is perhaps rather a mistake for Miss Thackeray to have tried her hand at an Æsthetic poet. Too much notice has been taken of late in letters of this curious and decidedly tiresome production of the last few years. The Æsthetic poet is a wearisome repetition, under a new form, of the Spasmodist of a little time ago, and he has been written about quite enough. It is time that he should now be quietly forgotten.

After Miss Thackeray's book, some other representatives of feminine fiction must come at a considerable distance. Mrs. Leith Adams tells a pleasant story of Canadian life, woven out of some trite materials, and peopled by somewhat commonplace characters.[6] The chief defect of her style is an inordinate indulgence in quotation marks, almost every page being defiantly studdied with some too familiar extracts from poetic literature. Miss Kortwright has written a decidedly marked story of the highly sensational school.[7] Those who like more or less thrilling narrative will find no little excitement in the pages of "On Latmos." "Mrs. Geoffrey," is a pleasant novel by a pleasant writer.[8] "The Brides of Ardmoor"[9] is an unsuccessful attempt to write an Irish historical novel.

[5] "Miss Williamson's Divagations." By Mrs. Thackeray Ritchie. London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1881.

[6] "Aunt Hepsey's Foundling." By Mrs. Leith Adams. London: Chapman & Hall. 1881.

[7] "On Latmos." By Fanny Aiken Kortwright. London: Remington. 1881.

[8] "Mrs. Geoffrey." By the author of "Phyllis." Smith, Elder & Co. 1881.

[9] "The Brides of Ardmoor." By Agnes Smith. London: Elliot Stock. 1881.

Sir Thomas Lauder's collection of Highland stories[10] will commend themselves to those persons who, by association or descent, have a love for the Highland tongue, or whose study of the immortal romances of Scott have made them as attached to Highland tales as if they themselves were Græmes or Campbells. The peculiarities of Scotch humour are well represented in the volume, while the more romantic features of Highland story are stirringly expressed in the grim and painful legend of the "Clan Allan Stewarts."

The second part of Jules Verne's "Steam Horse"[11] will be welcomed by that ever increasing circle who hang with delight upon the brilliant Frenchman's fairy tales of science. The wondrous art which M. Jules Verne possesses of making the practically impossible seem scientifically possible is here employed as well as ever in the wonderful story of the elephant-shaped locomotive, and the adventures of its occupants are as thrilling as any of those which happened to the voyagers round the world or to the centre of the earth. Every fresh novel of M. Jules Verne's only serves to increase the sense of satisfaction that so gifted an author abandoned the pursuit of practical science for the purpose of weaving such delightful stories.

After fiction, the turn of poetry comes appropriately, but unfortunately there is very little in the works in verse before us that can take a respectable place even in current literature.

Mr. Beatty's volume of verse[12] is strongly imbued with the Swinburnian school; "La Belle Aristocrate," for example, being a mere imitation, suited to respectable persons, of "Les Noyades" of the master. Mr. Beatty has also, of course, got poems to Victor Hugo, and Mazzini, and to Garibaldi. All the poetasters who follow Mr. Swinburne do this. There is, however, a poem to Arthur O'Shaugnessy, which will be read with some interest, now that this young singer has been placed in a too early grave, and a song to Charles Lamb, which has poetic merit, and an appreciation wholly denied to Mr. Carlyle.

"Songs and Sonnets of Spring-time"[13] is a respectable little volume, which has nothing to do with the Swinburnian school, but is chiefly inspired in a gentle way by the German poets.

Mr. St. John Brenon is chiefly conspicuous as the author of some stupid and vulgar papers in a fifth-rate society paper, now happily extinct, on "The Morals of Merrion Square." Having gained himself an unpleasant notoriety by these objectionable articles, he now makes an effort after distinction in verse, which he has hitherto failed to obtain, by the publication of what we believe he intends to be a satire, entitled "The Tribune Reflects.[14] The Tribune carries on his

---

[10] "Tales of the Highlands." By Sir Thomas Dick Lauder. London: Hamilton, Adams & Co. 1881.

[11] "Tigers and Traitors." By Jules Verne. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1881.

[12] "Three Women of the People, and other Poems." By Pakenham Beatty.

[13] "Songs and Sonnets of Spring-time." By Constance C. W. Naden. London: Kegan Paul & Co. 1881.

[14] "The Tribune Reflects." By Edward St. John Brenon. London: Reeves & Turner. 1881.

reflections in some forty-eight pages of exceedingly clumsy blank verse, to the end of which few persons are likely to follow him.

"The Lays of Romance and Chivalry"[15] of Mr. Ross would have been more appropriate in the pages of one of the "Books of Beauty" of the early part of this century than they are at the present hour. Their intention is admirable, which is more than can be said of their execution.

Two volumes of poems, which aim at being class productions, are "Fo'c's'le Yarns"[16] of an anonymous author, and a little collection of verses by Mr. Alsager Hay Hill.[17] "Fo'c's'le Yarns" is a collection of poems of seafaring life, written in the strange, rough dialect of seafaring men, but full of genuine power and genuine poetic feeling. They recall some of Mr. Robert Buchanan's poems of low London life, and occasionally memories of the "Pike County Ballads" will flicker into the minds of many readers of the "Fo'c's'le Yarns." Mr. Hill's poems, which are much shorter, are the expressions of the principles of temperance, and opposition to poor laws, and their intention is exceedingly good.

In all this mass of versification it is pleasant to come across a work which is better than most, if not all of it.[18] It is a pity that some persons, who are possessed by the impression that they can write verse, do not turn what talent they have to translation, for a respectable translation is always worth something, while gods, and men, and columns alike have a loathing for mediocre poetry. Mr. Morshead's translation of the great Æschylean trilogy, which deals with the doom of the house of Atreus, is very much more than respectable. In some parts the rendering is singularly powerful, and all through the work is careful and poetic. In the vast number of translations of the "Agamemnon" that exist, Mr. Morshead's will take a good place, though we do not like it so well as Mr. Plumtre's version of it. It is more literal than the strangely poetic "Perversion," by Mr. Fitzgerald, the famous translator of "Omar Khayyam," and more poetical than the fantastically literal version of Mr. Browning.

In Mr. Alfred J. Butler, however, we find a versifier who translates, but not very successfully.[19] He has added one more name to the list of those who, greatly daring, have attempted to render into English verse the exquisite flowers of the Greek anthology. It is small wonder that the rare and delicate beauty of this precious collection of epigrams should stir the pulses of poetically-minded scholars with an intense desire to turn their loveliness into English verse. Many persons have tried their hands at the Greek anthology. Mr. Macgregor's translation of the greater part of it, Lord Neaves's attempts,

---

[15] "Lays of Romance and Chivalry." By W. Stewart Ross. London: W. Stewart & Co. 1881.

[16] "Fo'c's'le Yarns." Macmillan. 1881.

[17] "A Household Queen." By A. H. Hill. "Labour News" Offices. 1881.

[18] "The House of Atreus." Translated by E. D. A. Morshead. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1881.

[19] "Amaranth and Asphodel." By Alfred J. Butler. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1881.

the admirable renderings in Mr. Richard Garnett's dainty little volume of "Idylls and Epigrams," the wonderful versions given by the author of "Ionica," all occur to the mind. Mr. Butler will certainly not rank with the best of these—Mr. Garnett and the author of "Ionica;" nor can he fairly take a worthy place with the others. He has a command of verse, and a good memory for other men's expressions, which he weaves in gracefully enough around his Hellenic models. The affectation of the hour evidenced in his first title, "Amaranth and Asphodel," is more easily forgivable than the inaccuracy of the second, which gives "Songs from the Greek Anthology," when the volume includes English versions of Sappho's greatest poems, the "hymn to Aphrodita," and the "φαινεται μοί κῆνος ἴσος θέοισιν," neither of which, we need scarcely say, are included in the collection known to scholars as the Greek Anthology. There is no harm whatever in Mr. Butler's doing "his level best" with those matchless love poems, and he has not, indeed, rendered them exceptionably badly; but he ought not to appear to include them among the poems of the Greek anthology, which contain only a very few fragments of the sweet-voiced singer of Lesbos. Perhaps most admirers of Sappho would, however, have preferred if Mr. Butler had kept himself to the Greek Anthology, and had refrained from the greater strain on his poetical capacity that was involved in the attempt to translate the almost untranslatable. As an example of the author's skill we may quote a few lines of the first poem:—

> Tears for a gift I bring thee in the dust,
> The remnant of desire come unto doom,
> And sorrow's tears in sorrow on thy tomb
> Pour for remembrance of thy love and trust.
> With bitter, bitter wailing, as I must,
> I give thee barren greeting in the gloom.
> Ah me! my lovely flower that brake in bloom
> Is stolen by death, and in the mould is thrust.
> O earth, great mother, at my tears behest,
> Close in thy clasp and fold her gently to thy breast!

That this is rather a travesty than a translation is obvious at once to any one familiar with the original epigram by Meleager. The extraordinary inaccuracy of Mr. Butler's method of thought is also evident in his speaking of the "pretty sonnet of Meleager," at the beginning of the division which he calls "Songs of Nature." Not only, we need scarcely say, was the sonnet form unknown to writers of the Greek anthology, but Mr. Butler's translation is not a sonnet, nor anything at all like it. A curious example of the conceit of authorship is afforded by Mr. Butler in his preface, when he expresses the hope that those who can read Greek will turn to the perusal of the originals after reading his translations (a rash wish, surely?), and modestly suggests the merit of his version by the following parallel: "If the coins are out of reach to some, interest may attach even to electrotypes." Now, as a matter of fact, electrotypes are perfect reproductions of coins. The specimens of Greek coinage on exhibition in the King's Library of the British Museum are not the original coins, but electrotype reproductions; so perfect are they, however, that only an expert

could possibly tell that they were not genuine Greek coins. Even Mr. Butler cannot be so absurdly in love with his own renderings as to claim for them that they are as like their Greek originals as the British Museum reproductions are like the actual money of Syracuse or Heliopolis, of Camarina or of Ætolia.

It is a great relief to turn from the verse of Mr. Butler to the prose of Mr. Thomson.[20] Mr. Thomson is already well-known to most readers as the author of a strange and brilliant volume of poems, "The City of Dreadful Night," in which the melancholy pessimism of Leopardi is expressed with the exquisite music of the "Castle of Indolence," and in which, at the same time, with a strange contradiction inherent in poetic natures, the author has celebrated the country enjoyments of the lower classes as they have seldom been done before. Indeed, there are those among Mr. Thomson's readers who think he did higher things in his wonderful "Sunday at Hampstead," and "Sunday on the River," than in all the defiant pessimism and despairing melancholy of "The City of Dreadful Night." That Mr. Thomson is not so attractive in prose as in verse is hardly to be wondered at, for if a man can write really good verse he is naturally more interesting than the man who can write really good prose, because the one accomplishment is rarer than the other, especially in this generation of little poets. As most of Mr. Thomson's poems were collections of earlier years, so most of these essays are collected from the various papers to which they were contributed any time between 1864 and 1875. There is something about these essays which suggests a contrast between another volume but recently written, the "Virginibus Puerisque" of Mr. Stevenson. Both writers are enabled to look at life from the outsider's point of view. Both have a keen sense of the dramatic interest of the existence that whirls about them. Both regard it with a certain lazy interest from the pit of the great theatre. There is eternal melancholy in Mr. Thomson's writings; there is a cheerier note in Mr. Stevenson's, but there is a resemblance, and a strong resemblance, all the same. Both, to begin with, owe something of the charm of their style to a close acquaintance with the writings of Mr. Carlyle. Both are profoundly impressed by the vast amount of sham and hideous unreality which takes possession of life, and at which both strike out with cynical determination. But Mr. Thomson is deeply informed by the spirit of revolt which consumed the spirit sung of by Baudelaire; he is stirred by the anger of an indignant republicanism, and full of a fiery scorn at the meanness and the cruelties of men's masters. Mr. Stevenson smiles with a kindly pity, with a scholarly good-humoured contempt at the idiocy and the indecency of others. We see him, like his own prophet of indolence, lazily lounging beneath the shadow of some stately tree, reflecting, over his pipe, on the vanity of human wishes, after the fashion of Thackeray. When Mr. Thomson writes, and writes delightfully, on indolence; when Mr. Stevenson utters his apology for idleness, both are preaching on the same theme to the same purpose. It is only the metres and the music of both that are really different.

---

[20] "Essays and Phantasies." By James Thomson. London: Reeves & Turner. 1881.

Another strong point in common is the attitude both take up with regard to life. In his exquisite essay, "Aes triplex," Mr. Stevenson dwells upon the importance of living life thoroughly, of existing to the end with a complete earnestness in the fact of existing. He paints as his ideal the man "Who has his heart on his sleeve, and a good whirling weathercock of a brain; who reckons his life as a thing to be dashingly used and cheerfully hazarded;" "who keeps all his pulses going true and fast, and gathers impetus as he runs, until, if he be running towards anything better than wildfire, he may shoot up and become a constellation in the end." To Mr. Thomson's mind, the truly happy are fully employed in living. "'Were a god asked to recite his life, he would do so in two words' is a grand truth in 'Le Centaure' of Maurice de Guerin. For health is simple, always one and the same, while the forms and variations of disease are innumerable and complex."

The solar myth may be considered as the favourite phantasy of the day. Sir George Cox discovers it in everything connected with the old Greek world.[21] For him the marvellous story of Œdipus the King, and that still more magnificent tragedy of Œdipus at Colonus, with its glorious choruses, and its matchless figure of the Athenian Theseus, is chiefly attractive because it is an interesting example of the procession of the sun from east to west. The awful punishment meted out for himself by the guilty guiltless king, expresses itself to Sir George Cox as signifying that "the sun has blinded and shrouded himself in vapour; clouds and darkness have closed in about him, and his gleaming orb is lost to sight." It is, perhaps, somewhat melancholy to think of scholars reducing the splendid creations of Attic genius to meaningless weather records of this kind, and finding alike in the wars of Troy, in the Tales of Arthur's Court, in the Gests of Charlemagne and the Twelve Peers, in the Chronicles of the Cid, yea, in all things whatever, this perpetual elaborate representation of the simple process of the sun's movements. Why they stop short at all it is difficult to conceive. Anything may be reduced to a solar myth. Professor Max Müller's life has been clearly shown by an ingenious scholar to be a solar myth of the most decided kind, and a little ingenuity could apply the process to anything. Take Don Quixote for example. The setting out of Don Quixote upon his journey is a perfect example of the rising of the sun; the presence of Sancho Panza is only one more example of that process of reduplication of the central figure so familiar to all who have made the least study of comparative mythology. His various adventures on the road, his encounter with the windmills, with *Gines de Pasemont*, are familiar examples of the clouds which at times come across the face of the great celestial luminary; and in the final death of the Don himself we have an exquisite example of sunset as expressed through the medium of a poetic mind. But, jesting apart, the great mistake made by the solar mythites, even if their theory be true, is in treating it as if it were true to the great epic poets, and to the Athenian

[21] "Introduction to Mythology and Folk Lore." By the Rev. Sir George W. Cox. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1881.

dramatists. This point Mr. Symonds has decidedly and successfully answered in the second volume of his "Greek Poets," in which he points out with perfect truth that, even if the first ideas of the great Greek myths had dawned in the minds of a semi-barbarous people, from the simple study of the movements of the heavenly bodies, yet, to the great authors of the ancient Hellenic world, any such idea of presenting the solar allegory in their creations was as far from their minds as it was from the mind of Mr. Tennyson, when he wrote "The Idylls of the King," and from the mind of Mr. Browning, when he turned to begin "The Ring and the Book." But if the masters among the solarists are trying, the scholars and students are more trying still, and Miss Laura Poor[22] does not manage to make her solar myth observations as interesting or as valuable as those of Sir George Cox.

It would be impossible in the space at our disposal to do anything like justice to the scholarly value and literary grace of Professor Sellars' work.[23] His studies of the Roman poets are already familiar to most students of the Roman world, and the book may almost be said to have taken a place amongst the scholastic classics. The new edition is in some respects different from the old. There are two new chapters on Roman comedy, which will be read with the greatest interest by those who are acquainted with the matchless humour of Plautus, or that more delicate wit which won for Terence from the lips of Cæsar himself the name of a semi-Menander. The chapters on Lucretius have been in some part re-written, and the same is the case with the chapter on that first of lyric love poets, Catullus. It is to be regretted, however, that in the English versions of this great poet, Professor Sellars should have been content with the imperfect renderings of Sir Theodore Martin.

The Folk-Lore Society has done admirable work during the short time since it came into existence, and its two last publications are very good examples of the valuable services it is able to render to scholars and students.[24] The printing in its entirety of John Aubrey's delightful commonplace book will give great pleasure to the lovers of such quaint fragments of erudition and antiquarian gossip as Aubrey collected, and for this pleasure they will be grateful to Mr. James Britten, who has performed his task most successfully. One of the most interesting papers in the new part of the "Folk-Lore Record" is one on the origin of certain of the tales told by M. Galland as belonging to the "Thousand and One Nights." M. Galland's book marked an epoch in literature. It gave to the world, to little children, and to grown men, the most fascinating collection of fairy stories that probably the genius of mankind ever put together. In that mine of inexhaustible incident and imagery, where men of genius have since quarried unceasingly, and where happy children have caught rare jewels that

---

[22] "Sanskrit and its Kindred Literatures." By Laura Elizabeth Poor. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1881.

[23] "The Roman Poets of the Republic." By W. Y. Sellars. New Edition. Oxford. 1881.

[24] "Remains of Gentilisme and Judaisme." By John Aubrey. 686–687. "Folk-Lore Record." Vol. III. Part II. London: Printed for the Folk-Lore Society by Nicholls & Sons. 1881.

have lent a lustre to all their childhood, there are, however, stories for which it seems that there is no known Eastern authority. There are tales for which there are no fellows in the cold realities of Lane's version, a version which will never surpass the less accurate but more eloquent Frenchman's rendering, and which will, in its turn, be surpassed by completer renderings and more perfected scholarship. The "Two Envious Sisters," "Aladdin," "Ali Baba," and the tale of "Prince Ahmed and the Fairy Pari Banou"—these four have no recognized Eastern originals, and it is to them that Mr. Coote devotes his interesting paper. It would be attributing more to M. Galland than he deserves to attribute to him the honour of having invented such a marvellous tale as that of the "Widow's Son of Pekin," or of that beloved woodcutter who flitted with his donkey before the sleep-shut eyes of Scrooge, and recalled with its delightful vision the memories of happy childhood before he had come to worship in the Temple of the Counting House, where the ledger was the only sacred volume. Nor could the authorship of the "Two Envious Sisters," or of the very dear story of "Prince Ahmed and the Pari Banou," be put down to M. Galland's own inventive faculties. Mr. Coote shows, and shows with a closeness of argument which will carry conviction with it to the minds of most of his readers, that though no story precisely similar is to be found in Oriental literature, yet their composing elements are to be found scattered about in other tales, and that almost identical narratives are to be found in the folk-lore of Greece and Italy. At the same time the interest of such a question will only be felt by a very limited number of persons. To most of us it is enough that the world of literature is fortunate in having so great a treasure as the "Arabian Nights" which M. Galland gave to it, and it matters little from what sources he gathered the materials for his immortal work.

The little volumes of "Foreign Classics for English Readers,"[25] are no doubt useful to persons, who, but for them, might remain entirely in ignorance of the lives and works of the authors from Dante to Cervantes, who are included in Mrs. Oliphant's scheme. They are practically magazine articles slightly expanded, and containing a considerable number of extracts. When they are done well they may be of great use. Even when they are badly done they cannot do much harm. It may be rather unfortunate that Sir E. B. Hamley should consider the "Henriade" of Voltaire to be on a level with the great classic epics, or that Mr. Henry Reeve should give as specimens of Petrarch's work translations which defy the laws of the sonnet, or that Mr. Hayward should be permitted, in the volume on Goethe, which is perhaps the best of the series, to express his somewhat diverting ideas on the second part of "Faust." The students of the series will, however, correct these mistakes if they pursue their studies, and if they are not sufficiently interested to do so, it matters very little what they think. Mr. Trollope's volume on "Corneille and Racine," cannot rank with the best of the series. The lives are fairly well done, and

---

[25] "Corneille and Racine." By Henry M. Trollope. Foreign Classics for English Readers. Blackwood. 1881.

the accounts of the plays sufficiently interesting, but the specimens of verse translation cannot be regarded as exhilarating.

The title "Classics for the Million" is decidedly misleading.[26] It suggests that the work which bears such a name is likely to be of use to a great many persons, that it will be able to convey to the very large class who have not time to obtain the knowledge of the great Latin and Greek classics at first hand an accurate and concise idea of their story and their purpose. But this is what Mr. Grey has most successfully failed in doing, and his volume could only be of real service to deep classical scholars, who might, indeed, pass an amusing half hour, in wondering that any man could succeed in making so many mistakes in so small a space, or could produce so wholly tiresome and valueless a work upon so attractive a theme. It might fairly enough be contended that the extraordinary individual who could speak of the "poetical effusions" of Catullus need hardly be considered worthy of further attention; but it may not be wholly unamusing to glance at one or two specimens of the bad style and worse information contained in this ridiculous volume. Mr. Grey describes—why, we know not—Helen as "writing her own history" in that third book of the "Iliad," in which the goddess Iris tells her of the approaching combat between Menelaus and Paris. He also describes the bosom friend of the great Pelides as "his man Patroclus," as if the Jonathan of the Greek David was the eighteenth century valet of a periwigged Achilles. In the account of the "Odyssey" Mr. Grey ingeniously contrives to sponge out the exquisite pathos of the passage in which the dog, Argos, sees his storm-tossed lord, Odysseus, by omitting the fact that the dog died immediately after recognizing his master. It is, after this, a comparatively small defect of Mr. Grey's to invariably describe the Greek gods and goddesses by the names of the Roman Pantheon. A short and silly article on "Hesiod" is chiefly remarkable for the patronising spirit in which its writer informs the world that the shield of Achilles is "generally considered as entitled to a place in classic literature." Two pages are devoted to Theognis, in neither of which is there any mention made of that friend of the poet, Cyrnus, to whom most of the gnomic verses of Theognis were written, and the article on the Greek anthology might really be considered as a little masterpiece of incapacity. Mr. Grey is no less unhappy with the Roman than with the Greek poets. He informs his readers that the most celebrated poems of Catullus "are those to Lesbia, a sister of the notorious Claudius," without even mentioning that the accuracy of this statement is called in question by many competent scholars; while he reaches almost the climax of his absurdity in describing the poem beginning "Ille mi par" as being "in the style of Sappho," apparently unaware that it is a direct translation of the "φαινεται μοι κῆνος," while he attains to the very triumph of bathos by adding that the dainty little conceit on the death of Lesbia's sparrow is "equally graceful and pathetic" with the masterpiece of passion which Catullus translated from the sweet Lesbian singer. Mr. Grey has evidently read the series of "Ancient Classics

[26] "The Classics for the Million." By Henry Grey. London: Griffiths & Farran. 1881.

for English Readers" to very little purpose. That series is by no means always perfect, but at least it has the merit of being written by men of culture and education; whereas, the meaningless compilation from that series made by Mr. Grey is as worthless as a volume of three hundred and thirty odd pages can possibly be.

Most literary men have enjoyed the experience of having had their creations rejected by editors, influenced of course by malice and envy. But it is rare enough to find a writer facing his rejection with a no less defiant determination to make writings known to the world. Dr. Hodgson has certainly done boldly in publishing the two essays,[27] one of which he tells us was rejected by one periodical, and the second by three. The article on the genius of De Quincey is a useful contribution to the study of one of the greatest of English prose writers. The essay on English verse will be found decidedly interesting by students of that wide subject, whose very wideness and vast importance has only been conspicuously comprehended of late days, any such comprehension being due undoubtedly in large measure to the marvellous rythmic genius and melodic movement of Mr. Swinburne's poems. The verse translations at the end of the volume, "may," says the author, "interest those who are accustomed to amuse themselves by a similar exercise."

We do not know if Mr. Vaughan is or is not a member of the new Shakespeare Society, but it is impossible not to consider, after glancing over his bulky volume,[28] that he ought undoubtedly to have that honour, if it has not already been granted to him. A man who could write so big a book upon only four of Shakespeare's plays, who could have so much to suggest in the way of improvement and alteration of the text, who should be so exceedingly anxious that every line in a tragedy should scan strictly, decidedly deserves to rank among the followers of Mr. Furnivall. There are, of course, some good and useful suggestions in the volume, and it may present features of interest to persons who seem to regard the great Elizabethan dramatist more as a field of ingenious inquiry, and a theme for grammatical interpretation, than for the poetic pleasure he affords his readers. Some, however, of Mr. Vaughan's elucidations of the text would seem to imply that he considers most readers of Shakespeare to be either exceedingly ignorant or exceedingly silly.

Another book on Shakespeare, scarcely less tiresome, but, perhaps, on the whole, more useful, is the second part of Mr. Ingleby's "Man and the Book,[29] of which the first part was issued some years back. To those dreary-minded persons who really can enjoy the metrical text-tests applied to Shakespeare by Mr. Fleay, this volume may possibly commend itself, and it will probably come in the way of no other persons. The most interesting paper to the ordinary reader is

[27] "Outcast Essays and Verse Translations." By Shadworth H. Hodgson. London: Longmans. 1881.

[28] "New Renderings and Readings of Shakespeare's Tragedies." By H. H. Vaughan. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1881.

[29] "Shakespeare." "The Man and the Book." Part II. By C. M. Ingleby. London: Trübner & Co. 1881.

that upon the Shakesperian forgeries of the Ireland family, but even that might have been much better done.

Several more books lie before us, but, unfortunately, we have no space left in which to notice them this quarter.

## MISCELLANEA.

MR. LANG'S little volume on "The Library"[1] seems somewhat out of place in the rather tedious series which bears the name of "Art at Home." Mr. Lang has at his command an exquisite English style, and an amount of culture which gives to the book a literary and a scholarly value alike apart from anything that has hitherto belonged to this series. In fact, Mr. Lang's observations on the Library form an essay on books and their belongings, which it would be a pleasure for any one to read, whether he be as devoted to books as Lamb was, or Southey; or as indifferent to the joys of collecting as one whose library boasts only cheap reprints. Only the Philistines, perhaps, will not be glad of Mr. Lang's volume, and will wonder at his love for old editions, and for famous bindings. To do Mr. Lang complete justice, his book should have appeared, not in the somewhat commonplace form of a cheap series, but brought out as a French publisher would have issued it, with dainty uncut edges, and wide margins, and fair printing, and loose vellum covers, delightful to the touch. For it is in some measure a book to be kept and studied, and annotated, and interleaved, and enjoyed by its possessor. Many of those into whose hands it falls, will not be enabled to make any great use of much of it. There are not many persons who can afford to collect rare MSS., or to devote much time or much money to hunting through book-shops for rare editions and curious volumes; but all who have ever succumbed, even in however slight a degree, to the pleasures of book-collecting, even though their collections number no greater rarities than perhaps an Aldine Cicero's Orations, or an Œuvres de Francois Villon set out in Paris, in the year 1723, at the imprimerie of Antoine Urbain Coustelier, who was imprimeur librarie to M. le Duc d'Orleans; or, perhaps, a vellum-bound copy of an eighteenth-century Horace, with designs by Nicholas Poussin—even these will rejoice to read what Mr. Lang has to say of collections of higher aims and vaster successes. It seems audacious to suggest anything to a master and critic so accomplished as Mr. Andrew Lang, but we think that when he speaks of the famous "Hypnerotrotomachia Poliphi" he might have made mention of that English translation thereof, which finds its place in Brunet's catalogue, but which is so rare, that the British Museum certainly boasts of no copy, and that few book collectors can claim to have looked upon it. When he is speaking on the great topic of how books should be bound, and is discoursing on M. Firmin Didot's advice about binding, the Iliad in red, and the Odyssey in blue, "because the old Greek rhapsodists wore a scarlet cloak when they recited the

[1] "The Library." By Andrew Lang. "Art at Home Series." London: Macmillan. 1881.

Wrath of Achilles, a blue one when they chanted of the Return of Odysseus," another and appropriate reference which might have been cited occurs to us. Readers of the old *World*, which was written for by Chesterfield and by gentlemen, and must, therefore, in no measure be confounded with its namesake of to-day, will, if we mistake not, find there a story of a man who was very proud of his bindings, and loved to expatiate upon them, and to point out their beauties to his friends; a man who had his "Cæsar" bound in red because the great Julius was a soldier, and red is a military colour, and so on. On the cruelty of binders who cut the edges of books Mr. Lang is justly severe. The happy possessors of any rare editions would do well to have his counsels hugged to heart when they think of committing their treasures to the binder's hands. We can cordially commend this little volume to all who like to read a pleasant book. Even to those who, like ourselves, have no great passion for the collection of rare and ancient tomes, the liking to have great books around one, and to be in frequent communion with the spirits of the immortal dead, with those princes and kings of the spirit, who are, as Mr. Ruskin has taught, so very much more worthy of conversing with than those of the world, may be gratified at all times with slight expense of money, and none of time, save the time devoted to their studies. To the book collector things are different. He loves a book less for itself than for its misprints and for the other reasons which have nothing to do with the matter of the book. But though the ways of the book collector are one, and the ways of the book reader usually another, both alike can enjoy Mr. Lang's essay, and also Mr. Austin Dobson's pleasant chapter on illustrated books, which, however, we should have preferred to see issued separately, and in daintier form, as the companion of a worthy edition of Mr. Lang's "Library." Mr. Austin Dobson's subject does not cover a very wide range. The epoch of English illustrated books begins practically with the last quarter of the last century. Hogarth illustrated "Hudibras" and "Don Quixote" it is true, and Frank Hayman turned off designs to Shakespeare, Milton and Pope, but Mr. Dobson is right in placing the beginning of the art with Bewick's cuts to Gay's "Fables" in 1779, and Stothard's plates to Harrison's Novelist's Library. In the whole period from 1779 to the present day, Mr. Austin Dobson is thoroughly at home, and he discourses upon his subject with the graceful ease which comes of close study and real culture, and which seems so easy to do until it is tried; for this delicate facility of criticism is as hard to acquire as the skill which enables the perfect swordsman to sever a lace handkerchief as it floats in the air. Especially happy are Mr. Dobson's observations upon Flaxman, the "dear sculptor of eternity," as Blake called him. "Flaxman was not a Hellenist as men are Hellenists to-day. Nevertheless, his Roman studies had saturated him with the spirit of antique beauty; and by his grand knowledge of the nude, his calm, his restraint, he is such an illustrator of Homer as is not likely to arise again. For who—with all our added knowledge of classical antiquity—who of our modern artists could hope to rival such thoroughly Greek compositions as the 'Ball-player of Nausica' in the 'Odyssey,' or that lovely group from Æschylus of the tender-hearted womanly 'Oceanides,' cowering like flowers beaten by the storm under the terrible anger of Zeus?" On Bewick, Mr. Dodson

discourses with genial and sympathetic affection and appreciation; and traces with a steady hand the growth of illustration from his time to the magazines of to-day, with a mention of that wonderful store-house of exquisite English wood engraving, *Once a Week*, for which Sandys, Pinwell, Lawless, Walker, Morten, and others did such splendid work. The glory of *Once a Week* has gone with the snows of yester-year; but the value of the aid it gave to English art is happily undying. Very good and true is Mr. Dobson's perception of Thackeray's undoubted worth and meaning as an artist, and of the importance his drawings possess as accompaniment to the genius of the text. Of the latter masters of illustration—of Tenniel and Crane and Caldecott—Mr. Dobson has no little praise to say in small space, and says it well and fairly.

A charming addition has been made to the literature of art—or rather, to that department of it which deals with monographs upon artists—by the study of Correggio by Mademoiselle Mignaty.[2] To the reading public of the day, who are expected to take a keen interest in art, and for whom innumerable treatises and biographies are prepared, this volume should prove exceptionally attractive. It is the result of a sincere love for the painter it treats of, and a laborious and critical investigation of his works, expressed in a style that is at once graceful and cultured. The lines of Alfred de Musset, which speak of

> "Le Corrège, homme pauvre and modeste
> Traivaillant pour son cocur, laissant a Dieu le reste,"

have certainly summed up, with the happy ease of a poet, the character of the great Italian painter who has contributed so much to the glory of the Renaissance. The Renaissance itself is the subject of Madlle. Mignaty's admirable introduction, in which she happily describes that great movement—of which we hear perhaps a little too much in the present day from incompetent persons—as a reconciliation, and as it were the marriage between Christian thought and the revived antique spirit. The reason why this union took place in Italy, she attributes with a fine spirit of historical perception to the fact that, in Italy the antique tradition had never been completely interrupted, as it had been, for example, in the country of its birth—in Greece. This introduction is a valuable and eloquent study of the great movement, and of the great men of the movement; Frederick II. with his purely pagan renaissance of Sicily; Dante, with the ideal Christianity which some find allegorized in the sweet love story of the New Life, but which certainly did much to inspire it; Lorenzo de Medici and Machiavelli, upon whom sheis perhaps too severe; Savonarola, Ariosto, Tasso, Michel Angelo, Leonardo, Raphael, and the Venetians and Correggio himself. The biography of the painter is an example of that complete criticism which unfortunately comes to us mostly from abroad, and has too seldom its birth within the circle of our own shores. It is the criticism which studies and expresses much in little, a criticism markedly in contrast with so much of our own, which is as diffuse in expression as it is lacking in culture and research. We have, it is true, contributed in our English speech monumental examples of artistic patience and erudition, of which one of the

[2] "Le Corrège." Sa vie and son œuvre. Par Marguerite Albana Mignaty. Paris: G. Fischbacher. 1881.

highest examples are the labours of Messrs. Crowe and Cavalcaselle, but on the other hand, we have amongst us too many persons ready and eager, after their first visit to a continental gallery, to turn off what they are pleased to term a study of some particular painter whom they have honoured with their attention. Happily for Correggio, the "dreamy and lovely visionary who lived obscurely in the depths of Lombardy" he has found a biographer who can appreciate him, and can express the appreciation worthily, who can understand the consciousness of the infinite moral grandeur of Christianity, that tenderness and delicate sense of beauty, that subtle intoxication of life which enchants nature, that fusion of the pagan genius with the Christian genius which are so particularly the attributes of Correggio. As a special example of the skill of Mdlle. Mignaty, her sketch of the character of Veronica Gambara may be safely cited. It is to be hoped that this book may make its appearance in an English translation, to take its place with the many other admirable works on art which we have adopted from foreign authors into our own literature. Grimm's "Life of Michael Angelo" is one; Wolckmann and Weltmann's "History of Art" is another; Mdlle. Mignaty's book must certainly be included in the list. As a guide to the results of Correggio's painful life of faithful devotion to his art, it reaches a high standard of critical excellence; as a piece of literary work it must receive enthusiastic commendation.

The next book before us is another example of the additions our scholastic literature receives from the culture of other countries.[3] It is an English adaptation of Professor Ten Brink's "Geschichte der Englischen Literatur," and it is executed by a professor of the Cincinnati University. The book is one that will be of great value to all students of Anglo-Saxon literature, for it presents clearly, in a brief space, all that it is most necessary to know on the subject. The chapter on Beowulf, "the most important and interesting monument of early German poetry," is an admirable example of the care and conciseness which is characteristic of the whole work. The growth of the story, from the combination of the myth of the Divine Being Beowa, with the story of the gallant deeds of the real Beowulf, nephew of Hygelac, king of the Geats, in the early part of the sixth century, is a curious example of the manufacture of mythology. Like most other epic poems, the Beowulf story has been declared by investigating critics to lack homogeneity, and it has been reduced to two independent stories, the first being that which tells of the fight between Beowulf and Grendel, the water-monster and man-eater, whose arm Beowulf tears off; the second telling of the fight between Beowulf and the fire-dragon, in which the hero pays for victory with his life.

This story of Beowulf[4] should be better known than it is, and the students of works like this sketch of Anglo-Saxon literature by Professor Ten Brink, will be grateful to Colonel Lumsden for having translated the grand old story into English verse for them. The sturdy figure from the ancient world, who overthrows monsters like a Teutonic Theseus or Heracles, ought to be a familiar character to the

[3] "A Syllabus of Anglo-Saxon Literature." Adapted from Bernhard Tenbrink by J. M. Hart. Cincinnati, O., U.S.A.: Robert Clarke & Co. 1881.

[4] "Beowulf. An Old English Poem translated into Modern Rhyme." By Lieut.-Colonel H. W. Lumsden. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1881.

descendants of the race who told a tale so filled with the old heroic spirit. The prose version of Kemble has done something to make Beowulf familiar, perhaps Colonel Lumsden's poetic rendering will do yet more. As a good example of the manner in which Colonel Lumsden has done his work we may quote the last dying speech of Beowulf.

> "Then of his wounds Beowulf spoke—that gash of deathly hue;
> Full well he knew that his life's day of earthly joy was done,
> His death exceeding near at hand, his tale of days outrun,
> And thus he said: 'Now to my son my battle-weed I'd give
> If of my body any heir to guard it yet did live.
> For fifty years I've ruled the folk. Of all the peoples near,
> No king durst meet me with his hosts nor cause me ought to fear.
> At home I bode my time; held well my own; no quarrel sought;
> Nor swore an oath unrighteously. With death-wounds now o'erwrought
> I may rejoice in that when life and body sundered be
> No kinsman's slaughter can the Lord of man impute to me:
> Now quickly go, dear, dear Wiglaf! seek the hoard beneath grey stone,
> Now that the dragon lies asleep with grievous wounds foredone,
> Of goods bereft; and use all speed, that I may close behold
> The ancient riches, jewels cunning wrought, and store of gold,
> And when I see the treasured wealth, that I may pass away
> More easily from life and land I've held this many a day.'"

It will be seen that Colonel Lumsden has adopted the metre which has proved of such good use in the hands of Mr. William Morris ere this for the retelling of a northern saga.

It was an ingenious idea for a bookmaker to think of turning to the Agony Column of the *Times* for the means of making a volume.[5] That strange medium of communication between men has certainly contained in its time curious matter enough, much of which, no doubt, has in it the making of many a three-volume novel. The compiler of the present volume has simply reprinted a selection of the most remarkable advertisements that have appeared in the second column of the *Times* from the 13th January, 1800, to the 23rd November, 1870. Some of these are interesting enough; some have no interest whatever; many are in cypher, the unpuzzling of which may be an amusement to those who are fascinated by cryptogramatic difficulties; The compiler of the volume shows that in almost all cases these cyphers are easy enough of solution, as in most instances they simply consist of transpositions of the alphabet; so that what appears to be as illegible to ordinary eyes as the inscriptions on a Babylonian cylinder, becomes with a little trouble easily reducible to ordinary English. In some cases there appears to be a sort of story traceable. Thus, one long series of advertisements, dating from 1851 to 1870, appear to belong to a single person, though what the story may be has to be left to conjecture, for the advertiser delights chiefly in the most extraordinary complications of language and fantastic utterance; and even when he comes to state precisely his complaints about some daughter being taken away from him, it is by no means clear how far the statements are to be accepted as literal. Another series of advertisements, signed J. de W., are continued for a long period, and they too would seem to conceal some curious story. Altogether, the volume will

[5] "The Agony Column of the *Times*." Edited by Alice Clay. London: Chatto & Windus. 1881.

afford plenty of amusement to persons who have little to do, or whose taste in reading is of a limited nature.

The second volume of Mr. Campbell's beautiful edition of the plays of Sophocles,[6] ought to be welcomed by all students of the Greek tragedians. Classical scholars could hardly have a handsomer edition in which to read the dramas of that :—

> "Mellow glory of the Attic stage,
> Singer of sweet Colonus and his child."

whom Mr. Matthew Arnold delights in. The type is clear and beautiful; the notes many and profound; the introductions elaborate and scholarly. This second volume contains "The Ajax," that melancholy story of defeated greatness, dear to us as it was to Ovid; the Electra, the Trachiniæ, and the splendid Philoctetes, with the Fragments, which are a study in themselves.

Amongst other books, we may mention the magnificent French dictionary of Clifton and Grimaux, which will be of great value to French students;[7] a valuable edition of the second book of Cicero's oratory;[8] a translation of Kiepert's admirable manual of ancient geography;[9] a useful volume of exercises in analytical geometry;[10] two volumes of a new method of learning the German language;[11] the second book of Horace, in Messrs. Macmillan's delightful series of elementary classics;[12] a series of examination papers, likely to be of great use to pupil teachers;[13] a sort of homily upon the Apocalyptic "Number of the Beast," which may be interesting to persons who care for such studies;[14] the first part of a dictionary of Swiss idioms;[15] a valuable volume of Leicestershire words, published for the English Dialect Society;[16] an interesting Latin essay on the "Ajax" of Sophocles;[17] and an "A B C of Chronology," amusingly absurd.[18]

---

[6] "Sophocles." Plays and Fragments. Vol II. Edited by Lewis Campbell. Oxford. 1881.

[7] "Dictionary of the French and English Languages." By E. C. Clifton and Adrian Grimaux. Paris: Garnier. London: Dulau. 1881.

[8] "Ciceronis de Oratore." Edited by A. S. Wilkins, M.A. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1881.

[9] "Manual of Ancient Geography." From the German of Heinrich Kiepert. London: Macmillan. 1881.

[10] "Exercises in Analytical Geometry." By J. M. Dyer. London: Macmillan. 1881.

[11] "German Colloquial Phraseology, and the German Prepositions, with the Cases they Govern." By Samuel Galdino. London: Crosby, Lockwood & Co. 1881.

[12] "Horace," Odes. II. Edited by T. E. Page, M.A. London: Macmillan. 1881.

[13] "Examination Papers for Pupil Teachers, with Answers." By A. Park. Manchester: John Heywood. 1881.

[14] "The Counting and the Interpretation of the Apocalyptic Number of the Beast." By Rev. James Challis. London: Rivingtons. 1881.

[15] "Wörtenbuch der Schweizerdeutschen Sprache." 1 Heft. Bearbeitet von Fr. Staub & Lud. Tobler. Frauenfeld: Jacques Huber. 1881.

[16] "Leicestershire Words, Phrases and Proverbs." Edited by Sebastian Evans. Trübner. 1881.

[17] "Commentatio de Aiacis Sophoclei Authentia et Integritate." Scripsit J. van Leeuwen Trajecti ad Rhenu. J. W. Leeflang. 1881.

[18] "A B C of Chronology." Hoyt, Fogg and Donham. Portland, Maine, U.S.A.

THE

# WESTMINSTER

AND

# FOREIGN QUARTERLY REVIEW.

OCTOBER 1, 1881.

## ART. I.—THE IRISH LAND ACT AND THE ENGLISH LAND QUESTION.

*The Land Law (Ireland) Act*, 1881.

THE attempt to estimate the present and prospective value of the new Land Bill for Ireland is beset with great difficulty, but it may not be unprofitable if it help us to obtain a proper appreciation of the past, present, and probable future of the great Land Question, not of Ireland alone, but of Great Britain also. Landlordism, as an institution, has been for some time back upon its trial, as it were, at the bar of public necessity, not only in Ireland, but in almost every country in Europe, and the belief is spreading and gaining strength, that it is a mischievous parasitical growth, needing to be pruned down, and, it may be, even eradicated, should any remedy less thorough prove insufficient to counteract its injurious influence. Landlordism of the existing type is neither a time-honoured nor a popular institution. It cannot boast a growth or existence contemporaneous with that of the British nation, for it is a modern development, and only derives its nourishment at the expense of the fruit-producing realities to which it clings; and though it has gained a firm hold of its victims, it may become necessary to sever this hold, and rescue them from its deadening grasp. To prove that landlordism is of a comparatively modern growth, we may turn to Ireland (where its baneful influence is most conspicuous), and we find that at the time of the accession of Queen Elizabeth to the English throne Ireland was free from landlordism. At that time,

and to nearly the end of Elizabeth's reign, the land of Ireland was cultivated by the people in common. But this system was not allowed to last. Landlordism was already in existence in England, and was causing revolt after revolt of the impoverished labourers, and, of course, the Irish communal land system, as something "un-English," was put down. Many of the Irish people were meanwhile dispersed, their lands were taken from them and given to English and Scotch settlers, and thus came about the establishment, for the first time, of landlordism in Ireland, the spoliation of the poor Irish cultivators, and the creation of a debt of hatred against England, which has gone on increasing even unto this day.*

Before entering on the main subject of this article, let us glance at the so-called great work of the last session of Parliament, the Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1881. Of this "message of peace" to the Irish people, we venture to express our apprehension that, like its predecessor of 1870, it will prove in its results another encouragement to expectations which are never to be realized. It will probably do something to encourage, for a while, a more productive cultivation of the soil—a thing much needed; but this gain can only be temporary, so long as private taxation, through advances in rent, is *possible*. And if these advances in rent are wrong in principle, as we hope to show hereafter, this wrong cannot be remedied by making the advances only possible at longer intervals of time, or in every fifteen years in lieu of every fifteen days or every fifteen months.

To go to the origin of the new Irish Land Act, we may take a letter by Mr. Bright, published a few years ago, in which he expressed the conviction that "the great Land Question was the question of the immediate future," to which he invited the young men of the rising generation to devote their study and attention. This invitation, though late in the day, as many (notably, the late John S. Mill) had been ventilating the subject before, was soon responded to. Some, who had devoted years of study to the subject, and who had come to the conclusion that no reform in our land-system except State-proprietorship, would prove just to every interest, were not encouraged by the tribune of the people, while others, who took up the clap-trap phrase, "Free-Trade in Land," were hailed by him as the new saviours of the nation. The late Joseph Kay, Q.C., possibly in response to Mr. Bright's invitation, published a series of letters, in a daily paper, advocating this remedy of Free-Trade in Land. These letters, upon Mr. Kay's death, were collected and published in book-form by C. Kegan Paul & Co., in 1879; and when this book appeared it contained a short preface by Mr. Bright, which

* See Green's "History of the English People," chap. vii. p. 444.

concluded thus:—"It (the book) may prove a legacy of much good from one who is now withdrawn from amongst us, if it hasten the time when, in addition to the many gains of freedom of which we justly boast, we may boast also of the freedom of the soil." In this extract we can see how Mr. Bright was misled, by Mr. Kay's special pleading, to believe—and announce to the public—that if we get power to buy the land out of the *private control* of a duke, and sell it over again into the *private control* of a dozen Sir Gorgius Midases, we shall then be able to add to our many boasts of freedom, "that also of the freedom of the soil"! As Mr. Bright yielded to this fallacy, it is not difficult to understand how the Cabinet, of which he is so distinguished a member, should follow suit; and hence, possibly, Mr. Gladstone's endorsement of the Free-Trade in Land programme in his speech at Dalkeith; also the germ of Free-Trade in Land as one feature in the Irish Land Act—a feature which, as the thin edge of the wedge, may produce unexpected and disastrous results. This part of the question, however, we shall deal with further on.

Coming, then, to the other features in the new Irish Land Act, we find, though they are not many, that all are sadly blurred and distorted by the "mauling" which they have received from friends and foes, in running the gauntlet through the two Houses. The most prominent features of the Act are, however, merely "the counterfeit presentment" of the three F's. Englishmen, from long association perhaps, love trinities in unities—hence our three R's, three F's, &c.; but we very much fear if the three F's (or the three R's of a former Act) will ever realize the great things expected from them. Confining our attention to the three F's, however, and beginning with the first, "Fixity of rent," we have to remark that it has been too late in coming to be of much benefit to cultivators of the soil, that it has come too soon to be of any benefit to the non-landed public, and that only the landholders can be benefited by the fixing of rents when land has got to a fictitious or "rack-rent" value. The poor Irish (and other) cultivators have been praying for generations for fixed rents, but so far to no purpose. Landlordism, Sisyphus-like, doomed to keep rolling its stone up to the mountain-top, has at length completed this labour; and now, when the stone is fated to roll down again, a fiat of Parliament has gone forth which attempts to fix the stone upon the summit of the mountain! In other words, land-rents are now at the highest, and they must gradually decline. No Act of Parliament can permanently prevent this, in the face of the tidal wave of surplus land-produce which is annually flowing into England from every quarter of the globe (a tidal wave which no Dame Partingtons need now attempt, by corn-law or "fair-trade" brooms, to sweep back);

and hence our declaration that the Act giving fixity of rent has come too late for the Irish cultivator, and too soon for the lasting interests of the general public. For, if agricultural rents, *at their present figures*, were to be fixed for fifteen years in England, Ireland, and Scotland, the only class that would be benefited, besides the lawyers, would be the landlords. The new Irish Land Act then, in its attempt to give fixity of rent, will not prove a "message of peace to Ireland," or a benefit to the cultivators of its soil, as its promoters honestly enough expected; but it may prove a "message of mercy" to the landholders, and save them from so rapid a reduction of rents as foreign competition must shortly and inevitably necessitate. The most prudent course therefore, under the circumstances, for Irish cultivators to take might be to abstain from rushing precipitately into court, to have a "fair rent" fixed for fifteen years, because in two or three years events may prove that even "a Griffith's valuation" is too high a rent for agricultural land in Ireland. Then "fixity of tenure" hangs by the same hook as fixity of rent, for if an Irish cultivator be induced to go into court to get a fair rent, and the court should fix it for fifteen years at something near its present value, the tenant might discover in two or three years that he could not continue to pay the fixed rent; so his "fixity of rent" would thus actually become the cause of the termination of his fixity of tenure, for he would either be evicted—with compensation, it is true (which might enable him to emigrate)—or he might struggle on under a fixed rent, until he finally succumbed, and, broken-hearted, went "over to the majority." The next feature in the Act is "free sale," or compensation for unexhausted improvements. In regard to this provision, few will deny that it is just and fair that under existing conditions the tenant should receive compensation for all the permanent additions he makes to his farm, either by his own labour or capital; but there is another increment to the value of land which the landholder has pocketed hitherto, to which neither landholder nor cultivator is justly entitled—viz., the increased value that land derives (so long as it is practically held as private property) from every description of labour. This injustice no Land Act, which does not make the State the recipient of all land-rents, can ever remedy.

Then, coming to the clauses for facilitating emigration, we are glad to see that they contain a "message of mercy" to starving cultivators—an offer, in fact, to assist them to transfer their labour from land that is rack-rented to land that is not; but is it not bad political economy to encourage the emigration of our wealth producers? Would it not be far better for the nation to offer every facility (and pay a large bounty even) to induce

those landholders who are mere wealth-consumers to emigrate? What a relief to depressed England would it be at the present moment, if every individual holder of its aggregate of 75,000,000 acres were to receive an equivalent number of acres in that recently discovered new Garden of Eden, Manitoba? But, alas! a free-trading English Liberal Government shows itself still wedded to protection when monopolist landholders are justly assailed, and continues to countenance their private taxation of the people through their monopoly. This Government last Session passed a measure to put an end to eviction, without compensation, in Ireland; but the House of Lords would have none of it. In a similar emergency, when people in Ireland were starving, and Sir Robert Peel had not got the Corn Laws repealed, he especially opened the ports to stay the famine! When the House of Lords refused to pass the Abolition of Purchase (Army) Bill, Mr. Gladstone, by Royal prerogative, made it the law of the land; but he made no attempt, when the Compensation for Disturbance Bill of last Session was rejected by the same House, to stay the evictions in Ireland, which were rendering thousands both homeless and penniless!

Leaving the new Irish Land Act (as an act of concession some half century behind the requirements of the times) to the logic of facts, and recording our belief that, probably, another ten years will render it as obsolete as the Land Act of 1870 has already become, we turn to our main subject, the English Land Question. This has become "the question of the immediate future," one of the most "burning questions" of the day, and the most important that has presented itself to practical Englishmen for solution for several generations. Were there more of the spirit of justice incorporated into our social system, this great land problem might easily narrow itself into one of a very simple form—viz., "How should the Government of England deal with the soil of England, so that the first great object of all good government might be secured—the due administration of justice, and, thus, the promotion of public good?" This object, which really is the primary consideration, is practically shut out of sight, and only the claims of the landholders, the claims of the farmers, or the claims of the agricultural labourers, are considered, in dealing with the land question.

Now, though of course all these three classes have a right to be considered, there is another numerous class which has been almost entirely overlooked—a class which amounts to a majority of the population of the country, and which also has a claim on the land of the country. This large class is the whole urban population — the manufacturing or non-agricultural British public. The labour and enterprise of this portion of the people

have done as much to enhance the value of the land of England as that of the agricultural labourers, farmers, and landholders; and hence the necessity of considering their claim, in any and every change or re-adjustment that may be made in the land-system of the nation.

Already some territorialists are recommending "expropriation" of the land,* but, so far, no mention is made of the basis of value upon which this expropriation is to be effected. Many an Irish landholder would doubtless be glad to exchange his already very insecure and diminishing land-rental, for a sure and certain equivalent from the Consolidated Fund, calculated upon the recent rack-rent value of the land. But the non-landed public should not be subjected to a burden so unjust and unfair. It is the increased population and its aggregated labour that have caused the increase in the marketable value of land, and landholders should never have been permitted to appropriate to their own uses all this increased value—the "unearned increment," the fruit of the labour of all—much less should they be permitted to capitalize it, as is not unlikely to be done, should "expropriation" ever become the order of the day.

The power hitherto possessed by landholders, through defective laws, to capitalize the increment of value added to the land by the labour of the cultivators, has by Parliament been voted unjust, and this power is, in principle, now taken from them by the Irish Land Act. This reform having been accomplished, another, equally important, promises to come up for consideration—viz., the justice and necessity of depriving landholders (or landholders and cultivators conjointly) of the power of capitalizing the increment of value which accrues to land through the labour of that portion of the population which has no direct connection with the land; for the food of all labourers must come from the land; and thus it is that every labourer is adding to its marketable value so long as we continue the practice of permitting land to be a *marketable* article.

Then, turning to the remedy recommended by others—peasant-proprietorship—the same difficulty and injustice meet us at the very outset. This remedy would give to peasants a share in that monopoly of the produce of the soil which peers have hitherto held; and this one-sided remedy some landholders are now advocating, to buttress their own tottering position possibly, for in offering to share their monopoly with the cultivators, they practically bid for the support of the latter to assist them in defending a system which empowers all land monopolists, great or small, privately to tax all other industrial pursuits.

---

* See the articles by the Marquis of Blandford and Lord Monteagle in *The Nineteenth Century*, for February last.

This remedy of peasant-proprietorship would also ignore the paramount claim of the whole labouring public, and would end, as will appear hereafter, in empowering the peasant-proprietors to appropriate or capitalize the increment of value that their land derived from the labour of the non-agricultural portion of the population. The new Irish Land Act of 1881 legalises this injustice. It practically divides the increment in the value of land between the landholders and the land cultivators, thus forming two classes, as it were, with a co-partnery. This is right, as far it goes, but it does not go far enough. Labour of every description adds its quota to the marketable value of land, and a system which would exclude any contributor to the total capital of the co-partnery, from participation in its profits, is manifestly incomplete and unjust.

Non-agricultural labour adds to the value of land as much as, or more than, agricultural labour does, through the demand it creates for the cultivator's surplus food and raw produce, and it consequently follows that every description of labour has a right to its share in the co-partnery. Hence the injustice of making this comprise landholders and cultivators only, and of confiscating for their benefit the increment of value caused by manufacturing labour.

In 1836, the total land-rents of the kingdom amounted to about £45,000,000 ;* recently they have increased to £67,000,000. This increase of about £22,000,000 has been caused almost entirely by the growth of manufactures, and this large sum may be set down as the interest of the total amount of share capital (or capitalized increase of the value of our agricultural land) which manufacturing labour has contributed to the great land co-partnery. So some means will have to be discovered for securing to these depositors their share of the profits of this co-partnery.

It may be said that the manufacturing labourers will practically obtain their share in an increased supply of cheaper food, but this is not giving them a share equal to the capital they have added to the concern, and they may lose the benefit of this cheaper food in fifteen years, or sooner, should an increase of manufacturing prosperity, such as the repeal of the Corn Laws inaugurated, ever again open the door to land monopolists to advance their rents. The rock ahead, with the Irish Land Act of 1881, is the possibility of advanced rents every fifteen years, if not at shorter intervals, and its redeeming feature is where it practically declares that there is no landholder recognized by the law but the State.

* See Caird's "Landed Interest," p. 133. London: Cassell, Petter, & Galpin. 1878.

By this very hopeful feature this Land Act may hereafter come to be chiefly remembered, if it finally pave the way for the State to resume direct control of the land, and so rescue it from that private control which has afflicted our country, by creating in it so much poverty, misery, and crime.

Whatever new industry the intellect or ingenuity of man may invent, and however it may prosper for a time, the land monopolist soon begins practically to handicap it, with private taxation, through higher land-rents, until finally the new industry becomes unremunerative, or dwindles away. In proof of this, we have only to look at Lancashire, to see how much manufacturing has added to the value of land; and to see how much it is handicapped by the land monopolists, we have only to compare their rent-rolls with what they were half a century ago. Further, we can only conjecture how many struggling manufacturers these swelling rent-rolls have driven into bankruptcy, or how many factory-workers they have reduced to want, all because the English land system is as iniquitous as the Irish one, and because there was no law court to intervene and prevent rack-renting of Lancashire, and put a stop to this virtual social cannibalism.

Now, believing with Mr. J. S. Mill that State-proprietorship of land is the best remedy for the evils which beset private proprietorship, and the surest method for securing to every description of labour its just reward, we may proceed to submit for consideration a few statements, which point to the conclusion that direct State control of the land of the nation and of all its mineral contents, is the most reasonable and permanent solution of the great Land Question.

I. As experience has demonstrated that even nominal personal proprietorship of the land empowers the holders to levy private taxation upon all its cultivators, also upon the public at large through these cultivators, land should never be either the nominal or real property of private persons, be they peasants or peers, but ought to be kept under the direct control and management of the State, for the promotion of the public good.

II. As land is the chief source of existence and comfort to the human family, there should never be any private or personal monopoly of this source of human existence and comfort: and no other plan except State-proprietorship can protect land from private monopoly, and the public from the many hardships which this monopoly inflicts upon them.

III. As personal proprietorship, carried to its utmost possible power of mischief, would enable any given territorialist or plutocratic family of a Daniel Dancer disposition to buy up eventually all the land in the kingdom, and to starve or enslave (if they

could evict as their own parsimony might suggest) all the rest of the British nation, personal proprietorship of land is contrary to justice, reason, common sense, and the general welfare.

IV. As personal proprietorship of land enables the holders to make such arbitrary advances of rent, just or unjust, as their own avarice or extravagance may dictate or necessitate, it can become to land cultivators a tyranny which is incompatible with the most perfect cultivation of the soil, and thus produce unnecessary suffering and distress among the general public.

V. As personal proprietorship of the land has compelled millions of our agriculturists to leave our shores to obtain bread in other lands, it is slowly but surely making this country more dependent upon other countries for a food-supply than is necessary; and as this condition might, during any sudden crisis, such as a war in or with the United States of America, produce a famine in England, personal proprietorship of land is inimical to the true interests of the country.

VI. As land is not the production of any individual, and as we may assume it exists for the good of all, it must be inexpedient to permit any one class of men to arrogate to itself the sole proprietorship of any of this land, to the exclusion and starvation of all other classes of men.

VII. As it is the supreme duty of the Government of a country to provide for the effective administration of justice, and thus to ensure the greatest possible good for the greatest possible number, and as personal proprietorship of land provides the greatest wealth for the smaller number, and the greatest poverty for the greater number, it becomes the duty of the Government, as the head of the State, and the national executive, to take the land under its own direct control, to be managed as may be found most conducive to the public good.

Now, if the foregoing statements be logically fair and honest, it follows that neither peasants nor peers have any just ground for obtaining a personal monopoly of the soil, which would, or does, enable them to deal with it as they may think proper, or to regard the whole of its productions as their exclusive property. There is a total area of 75,000,000 acres in the three kingdoms, and these, if divided out, would give farms of twenty-five acres each to 3,000,000 "peasant proprietors," if every acre of the whole area were available for cultivation (which, of course, is not the case). Now, were such a division of the land made, these 3,000,000 proprietors, with their families, would amount to about 15,000,000 souls, or less than one-half of the present population; and under such a system, these 15,000,000 would have it in their power, as the proprietors of all the productions of the soil, to harass or starve all the rest of the population, inasmuch as they could

demand all the surplus wealth of the non-landed in exchange for the surplus food of which the cultivators held the monopoly, and which they could decline to supply altogether, until their unreasonable demand was complied with; for every man, when necessity compels, must give all for his life. We have a proof of this at the present time in France, where the peasant proprietors have this monopoly, and the manufacturing labourers are already feeling it. And instead of going to the root of the matter and remedying the evil by State proprietorship of the land, the French Government are vainly endeavouring to produce a just balance by tinkering up their protective tariff system.

Now, as peasant-proprietorship of the land would inevitably lead to the above-mentioned results, it is surprising to see so many advocating it as a remedy to the existing land system, particularly when the fact is so patent that it is more perfect and justly remunerated cultivation which is the goal to be won. This, too, can be more easily won by peasants without any proprietorship than with it, because a cultivator can begin more readily, being less heavily handicapped, if he be required to pay £1 an acre as an annual rent, than he can when required to pay £30 an acre at the outset. Few who have got the money are disposed to dig; many who have got no money would be glad of the opportunity to begin, on the first-named conditions, if there were some security that the fixed rent at which they began would not be doubled or quadrupled, as soon as the land began to make them some return for the labour and patience they had invested in it. Then, with the State as sole landlord of all the soil of England, cultivators of every description would have full encouragement to bring all suitable portions into a condition of the most complete productiveness, undeterred by the paralysing fear which now besets them, of arbitrary advances of their rents, should they increase the productive power of their farms. Further, should the necessities of the Government ever require a re-arrangement of rents, every cultivator would have a voice in the matter through his representative in Parliament, exactly as he now has a voice in increasing or reducing the income-tax, or any other tax; and were so great a reform as this once accomplished, all cultivators would soon discover that their choice of a parliamentary representative was a most important duty, so closely connected with their own interests and personal welfare, that they would not be so easily befooled, as at present, by the humbug of the charlatan, or by the money-bags and beer of the briber.

If one or two millions of peasant cultivators, on small farms of from five to twenty acres (good judges say that *five* acres of fair soil is as much as one tiller can manage properly), were culti

vating the soil under this system as tenants of the Government, and investing their capital (*i.e.*, their labour and experience) in the soil, its produce would be soon considerably increased, so much so that every interest would participate in the benefit, and ere long private proprietorship of the fatherland would soon become as much a thing of the past as the Corn Laws now are, and be universally regarded as a system which could only have been tolerated in the darkest of dark ages. Smaller farms, too, would be multiplied as soon as their extra productiveness was demonstrated, and as more of the sense of justice expressed in the phrase, "live and let live," became developed.

One crying evil, the offshoot of personal proprietorship, has attracted much less public notice and condemnation than it deserves. This is the sad system that has played havoc in many families, and with the public welfare, during the last half century —viz., the grouping of small farms into large ones, to the aggrandizement of the landholder, in the *first* place; to the improvement, in a smaller degree, of the condition of the colossal farmer, in the *second;* and, alas! to the eviction, emigration, and too frequently the pauperization of thousands of small farmers, in the the *third*. No Government of a country, careful of its own honour and perpetuity, or the prosperity and comfort of its people, should have winked at this shameful and wicked practice as our Government has done for many years past. But it has had its attention so distracted by foreign affairs in every quarter of the globe, that it may never have noticed this insidious change in the agricultural system of the country. But now, when the mischief has got into Ireland, and small cultivators are being evicted to make the farms larger, the sufferers are making so much protest, that the grouping cannot be carried out so quietly and unobservedly as it was done in England and Scotland, particularly as Ireland has no gigantic manufacturing industries springing up to absorb the evicted cultivators, as was the case in England and Scotland when the same process was being carried out on this side of the Channel.

Before proceeding to depict what takes place when small farms are grouped into large ones, we may venture to assert that this process can seldom or never be accomplished without inflicting great wrong and hardships upon a number of industrious members of the community, and without effecting a greater or lesser reduction of the produce of the farms which have been thus grouped, to the detriment of the public. All this being so, no Government, careful of the welfare of its people, and alive to these facts, could have allowed this swallowing-up of small farms to continue so long as it has done. Indeed, no system of landholding, but one approximating to personal proprietorship, like

our own peculiar system, would have found it to its interest to resort to this grouping, as will be shown presently. Even the "Compensation for Disturbance Bill" did not attempt to forbid the "disturbance" as it ought to have done, for this is the real wrong to the small farmer, and a greater wrong to the public at large; but the Bill permitted the "disturbance," and provided "compensation." The House of Lords, however, rejected the Bill, to avoid the compensation probably, as it had been avoided when the small farms in England and Scotland were grouped together; and what was good enough for England and Scotland they probably considered quite good enough for Ireland. It will be seen, however, that the landholders are large gainers in rent when small farms are grouped together; and the present Government may have to consider, not merely how they can secure fair "compensation" to the Irish farmer, but also whether they cannot secure all our cultivators from such "disturbance" as is resorted to, to make farms larger merely that landholders may obtain larger rents. If they cannot do this, it may hereafter be said equally of each of the leaders of the two great parties, in Byron's words:

> "*He* was of the *other* interest (meaning
> The self-same *interest*, with a different leaning)."

Now, the result of the process of grouping small farms into larger ones is something like this—say five small farms of five acres each are to be made into one farm of twenty-five acres; this change divorces four families from the soil at once, and these must emigrate, if they can, or go to swell the pauper population in the cities. Before this change, the five families with five acres each might be paying ten shillings an acre as rent. This would yield £12 10s. annually to the landholder for the whole five farms, and if each cultivator raised produce of the value of £50, each would have £47 10s. annually, after paying the £2 10s. to the landholder in rent. These twenty-five acres would thus be supporting five families with some degree of comfort. But as soon as some economist suggests that the land would "*pay* better" if these twenty-five acres were all made into one farm, and, in his way, readily proves it by figures, the change is decided upon at once, for the figures show that it will certainly pay the landholder a bigger rent, whatever it may do to the four families who are evicted, to be sent adrift across the ocean, or to take their chance in the back-slums of our cities, where the children soon begin to attract the attention of a HOME Secretary, by swelling the ranks of the street arabs. And all this spoliation and degradation is merely that these twenty-five acres may pay their landholder a bigger rent! The figures are clear enough, however, and may now be jotted

down. The produce of these twenty-five acres, with five cultivators, we have assessed at £50 per five acres. This makes £250 for the whole five farms. But the *one* family now in occupation of the whole, cannot do so much justice to twenty-five as it could to five acres, and consequently there is a falling off in the annual produce from £250 to £200 say. Out of this the cultivator may be allowed £150, and there are £50 left as rent for the landholder. Thus the grouping has paid the remaining farmer better. It has tripled the one farmer's income and quadrupled the landholder's rent. This is very gratifying to both, and they never stop to inquire how *their* increased prosperity has affected that of the four ejected families, or how the diminution of the food supply will affect the community at large! And so the work of improvement (?) goes on. It is next discovered that a farm of 100 acres will pay better than four of twenty-five acres each. Three more farmers' families have to go away into the wilderness that the one left behind may divide the spoil with the landholder. Each 25-acre farm was producing £200 annually, and when grouped into one farm of one hundred acres, the produce may become £600. Here again the food of the public is diminished, and the price of it is enhanced; but the one farmer and the landholder have £600 to divide between them. The farmer of 25 acres had £150; now, as the farmer of 100 acres, he may be permitted to have £300, and the landholder has £300 for his rent, or another advance of 50 per cent. This 100 acres, then, which at one time—the time of "Sweet Auburn," possibly—might be supporting twenty farmers' families, is now supporting only one, and with this result, it is producing little more than one-half of the food which it formerly produced when cultivated in five-acre farms.

In this manner, the work of this so-called improvement goes steadily on, the 100 acre farmers finally being swallowed up between the 500 to 1,000 acre farmers and the landholders, to the still further increase of their respective incomes, the still further diminution of the food supply of the people, the still further depopulation of the agricultural districts, and the degradation of the evicted agriculturists. And where is it to end? Has this eviction and grouping to continue till we have farms of a million acres in extent, with only dukes, earls, &c., to farm them, and all the cultivation performed by steam? What prices will horses bring then? The grouping of small farms made men cheap and horses dear! And has steam-ploughing to make a surplus population of horses the next probable politico-economical bugbear? It may come to this, that all our labouring population may have to expatriate themselves or be starved, for our HOME SECRETARY is too much occupied in determining how to *punish*

"juvenile criminals," to have time to discover how they are *manufactured!* But by the time he has discovered what to do with our juvenile and other criminals, let us hope that some modern Ulysses will have grappled with that single-eyed monster, or modern Polyphemus (Landlordism), which has for so many generations been swallowing up the land of the people, to the multiplication of juvenile and adult criminals, and that the result of the strategy of the new Ulysses will be the diminution of our pauper and criminal population, by a restoration to them of the liberty, on rational terms, to make their own living by the cultivation of *their* ancestral acres.

Now, all the evils here depicted would be reduced to a minimum, were the land held directly by the State. Rents being comparatively fixed, cultivators would have every inducement to cultivate their plots to the highest pitch of productiveness, no man daring to make them afraid of the spoliation of an advanced rent, or of his farm being added to another, to the aggrandizement of the landholder or of some neighbouring cultivator. Then, even though mechanical means were eventually found qualified to cultivate all our land and supersede human labour altogether, under State-proprietorship, the proceeds would go into the national exchequer, and the public would all share in the benefit.

The cultivation of land by machinery, where land is largely in excess of the population, as it is in America, and where a large surplus of food is the consequence, is undoubtedly an unqualified blessing to the crowded populations of Europe; but the cultivation by machinery of land held practically in private possession, for the exclusive benefit of a few monopolist holders, and involving the lessening of its aggregate production, as well as the eviction and possible starvation of its previous occupants, is not a blessing, but the reverse of a blessing, to any community or nation, as all history and experience prove. We need not stop here to inquire (though it is a tempting subject) whether a possible Utopia, with all labour performed by machinery, human toil being practically superseded, would be a blessing to man or not, or whether some daily exercise of his limbs and brain in salutary contact with the soil, to the opening of its many still unopened sesame caves, is not absolutely necessary for his perfect health and well-being, physical and mental; but the conclusion seems inevitable, that with large farms and steam-cultivation, or with small farms and the most microscopic cultivation, or the two combined, State-proprietorship of the land is indispensable, if the public are to have a just and equitable share of the proceeds, and be saved from the private taxation of irresponsible landholding monopolists; for if it should be eventually demon-

strated that steam cultivation is the most economical, the State, as landowner for the whole nation, would réceive the whole benefit, and administer it to the advantage of the whole community.

Having given a brief sketch of the extremely questionable improvement ensuing from the transforming of small into large farms, we will now glance at what others, who see the necessity of some reform in our land-system, are proposing as a remedy. Lord Sherbrooke settles the whole question so very summarily in the paper which he contributed to the *Nineteenth Century*, for November last, on "Legislation for Ireland," by the one word "Law" that it is a pity he omitted to conclude with this quotation as a motto—

"Laws grind the poor, and rich men rule the Law."

He asserts that in legislating for Ireland, the Government "must please pit, boxes, and gallery, and each of them without displeasing the other," oblivious possibly of some of his own legislative efforts, and certainly forgetful of the fact that all real legislation attempts the adjustment of the burdens which different interests have to bear, ever mitigating one overburdened interest by increasing (if no other course is open) the burden of another. This being so, legislation can seldom or never be such as "must please" all parties. Again, Lord Sherbrooke lays down the law of landlord and tenant in a rather superficial way, when he says, "They are the parties to a single contract, and *they are nothing more.* Whatever the lease into which they have entered binds them to do, they are bound to do, and they are *bound to do nothing else.*" The deeper unwritten contract, which both landlord and tenant practically are bound to perform to the people—faithfully to utilize the land for the public good, Lord Sherbrooke utterly ignores, though, we suppose, he would admit that if any thoughtless landholder were to attempt to sink his holding or invite the sea to encroach upon it, to the loss of some thousands of acres, or an eastern county, say, that he might have more duck-shooting, the Government and the public would have something to say to him, to remind him that there was a deeper contract than the only one Lord Sherbrooke sees—the one existing between him and his tenant—and that he could not and should not waste the land he had charge of, it being really and truly not *his*, but the nation's.

Now, Mr. Bright, in his speech at Birmingham (November 16), deals more earnestly with the subject; but he, unfortunately, still believes in the delusive remedy, "free trade in land," and still adheres to the fallacy that we may eventually "boast also of the freedom of the soil," if we only succeed in buying a few millions

of acres from the territorialists, to sell them to the plutocrats. This is as bad as saying that if you buy a hundred slaves from one slave-owner, and sell them in batches of ten to ten slave-owners, you are emancipating them! Land under the *private control* of plutocrats or capitalists will be no more "free," and probably may be less so, than land under the *private control* of the most colossal territorialists; and we are sorry that Mr. Bright, whose judgment is usually so clear, and whose reasoning is so cogent, cannot recognize this palpable deduction. Another point in his speech deserves notice: he appears to endorse the remark of a friend, which he quotes thus, "The measure that gives security of tenure to the Irish farmer would add ten years' purchase to the landed property in Ireland;" but, indeed, it will be another sad day for either Ireland or England which sees another "ten years' purchase" added to the value of the landed property of either country. It is the addition of "years' purchase" which necessitates the advances in rent, and these, in their turn, are the cause of all the evictions, with the misery and strife attendant thereon; and are not rents, Irish and English, already found to be so high that a "ten years' purchase" *less* in the value of land is becoming imperatively necessary? Then, supposing that this ten years' additional value were obtained, where has the money to come from to pay the extra interest? From the already impoverished cultivator, or from the equally impoverished consumer of his produce. And can Irish or English cultivators now expect to obtain such high prices for land-produce, when America is every year raising larger and larger quantities of it to be sent over to England? This power of adding "ten years' purchase of landed property" is what requires to be for ever annihilated by State-proprietorship, if we are ever to see these landholder and tenant injustices ended, and the private taxation by landholders of every other interest and industry abolished.

But perhaps Mr. Bright refers especially to State-proprietorship, when, in his speech, he refers to "Violent and impossible schemes, where the tenants apparently are to fix their own rents, under which the landlords as a body are to be got rid of and banished, or where the Government is to undertake some gigantic transactions, such as raising two or three hundred millions of money to buy them out of their estates, and to convey the estates over to the farmers who cultivate them." This is a very alarmist picture to proceed from Mr. Bright. "Violent and impossible schemes." What is there violent and impossible in giving farmers a voice in fixing their rents, such as they have now in fixing their taxes? and the gigantic transaction is only the repetition seventy-five times over of the transaction which

Mr. Bright proposes, in the same speech, and the thing is done with no violence or impossibility about it; for his proposal of 40,000 farms of twenty-five acres each would absorb one million acres, and this repeated *seventy-five* times would enable us all to "boast also of the freedom of the soil" from all private monopoly for ever. Again, this emancipated soil would not be given or "conveyed to the farmers who cultivate it," but let to them as at present, at a just and comparatively fixed rent, to secure the cultivator the results of his industry, and the public a cheaper food-supply. The whole affair seems so rational, feasible, and just, that it is surprising to see Mr. Bright go into a fit of oratorical excitement about it, particularly after he had the advantage of the example of Mr. Gladstone, who, in his speech at West Calder, Midlothian, November 27, 1879, could canvass this same scheme in the following fair, cool, and appreciative way:—

"There are some gentlemen, and there are persons for whom I for one have very great respect, who think that the difficulties of our agriculture may be got over by a fundamental change in the land-holding system of this country. I do not mean, now pray observe, a change as to the law of entail and settlement, and all those restraints, which, I hope, were tolerably well disposed of yesterday at Dalkeith; but I mean those who think that if you can cut up the land, or a large part of it, into a multitude of small properties, that of itself will solve the difficulty, and start everybody on a career of prosperity. Now, gentlemen, to a proposal of that kind I, for one, am not going to object upon the ground that it would be inconsistent with the privileges of landed proprietors. In my opinion, if it is known to be for the welfare of the community at large, the Legislature is perfectly entitled to buy out the landed proprietors. It is not intended probably to confiscate the property of a landed proprietor more than the property of any other man; but the State is perfectly entitled, if it please, to buy out the landed proprietors as it may think fit, for the purpose of dividing the property into small lots. I do not wish to recommend it, because I will show you the doubts that to my mind hang about that proposal; but I admit that in principle no objection can be taken. Those persons who possess large portions of the spaces of the earth are not altogether in the same position as the possessors of mere personalty; that personalty does not impose the same limitations upon the action and industry of man, and upon the well-being of the community, as does the possession of land; and, therefore, I freely own that compulsory expropriation is a thing which, for an adequate public object, is in itself admissible, and so far sound in principle."

Though Mr. Gladstone acknowledges that compulsory expropriation of the land is a thing which, for an adequate public object, is in itself admissible, and so far sound in principle, it is due to him to add that he, like Mr. Bright, declares himself to be more in favour of the remedy known as the repeal of the laws

of entail and settlement; and we shall proceed to canvass the reasons he gives for his preference of this remedy, after a few remarks about "compulsory expropriation." It will be seen from the whole of the foregoing, that much could be done in achieving the real "freedom of our soil," without resorting to *compulsory* expropriation. By economy in the national expenditure, surpluses might be obtained to invest in land, as it came into the market naturally; and if this supply were insufficient, there surely would be some territorialists who would see it to be their duty, for the public good, to hand back to the State, for a fair equivalent, such portions of their land as might be required for the general welfare. Further, Mr. Gladstone does not exactly represent the aims of the advocates of State-proprietorship when he interprets their object in the above extract, thus: "Those who think that if you can cut up the land, or a large part of it, into a multitude of small *properties*, that of itself would solve the difficulty." This really represents the aims of the advocates of free-trade in land. These want the land cut up "into small properties," whereas the advocates of State-proprietorship want to see the land welded into one undivided property, to be kept sacred to the State, then to be cut up and *let* out for revenue purposes, at moderate and comparatively fixed rents payable to the State for the cultivation of its surface or the utilization of its minerals, as the State might find best for the public good. This principle acted on, we are quite ready to leave to the future the settlement of the question —Are large or small farms most conducive to the national welfare?

We now revert to the Midlothian speeches of Mr. Gladstone, where he gave his adherence to the remedy now popular among Liberals—the repeal of the laws of entail and settlement. In the second Midlothian speech, delivered at Dalkeith (Nov. 26, 1879), he thus expresses himself in favour of this dubious remedy:—

"Why, gentlemen, it appears to me that if there is one law written more distinctly than another upon the constitution of human society by the finger of the Almighty, it is this, that the parent is responsible for making sufficient provision on behalf of the child; but the law of England is wiser than the Almighty. It improves upon divine Providence. It will not trust the father to make provision for his son. It calls in the aid of the grandfather, commits to him the function of the parent, introduces a false and, in my opinion, a rather unnatural relation even into the constitution of that primary element of society, the sacred constitution of the family. Not only, then, to liberate agriculture, gentlemen, but upon other grounds—and I will say upon what I think still higher grounds—I am for doing away with the present law of settlement and entail."

Now, that the repeal of these laws would or could "liberate

agriculture," we have already shown to be extremely doubtful, as the breaking up of the large estates into smaller would not help to reduce or steady rents, but would help to advance them. The large holdings of some dukes, for instance, are now letting at an average of less than nine shillings an acre, while in one case this average is under *two* shillings an acre. If these were sold to smaller private holders—say, in lots of one hundred or one thousand acres each—the new holders would endeavour to advance the rents, and the cultivators and consumers of the produce would be in a worse condition than at present. Then, as regards the alleged hardship of entailing these large estates to the eldest son, may there not be more in this law than lies on the surface? Is not all land in England State property in the eye of the law? And may not this law of entail be the best means of maintaining the State's title to the land? And if this law be repealed, will not the old law of William the Conqueror, that made him "supreme lord of all the soil of England," be abrogated? Will not land at last become absolutely private personal property? May not the wealthy nobles and wealthy capitalists still continue to buy up most or all of the land that comes into the market? and may not the last state of the non-landed under "free-trade in land" be worse than the first?

Free-trade in coal mines, iron mines, ironworks, &c. (that is, selling them at greatly inflated values), has told sadly upon the comfort of the labourers employed in them; and similar results are calculated to follow from "free-trade in land." It seems the fate of "free-trade," which originally meant antagonism to all "monopoly," to beget the most colossal monopolies,—as, for instance, the raw-cotton monopoly and the American bacon monopoly, though the name these now go by is "speculation," and they are treated as fair transactions since the repeal of the old laws against forestallers and regraters. These old laws really protected "free-trade," for they kept raw produce out of the hands of mere hucksters, who buy to sell over again at a profit, and whose speculations virtually inflict private taxation upon the consumer to the extent of this profit. Last year these forestallers bought the entire crop of raw cotton *nearly five times over during the year;* and these "speculators," with their "rings" and their "corners"—though they never even see the cotton they are parasitically living upon—make it pay, or they would give up "the game," as it really is. They do not give up, however, but manage somehow to live sumptuously by their speculation, though often the same cotton (their profit has so increased its price between New Orleans and Manchester), cannot afford a decent livelihood to the poor workpeople who have to manipulate it, and, by their skill and dexterity, trans-

of entail and settlement; and we shall proceed to canvass the reasons he gives for his preference of this remedy, after a few remarks about "compulsory expropriation." It will be seen from the whole of the foregoing, that much could be done in achieving the real "freedom of our soil," without resorting to *compulsory* expropriation. By economy in the national expenditure, surpluses might be obtained to invest in land, as it came into the market naturally; and if this supply were insufficient, there surely would be some territorialists who would see it to be their duty, for the public good, to hand back to the State, for a fair equivalent, such portions of their land as might be required for the general welfare. Further, Mr. Gladstone does not exactly represent the aims of the advocates of State-proprietorship when he interprets their object in the above extract, thus: "Those who think that if you can cut up the land, or a large part of it, into a multitude of small *properties*, that of itself would solve the difficulty." This really represents the aims of the advocates of free-trade in land. These want the land cut up "into small properties," whereas the advocates of State-proprietorship want to see the land welded into one undivided property, to be kept sacred to the State, then to be cut up and *let* out for revenue purposes, at moderate and comparatively fixed rents payable to the State for the cultivation of its surface or the utilization of its minerals, as the State might find best for the public good. This principle acted on, we are quite ready to leave to the future the settlement of the question —Are large or small farms most conducive to the national welfare?

We now revert to the Midlothian speeches of Mr. Gladstone, where he gave his adherence to the remedy now popular among Liberals—the repeal of the laws of entail and settlement. In the second Midlothian speech, delivered at Dalkeith (Nov. 26, 1879), he thus expresses himself in favour of this dubious remedy:—

"Why, gentlemen, it appears to me that if there is one law written more distinctly than another upon the constitution of human society by the finger of the Almighty, it is this, that the parent is responsible for making sufficient provision on behalf of the child; but the law of England is wiser than the Almighty. It improves upon divine Providence. It will not trust the father to make provision for his son. It calls in the aid of the grandfather, commits to him the function of the parent, introduces a false and, in my opinion, a rather unnatural relation even into the constitution of that primary element of society, the sacred constitution of the family. Not only, then, to liberate agriculture, gentlemen, but upon other grounds—and I will say upon what I think still higher grounds—I am for doing away with the present law of settlement and entail."

Now, that the repeal of these laws would or could "liberate

agriculture," we have already shown to be extremely doubtful, as the breaking up of the large estates into smaller would not help to reduce or steady rents, but would help to advance them. The large holdings of some dukes, for instance, are now letting at an average of less than nine shillings an acre, while in one case this average is under *two* shillings an acre. If these were sold to smaller private holders—say, in lots of one hundred or one thousand acres each—the new holders would endeavour to advance the rents, and the cultivators and consumers of the produce would be in a worse condition than at present. Then, as regards the alleged hardship of entailing these large estates to the eldest son, may there not be more in this law than lies on the surface? Is not all land in England State property in the eye of the law? And may not this law of entail be the best means of maintaining the State's title to the land? And if this law be repealed, will not the old law of William the Conqueror, that made him "supreme lord of all the soil of England," be abrogated? Will not land at last become absolutely private personal property? May not the wealthy nobles and wealthy capitalists still continue to buy up most or all of the land that comes into the market? and may not the last state of the non-landed under "free-trade in land" be worse than the first?

Free-trade in coal mines, iron mines, ironworks, &c. (that is, selling them at greatly inflated values), has told sadly upon the comfort of the labourers employed in them; and similar results are calculated to follow from "free-trade in land." It seems the fate of "free-trade," which originally meant antagonism to all "monopoly," to beget the most colossal monopolies, —as, for instance, the raw-cotton monopoly and the American bacon monopoly, though the name these now go by is "speculation," and they are treated as fair transactions since the repeal of the old laws against forestallers and regraters. These old laws really protected "free-trade," for they kept raw produce out of the hands of mere hucksters, who buy to sell over again at a profit, and whose speculations virtually inflict private taxation upon the consumer to the extent of this profit. Last year these forestallers bought the entire crop of raw cotton *nearly five times over during the year;* and these "speculators," with their "rings" and their "corners"—though they never even see the cotton they are parasitically living upon—make it pay, or they would give up "the game," as it really is. They do not give up, however, but manage somehow to live sumptuously by their speculation, though often the same cotton (their profit has so increased its price between New Orleans and Manchester), cannot afford a decent livelihood to the poor workpeople who have to manipulate it, and, by their skill and dexterity, trans-

form it into cloth.* These facts should warn us against opening more doors for such speculators as these; and what an opening "free-trade in land" would be to them! If they buy cotton and bacon to hold monopolistically for a rise in price, would not land be bought for the same purpose—say, till it had increased in value by "ten years' purchase"? Then the sentimentality that is paraded in advocating the repeal of the laws of entail and settlement recalls the tears of the defending lawyer when addressing the jury. A sad spectacle is drawn of the eldest son taking all, and of the other children of the family having no provision. Well, it may be a hardship if the father of a family in receipt of the rents of a hundred thousand acres cannot save something out of this princely income to portion off his younger children. But if he cannot, and if he obtain power to sell off the estate, or principal, that the breed of horses may be improved, or his racing debts paid, are his younger sons likely to obtain more handsome portions then? And what other laws will be repealed if the great territorialists obtain power to break up their estates and sell them, thus selling what was not their own private property, but a *trust* property really? This must be the real state of the case, or all land cannot, "in the eye of the law," *be* State property.

It is noticeable how much more appreciative Mr. Gladstone is of his subject when speaking at West Calder on "expropriation of the land," than when speaking of the repeal of the laws of entail and settlement at Dalkeith. This is explicable, because with expropriation the mind can comprehend the whole future vista, whereas the repeal of the laws of entail and settlement is simply another "leap in the dark."

Even Mr. Bright begins to wander round a circle when he treats upon "free-trade in land." First he argues that by breaking up the great holdings of the territorialists, poor cultivators (without the purchase-money) would secure small portions for cultivation. Next, finding from experience of the "Bright clauses" that this expectation is almost hopeless, he suggests 40,000 farms of twenty-five acres each to be made out of the waste lands of Ireland. This, properly arranged, would be a good beginning, but if he intends each of these 40,000 cultivators to become the proprietor of the twenty-five acres, then the scheme possesses an inherent weakness which must be fatal to its success. Under the old feudal system, every man had a few acres as much

* Since the above was written, we are glad to find that a very strong public protest has been made against the "cotton corner," which a few unscrupulous speculators have recently made in Liverpool. But something stronger than protests may be required to root out this evil, which is, really, pocket-picking not yet forbidden by law. So justice may shortly require an enactment which will stigmatize this new form of business (or new form of robbery) as a crime.

his own as the whole was the baron's; and where are they now? And if, under Mr. Bright's proposal, every farmer were made *proprietor* of his twenty-five acres, the grouping system, as depicted above, would immediately recommence, finally ending in the evils which now prevail, and for which a lasting remedy is required.

The only safe cure, then, is to make these 1,000,000 acres into one Government estate, to be let out in small farms at reasonable and practically fixed rents. These farms could never be grouped again for mere private aggrandisement, nor put upon the market for sale to realize a profit. Then, though under this benign and sensible system the productiveness of this land might be increased tenfold, it would be for ever protected by State proprietorship from becoming periodically the stake of practical gamblers, and, what would be better still, from such a curse to the cultivator and the public as an increase in marketable value of "ten years' purchase."

It follows, therefore, that the repeal of the laws of entail and settlement is not a safe remedy, but a very dangerous one, and that *gradual* "expropriation" is the only sure course for the Government to pursue, with any certain hope of attaining the desired ends in view, steadiness of rent,* fixity of tenure, security to cultivators of the just fruit of *their* labour, and increased wealth and prosperity to the whole of the United Kingdom.

---

## Art. II.—Political Memoirs: The Goderich and Wellington Administrations, 1827-30.

1. *Memoir of the Public Life of the Right Hon. John Charles Herries, in the reigns of George III., George IV., William IV., and Victoria.* By his Son, Edward Herries, C.B., with an Introduction by Sir Charles Herries, K.C.B. In 2 vols London: John Murray, 1880.
2. *A Political Diary,* 1828–1830. By Edward Law, Lord Ellenborough. Edited by Lord Colchester. In 2 vols. London: Richard Bentley and Son.

Many even well-informed persons know little of the political history of the period which elapsed between the death of Lord Liverpool and the fall of the Wellington Ministry.

The two works named at the head of this paper give informa-

* Under State proprietorship, of course, land-rents would vary slightly, as the income-tax or any other tax does, according to the requirements of the Government. But the rent-payers would have a voice, through their representatives, in making any changes, up or down, and, consequently rack-renting would disappear.

tion of some value as to the transactions of the portion of that period which followed the death of Mr. Canning, and deserve notice.

The memoir of Mr. Herries is published from his son's desire to vindicate his reputation against some disparaging remarks by Lord Palmerston and Mr. Spencer Walpole. The contents of the book do not justify the promise held out by its somewhat pretentious title—for it is mainly occupied with the history of Mr. Herries' connection with the ministries of Lord Goderich and of the Duke of Wellington. The periods of his life before and after the existence of those ministries are dealt with in a very meagre manner, and concerning those periods which comprise the larger portions of his career, the memoir tells us little that was not known before, and that little is of small value.

"The true story," we quote Sir Charles Herries' introduction, "of the formation and dissolution of the Goderich administration has never before been made public, and the detailed account of all the intrigues and negotiations by which the King was harrassed by the Whigs, is so curious as to be interesting as a mere narrative, besides clearing away the mystery which has hitherto surrounded the events of the time."*

The Goderich administration is distinguished from all others by its being the only one in our history which having been formed after the close of one session of Parliament, through its internecine divisions and the imbecility of its chief, broke up before the opening of the next. It is difficult at this day to revive any interest in its brief and inglorious career, or in that of the second-rate politician who is the subject of this memoir. Whatever interest the book may have consists mainly in the proof which it affords of a direct act of personal government on the part of George IV., by his appointment of Mr. Herries to be *his* Chancellor of the Exchequer, and any case which illustrates the working of the personal interference of the sovereign in the government of the country is valuable. It also supplies us with fresh tests of the truth and value of Lord Campbell's dictum, to which we referred in our last number, † "George IV. is the model of a Constitutional King of England, and when he is missed, he may be mourned. *He has stood by and let the country govern itself.*"‡ We should be content to test George IV.'s character as "The model Constitutional King" by his conduct in the appointment of Mr. Herries as Chancellor of the Exchequer.

---

* "Memoir of Herries," vol. i. p. 9.

† "WESTMINSTER REVIEW, July, 1881, art. "Mr. Fitzgerald's 'Life of George IV.'"

‡ "Life of Lord Campbell," vol. i. p. 467.

The remark of Lord Palmerston, which has provoked the wrath of Mr. Herries' sons, and led to the publication of this "Memoir," occurs in his "Autobiography." "George IV.," he there tells us, "who personally hated me, did not fancy me as Chancellor of the Exchequer. He wanted to have Herries in that office. There were questions coming on about palaces and Crown lands which the King was very anxious about, and he wished to have a creature of his own at the Exchequer."*

This statement is corroborated by Mr. Greville, who, equally with Lord Palmerston, has posthumously incurred the wrath of Mr. Herries' sons: "The appointment [of Mr. Herries] was the King's, with whom Herries had ingratiated himself by transacting some of his pecuniary business, and getting him odds and ends out of droits, &c." † Mr. Percy Fitzgerald truly says, "that it was not so unprecedented a thing for Ministers to allow the King to help himself to odds and ends of the public monies, as Mr. Herries would make out."‡ In fact, in the Appendix F to the first volume of the Memoir, the editors show that out of the Droits of the Admiralty and Crown, the sum of £385,000 was applied in various payments for the purpose of the Privy Purse, as directed by His Majesty.§ Lord Ellenborough, in his Diary, mentions that a sum of £250,000, surplus of the compensation to British subjects after the settlement of all claims, belonged to the Crown as a droit, and was lent to the Woods and Forests for the completion of Buckingham House. An account of this sum should have been laid before Parliament. Lord Ellenborough congratulates himself "that the Wellington Ministry had nothing to do with it."‖ Mr. Spencer Walpole also has incurred the wrath of the Herries family, by speaking of their father, rather perhaps rhetorically than with literal exactness, "as a Treasury clerk—suddenly pressed by George IV. into the place of Chancellor of the Exchequer." Mr. Herries began life as a clerk in the Revenue Department of the Treasury. Under Addington's administration he became private secretary to Vansittart, the then Secretary to the Treasury, and subsequently he became private secretary to Spencer Perceval when Chancellor of the Exchequer. Afterwards, and until 1816, he acted as Commissary-in-Chief. On the abolition of that office at the close of the war, he was made Auditor of the Civil List, and so became known to, and mixed up with, George IV. In 1822 he was made by Lord Liverpool Financial Secretary of the Treasury,

* Quoted in "Memoir of Herries," vol. i. p. 129.
† "Greville's Journal," vol. i. p. 109.
‡ "Life of George IV." vol. ii. p. 271.
§ "Memoir," vol. i. p. 278. ‖ "Diary," vol. i. p. 93.

and then first entered the House of Commons. He continued to hold the Secretaryship until the death of Mr. Canning in August, 1827, During this period he acted under Lord Goderich when he was Chancellor of the Exchequer. Had Mr. Spencer Walpole described Mr. Herries, not as a "Treasury clerk," but as a "Treasury hack," we think he would have been more accurate. Mr. Herries himself had a very moderate estimate of his own abilities and fitness for office. He told Mr. Canning that his "natural place was in the working class of politicians, and that he should be wholly lost and out of place in high office.* This judgment on himself was that also of others. The Duke of Newcastle, writing to the first Lord Colchester, classes Mr. Herries amongst the "rubbish men" of the Ministerial world.† He was, in fact, one of "the men of mean attainments, and moderate abilities" of which, according to Lord Beaconsfield, the Liverpool Government was composed. Lord Ellenborough, when he first met him as a colleague in the Wellington Cabinet, was impressed by him "as being a plain, ordinary clerk-like looking man, full of information, of the class of under-secretaries."‡ Lord Colchester, in a note in this passage, remarks that Lord Ellenborough's "first impression of Mr. Herries, on being brought into official relations with him, must not be taken as reflecting his matured judgment of a colleague with whom he acted for many years in office and opposition." This is a charitable judgment of Lord Colchester; against it must be set the fact that Lord Ellenborough, after a year's experience of Mr. Herries as a colleague in the Cabinet, writes of him in his Diary thus—"I distrust him, and have ever done so." Another entry records this opinion, of which Lord Lyndhurst highly approved—"He is useless to us, and a discredit." Lord Ellenborough therefore proposed to the Duke of Wellington to send out Mr. Herries as Governor-General of Bombay. "It did not seem to have occurred to him" [the Duke]. He said he thought Herries would not go; but he evidently thought it would be a very good thing if he would."§ So much for the opinion entertained of Mr. Herries by himself and others. We turn to the question, whether it is true, as represented by Lord Palmerston, Mr. Greville, and Mr. Spencer Walpole, that the appointment of Mr. Herries as Chancellor of the Exchequer was the King's own act, and, owing to his desire in order to serve his own purposes, to have a creature of his own at the Exchequer.

---

* "*Vide* his letter to Canning, "Memoir," vol. i. p. 135.
† "Lord Colchester's Diary," vol. iii. p. 537.
‡ Lord Ellenborough, "Diary," vol. i. p. 3.
§ Ibid., vol. i. p. 398; vol. ii. p. 12, 19.

It is noteworthy that in the last month of Canning's Administration Mr. Herries was placed on the Royal Commission for directing the restoration of Windsor Castle, one of George IV.'s subjects of anxiety; and a few days before Canning's death we find Mr. Herries in confidential communication with Sir William Knighton, who held under George IV. the same position of secret and irresponsible Minister which in the present reign was held by Baron Stockmar; the avowed subject of their communications being "the furnishing of Windsor Castle, and some other matters connected with Civil List expenditure." * By the death of Mr. Canning † "the whole power of the State," to borrow Mr. Gladstone's phrase, "returned into the Royal hands," ‡ and George IV. sent for Lord Goderich as the weakest and most pliant of politicians, and therefore, for Royal purposes, the most eligible of Premiers; and, after the fashion of his father, proceeded, as Sir Robert Peel complained to Lord Colchester, to play off "one-half of the administration against the other half; receiving recommendations to honours and offices from each party in the Government, and putting aside both 'that neither might have a triumph,' and bestowing the favour on some third individual of his own choice, for which there was no responsible adviser."§

"The Times" announced that the arrangement of the places in the Goderich Administration was "after the will of the real sovereign, and under his direction." || On the day of Canning's death, Lord Lyndhurst, then Chancellor, wrote to Mr. Herries, who was about to go for a holiday on the Continent: "Circumstances are such that you must not leave England at present. Let me see you to-morrow. Mr. C. is in a very sad state."¶ Goderich also urged Herries not to leave England, but nothing was said as to his going to the Exchequer. On the 13th of August Herries came to London by appointment to see Goderich, but first he paid a visit, apparently of his own accord, to the Lord Chancellor, when, to quote Herries' narrative, "He told me that the King desired him to convey to me his own particular wish that I should accept the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer, which Goderich would offer me." ** It was a wholly unprecedented thing for such a communication to be made by anybody

* "Memorandum," vol. i. p. 149. † August 8, 1827.

‡ "Gleanings of Past Years," vol. i. p. 38.

§ Lord Colchester's "Diary," vol ii. p. 327.

|| Of August 15, 1827, *vide* "Memoir," vol. i. p. 180, note.

¶ "Memoir," vol. i. p. 150.

** And see letter of Herries to Goderich in which he acknowledges Goderich's communication of "the King's most gracious condescension in desiring Goderich to propose to him to take the Exchequer."—"Memoir," vol. i. p. 182.

but the person charged with the formation of the Ministry. The fact that it was made shows that the King had made up his mind, probably by the advice of Lyndhurst, that the appointment should be made. "I afterwards," continues Mr. Herries, "saw Lord Goderich on his return from Windsor in the evening, and he told me that the King desired I would undertake the office, and come to him to-morrow morning to kiss hands. . . . . Lord Goderich expressed himself much gratified by this result, which he communicated to me with much cordiality."

Mr. Herries was, or affected to be, unwilling to take the Exchequer, and put his reasons for declining it into the hands of Goderich, who thereupon offered the office to Lord Palmerston. On August 14, a message from Windsor forced Herries to reconsider his refusal. Goderich expressed much anxiety and distress on the apprehension of Herries abandoning him, yet (adds Herries) "he did not in this interview appear to be particularly anxious on the subject of my accepting the particular office which he had offered me." Notwithstanding Goderich's vacillation, Herries felt himself compelled to declare that "he would do his best to meet the King's wishes," a fact which was made known to Goderich by Knighton. This brought Goderich to Herries on the 15th, in much "embarrassment," repeating his assurances that Herries was the only person he could wish to have in the office, "and the fittest, in his opinion, to fill it;" * but Goderich also adverted, in obscure terms, to "certain peculiar embarrassments arising out of the composition of his Gorvernment."† The cause of his embarrassment was that he had in the meantime offered the Exchequer to Palmerston. Herries assured Goderich "that he should be most happy if some other person were appointed to the office." Goderich "was much delighted," and they parted, Herries leaving London, and expressing his intention speedily to leave England, first taking care to write to Knighton, so that the real state of the case should be known at Windsor.‡ The next day (16th), he was recalled by Goderich. What took place we must give in his own words:

"I found him again in perplexity. He informed me that the King desired I would attend the next day at Windsor, when he would give me an audience, and offer me the seals himself. I begged of Lord Goderich to inform me whether I was to understand that as being his own advice to the King, and whether I was to consider that he himself offered me the seals. In other words, whether I was going to the King in conformity with the wishes of the present Government or independently of them. He was obliged to own that the appointment which the

* *Vide* "Greville," vol. i. p. 111. † "Memoir," vol. i. pp. 154–9.
‡ See the letter to Knighton, "Memoir," vol. i. p. 183.

King was now pressing upon me had, since he first proposed it to the King, become liable to some objections on account of the conflicting feelings and pretensions of the several parts of the Cabinet, and that he was overwhelmed by the difficulties which surrounded him; personally my appointment would be most satisfactory, but he gave me plainly to understand that he should be glad if I would relieve him of his difficulties by resisting the King's wishes. I told him distinctly that I could not now do that. I pointed out to him that it was his business, as the head of the Government, to assert his right and advise the King exclusively on the subject of appointments of so high a nature; that he could indeed no longer consider himself with justice as being entrusted with the formation of the Government if the King took any other course in spite of his advice; and that I should therefore recommend him to request the King to desist from his present intentions, and to think of me no more."*

Mr. Herries correctly stated the constitutional rule, but how does he reconcile with it his receiving his appointment in the first instance, not from the Premier, but from the King, through the Chancellor, and with his secret communications behind the Premier's back with the irresponsible Minister Knighton. On the 17th, Herries, previous to starting for Windsor, called on Goderich. Goderich then produced to him an autograph letter from the King, which he had sent open by Goderich on the 15th, but which Goderich had suppressed. It was addressed to Herries, and stated "the King cannot dispense with Mr. Herries' services as his Chancellor of the Exchequer."† After this it appeared to Herries impossible any further to resist the King's wishes, and he told Goderich "he took it for granted that he must go to Windsor and take the seals." After "a scene of unmanly perplexity,"‡ Goderich at length brought himself to say, "There is no alternative; you must accept office."

The two Ministers then started for Windsor, Goderich taking with him the seals of the Exchequer. "The scenes that occurred at Windsor would fill a volume," is Herries' own account of what then and there occurred.

When the two Ministers arrived at Windsor, the King, as his manner was, was not ready to receive them; there can be no doubt he was still in bed. Herries, Lord Bexley, Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, and Greville, the Clerk of the Council, filled up their time by walking round the Castle with Wyattville, the architect engaged in its restoration. In the course of a conversation about the elevationof the Round Tower, Herries said to the architect, "But it is my business *now* to ask you

---

* "Memoir," vol. i. pp. 161–2. † Ibid. p. 185.
‡ Herries' own words.

what will you do it for, how much will it cost? Will you do it for £10,000?" Wyattville said, "You must give me £15,000."

Goderich's private secretary had before told Greville that Herries' appointment to the Exchequer had been determined on. After this conversation Greville felt "he could have no doubt that Herries was Chancellor of the Exchequer." In the meantime the other Ministers had arrived. Lord Lansdowne and the rest of the Whig section of the Ministry not only disliked Herries' politics, but they still more objected to the King's taking upon himself to nominate the members of the Government without consulting his Ministers. They were determined to resist Herries' appointment. The King kept his Ministers so long waiting that it gave Lord Lansdowne time, to use Herries' words, "to direct a new battery against Goderich." There were repeated conferences between various Ministers and with the King, and Greville noticed that the King sent for Knighton, "who was closeted with him for an hour." Goderich came to Herries, and "with the strongest demonstrations of distress," says Herries, "entreated that I would avoid the positive acceptance of the seals. He said that his Government depended upon it." Herries then privately saw the King, "who told him that Lord Goderich had suggested some objections which he (the King) knew came from the Whigs; that he would not be dictated to, and," continues Herries, "that he desired I would take the seals (putting them, at the same time, into my hands)." After more conferences and audiences, Herries returned to the King, "and he (we again quote Herries) told me that he had very reluctantly consented to put off the matter until Mr. Huskisson's return. 'But remember,' he said (Sir W. Knighton was present), 'the seals are for you—they are yours.'" The only thing accomplished that day was the making Herries a Privy Councillor, and of that he says, "I must add that I do not owe my nomination to the Privy Council to Lord Goderich. The King himself proposed it to me." The day's proceedings were not calculated to enhance the dignity or the comfort of the new Premier, but he returned to London satisfied with having, as he said, "gained a day."*

On Huskisson's return he absolutely refused to be Chancellor of the Exchequer. The office was then offered to Mr. Sturges Bourne, and, after some hesitation, declined by him. The Whigs continued their opposition to Herries, but, as a compromise, offered to remain in the Ministry if Herries would at first take some other office, on the understanding that he should, after a

* "Memoir," vol. i. pp. 162-4; Conf. "Greville," vol. i. pp. 108-10; and the revised but less accurate version of the same proceedings at pp. 111, 112.

time, go to the Exchequer. In the end, after many discussions and much altercation, the King personally appealed to Lord Lansdowne, "in his own name, and for the sake of the country," not to resign on account of a series of blunders "which, let me say," the King added, "were neither yours nor mine." Lord Lansdowne and his Whig colleagues thereupon waived their objection to Herries, and agreed to remain in office. With Herries as Chancellor of the Exchequer, Lord Lansdowne consented to remain only on condition that he might have the Royal authority for stating that it was solely in submission to the express desire of the King that he did so. On the 3rd of September, Herries formally received the seals of the Exchequer at Windsor, none of the Whig members of the Cabinet being present.

"'The thing that appears most foolish,' wrote Lord Althorp to Earl Spencer, 'is that our Whig friends, having determined to submit, should absent themselves from the Cabinet at which the thing was done, that is, having been obliged to swallow a nasty dose, they take care that the faces they make shall be seen by the whole country. This must not only destroy all cordiality and concert in the Ministry, but, by making their want of power notorious, diminishes what little they might have hoped for.'* 'The King,' wrote Herries to his sister, 'is highly pleased with his own successful management of the affair, which has indeed been at once able and dignified.'"

Knowing the King's habit of deluding himself into the belief that he was the chief actor in all the events of the regency and his reign, we have no doubt that he would have expressed himself equally pleased had either Palmerston, Huskisson, or Sturges Bourne been appointed to the Exchequer, and he would have claimed as exclusively belonging to himself the merit, if any, of the appointment.

As the case stands, no historical fact was ever better established than that the King, for purposes of his own, desired to place Herries at the Exchequer, and succeeded in doing so. The common opinion was that throughout these proceedings Goderich acted equally ill to the King and to Herries, and to the rest of his colleagues.†

No cabinet so formed could have energy or authority, or cordially act together, neither was its long continuance in office

---

* "Memoir of Earl Spencer (Viscount Althorp)," p. 226.

† *Vide* "Memoir," and the letters therein contained, vol. i. p. 168 to the end; "Greville," vol. i. pp. 110–114. As to Lord Lansdowne, *vide* "Memoirs of Moore," vol. v. p. 198. Sir G. C. Lewis's "Administrations of Great Britain," 1783, 1830, p. 446, note; and "Memoirs of Viscount Melbourne," vol. i. p. 233-7.

probable. The King, as was his custom when he had a weak Minister to deal with, claimed the disposal of every sort of patronage. "The King," writes Lord Campbell to his brother, "is very troublesome about appointments. He has more power and influence than constitutionally he ought to have, Lord Goderich has no authority, and is no check on the King."* The King and the Duke of Clarence, then Lord High Admiral, without consulting the Ministers, made the promotions and dispensed the honours after the "untoward event" of the battle of Navarino; and the King, without the slightest reference to the Premier, gave the See of Winchester to Dr. C. R. Sumner, who had been tutor in the family of Lady Conyngham, the reigning favourite. Lord Liverpool had, by the threat of resigning, successfully resisted the too rapid promotion of Sumner, which was urged by the King from whim or caprice. The King, *more suo*, gave way to a strong Minister. With Lord Goderich, the weakest of all the Premiers England has seen in her history, he could take liberties, and Sumner's appointment was completed. Such was Lord Campbell's "model of a constitutional king."

The Whigs were anxious to strengthen themselves in the cabinet by bringing in Lord Holland. At first Goderich had no inclination to accede to this proposal, and it is beyond doubt that the King had decided objections to it; but later in the year Goderich wrote to the King, urging the admission, not only of Lord Holland but of Lord Wellesley, and stating that, "without such an addition of strength to the Government, he felt himself unable to make himself responsible for carrying on the King's service; and unless his advice was adopted he begged leave to retire."

"Lord Lansdowne and Huskisson concurred, both in the advice and the determination to resign expressed in this letter." But with characteristic weakness, if not duplicity, Goderich, unknown to Lansdowne and Huskisson, or any other of his colleagues, added a postscript, in which he stated, "he felt himself, from domestic circumstances affecting the health of one most dear to him, wholly incapable of continuing to perform the duties of his station."

The sending of this letter with its postscript became known to the cabinet on the 13th of December, when, in consequence of the dissensions it created between his colleagues, Goderich tendered his resignation. This he aftewards withdrew. Another disturbance, however, broke out, which, added to the

* Under date Nov. 13, 1827, "Life of Lord Campbell," vol. i. p. 450.

former causes of division, brought this most feeble and wretched of Governments to an end.

Canning had given notice for the session of 1828 to move the appointment of a Select Committee of the House of Commons on finance. The proposal of the Committee originated, it is said, with Herries. A difference arose between Huskisson, the leader of the House, and Herries as to its chairman. Huskisson fixed on Lord Althorp, who was especially obnoxious to "the King's own Chancellor of the Exchequer," who regarded him "as the most prominent member of the most reforming party in the house."* Herries had not only been sent by the King to the Exchequer to help him in his raids on the public monies; but in common with all Tory officials of the old school, he had the objection to any reduction in taxation, which Lord Beaconsfield, in "Coningsby" attributes to Taper.† Neither Herries nor Huskisson would give way, Goderich hesitated, and finally declined to become the arbiter of the dispute between his two colleagues."‡

The particulars of this dispute are given at great length in the "Memoir," but on this subject we learn from it little, if anything, which was not known before.§

We learn, however, something as to the causes which brought about the dissolution of the Ministry. Goderich affirmed that its sole cause was the dissension as to the chairmanship of the Finance Committee. Herries admitted that this was one cause, but affirmed that the contemplated admission to the Cabinet of more of the Whigs was another, and equally as great, if not indeed a greater cause of the disruption.

From his account it would appear that on the 29th of December there was a conversation between him and Goderich, in which Goderich, "in an uncertain and hesitating and confused manner, as if more the expression of his own ruminations than intended as a distinct communication" to Herries, informed him that he had assented to the introduction of Lord Holland, and when asked by Herries if Lord Wellesley also was likely to be introduced—

"He said, hesitatingly, 'Yes, he thought so.' He added 'that Lord Wellesley had been forced upon him on several occasions and

---

* "Memoir," vol. ii. p. 16.

† "No repeal of any tax," said Taper, sincerely shocked, and shaking his head; "and the malt-tax of all others, I am altogether against that." It is not unlikely that Herries was the original of Taper.

‡ "Memoir of Herries," vol. ii. pp. 8–13; Conf. Sir G. C. Lewis's "Administration," &c., pp. 446.

§ Ibid. pp. 20–70.

that it was not an act of his own choice. I took the opportunity, however,' continues Herries, 'of telling him upon my part very distinctly that I feared that these measures were all pressed upon him by persons out of the Cabinet in communication with a part of ourselves, and that I was afraid he would in the end experience all the evils and misfortunes which had attended all other parties or persons who had been governed by the suggestions of Mr. Brougham.'"

Here, therefore, Herries attributes to Brougham an influence over the Goderich Ministry to which we find no claim laid in Brougham's Autobiography, though there is a letter of Brougham which tends to justify the statement that he aspired tobe the "irrepressible patron" of the Ministry.

"'I rejoice,' wrote Brougham to the late Lord Monteagle, 'in the prospect before us for the next Session. I shall have some half-dozen reforms in our law and policy well matured, for I must avail myself of the influence my singular position gives me in the House to do permanent good—viz., all the weight of being out of place (both weight with the King and country), and the favour of the old Tory Opposition, who, I do not think, will quarrel with me rashly.'"*

Brougham was indeed given over to "a strong delusion that he should believe a lie" when he persuaded himself that at any time he had weight with George IV. Herries also assigns to Brougham a part in the tragedy of the fall of the Ministry, of which we find no trace either in the "Autobiography" in "Campbell's Life of Brougham," † or in "Greville's Journal."

On the 5th of January, 1828, Sir Alexander Spearman, then Herries' private secretary, wrote to inform him of a visit from some one whose name the editors of the "Memoir" suppress. It seems likely that it was Knighton—whoever it was he had just seen Brougham, and came to report to Herries the "conversation he had had with him. He said 'that B. was in high spirits, and was quite satisfied that they were all in the right course, that Lord Holland would certainly come in, that none of the present men would go out on that account, that *one* ‡ of them might indeed go no more.'" The anonymous visitor, according to his own account, rejoined, "Take my word for it, Brougham, that *you* have broken up the Government."

Sir Alexander continues, "Holmes § has been here this morn-

---

* See the letter in Torrens' "Memoirs of Viscount Melbourne," vol. i. p. 236.

† As to Brougham and the Goderich Ministry, see "Lives of Chancellors," vol. viii. p. 355.

‡ The one Minister referred to was evidently Herries.

§ The whipper-in.

morning. He saw the Chancellor late last night. The Chancellor was yesterday again with Lord Goderich. He repeated again to Lord G. and to Huskisson his determination upon the subject of the Government, 'that he was determined immediately to communicate with the King, in order that the state of the Government might not come upon His Majesty unawares.'"

Lord Campbell, writing to his brother shortly after this time, tells him of a conversation he had had with the Chancellor "in the tone of former confidence," who "intimated an opinion that Brougham had done a great deal of mischief—indeed, my private opinion is that Copley's dread of Brougham led mainly to breaking up the Government. If Lord Holland had come in with Brougham in his train, Copley would have been in the hands of the Whigs, and would have held the Great Seal by an insecure tenure."*

Campbell, in his "Life of Lyndhurst," gives an account, apparently founded on information received from Lyndhurst himself, of the part he took in bringing about the change of Ministry, which differs from that given in Sir Alexander Spearman's letter. According to Campbell, late at night on the 6th of January, 1828, Goderich came to Lyndhurst in one of his customary fits of "unmanly perplexity," and told him he had made up his mind to resign immediately. The Chancellor endeavoured to dissuade him from resigning, and urged him to meet Parliament, as, after all, the Session might pass over quietly, and, at any rate, it would be more dignified to fall before an adverse vote than to tumble down with a confession of incapacity. Goderich "mopped the perspiration from his brows with his handkerchief, as he was used to do in debate when his ideas became very confused," he said his decision was irrevocable, but that he feared breaking the matter to the King, who would be embarrassed by a change of Ministry a few days before the meeting of Parliament. "As far as that goes," said the Chancellor, "instead of your writing a letter to His Majesty (about which there might be some awkwardness), if you do not like to face him in a private audience, I don't mind accompanying you to Windsor." Goderich caught at this offer. Lyndhurst paved the way for the audience by a communication to Knighton, "his fast friend." Accordingly, the King received the two Ministers "very graciously, and accepted the resignation;" "but," said he, rather addressing himself to the Chancellor, "I ought to ask your advice about the person I ought to send for to consult about the formation of a new administration." "Sir," said the Chancellor, "I venture to mention the name which

* Under date 21st of January, 1828, "Campbell's Life," vol. i. p. 453.

must have already presented itself to the mind of your Majesty, the Duke of Wellington." *The King :* "Let him come to me as soon as possible," and, as Lyndhurst always averred, he added, "But, remember, whoever is to be Minister, you, my Lord, must remain my Chancellor."*

The author of an *Apologia* of Lyndhurst, which appeared in *The Times*† on his death, says :

> "In the perplexities which beset the brief Cabinet of Lord Goderich, it has been popularly asserted that Lord Lyndhurst had some share, and that he was instrumental to some extent in the Duke of Wellington's return to office. It is true that he afterwards closely allied himself with the Duke, that he was always thenceforth what might be termed the Duke's man, but there appear no further reasons for charging him with undermining a Cabinet which must have been broken up and replaced before long without his intervention."

Lyndhurst may not have undermined the Cabinet, but there is no doubt that Campbell's judgment is right, that by his "dexterous stroke of policy" in accompanying Goderich to Windsor, he became master of the position which gave him the power of forming the new administration, and so brought Wellington into power. If Lyndhurst's reputation remains overclouded by the suspicion of intriguing on this and other occasions during his long career, it is largely due to his having burnt every letter and paper which could be useful to his biographer, leaving him, to use Lyndhurst's own words, "at liberty to follow his own inclination."‡

Parliament met on 29th of January, but it was not until February 11, that Goderich made a statement of the circumstances which led to the breaking up of his administration. This he attributed entirely to the difference between Herries and Huskisson, throwing all the blame upon Herries. At the Cabinet the next day Herries complained that Goderich had omitted all mention of his first abdication on the King's refusal to admit Lord Holland. He impressed Ellenborough with the belief that he had seen "that the Whigs were strengthening themselves in the Cabinet, and took the first opportunity of going out." A week later, on the 18th of February, Huskisson and Herries gave their versions of the affair. Herries' speech

---

* "Lives of the Chancellors," vol. viii. pp. 56–7 ; Conf. "Memoir of Herries," vol. ii. p. 57 ; "Greville," vol. i. pp. 120–1.

† *The Times*, Oct. 13, 1863 ; reprinted "In Mornings of the Recess," vol. ii. p. 1.

‡ See Lyndhurst's declaration to Campbell, "Lives of the Chancellors," vol. viii. pp. 1–2.

was the best received, and, according to Lord Ellenborough, his statement at first "set him up very much," but towards the end he declared that he *knew* (an expression he qualified afterwards) that the difference between him and Huskisson was made the excuse for breaking up the administration, but was not the real cause.

The next evening Goderich, in the House of Lords, reiterated his declaration that Herries' resignation was the sole cause of the breaking up of the Government. The ex-Premier and his late colleague were, therefore, directly at issue. On the 21st the late Thomas Slingsby Duncombe made his first appearance as a Parliamentary speaker. He made a violent attack upon Herries, the gist of which was that he had been secretly instigated by the King or Knighton to break up the Ministry rather than allow Lord Althorp to be Chairman of the Finance Committee, an appointment inexpressibly repugnant to the King. Sir H. Hardinge (then Irish Secretary) told Ellenborough that "Herries was damaged, and the House against him." Another eye-witness who had been favourably disposed towards Herries, was "much distressed by the scene that took place, and noticed that Sir R. Peel's countenance evidently showed he felt Herries was damaged." Herries, in his previous explanation, had declared "with the most solemn asseverations, as he hoped to be saved, &c., that he had consulted no one as to the line of conduct he should pursue." Brougham, with evident reference to the King or Knighton, now asked him "if no one consulted with him?" and to this Herries declined giving an answer. "The impression," says Greville, "left with regard to Herries was as unfavourable as possible." Lord Wellesley compared the discussion to the concluding chorus in "Tom Thumb," where all the characters say "You lie! you lie!! you lie!!!" It was reported that Herries went to Windsor "to ask the King to allow him to disclose all he cannot state without the King's permission." If the permission was asked, apparently it was not given; Herries never again attempted any Parliamentary defence or explanation of his conduct in this transaction.*

Just at this juncture Knighton went one of his journeys to the Continent, and it was commonly believed that "Duncombe was the man who had driven him out, and that he had given the first blow to that secret influence which had only been obscurely hinted at before, and never openly attacked." If Mr. Percy

* See "Memoirs of Herries," vol. ii. p. 57-70; and his own statement of events, *ibid.* p. 71-77; and Herries' letter to Knighton, *ibid.* p. 81; Ellenborough's "Diary," vol. i. pp. 24, 30, 31, 34, 35, 38; "Greville," vol. i. p. 126-7; Colchester's "Diary," vol. iii. p. 548.

Fitzgerald is to be regarded as any authority, it is at least as probable that the object of Knighton's visit to the Continent was to settle some of the King's debts.*

For the sake of clearness we have sacrificed chronological order in our narrative, so as to complete the story of the fall of Goderich.

We now turn to that of the formation of the Duke of Wellington's Ministry, so far forth as any new light is thrown upon it by these two publications. An atmosphere, if not of intrigue, yet of mystery, surrounded the birth of that ministry. A list of its members appeared in the papers, the publication of which the new Premier considered to be, if not a breach of faith on the part of Herries, to be at least premature; he thereupon wrote him in these intemperate terms: "There never was an event comparatively so trifling in itself that will produce such important consequences on the destinies of this country, as will the premature disclosure in the newspapers of the names of the new-formed Ministry, notwithstanding the precautions and the pains I took to prevent such disclosure."† What these apprehended consequences were we know not. There is no evidence that any mischief whatever followed the publication. As in the formation of the Goderich Ministry, so in the formation of its successor, Lyndhurst appears in the character of a go-between or secret mediator between the King and Herries. On the 15th of January he wrote to Herries, "I have been with the Duke today to Windsor, and the King has desired me to make a communication to you." The King's Chancellor of the Exchequer thereupon went to the King's Chancellor of the Realm, no doubt expecting that the promised Royal communication would be, "Whoever is to be Minister, Herries must remain my Chancellor of the Exchequer;" but Lyndhurst informed him that he had received another communication which rendered it impossible for him then to tell Herries what he had been commissioned to state to him, but he promised to come to him on the next day. Herries was equally surprised and vexed at what he calls "this versatility and mystery" towards him, but inasmuch as all was professed to be done in the King's name, he considered that he could not properly express his feelings.‡ Huskisson had, in the meantime, agreed to join the Duke's Ministry, on condition that Herries should not continue to be Chancellor of the Exchequer,§ though Huskisson did not object to his remaining in the Cabinet.

* "Greville," vol. i. pp. 129-30; Fitzgerald's "Life of George IV." vol. ii. p. 324.

† "Memoirs of Herries," vol. ii. p. 65. ‡ *Ibid.* p. 61.

§ *Ibid.* p. 59, and the authority there referred to.

This condition was not at the time disclosed to Herries. The Duke was always the dictator of his Ministry, and in order to retain office at all, Herries was reluctantly compelled to descend to the Mastership of the Mint, "an office"—as his sons truly say—"having no administrative importance." The Duke, with characteristic bluntness, told him "particular circumstances placed you in the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer, for which you are highly qualified, and another train of circumstances rendered it necessary to remove you from it."*

"'The part of this transaction,' shrewdly remarks Greville, 'which will appear extraordinary is, that the Government, having been broken up by a quarrel between Huskisson and Herries, the opposite party come in, and both these Ministers with them. In private life the transaction would look very like a fraud, and be open to great suspicion.' It would appear as if they had got up a sham quarrel in order to get out their colleagues and stay in themselves with the Tories. This, however, I believe not to be the case, at least as far as Huskisson is concerned, though perhaps Herries may not be altogether so clear."†

When Huskisson and the other Canningites seceded from the Ministry, Herries applied to the Duke for some more important employment, but in reply received this cold comfort:—

"You are in the Cabinet and holding an office which has not much business connected with the Government; and for that reason your being in the Cabinet is more honourable to your character. . . . I entreat you then to be satisfied and have patience, and be assured that you must rise eventually to offices of more business, though not of more importance, or more honourable to your character, than that you now hold."‡

During the remaining existence of the Wellington Ministry this prophecy was not fulfilled.

In November, 1830, Herries, with the rest of his colleagues, retreated from office before the adverse vote of the Commons. In the short-lived Peel Cabinet of 1834-5, he held the office of Secretary of War.§ On the restoration of the Conservatives to power in 1841, owing to his rejection at Ipswich, he was not in Parliament, and so not eligible for the Ministry. Sir Robert Peel could easily have found him a seat both in the House and in the Cabinet.‖ It is significant of the place which he held in Sir Robert's estimation that the great minister *did neither.*

* "Memoirs of Herries," vol. ii. p. 89. † "Journal," vol. i. p. 123.
‡ "Memoir," vol. ii. p. 89. § *Ibid.* p. 170.
‖ *Ibid.* p. 190, *et seq.*

Lord Ellenborough's Diary is co-extensive with the duration of the Wellington Ministry, at the formation of which he was made Lord Privy Seal; but, finding himself "désoeuvré and bored, as," he says, "all Privy Seals will be," he afterwards took what he calls "the *incognito* office" of President of the Board of Control. He retained the Privy Seal for a considerable period.*

The Diary consists mostly of notes of Cabinet meetings, made from day to day as they were held. The publication of such a record is wholly unprecedented, and would have provoked the censure of Lord Campbell. Campbell, in his "Autobiography," referring to his first becoming a Cabinet Minister, says, "My narrative might now be expected to become much more interesting; but I am afraid that disappointment will follow. In my opinion it would be highly unjustifiable at any period, however distant, to publish to the world all that passes in a Cabinet. Under the apprehension of such a disclosure, the members would not boldly and freely do their duty;" and again, when towards the close of his life he, for the second time, became a member of a Cabinet, "I still," he says, "abstain on principle from making a statement in my journal of the deliberations of the Cabinet."

But even Campbell admits that "when times and characters have became historical, there are deliberations of the Cabinet which may fairly be made matter of history, and which those who took part in them would not wish to be concealed."†

More than fifty years have passed since the last entry in Lord Ellenborough's Diary, and probably no greater inconvenience or injury will arise from its publication than the annoyance which may be caused to the relatives or friends of persons of whom the Diarist has left on record opinions expressed always with frankness—often with severity.

The Diary will be of great use to historians of the time to which it refers, but it is, to borrow a phrase of Carlyle, "an uncounted handful of needles to be collected from an unmeasured continent of hay." It is, therefore, scarcely possible either to condense its narrative or give a continuous comment on it. We can deal only with some of its anecdotes and personal references. We commend it to the careful study of certain economists who seek the abolition of what they are pleased to call the sinecure office of Privy

* Lord Ellenborough was made Privy Seal 22nd of January, 1828, and President of the Board of Control 5th of September, 1828; but his successor (Lord Rosslyn) was not made Privy Seal until 10th of June, 1828.

† "Life of Lord Campbell," vol. ii. pp. 203, 373.

Seal. It shows what a useful and important office it is when held by men of equal ability and industry, such as Lord Ellenborough, Viscount Halifax, the Duke of Argyll, or Lord Carlingford; not being absorbed in departmental business, Ellenborough, while Privy Seal, was able to give a general assistance to the Government, the value of which it is hard to overrate. Within six months of the formation of the Wellington Ministry the Duke expressed himself to his private secretary as charmed with Ellenborough, who was always ready to work for him. Later on he said that Ellenborough was "a little too lively, but was of great use."* He told Ellenborough himself that he had been as useful as any member of the Cabinet, both in discussing all questions and in concocting papers. Nearly every page of these volumes supply proof that this was so, and equally that Ellenborough acted as viceroy over the Earls Dudley and Aberdeen, who were successively Foreign Secretaries under Wellington. Wellington, however, always was really his own Foreign Secretary. The Foreign Secretaryship was then the object of Ellenborough's ambition; it was fortunate for his country he did not obtain it. Throughout his life, whether in or out of office, Ellenborough was equally industrious. We know, on the testimony of Lord Duncannon, that during the Whig Administration of 1835-41, Ellenborough used to read all the Bills and Blue Books, so that when Government Bills came up to the Lords, of which Duncannon, though officially in charge, knew nothing, "he used to ask Lord Ellenborough what they meant, and Ellenborough would take him into the library and explain them to him."†

The world has lately been satiated with a *réchauffé* of the sins, follies, and meannesses of George IV. We will not, therefore, dwell at any length on the fresh illustrations of his character which this Diary affords. Before Ellenborough's accession to office he had become an object of the King's special aversion. Lord Colchester, or whoever wrote the preface, attributes this feeling to Ellenborough's opposition to the Bill of Pains and Penalties in the Queen's case. Elsewhere‡ he states that it was owing to Ellenborough having in the debates on the "King's Property Bill," questioned the expediency of giving the King, "especially when he had no children to provide for, the power of taking away from his successor property enjoyed by

---

* Vol. ii. p. 299.

† "Life of Lord Campbell," vol. ii. p. 86, note.

‡ "Diary," vol. i. p. 10, note.

him before his succession." Be the cause what it might, of the fact of the King's ill-feeling towards his new Minister, there can be no doubt. Nevertheless, at their first meeting, the King, in his usual wheedling way, said to Ellenborough, "Circumstances have not enabled me to become acquainted with you; but I knew your father well, and had the greatest respect and affection for him. I know you have very considerable talents, and I have no doubt you will exert them for the public service;"* but for the rest of his life he never again spoke to Ellenborough, and excluded him from the dinners given to the Ministers. On one occasion the King apologized to Greville for not asking him to dine with the Ministers after a Council, because then Ellenborough was not "the only man not invited, and he would be d——d if Ellenborough should ever dine in his house."† Ellenborough was aware of the King's ill-feeling towards him, but felt that if he was proposed for any office which brought him into contact with the King, the King's personal feeling would not sufficiently outweigh his love of ease to induce him to oppose his appointment.‡ After a year's ministerial experience, he made this entry in his Diary: "It is impossible not to feel the most perfect contempt for the King's conduct. We should be justified in declaring we will have no further intercourse with one who has not treated us like a gentleman."§ A few months later he writes—"The misery is, we have a lying master."|| A few weeks before the King's death Ellenborough records: "The thing most surprising to me is the Duke's opinion of the King's firm courage. He said he had seen him not only now, but before, when he was considered not to have twenty-four hours' life in him; yet he, knowing his situation, was perfectly firm." The Duke had make a similar communication to the King, with "which he was much pleased." Ellenborough's comment, if cynical, is shrewd: "I have no doubt that the feeling that he is always in representation makes him behave in the face of death as a man would in the field of battle." Ellenborough was at the King's funeral, and he remarks of it: "Splendid the pageant was, but it was considered a mere pageant even by his household, who had lived so intimately with him for years. There was no regret. A coronation could hardly be gayer, but the procession was gravely done and decently."¶ Ellenborough's record of the proceedings of the Wellington Cabinet is rich in illustrations of "the embarrassments of coalitions." As long as the Canningites remained in the

* "Diary," vol. i. pp. 1-2. † "Greville's Journal," vol. i. p. 189.
‡ "Diary," vol. i. p. 144. § *Ibid.* p. 377.
|| *Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 31. ¶ *Ibid.* pp. 234, 239, 266, 312.

Ministry the Cabinet meetings were signal illustrations of Lord Holland's saying, that "he never knew a Cabinet meeting at which more time was not spent in arguments and quarrels between its members than in considering the arguments of their opponents."

In reference to one of these meetings, from which Huskisson "went away much annoyed," and the "Duke, too, was rather out of humour," the Chancellor remarked to the Privy Seal: "We should have no Cabinets after dinner; we all drink too much wine, and are not civil to each other."* Not long afterwards a Cabinet dinner was given by the Lord President.† "The Chancellor was not there," records Ellenborough; "and I suspect," he continues—"he thought we should have an angry discussion, and chose to be absent, and so clear of it." The proceedings at this meeting show the soundness of the Chancellor's opinion as to such Cabinets, for the Diary continues—"We had a great deal of useless talk, a large portion of which originated in Lord Bathurst's being rather drunk." We are glad, however, to learn that on this occasion Sir Robert Peel "was in better humour" than usual. After the secession of the Canningites, the Cabinet became more homogeneous, and acted with greater unanimity. Much to Ellenborough's disappointment, not he, but the travelled Thane Athenian, Aberdeen, "was made Foreign Secretary in room of Dudley." From this we should have inferred that the King was partial to Aberdeen, and that Aberdeen had influence over him, and that those were the reasons for making Aberdeen Foreign Secretary; but we find the following entry in Ellenborough's Diary. Being made at the time, it is entitled to more weight than Aberdeen's subsequent recollections: "The King says he took more pains to get on with Aberdeen than ever he did with any one, but all to no purpose. Aberdeen thinks the King hates him, but does not care about it."‡

Aberdeen, towards the close of his life, remarked to Bishop Wilberforce: "When I was sent to George IV. he asked, 'What d——d thing have I got to yield to now that they have sent *you* to break it to me?'"§ On the day on which Aberdeen received the Seals of the Foreign Office, Ellenborough makes this entry: "I had some talk with Aberdeen; he gave me to understand that I should succeed him in three or four months."‖ Within three months, however, he writes: "As to the Foreign

* "Diary," vol. i. p. 76. † Earl Bathurst.

‡ Under date 22nd of July, 1828, vol. i. p. 173.

§ "Life of Bishop Wilberforce," vol. ii. p. 411.

‖ "Diary," vol. i. p. 181.

Office, which, from what fell from Aberdeen, I expected to have about the middle of October, I now think I shall not have it."* And he was right. Aberdeen continued Foreign Secretary until the catastrophe of November, 1830.

It is a curious coincidence that among the "Recollections" of one who, twenty-five years later, became a colleague of Aberdeen, we find this passage: "Lord Aberdeen always told me," writes Earl Russell, "that after being Prime Minister for a short time, he meant to make way for me and give up the post. But somehow the moment never came for executing his intentions."† To hold out such delusive hopes and not fulfil them, perhaps without meaning to fulfil them, would seem to have been a peculiarity of Aberdeen.

It is scarcely possible for any one man to hold another in greater contempt than Ellenborough held Aberdeen. When it was first rumoured that Aberdeen was to become Foreign Secretary, Ellenborough writes in his Diary: "I cannot think Aberdeen a fitter man than myself. He has been useless to the Duke in the Cabinet, and he failed as Ambassador to Austria. He cannot speak at all." Later, he modified his opinion of Aberdeen as a speaker so far as to admit that "he could make a biting speech as well as anyone, and in a quiet way;" and on another occasion he says Londonderry was put down by Aberdeen, who really "with a bad manner said very good things." It was his opinion that Aberdeen, being known to be quite Austrian, "his appointment will create suspicion in the minds of Russia and France." Again, he says, "Aberdeen is unfit for all the higher parts of his duty. All the ordinary work he does very well, but he cannot grasp the argument on a great question." And once more, "Certainly, Aberdeen, left to himself, would be a very incautious writer;" and after twelvemonths' experience of Aberdeen as Foreign Secretary, he says, "He will do nothing very glaringly wrong; but he will conduct foreign affairs without ability, and will commit a number of little errors which will let down the character of our diplomacy, and will injure us." Aberdeen "disliked Cabinet criticism" of his State papers, and relating the discussions in the Cabinet as to the last King's speech prepared by the Ministry, Ellenborough records, "Aberdeen is the most obstinate man I ever saw about the mere *words* of his part of the speech. We lost half-an-hour at least in talking about words to-day."

All that we learn from Ellenborough of Aberdeen does not

* "Diary," vol. i. p. 179.

† Earl Russell's "Recollections and Suggestions," p. 272.

increase our respect for the statesman whom the late Prince Consort unconstitutionally chose in preference to the recognized leaders of the Liberal party, to head the unfortunate Coalition Ministry of 1853.*

We gain from both Herries and Ellenborough fresh illustrations of what the lamented Dean Stanley called the "comparative obscurity" in early life of Aberdeen's successor at the Foreign Office—Lord Palmerston, of whom it was said by Earl Russell that, in contradistinction to Aberdeen, "he would not be the Minister of Austria, the Minister of Russia, nor the Minister of France, but the Minister of England." So low, indeed, was the place he held in the estimation of his colleagues, that on one occasion, when Palmerston was speaking in the House of Commons, Herries—with a prophetic insight of which we should have thought him incapable—said to Sir Robert Peel, "You may depend upon it, that man will be the leading spirit in the House some day," to which Peel replied in a tone and with a manner of the utmost contempt, "Do you really think so."† And so late as 1828, on the resignation of Huskisson, the Duke told Ellenborough that "Palmerston must follow Huskisson, and *he did not choose to fire great guns at sparrows.*" "How pleased"—is Ellenborough's comment—"this expression would make Palmerston."‡ Peel, we know, reversed his opinion. In the memorable debate on Palmerston's foreign policy in 1850, in the course of that "speech of peace,"§ which was the last Sir Robert made in the House of Commons, he referred to Palmerston's speech as "that most able and temperate speech which made us proud of the man who delivered it, and in which he vindicated, with becoming spirit, and with an ability worthy of his name and place, that course of conduct which he has pursued." We never heard of any such recantation on the part of Wellington. We believe him to have been unable to appreciate the merits of an opponent.

We find in this Diary a striking illustration of that total want of "civil wisdom" which, according to the Marquess Wellesley, characterized the Duke. "The Duke," writes Ellenborough,‖ "agreed with me in thinking the Government here would be strengthened by what was occurring in France." He refers to the Revolution of July, 1830, which was one and not the least effective cause of the uprising of the Liberal party and the fall

---

* *Vide* "Diary," vol. i. pp. 127-8, 204; vol. ii. 113, 256, 266, 307, 410.

† "Memoirs of Herries," vol. i. (Introduction), p. 19.

‡ "Diary," vol. i. p. 116.

§ His own description of his last speech.

‖ Under date July 28, 1830, vol. ii. p. 329.

of the Duke's Government. Ellenborough records with admiration that the Duke managed to get from a great Whig lady "all the secrets of the Opposition; and while he did all his own business, all Aberdeen's, and overlooked the business of all the departments, he found time to call upon ladies, and secure them to his party."* The Duke himself, however, seems to have been amenable to female influence. A Mrs. Arbuthnot, the wife, we suppose, of the gentleman so long the Duke's private secretary, seems to have busied herself, with the Duke's consent, in the disposal of Government offices.†

The relations between Ellenborough and the second most distinguished and influential member of the Cabinet, Sir Robert Peel, were not at first friendly, and Ellenborough's estimate of Peel varied much and often. At first, Peel was delighted to have Ellenborough as a member of the Government. Ellenborough owns that perhaps he did *not* meet Peel with enough cordiality; "but," he adds, "he does not suit me; I get on better with all the other members of the Government than him; he certainly has not the character suited to the leader of a party, or to the command of a popular assembly." Shortly after this opinion was recorded, we read this entry: "The Cabinet dined with me. I asked Peel to drink a glass of wine, and showed him two or three pictures. The consequence was a cordiality of manner. I really believe he is only rather a proud, touchy man, and that the least attempt at management would make him very cordial."

On the much-disputed question of Peel's conduct in reference to the Roman Catholic question, Ellenborough writes, "Peel has acted nobly as well as wisely, and I wrote a note to tell him I thought so. He was much pleased." Ellenborough soon discovered the real bent of Peel's mind. Discussing with Sir H. Hardinge the prospect of Peel's succeeding Wellington as Premier, Ellenborough notes that he said, "I feared he would be a very Radical Minister." Hardinge seemed "to be dissatisfied with Peel, who, he says, is cold, and never encourages any one. All this," adds Ellenborough, "is very true." Though he saw Peel's Radical tendencies, he also records that the growing strength of the Liberal party in Parliament towards the end of George IV.'s reign, gave Peel great annoyance. After a Cabinet dinner, "Peel spoke much of the *ennui* of his position in the House of Commons." He complained that it really "was not worth a man's while to be there for so many hours every night. The sacrifice was so great. He said the Radicals had brought the House into such a state that no man could do business but

* "Diary," vol. i. p. 267. † "Diary," vol. i. p. 122; vol. ii. p. 6.

themselves. He seemed not well, and thoroughly out of humour." A few days later he says, "that a very little would induce Peel to give up," and that Peel foresaw at the coming general election that "The Low Party would gain strength." On the accession of William IV., Ellenborough accuses Peel of adopting the policy of his opponents: "His disposition," he writes, "seems to turn the King into ridicule, and to throw the suspicion of insanity upon all his acts. This is the tactique of the Whigs."

In another conversation with Hardinge, we find the arrangement foreshadowed which was carried out "in the Peel-Wellington Government of 1835." "Hardinge's idea is, that the strength of the Government is much injured by Peel's being in a subordinate situation to the Duke; that if he was Chancellor of the Exchequer and first Lord of the Treasury, things would go on better, the Duke taking a Secretaryship of State."

About this time, Brougham "almost drunk," talked in the House of Commons of the "parasites of the Duke of Wellington." "Peel asked whether he presumed to call him a parasite. There was great confusion, and it ended by Peel's making an explanation for Brougham, in which Brougham acquiesced." "Hardinge says Peel managed admirably." This incident led to a conversation between Peel and Ellenborough, in which Peel expressed his belief that Brougham "was really rather mad, and would not be surprised to hear he was confined. Last year he was melancholy, and his friends, and *he himself*, feared he might commit suicide; now he is in an excited state. Peel speaks of him as a man of wonderful ability."

As the fall of the Wellington Ministry drew nearer, Peel fell more and more in Ellenborough's estimation. "He certainly"—is one entry in his Diary—"is not an agreeable person to do business with." Soon afterwards he writes, "Unless his manner should change, it would be impossible to go on with him as Minister; but I trust in God we shall never lose the Duke." Peel's economizing tendencies appeared during the settlement of William IV.'s Civil List. "It seems possible to reduce prospectively many officers in England and in Ireland who do not really contribute to the State of the Crown." This, however, did not occur to Goulburn,* but to Peel.†

Parliamentary Reform was always one of the many "rocks a-head" of the Wellington Ministry. In reference to it, the Duke showed his usual want of civil wisdom, and Ellenborough showed that prudent foresight which is one of the notes of statesmanship. In the East Retford

* Then Chancellor of the Exchequer.

† "Diary," vol. i. 153, 154, 175, 301; vol. ii. 220, 221, 271, 275, 289, 295, 298, 316, 385.

case, when Lord Wharncliffe moved a resolution, with the view of giving the representation to Birmingham instead of extending the borough franchise to the Hundred of Bassetlaw, Ellenborough says, "I spoke shortly; I guarded myself against being considered as pledged to any other measure, intending to decide all measures according to the special circumstances of the case. The Duke was not so cautious as I was, and spoke strongly against giving the franchise to great towns. Lord Holland said to the Chancellor, 'he will live to see it done.' I think I may, and therefore was cautious."* It was not anticipated by any of the persons engaged in this conversation, that within two years from that day the franchise would be given to the great towns. It seems probable that Ellenborough was the colleague to whom Lord Russell refers in his reminiscence of the opening of Parliament in November, 1830. The Duke then made his memorable speech against all Reform: "The House of Lords, usually so calm, showed signs of amazement and perturbation. The Duke whispered to one of his colleagues, 'What can I have said which seems to make so great a disturbance?' 'You have announced the fall of your Government, that is all,' replied his more clear-sighted colleague."† When Brougham's Reform Motion was discussed in the Cabinet, Ellenborough shewed, if not more statesmanship, more craft than his colleagues.

"I suggested—is his note—that neither the Duke nor Peel had gone further than to say that no proposition had yet been made which seemed to them to be safe, and that we might perhaps agree to a committee to inquire into the state of the representation, and afterwards defeat the specific measures. Peel said he thought the terms of the motion did not signify. It was 'Reform,' or 'No Reform.' He never would undertake Reform."

Peel, no wiser than his colleagues, told the King that in his opinion "the Government, by opposing all Reform in the first instance, would be able to make better terms afterwards."‡

Two days, however, before the fatal vote of the Commons, Peel told his colleagues at their last Cabinet meeting, "he was satisfied that whatever might be the division on Reform, the question was carried." "If," he said, forecasting very nearly what afterwards happened, "the county members voted for it, and it was thrown out by the representatives of Scotch and English boroughs, it was impossible to stand much longer."§

---

* "Diary," vol. ii. p. 318.

† "Recollections and Suggestions," p. 62. (As to Ellenborough's subsequent conduct in reference to Reform, *ibid.* p. 99.)

‡ *Ibid.* p. 428. § *Ibid.* p. 43.

The fall of the Wellington Ministry was generally expected, but the events which actually followed were so little anticipated that a "Government as Tory as possible was actually formed, and they expected to be in within a week."*

One reads with interest the following entry: "In February, 1830, Lord Lansdowne brings in Zachary Macaulay, son of the Old Saint. They say a very clever man indeed, at least as a writer."†

Ellenborough, why we know not, was already the object of Macaulay's antipathy and contempt. In his clever political Georgics, written in March, 1828, he had christened him "Lord Prig."‡ When Ellenborough made this entry, he little anticipated that he himself "may be better known to our grandchildren by Macaulay's oration on the Gates of Somnauth, than by the noise of his own deeds or the echo of his own eloquence."§

We are reminded by this Diary, that to the Duke of Wellington the country was indebted for the creation of Dr. Howley as Archbishop of Canterbury. During the progress of the Catholic Relief Bill, Ellenborough recorded this opinion of this prelate; "He is a weak man."‖ But at one time during the Reform crisis, as every student of Greville will remember, the virtual decision of the question was in the hands of this man, whom Lord Grey described as a poor, miserable creature, on whom no dependence could be placed. Of his fitness for a position of such gravity and importance, and of the sound judgment formed of him by Grey and Ellenborough, the testimony of his own wife supplies a noteworthy illustration.

"'Oh yes,' said Mrs. Howley to a friend, 'the Archbishopric is all very well, but my husband looks back with longing to other days when the *responsibility* was less. "When I was Bishop of London," he says, "and some troubles came, as they always are coming, I could order my carriage and drive to Lambeth, and get advice and come

* "Diary," p. 430.

† Vol. ii. p. 191. Lord Macaulay is erroneously described by his father's Christian name.

‡ The phrase occurs in the address to Eldon:—

> "Whate'er high station, undetermined yet,
> Awaits thee in the longing cabinet—
> Whether thou seat thee in the room of Peel,
> Or from Lord Prig extort the Privy Seal."

From Macaulay's "Miscellaneous Writings and Speeches," p. 459, edition 1871.

§ Trevelyan's "Life of Macaulay," vol. ii. p. 432. Macaulay, in his second Indian speech, again exhibits Ellenborough in a very unfavourable light. *Ibid.* p. 343-5.

‖ "Diary," vol. i. p. 396.

back again with a light heart; but now I have no one to go to—no one to share my responsibility." ' "*

This confession of incapacity calls to mind a passage in Cardinal Newman's *Apologia.* It refers to another Oxford Divine, in his day of some celebrity of a heterodox sort—who afterwards became, like Howley, an incapable bishop. "Phaeton has now got into the Chariot of the Sun; we, alas! can only look on and watch him down the steeps of Heaven; meanwhile, the lands which he is passing over suffer from his driving."†

We cannot part with Lord Ellenborough without alluding to an evidence of his statesmanship, which his Diary supplies *passim.* Very soon after he became President of the Board of Control, he became convinced of the necessity of substituting the King's Government in India for that of the Company. "I am sure," he writes, "that in doing so, I shall confer a great benefit upon India, and effect the measure which is most likely to retain for England the possession of India." Ellenborough, however, was not in favour of the amalgamation of the Queen's and the Indian Army. The Duke, who was much swayed by early recollections wished to preserve, not only the Company's monopoly of the Eastern trade, but also their continued existence as administrators of Indian affairs. Of course, Ellenborough could do nothing against the opposition of the autocratic Premier, who brought to bear against the proposed reform all his early prepossessions and all his natural conservatism, not to say obstinacy. It was not for seventeen years, and until after England's possession of India had been imperilled by the great mutiny, that the Government of India was transferred to the Crown.

---

## Art. III.—The Systematic Philosophy of Aristotle.

*Aristotelis Opera.* Edidit Academia Regia Borussica. Berlin. 1831–1870.

In a former article we considered the Aristotelian philosophy in relation to the great concrete interests of life, morals, politics, literature, and science. We have now to ask what it has to tell us about the deepest and gravest problems of any, the first principles of Being and Knowing, God and the soul, spirit and matter, metaphysics, psychology, and logic. We saw that

* "Clerical Reminiscences," by Senex (the Rev. J. Bateman), p. 162–3.

† "Apologia pro Vitâ Suâ," pp. 132, 192.

very high claims were advanced on behalf of Aristotle in respect to his treatment of these topics; and had we begun with them, we should only have been following the usual example of his expositors. We have, however, preferred keeping them to the last, that our readers might acquire some familiarity with the Aristotelian method, by seeing it applied to subjects where the results were immediately intelligible, and could be tested by an appeal to the experience of twenty-two centuries. We know that there are some who will demur to this proceeding, who will say that Aristotle the metaphysician stands on quite different ground from Aristotle the man of science, because in the one capacity he had, and in the other capacity he had not, sufficient facts to warrant an authoritative conclusion. They will say, with Professor St. George Mivart, that in accumulating natural knowledge men's minds have become deadened to spiritual truth; or with Mr. Edwin Wallace, that the questions opened by Aristotle have not yet been closed, and that we may with advantage begin our study of them under his guidance. We, on the other hand, will endeavour to show that there is a unity of composition running through the Stagirite's entire labours, that they everywhere manifest the same excellences and defects, which are those of an anatomizing, critical, descriptive, classificatory genius; that his most important conclusions, however great their historical interest, are without any positive or even educational value for us, being almost entirely based on false physical assumptions; that his ontology and psychology are not what his admirers suppose them to be; and that his logic, though meriting our gratitude, is far too confused and incomplete to throw any light on the questions raised by modern thinkers.

Here, as elsewhere, we shall employ the genetic method of investigation. Aristotle's writings do not, indeed, present that gradual development of ideas which makes the Platonic dialogues so interesting. Still they exhibit traces of such a development, and the most important among them seems to have been compiled from notes taken by the philosopher before his conclusions were definitely reasoned out, or worked up into a consistent whole. It is this fragmentary collection which, from having been placed by some unknown editor after the *Physics*, has received a name still associated with every kind of speculation that cannot be tested by a direct or indirect appeal to the evidence of external sense.

Whether there exist any realities beyond what are revealed to us by this evidence, and what sensible evidence itself may be worth, were problems already actively canvassed in Aristotle's time. His *Metaphysics* at once takes us into the thick of the debate. The first question of that age was, What are the causes

and principles of things? On one side stood the materialists—the old Ionian physicists and their living representatives. They said that all things came from water or air or fire, or from a mixture of the four elements, or from the interaction of opposites, such as wet and dry, hot and cold. Aristotle, following in the track of his master, Plato, blames them for ignoring the incorporeal substances, by which he does not mean what would now be understood—feelings or states of consciousness, or even the spiritual substratum of consciousness—but rather the general qualities or assemblages of qualities which remain constant amid the fluctuations of sensible phenomena; considered, let us observe, not as subjective thoughts, but as objective realities. In one passage he mentions the dimensions of space as something which can be conceived apart from body, while body cannot be conceived apart from them; and apparently he would have included all the attributes that make up our notion of a thing under the same denomination, except one—namely, the material substance in which they are supposed to inhere. Another deficiency in the older physical theories is that they either ignore the efficient cause of motion altogether (like Thales), or assign causes not adequate to the purpose (like Empedocles); or when they hit on the true cause do not make the right use of it (like Anaxagoras). Lastly, they have omitted to study the final cause of a thing—the good for which it exists. The teleology of Aristotle requires a word of explanation, which may appropriately find its place in the present connection. In speaking of a purpose in Nature, he does not mean that natural productions subserve an end lying outside themselves; as if, to use Goethe's illustration, the bark of cork-trees was intended to be made into stoppers for ginger-beer bottles; but that in every perfect thing the parts are interdependent, and exist for the sake of the whole to which they belong. Nor does he, like so many theologians, both ancient and modern, argue from the evidence of design in Nature to the operation of a designing intelligence outside her. Not believing in any creation at all apart from works of art, he could not believe in a creative intelligence other than that of man. He does, indeed, constantly speak of Nature as if she was a personal providence, continually exerting herself for the good of her creatures. But, on looking a little closer, we find that the agency in question is completely unconscious, and may be identified with the constitution of each particular thing, or rather of the type to which it belongs. We have said that Aristotle's intellect was essentially descriptive, and we have here another illustration of its characteristic quality. The teleology which he parades with so much pomp is nothing that adds anything to our knowledge of causes, nothing that a positivist need not readily accept. It is a mere study of functions, an analysis of statical relations. Of

course, if there were really any philosophers who said that the connection between teeth and mastication was entirely accidental, the Aristotelian doctrine was a useful protest against such an absurdity; but when we have established a fixed connection between organ and function, we are bound to explain the connection in some more satisfactory manner than by re-affirming it in general terms, which is all that Aristotle ever does. Again, whatever may be the relative justification of teleology as a study of functions in the living body, we have no grounds for interpreting the phenomena of inorganic nature on an analogous principle. Some Greek philosophers were acute enough to perceive the distinction. While admitting that plants and animals showed traces of design, they held that the heavenly bodies arose spontaneously from the movements of a vortex or some such cause;* just as certain religious savants of our own day reject the Darwinian theory while accepting the nebular hypothesis.† But to Aristotle the unbroken regularity of the celestial movements, which to us is the best proof of their purely mechanical nature, was, on the contrary, a proof that they were produced and directed by an absolutely reasonable purpose; much more so indeed than terrestrial organisms, marked as these are by occasional deviations and imperfections; and he concludes that each of those movements must be directed towards the attainment of some correspondingly consummate end;‡ while, again, in dealing with those precursors of Mr. Darwin, if such they can be called, who argued that the utility of an organ does not disprove its spontaneous origin, since only the creatures which, by a happy accident, came to possess it would survive—he answers that the constant reproduction of such organs is enough to vindicate them from being the work of chance;§ thus displaying his inability to distinguish between the two ideas of uniform causation and design.

As a result of the foregoing criticism, Aristotle distinguishes four different causes or principles by which all things are determined to be what they are—Matter, Form, Agent, and Purpose. If, for example, we take a saw, the matter is steel; the form, a toothed blade; the agent or cause of its assuming that shape, a smith; the purpose, to divide wood or stone. When we have enumerated these four principles, we have told everything that can be known about a saw. But Aristotle could not keep the last three separate; he gradually extended the definition of form until it absorbed, or became identified, with agent and purpose. It was what we should call the idea of function that facili-

* *Phys.* II. 8, p. 198, b. 24. † The late Father Secchi, for example.
‡ *Phys.* II. 4, p. 196, a. 28; *De Coel.* II. 12. § *Phys.* II. 8, p 199, b. 14.

tated the transition. If the very essence or nature of a saw implies use, activity, movement, how can we define it without telling its purpose? The toothed blade is only intelligible as a cutting, dividing instrument. Again, how came the saw into being? What shaped the steel into that particular form? We have said that it was the smith. But surely that is too vague. The smith is a man, and may be able to exercise other trades as well. Suppose him to be a musician, did he make the saw in that capacity? No; and here comes in a distinction which plays an immense part in Aristotle's metaphysics, whence it has passed into our every-day speech. He does not make the saw *quâ* musician but *quâ* smith. He can, however, in the exercise of his trade as smith make many other tools—knives, axes, and so forth. Nevertheless, had he only learned to make saws it would be enough. Therefore, he does not make the saw *quâ* axe-maker, he makes it *quâ* saw-maker. Nor, again, does he make it with his whole mind and body, but only with just those thoughts and movements required to give the steel that particular shape. Now what are these thoughts but the idea of a saw present in his mind and passing through his eyes and hands, till it fixes itself on the steel? The immaterial form of a saw creates the real saw which we use. Let us apply the preceding analogies to a natural object, for example, a man. What is the Form, the definition of a man? Not a being possessing a certain outward shape, for then a marble statue would be a man, which it is not; nor yet a certain assemblage of organs, for then a corpse would be a man, which, according to Aristotle, criticising Democritus, it is not; but a living, feeling, and reasoning being, the end of whose existence is to fulfil all the functions involved in this definition. So, also, the creative cause of a man is another man, who directly impresses the human form on the material supplied by the female organism. In the same way, every definite individual aggregate becomes what it is through the agency of another individual representing the same type in its perfect manifestation.

The substantial forms of Aristotle, combining as they do the notion of a definition with that of a moving cause and a fulfilled purpose, are evidently derived from the Platonic Ideas; a reflection which at once leads us to consider the relation in which he stands to the spiritualism of Plato and to the mathematical idealism of the Neo-Pythagoreans. He agrees with them in thinking that general conceptions are the sole object of knowledge—the sole enduring reality in a world of change. He differs from them in maintaining that such conceptions have no existence apart from the particulars in which they reside. It has been questioned whether Aristotle ever really understood his master's teaching on the subject. Among recent critics, M. Barthélemy

Saint-Hilaire asserts, with considerable vehemence, that he did not. It is certain that in some respects Aristotle is not just to the Platonic theory, that he exaggerates its absurdities, ignores its developments, and occasionally brings charges against it which might be retorted with at least equal effect against his own philosophy. But on the most important point of all, whether Plato did or did not ascribe a separate existence to his Ideas, we could hardly believe a disciple of twenty years' standing to be mistaken, even if the master had not left on record a decisive testimony to the affirmative side in his *Parmenides*, and one scarcely less decisive in his *Timæus*.* And so far as the controversy reduces itself to this particular issue, Aristotle is entirely right. His most powerful arguments are not, indeed, original, having been anticipated by Plato himself; but as they were left unanswered he had a perfect right to repeat them, and his dialectical skill was great enough to make him independent of their support. The extreme minuteness of his criticism is wearisome to us, who can hardly conceive how another opinion could ever have been held. Yet such was the fascination exercised by Plato's idealism, that not only was it upheld with considerable acrimony by his immediate followers,† but under one form or another it has been revived over and over again, in the long period which has elapsed since its first promulgation, and on every one of these occasions the arguments of Aristotle have been raised up again to meet it, each time with triumphant success. Occam's razor, *Entia non sunt sine necessitate multiplicanda*, is borrowed from the *Metaphysics*; Locke's principal objection to innate ideas closely resembles the sarcastic observation in the last chapter of the *Posterior Analytics*, that, according to Plato's theory, we must have some very wonderful knowledge of which we are not conscious.‡ And the weapons with which Trendelenburg and others have waged war on Hegel are avowedly drawn from the Aristotelian arsenal.§

In his criticism on the ideal theory, Aristotle argues that it is unproved; that the consequences to which it leads would be

---

* *Parmen*, 130 A ff.; *Tim.* 28 A.

† As we may infer from a passage in the *Rhetoric* (II. 2, p. 1379, a. 35), where partisans of the Idea are said to be exasperated by any slight thrown on their favourite doctrine.

‡ Repeated in the *Metaphysics*, I. 9, p. 993, a. 1.

§ This may seem inconsistent with our former assertion that Hegel holds in German philosophy a place analogous to that held by Aristotle in Greek philosophy. Such analogies, however, are always more or less incomplete; and, so far as he attributes a self-moving power to ideas, Hegel is a Platonist rather than an Aristotelian. Similarly, as an evolutionist, Mr. Herbert Spencer stands much nearer to early Greek thought than to Aristotle, whom, in other respects, he so much resembles.

rejected by the idealists themselves; that it involves a needless addition to the sum of existence; that it neither explains the origin of things nor helps us to understand them, while taking away from them their substantial reality; that the Ideas are merely sensible objects hypostasized, like the anthropomorphic divinities of primitive men; that, to speak of them as patterns, in whose likeness the world was created, is a mere idle metaphor; that, even assuming the existence of such patterns, each individual must be made in the likeness, not of one, but of many ideas; a human being, for instance, must be modelled after the ideal biped and the ideal animal, as well as after the ideal man; while many of the ideas themselves, although all are supposed to exist absolutely, must be dependent on other and simpler types; finally, that, assuming an idea for every abstract relation, there must be ideas to represent the relation between every sensible object and its prototype, others for the new relations thus introduced, and so on to infinity.

Such arguments manifestly tell not only against Platonism, but against every kind of transcendental realism, from the natural theology of Paley to the dogmatic agnosticism of Mr. Herbert Spencer. A modern Aristotle might say that the hypothesis of a creative first cause, personal or otherwise, logically involves the assumption of as many original specific energies as there are qualities to be accounted for, and thus gives us the unnecessary trouble of counting everything twice over; that every difficulty and contradiction from which the transcendental assumption is intended to free us, must, on analysis, reappear in the assumption itself; for example, the God who is to deliver us from evil must be himself conceived as the creator of evil; that the infinite and absolute can neither cause, nor be apprehended by, the finite and relative; that to separate from Nature all the forces required for its perpetuation, and relegate them to a sphere apart, is a false antithesis and a sterile abstraction; lastly, that causation, whether efficient or final, once begun, cannot stop; that if this world is not self-existing, nothing is; that the mutual adaptation of thoughts in a designing intelligence requires to be accounted for just like any other adaptation; that if the relative involves the absolute, so also does the relation between the two involve another absolute, and so on to infinity.

These are difficulties which will continue to haunt us until every shred of the old metaphysics has been thrown off. To that task Aristotle was not equal. He was profoundly influenced by the very theory against which he contended; and, at the risk of being paradoxical, we may even say that it assumed a greater importance in his system than had ever been attributed to it by Plato himself. To prove this, we must resume the thread of our

exposition, and follow the Stagirite still further in his analysis of the fundamental reality with which the highest philosophy is concerned.

Ever since the age of Parmenides and Heracleitus, Greek thought had been haunted by a pervading dualism which each system had in turn attempted to reconcile, with no better result than its reproduction under altered names. And speculation had latterly become still further perplexed by the question whether the antithetical couples supposed to divide all Nature between them could or could not be reduced to so many aspects of a single opposition. We have shown, in a former article,* that there were four such competing pairs—Being and Not-Being, the One and the Many, the Same and the Other, Rest and Motion. Plato employed his very subtlest dialectic in tracing out their connections, readjusting their relationships, and diminishing the total number of terms which they involved. In what was probably his last great speculative effort, the *Timæus,* he seems to have selected Sameness and Difference as the couple best adapted to bear the heaviest strain of thought. There is some reason for believing that in his spoken lectures he followed the Pythagorean system more closely, giving the preference to the One and the Many; or he may have employed the two expressions indifferently. The former would sooner commend itself to a dialectician, the latter to a mathematician. Aristotle was both, but he was before all things a naturalist. As such, the antithesis of Being and Not-Being, to which Plato attached little or no value, suited him best. Accordingly, he proceeds to work it out with a clearness before unknown in Greek philosophy. The first and surest of all principles, he declares, is, that a thing cannot both be and not be in the same sense of the words, and furthermore that it must either be or not be. Subsequent logicians prefixed to these axioms another, declaring that whatever is is. The three together are known as the laws of Identity, Contradiction, and Excluded Middle. By all, except Hegelians, they are recognized as the highest laws of thought; and even Hegel was indebted to them, through Fichte, for the ground-plan of his entire system.

The whole meaning and value of such excessively abstract propositions must lie in their application to the problems which they are employed to solve. Aristotle made at once too much and too little of his. Too much—for he employed them to refute doctrines not really involving any logical inconsistency—the theory of Heracleitus, that everything is in motion; the theory of Anaxagoras, that everything was originally confused

---

* WESTMINSTER REVIEW for Jan. 1881, art. "Plato as a Reformer."

together; the theory of Protagoras, that man is the measure of all things. Too little—for he admitted a sphere of possibilities where logical definition did not apply, and where subjects simultaneously possessed the capacity of taking on one or other of two contradictory attributes.

Nor is this all. After sharply distinguishing what is from what is not, and refusing to admit any intermediary between them, Aristotle proceeds to discover such an intermediary in the shape of what he calls Accidental Predication. An accident is an attribute not necessarily or usually inhering in its subject—in other words, a co-existence not dependent on causation. Aristotle could never distinguish between the two notions of cause and kind, and so he could not frame an intelligible theory of chance. Some propositions, he tells us, are necessarily true, others are only generally true; and it is the exceptions to these which constitute accident; as, for instance, when a cold day happens to come in the middle of summer. So also a man is necessarily an animal, but only exceptionally white. Such distinctions are not uninteresting, for they prove with what difficulties the idea of invariable sequence had to contend before even the highest intellects could grasp it. There was a constant liability to confound the order of succession with the order of co-existence, the order of our sensations with the order of objective existence, and the subjection of human actions to any fixed order, with the impossibility of deliberation and choice. The earlier Greek thinkers had proclaimed that all things existed by necessity; but with their purely geometrical or historical point of view, they entirely ignored the more complex questions raised by theories about classification, logical attribution, and moral responsibility. And the modifications introduced by Epicurus, into the old physics, show us how unanswerable Aristotle's reasonings seemed to some of his ablest successors.

Absolute Being is next distinguished from truth, which, we are told, has no objective existence*—a remarkable declaration, which throws much light on other parts of the Aristotelian system, and to which we shall subsequently return.

After explaining at considerable length what Being is not, Aristotle now proceeds to ascertain what it is. He tells us that just as all number *quâ* number must be either odd or even, so all Being *quâ* Being must have certain universal attributes. These he sets himself to discover. When Descartes long afterwards entered on a somewhat similar inquiry, he fell back on the facts of his own individual consciousness. Aristotle, on the contrary, appeals to the common consciousness of mankind as

---

* *Metaph.* VI. 4, p. 1027, b. 29.

embodied in ordinary language. In how many senses do we say that a thing is? The first answer is contained in his famous Ten Categories. These are, not what some have supposed them to be, *summa genera* of existence, but *summa genera* of predication. In other words, they are not a classification of things, but of the information which it is possible to receive about a single thing, more especially about the richest and most concrete thing known to us—a human being. If we want to find out all about a thing we ask, What is it? Of what sort? How large? To what does it belong? Where and when can we find it? What does it do? What happens to it? And if the object of our investigations be a living thing, we may add, What are its habits and dispositions? The question has been raised, how Aristotle came to think of these ten particular categories, and a wonderful amount of rubbish has been written on the subject, while apparently no scholar could see what was staring him in the face all the time, that Aristotle got them by collecting all the simple forms of interrogation supplied by the Greek language,* and writing out their most general expressions.

Having obtained his categories, Aristotle proceeds to mark off the first from the other nine. The subject or substance named in answer to the question, What is it? can exist without having any quality, size, and so forth predicated of it; but they cannot exist without it. Logically, they cannot be defined without telling *what* they are; really they cannot be conceived without something not themselves in which they inhere. They are like the tail of a kite, giving greater conspicuousness and buoyancy to the body, but entirely dependent on it for support. What our philosopher fails to perceive is, that the dependence is reciprocal, that substance can no more be conceived without attributes than attributes without substance; or rather, that substance, like all the other categories, can be resolved into Relation.†

---

* These are *τί, ποιόν, ποσόν, ποῦ, ποτέ,* and *πῶς*. *Τί* is associated with *πρός* in the question *πρὸς τί*, which has no simple English equivalent. Apparently it was suggested to Aristotle by *ποσόν*, how much? in connection with which it means, in relation to what standard? If we were told that a thing was double, we should ask, double what? Again, the Greeks had a simply compound question, *τὶ παθών*, meaning, what was the matter with him, or, what made him do it? From this Aristotle extracted *πάσχειν*, a wider notion than our passion, meaning whatever is done or happens to anything; which again would suggest *ποιεῖν*, what it does. Finally *πῶς*, taken alone, is too vague a question for any answer, but must be taken in its simplest compounds *πῶς διακείμενος* and *πῶς ἔχων*, which give the two rarely-occurring categories *ἔχειν* and *κεῖσθαι*, for which it is on one occasion substituted (*Soph. El.* 22 p. 178, b. 39). *Διὰ τί* does not figure among the categories, because it is reserved for the special analysis of *οὐσία*.

† As Grote has shown in his chapter on the Categories.

Meanwhile, he had a logical machine ready to hand, which could be used with terrible effect against the Platonic Ideas. Any of these—and there were a great number—that could be brought under one of the last nine categories were at once deprived of all claim to independent existence. Take Equality, for instance. It cannot be discovered outside quantity, and quantity is always predicated of a substance. Moreover the categories served not only to generalize and combine, but also to specificate and divide. The idea of motion occurs in three of them; in quantity, where it means increase or diminution; in quality, where it means alteration, as from hot to cold, or *vice versâ;* and in place, implying transport from one point to another. The Idea of Good, which stands at the very summit of Plato's system, may be traced through all ten categories.* Thus, the supposed unity and simplicity of such conceptions was utterly destroyed. Platonism was, in truth, so inconsistent with the notions embodied in common language, that it could not but be condemned by a logic based on those notions.

Aristotle next takes the Idea of Substance and subjects it to a fresh analysis. Of all things none seem to possess so evident an existence as the bodies about us—plants and animals, the four elements, and the stars. But each of these has already been shown to consist of Form and Matter. A statue, for instance, is a lump of bronze shaped into the figure of a man. Of these two constituents, Matter seems at first sight to possess the greater reality. The same line of thought which led Aristotle to place substance before the other categories now threatens to drive him back into materialism. This he dreaded, not on sentimental or religious grounds, but because he conceived it to be the negation of knowledge. He first shows that Matter cannot be the real substance to which individuals owe their determinate existence, since it is merely the unknown residuum left behind when every predicate, common to them with others, has been stripped off. Substance, then, must be either Form alone or Form combined with Matter. Form, in its completest sense, is equivalent to the essential definition of a thing—the collection of attributes together constituting its essence or conception. To know the definition is to know the thing defined. The way to define is to begin with the most general notion, and proceed by adding one specific difference after another, until we reach the most particular and concrete expression. The union of this last with a certain portion of Matter gives us the individual Socrates or Callias. There are no real entities (as the Platonists pretend) corresponding to the successive stages of generalization, biped, animal,

* *Eth. Nic.* I. 4, p. 1096, a, 24, where six are enumerated.

and so forth, any more than there are self-existing quantities, qualities, and relations. Thus the problem has been driven into narrower and narrower limits, until at last we are left with the *infimæ species* and the individuals contained under them. It remains to discover in what relation these stand to one another. The answer is unsatisfactory. We are told that there is no definition of individuals, and also that the definition is identical with the individual.* Such, indeed, is the conclusion necessarily resulting from Aristotle's repeated declarations that all knowledge is of definitions, that all knowledge is of something really existing, and that nothing really exists but individual things. Nevertheless, we have to set against these equally strong declarations to the effect that knowledge is of something general, not of the perishing individuals which may pass out of existence any moment. The truth is, that we are here, as Zeller has shown,† in presence of an insoluble contradiction, and we must try to explain, not how Aristotle reconciled it with itself, for that was impossible, but how he reconciled himself to it.

His analysis of individuality was the first step in this direction. We have seen that he treats definition as a process of gradual specification, beginning with the most general notions, and working down by successive differentiations to the most particular. Now, the completed conception is itself the integration of all these differences, the bond of union holding them together. Turning to an antithetical order of ideas, to the material substance of which bodies are composed, and its various transformations, we find him working out the same vein of thought. According to the Aristotelian chemistry, an ultimate undeterminate, unknowable something clothes itself with one or other of the opposing attributes, dry and moist, hot and cold; and when two of these are combined, manifests itself to our senses as one of the four elements. The elements combine in a particular manner to form homogeneous animal tissues, and these again are united into heterogeneous organs, which together constitute the living body. Here, then, we have two analogous series of specifications—one conceptual and leading down from the abstract to the concrete, the other physical, and leading up from the vague, the simple, and the homogeneous, to the definite, the complex, and the heterogeneous. Aristotle embraces both processes under a single comprehensive generalization. He describes each of them as the continuous conversion of a possibility into an actuality. For the sake of greater clearness, let us take the liberty of substituting modern scientific terms for his cumbrous and obsolete classifications. We shall then say that

---

* *Metaph.* VII. 6, p. 1031, b. 18 ff. † Zeller, *Phil. de Gr.* II. 2, p. 309.

the general notion, living thing, contains under it the two less general notions—plant and animal. If we only know of any given object that it has life, there is implied the possibility of its being either the one or the other, but not both together. On determining it to be (say) an animal, we actualize one of the possibilities. But the actualization is only relative, and immediately becomes the possibility of being either a vertebrate or an invertebrate animal. The actuality vertebrate becomes the possibility of viviparous or oviparous, and so on through successive differentiations until we come (say) to a man. Now let us begin at the material end. Here are a mass of molecules, which, in their actual state are only carbon, nitrogen, and so forth. But they are potential starch, gluten, water, or any other article of food that might be named; for under favourable conditions they will combine to form it. Once actualized as such, they are possible blood-cells; these are possible tissues; these, again, possible organs, and lastly we come to the consensus of vital functions, which is a man. What the raw material is to the finished product, that are the parts to the entire organism, the elements to the compound, the genus to the species, and such in its very widest sense is potency to realization, δύναμις to ἐντελέχεια, throughout the universe of growth and decay.

It will be observed that, so far, this famous theory does not add one single jot to our knowledge. Under the guise of an explanation, it is a description of the very facts needing to be explained. We did not want an Aristotle to tell us that before a thing exists it must be possible. We want to know how it is possible, what are the real conditions of its existence, and why they combine at a particular moment to produce it. The Atomists showed in what direction the solution should be sought, and all subsequent progress has been due to a development of their method. Future ages will perhaps consider our own continued distinction between force and motion as a revival of the Peripatetic philosophy. Just as sensible aggregates of matter arise not out of potential matter, but out of matter in an extremely fine state of diffusion, so also sensible motion will be universally traced back, not to potential motion, which is all that force means, but to molecular or ethereal vibrations, like those known to constitute heat and light.

We have said, in comparing him with his predecessors, that the Stagirite unrolled Greek thought from a solid into a continuous surface. We have now to add that he gave his surface the false appearance of a solid by the use of shadows, and of aërial perspective. In other words, he made the indication of his own ignorance and confusion do duty for depth and distance. For to say that a thing is developed out of its possibility, merely

means that it is developed out of something, the nature of which we do not know. And to speak about such possibilities as imperfect existences, or matter, or whatever else Aristotle is pleased to call them, is simply constructing the universe, not out of our ideas, but out of our absolute want of ideas.

We have seen how, for the antithesis between Form and Matter, was substituted the wider antithesis between Actuality and Possibility. Even in this latter the opposition is more apparent than real. A permanent possibility is only intelligible through the idea of its realization, and sooner or later is certain to be realized. Aristotle still further bridges over the interval between them by a new conception—that of motion. Motion, he tells us, is the process of realization, the transformation of power into act. Nearly the whole of his *Physics* is occupied with an inquiry into its nature and origin. As first conceived, it is equivalent to what we call change rather than to mechanical movement. The table of categories supplies an exhaustive enumeration of its varieties. These are, as we have already mentioned, alteration of quality or transformation, increase or decrease of quantity, equivalent to growth and decay, and transport from place to place. Sometimes a fourth variety is added, derived from the first category, substance. He calls it generation and destruction, the coming into existence or passing out of it again. A careful analysis shows that motion in space is the primordial change on which all others depend for their accomplishment. To account for it is the most vitally important problem in philosophy.

Before entering on the chain of reasoning which led Aristotle to postulate the existence of a personal First Cause, we must explain the difference between his scientific standpoint, and that which is now accepted by all educated minds. To him the eternity not only of Matter, but also of what he called Form, —that is to say, the collection of attributes giving definiteness to natural aggregates, more especially those known as organic species—was an axiomatic certainty. Every type, capable of self-propagation, that could exist at all, had existed, and would continue to exist for ever. For this, no explanation beyond the generative power of Nature was required. But when he had to account for the machinery by which the perpetual alternation of birth and death below, and the changeless revolutions of the celestial spheres above the moon were preserved, difficulties arose. He had reduced every other change to transport through space; and with regard to this his conceptions were entirely mistaken. He believed that moving matter tended to stop unless it was sustained by some external force; and whatever their advantages over him in other respects, we cannot say that the Atomists were in a position to correct him here: for their theory, that

every particle of matter gravitated downward through infinite space, was quite incompatible with the latest astronomical discoveries. Aristotle triumphantly showed that the tendency of heavy bodies was not to move indefinitely downwards in parallel lines, but in converging lines to the centre of the earth, which he, in common with most Greek astronomers, supposed to be also the centre of the universe; and seeing light bodies move up, he credited them with an equal and opposite tendency to the circumference of the universe, which, like Parmenides and Plato, he believed to be of finite extent. Thus each kind of matter had its appropriate place, motion to which ended in rest, while motion away from it, being constrained, could not last. Accordingly, the constant periodicity of terrestrial phenomena necessitated as constant a transformation of dry and wet, hot and cold bodies into one another. This is explained with perfect accuracy by the diurnal and annual revolutions of the sun. Here, however, we are introduced to a new kind of motion, which, instead of being rectilinear and finite, is circular and eternal. To account for it, Aristotle assumes a fifth element entirely different in character from the four terrestrial elements. Unlike them, it is absolutely simple, and has a correspondingly simple mode of motion, which, as our philosopher erroneously supposed, could be no other than circular rotation.

Out of this eternal, unchanging divine substance, which he calls æther, are formed the heavenly bodies and the transparent spheres containing them. But there is something beyond it of an even higher and purer nature. Aristotle proves, with great subtlety, from his fundamental assumptions, that the movement of an extended substance cannot be self-caused. He also proves that motion must be absolutely continuous and without a beginning. We have, therefore, no choice but to accept the existence of an inextended, immaterial, eternal, and infinite Power on which the whole Cosmos depends.

So much only is established in the *Physics*. Further particulars are given in the twelfth book of the *Metaphysics*. There we learn that, all movement being from possibility to actuality, the source of movement must be a completely realized actuality —pure form without any admixture of matter. But the highest form known to us, in the ascending scale of organic life, is the human soul, and the highest function of soul is reason. Reason then must be that which moves without being moved itself, drawing all things upwards and onwards by the love which its perfection inspires. The eternal, infinite absolute actuality existing beyond the outermost starry sphere is God. Aristotle describes God as the thought which thinks itself and finds everlasting happiness in the simple act of self-consciousness, wonder-

ful if it always equals the best moments of our mortal life, more wonderful still if it surpasses them. There is only one supreme God, for plurality is due to an admixture of matter, and He is pure form. The rule of many is not good, as Homer says. Let there be one Lord.

Such are the closing words of what was possibly Aristotle's last work, the clear confession of his monotheistic creed. A monotheistic creed, we have said, but one so unlike all other religions, that its nature has been continually misunderstood. While some have found in it a theology like that of the Jews or of Plato, or of modern Europe, others have resolved it into a vague Pantheism. Among the latter we are surprised to find Sir A. Grant, a writer to whom the Aristotelian texts must be perfectly familiar both in spirit and in letter. Yet nothing can possibly be more clear and emphatic than the declarations they contain. Pantheism identifies God with the world; Aristotle separates them as pure form from form more or less alloyed with matter. Pantheism denies personality to God; Aristotle gives him unity, spirituality, self-consciousness, and happiness. If these qualities do not collectively involve personality, we should like to know what does. Need we remind the accomplished editor of the *Nicomachean Ethics*, how great a place is given in that work to human self-consciousness, to waking active thought as distinguished from mere slumbering faculties or unrealized possibilities of action? And what Aristotle regarded as essential to human perfection, he would regard as still more essential to divine perfection. Finally, the God of Pantheism is a general idea; the God of Aristotle is an individual. Sir A. Grant says that he (or it) is the idea of Good.* We doubt very much whether there is a single passage in the *Metaphysics* to sanction such an expression. Did it occur, however, that would be no warrant for approximating the Aristotelian to the Platonic theology, in presence of such a distinct declaration as that the first mover is both conceptually and numerically one,† coming after repeated repudiations of the Platonic attempt to isolate ideas from the particulars in which they are immersed. Then Sir A. Grant goes on to speak of the desire felt by Nature for God as being itself God,‡ and therefore involving a belief in Pantheism. Such a notion is not generally called Pantheism, but Hylozoism, the attribution of life to matter. We have no desire, however, to quarrel about words. The philosopher who believes in the existence of a vague consciousness, a spiritual effort towards something higher diffused

*Grant's *Aristotle*, p. 176. † *Metaph.* XII. 8, p. 1074, a. 36.
‡ Grant's *Aristotle*, p. 176.

through nature, may, if you will, be called a Pantheist, but not unless this is the only divinity he recognizes. The term is altogether misleading when applied to one who also proclaims the existence of something in his opinion far higher, better, and more real—a living God, who transcends Nature, and is independent of her although she is not independent of Him.

We must also observe that the parallel drawn by Sir A. Grant between the theology of Aristotle and that of John Stuart Mill is singularly unfortunate. It is in the first place incorrect to say that Mill represented God as benevolent but not omnipotent. He only suggested the idea as less inconsistent with facts than other forms of theism.* In the next place Aristotle's God was almost exactly the reverse of this. He possesses infinite power, but no benevolence at all. He has nothing to do with the internal arrangements of the world, either as creator or as providence. He is, in fact, an egoist of the most transcendent kind, who does nothing but think about himself and his own perfections. Nothing could be more characteristic of the unpractical Aristotelian philosophy; nothing more repugnant to the eager English reformer, the pupil of Bentham and of Plato. And, thirdly, Sir A. Grant takes what is not the God of Aristotle's system at all, but a mere abstraction, the immanent reason of Nature, the Form which can never quite conquer Matter, and places it on the same line with a God who, however hypothetical, is nothing if not a person distinct from the world; while, as if to bewilder the unfortunate "English reader" still further, he adds, in the very next sentence, that "the great defect in Aristotle's conception of God is" the denial "that God can be a moral Being."†

The words last quoted, which in a Christian sense are true enough, lead us over to the contrasting view of Aristotle's theology, to the false theory of it held by critics like Prof. St. George Mivart. The Stagirite agrees with Catholic theism in accepting a personal God, and he agrees with our own First Article, though not with the Pentateuch, in saying that God is without parts or passions, but there his agreement ceases. Excluding such a thing as divine interference with Nature, his theology of course excludes the possibility of revelation, inspiration, miracles, and grace. Nor is this a mere omission; it is a necessity of the system. If there can be no existence without time, no time without motion, no motion without unrealized desire, no desire without an ideal, no ideal but eternally self-

* The rational attitude of a thinking mind towards the supernatural, whether in natural or revealed religion, is that of scepticism, as distinguished from belief on the one hand and atheism on the other."—Mill's *Essays on Religion*, p. 242.

† Grant's *Aristotle*, p. 177.

thinking thought—then it logically follows that God, in the sense of such a thought, must not interest himself in the affairs of men. Again, Aristotelianism equally excludes the arguments by which modern theologians have sought to prove the existence of God. Here again the system is true to its contemporaneous, statical, superficial character. The First Mover is not separated from us by a chain of causes extending through past ages, but by an intervening breadth of space and the wheels within wheels of a cosmic machine. Aristotle had no difficulty in conceiving what some have since declared to be inconceivable, a series of antecedents without any beginning in time; it was rather the beginning of such a series that he could not make intelligible to himself. Nor, as we have seen, did he think that the adaptation in living organisms of each part to every other required an external explanation. Far less did it occur to him that the production of impressions on our senses was due to the agency of a supernatural power. It is absolutely certain that he would have rejected the Cartesian argument, according to which a perfect being must exist if it is only conceivable—existence being necessarily involved in the idea of perfection.* Finally, not recognizing such a faculty as conscience, he would not have admitted it to be the voice of God speaking in the soul.

On the other hand Aristotle's own theistic arguments cannot stand for a moment in the face of modern science. We know by the law of inertia that it is not the continuance, but the arrest or the beginning, of motion which requires to be accounted for. We know by the Copernican system that there is no solid sidereal sphere governing the revolutions of all Nature. And we know by the Newtonian physics that gravitation is not dependent on fixed points in space for its operation. "*The* Philosophy of *the* Philosopher Aristotle" is as inconsistent with the demonstrations of modern astronomy as it is with the faith of mediæval Catholicism.

It remains to be seen whether the system which we are examining is consistent with itself. It is not. The Prime Mover, being extended, cannot be located outside the sidereal sphere; nor can he be brought into immediate contact with it more than with any other part of the Cosmos. If the æther has a motion proper to itself, then no spiritual agency is required to keep it in perpetual rotation. If the crystalline spheres fit accurately together, as they must, to avoid leaving a vacuum anywhere, there can be no friction, no production of heat, and consequently no effect produced on the sublunary sphere. Finally, no rotatory or other movement can, taken alone,

---

* *τὸ δ'εἶναι οὐκ οὐσία οὐδενί οὐ γὰρ γένος τὸ ὄν—An. Post.* II. 7, p. 92, b. 13.

have any conceivable connection with the realization of a possibility in the sense of progress from a lower to a higher state of being. It is merely the perpetual exchange of one indifferent position for another.

We have now to consider what were the speculative motives that led Aristotle to overlook these contradictions, and to find rest in a theory even less satisfactory than the earlier systems which he is always attacking with relentless animosity. The first motive, we believe, was the train of reasoning already laid before the reader, by which universal essences, the objects of knowledge, gradually came to be identified with particular objects, the sole existing realities. For the arguments against such an identification, as put forward by our philosopher himself, still remained unanswered. The individuals comprising a species were still too transient for certainty and too numerous for comprehension. But when for the antithesis between Form and Matter was substituted the antithesis between Actuality and Possibility, two modes of evasion presented themselves. The first was to distinguish between actual knowledge and potential knowledge. The former corresponded to existing particulars, the latter to general ideas.* This, however, besides breaking up the unity of knowledge, was inconsistent with the whole tenour of Aristotle's previous teaching. What can be more actual than demonstration, and how can there be any demonstration of transient particulars? The other mode of reconciliation was perhaps suggested by the need of an external cause to raise Possibility into Actuality. Such a cause might be conceived with all the advantages and without the drawbacks of a Platonic Idea. It could be at once the moving agent and the model of perfection; it could reconcile the general and the particular by the simple fact of being eternal in time, comprehensive in space, and unique in kind. Aristotle found such a cause, or rather a whole series of such causes, in the celestial spheres. In his system these bear just the same relation to terrestrial phenomena that Plato's Ideas bear to the world of Sense. They are, in fact, the Ideas made sensible and superficial, placed alongside of, instead of beneath or behind, the transient particulars which they irradiate and sustain. The analogy may be carried even farther. If Plato regarded the things of sense as not merely a veil, but an imperfect imitation of the only true realities; so also did Aristotle represent the sublunary elements as copying the disposition and activities of the æthereal spheres. They too have their concentric arrangements—first fire, then air, then water, and lastly earth in the centre; while their perpetual transformation into one another presents

* *Metaph.* XIII. 10.

an image in time of the spatial rotation which those sublime beings perform. And although we think that Sir A. Grant is quite mistaken in identifying Aristotle's Supreme Mind with the Idea of Good, there can be no doubt of its having been suggested by that Idea. It is, in fact, the translation of Plato's abstraction into concrete reality, and the completion of a process which Plato had himself begun. From another point of view we may say that both master and disciple were working, each in his own way, at the solution of a problem which entirely dominates Greek philosophy from Empedocles on —— the reconciliation of Parmenides and Heracleitus, Being and Becoming, the eternal and the changeful, the one and the many. Aristotle adopts the superficial, external method of placing the two principles side by side in space; and for a long time the world accepted his solution for the same reason that had commended it to his own acceptance, its apparent agreement with popular tradition and with the facts of experience. It must be confessed, however, that here also he was following the lines laid down by Plato. The *Timæus* and the *Laws* are marked by a similar tendency to substitute astronomy for dialectics, to study the celestial movements with religious veneration, to rebuild on a scientific basis that ancient star-worship which even among the Greeks enjoyed a much higher authority and prestige than the humanized mythology of the poets. But for Christianity this star-worship would probably have become the official faith of the Roman world. As it is Dante's great poem presents us with a singular compromise between the two creeds. The crystalline spheres are retained, only they have become the abode of glorified spirits instead of being the embodiment of eternal gods. We often hear it said that the Copernican system was rejected as offensive to human pride, because it removed the earth from the centre of the universe. This is a profound mistake. Its offence was to degrade the heavenly bodies by assimilating them to the earth. Among several planets, all revolving round the sun, there could not be any marked qualitative difference. In the theological sense there was no longer any heaven; and with the disappearance of the solid sidereal sphere there was no longer any necessity for a Prime Mover.

There is perhaps no passage in Aristotle's writings—there is certainly none in his scientific writings—more eloquent than that describing the glories of his imaginary heavens. The following translation may give some faint idea of its solemnity and splendour:—

"We believe, then, that the whole heaven is one and everlasting, without beginning or end through all eternity, but holding infinite time within its orb, not, as some say, created or capable of being destroyed.

We believe it on account of the grounds already stated, and also on account of the consequences resulting from a different hypothesis. For it must add great weight to our assurance of its immortality and everlasting duration that this opinion may, while the contrary opinion cannot possibly, be true. Wherefore we may trust the traditions of old time, and especially of our own race, when they tell us that there is something deathless and divine about the things which, although moving, have a movement that is not bounded, but is itself the universal bound, a perfect circle enclosing in its revolutions the imperfect motions that are subject to restraint and arrest; while this, being without beginning or end, or rest through infinite time, is the one from which all others originate, and into which they disappear. That heaven which antiquity assigned to the gods as an immortal abode, is shown by the present argument to be uncreated and indestructible, exempt alike from mortal weakness, and from the weariness of subjection to a force acting in opposition to its natural inclination; for in proportion to its everlasting continuance such a compulsion would be laborious, and far removed from the highest perfection of design. We must not then believe with the old mythologists that an Atlas is needed to uphold it; for they, like some in more recent times, fancied that the heavens were made of heavy earthy matter, and so fabled an animated necessity for their support; nor yet that, as Empedocles says, they will last only so long as their own proper momentum is exceeded by the whirling motion of which they partake. Nor, again, is it likely that their everlasting revolution can be kept up by the exercise of a conscious will; for no soul could lead a happy and blessed existence that was engaged in such a task, necessitating, as it would, an unceasing struggle with their native tendency to move in a different direction, without even the mental relaxation and bodily rest which mortals gain by sleep, but doomed to the eternal torment of an Ixion's wheel. Our explanation, on the other hand, is, as we say, not only more consistent with the eternity of the heavens, but also can alone be reconciled with the acknowledged vaticinations of religious faith."*

It will be seen from the foregoing passage how strong a hold the old Greek notion of an enclosing limit had on the mind of Aristotle, and how he transformed it back from the high intellectual significance given to it by Plato into its original sense of a mere space-enclosing figure. And it will also be seen how he credits his spheres with a full measure of that moving power which, according to his rather unfair criticism, the Platonic Ideas did not possess. His astronomy also supplied him with that series of graduated transitions between two extremes in which Greek thought so much delighted. The heavenly bodies mediate between God and the earth; partly active and partly passive, they both receive and communicate the moving creative impulse. The four terrestrial elements are moved in the various categories of substance,

* *De Cœlo*, II. 1.

quantity, quality, and place ; the æther moves in place only, God remains "without variableness or shadow of a change." Finally, by its absolute simplicity and purity, the æther mediates between the coarse matter perceived by our senses and the absolutely immaterial Nous, and is itself supposed to be pervaded by a similar gradation of fineness from top to bottom. Furthermore, the upper fire, which must not be confounded with flame, furnishes a connecting link between the æther and the other elements, being related to them as Form to Matter, or as agent to patient; while, when the elements are decomposed into their constituent qualities, hot and cold occupy a similar position with regard to wet and dry.

In mastering Aristotle's cosmology, we have gained the key to his entire method of systematization. Henceforth the Stagirite has no secrets from us. Where we were formerly content to show that he erred, we can now show why he erred ; by generalizing his principles of arrangement, we can exhibit them still more clearly in their conflict with modern thought. The method, then, pursued by Aristotle is to divide his subject into two more or less unequal masses, one of which is supposed to be governed by necessary laws, admitting of certain demonstration ; while the other is irregular, and can only be studied according to the rules of probable evidence. The parts of the one are homogeneous and concentrically disposed, the movements of each being controlled by that immediately outside and above it. The parts of the other are heterogeneous and distributed among a number of antithetical pairs, between whose members there is, or ought to be, a general equilibrium preserved, the whole system having a common centre which either oscillates from one extreme to another, or holds the balance between them. The second system is enclosed within the first, and is altogether dependent on it for the impulses determining its processes of metamorphosis and equilibration. Where the internal adjustments of a system to itself or of one system to the other are not consciously made, Aristotle calls them Nature. They are always adapted to secure its everlasting continuance either in an individual or a specific form. Actuality belongs more particularly to the first sphere, and possibility to the second, but both are, to a certain extent, represented in each.

We have already seen how this fundamental division is applied to the universe as a whole. But our philosopher is not content with classifying the phenomena as he finds them ; he attempts to demonstrate the necessity of their dual existence ; and in so doing is guilty of something very like a vicious circle. For, after proving from the terrestrial movements that there must be an eternal movement to keep them going, he now assumes the

revolving æther, and argues that there must be a motionless centre for it to revolve round, although a geometrical axis would have served the purpose equally well. By a still more palpable fallacy, he proceeds to show that a body whose tendency is towards the centre, must, in the nature of things, be opposed by another body whose tendency is towards the circumference. In order to fill up the interval created by this opposition, two intermediate bodies are required, and thus we get the four elements—earth, water, air, and fire. These, again, are resolved into the antithetical couples, dry and wet, hot and cold, the possible combinations of which, by twos, give us the four elements once more. Earth is dry and cold, water cold and wet, air wet and hot, fire hot and dry; each adjacent pair having a quality in common, and each element being characterized by the excess of a particular quality; earth is especially dry, water cold, air wet, and fire hot. The common centre of each antithesis is what Aristotle calls the First Matter, the mere abstract unformed possibility of existence. This matter always combines two qualities, and has the power of oscillating from one quality to another, but it cannot, as a rule, simultaneously exchange both for their opposites. Earth may pass into water, exchanging dry for wet, but not so readily into air, which would necessitate a double exchange at the same moment.

Those who will may see in all this an anticipation of chemical substitution and double decomposition. We can assure them that it will be by no means the most absurd parallel discovered between ancient and modern ideas. It is possible, however, to trace a more real connection between the Aristotelian physics and mediæval thought. We do not of course mean the scholastic philosophy, for there never was the slightest doubt as to its derivation; we allude to the alchemy and astrology which did duty for positive science during so many centuries, and even overlapped it down to the time of Newton, himself an ardent alchemist. Aristotle himself, as we have seen, limited the action of the heavens on the sublunary sphere to their heating power; but, by crediting them with an immortal reason and the pursuit of ends unknown to us, he opened a wide field for conjecture as to what those ends were, and how they could be ascertained. That the stars and planets were always thinking and acting, but never about our affairs, was not a notion likely to be permanently accepted. Neither was it easy to believe that their various configurations, movements, and names (the last probably revealed by themselves) were entirely without significance. From such considerations to the casting of horoscopes is not a far remove. The Aristotelian chemistry would still more readily lend itself to the purposes of alchemy. If Nature is one vast

process of transmutation, then particular bodies, such as the metals, not only may, but must be, convertible into one another. And even those who rejected Aristotle's logic with scorn still clung to his natural philosophy when it flattered their hopes of gain. Bacon kept the theory of substantial forms. His originality consisted in looking for a method by which any form, or assemblage of forms, might be superinduced at pleasure on the underlying matter. The real development of knowledge pursued a far different course. The great discoverers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries achieved their success by absolutely reversing the method of Aristotle by bringing into fruitful contact principles which he had condemned to barren isolation. They carried terrestrial physics into the heavens; they brought down the absoluteness and eternity of celestial law to earth; they showed that Aristotle's antithetical qualities were merely quantitative distinctions. These they resolved into modes of motion; and they also resolved all motions into one which was both rectilinear and perpetual. But they and their successors put an end to all dreams of transmutation, when they showed by another synthesis that all matter, at least within the limits of our experience, has the changeless consistency once attributed exclusively to the stellar spheres.

When Aristotle passes from the whole Cosmos to the philosophy of life, his method of systematic division is less distinctly illustrated, but still it may be traced. The fundamental separation is between body and soul. The latter has a wider meaning than what we associate with it at present. It covers the psychic functions and the whole life of the organism, which, again, is not what we mean by life. For life with us is both individual and collective; it resides in each speck of protoplasm, and also in the consensus of the whole organism. With Aristotle it is more exclusively a central principle, the final cause of the organism, the power which holds it together, and by which it was originally shaped. Biology begins by determining the idea of the whole, and then considers the means by which it is realized. The psychic functions are arranged according to a system of teleological subordination. The lower precedes the higher in time, but is logically necessitated by it. Thus nutrition, or the vegetative life in general, must be studied in close connection with sensation and impulse, or animal life; and this, again, with thought or pure reasoning. On the other hand, anatomy and physiology are considered from a purely chemical and mechanical point of view. A vital purpose is, indeed, assigned to every organ, but with no more reference to its specifically vital properties than if it formed part of a steam-engine. Here, as always with Aristotle, the idea of moderation

determines the point of view whence the inferior or material system is to be studied. Organic tissue is made up of the four elemental principles—hot, cold, wet, and dry—mixed together in proper proportions; and the object of organic function is to maintain them in due equilibrium, an end effected by the regulating power of the soul, which accordingly has its seat in the heart or centre of the body. And we showed in a former article how, in endeavouring to work out this chimerical theory, Aristotle went much further astray from the truth than sundry other Greek physiologists less biassed by the requirements of a symmetrical method.

After the formal and material elements of life have been separately discussed, there comes an account of the process by which they are first brought into connexion, for this is how Aristotle views generation. With him it is the information of matter by psychic force; and his notions about the part which each parent plays in the production of a new being are vitiated throughout by this mistaken assumption. Nevertheless his treatise on the subject is, for its time, one of the most wonderful works ever written, and, as we are told on good authority,* is now less antiquated than the corresponding work of Harvey. The philosopher's peculiar genius for observation, analysis, and comparison will partly account for his success; but, if we mistake not, there is another and less obvious reason. Here the fatal separation of form and matter was, except at first starting, precluded by the very idea of generation; and the teleological principle of spontaneous efforts to realize a predetermined end was, as it happened, perfectly in accordance with the facts themselves.

And now, looking back on his cosmology, we can see that Aristotle was never so near the truth as when he tried to bridge over the gulf between his two spheres, the one corruptible and the other eternal, by the idea of motion considered as a specific property of all matter, and persisting through all time, as a link between the celestial revolutions and the changes occurring on or near the earth's surface, and finally as the direct cause of heat, the great agent acting in opposition to gravity—which last view may have suggested Bacon's capital discovery, that heat is itself a mode of motion.

Another method by which Aristotle strove to overcome the antithesis between life as a mechanical arrangement and life as a metaphysical conception, was the newly created study of comparative anatomy. The variations in structure and function which accompany variations in the environment, though statically and not dynamically conceived, bring us very near to the truth,

* Lewes, quoted by Zeller, p. 524.

that biological phenomena are subject to the same general laws of causation as all other phenomena; and it is this truth which in the science of life corresponds to the identification of terrestrial with celestial physics in the science of general mechanics. Vitality is not an individualized principle stationed in the heart and busy balancing opposite forces against one another; but it is diffused through all the tissues, and bestows on them that extraordinary plasticity which responds to the actions of the environment by spontaneous variations capable of being summed up in any direction, and so creating entirely new organic forms without the intervention of any supernatural agency.

We have now to consider how Aristotle treats psychology, not in connexion with biology, but as a distinct science—a separation not quite consistent with his own definition of soul, but forced on him by the traditions of Greek philosophy and by the nature of things. Here the fundamental antithesis assumes a three-fold form. First the theoretical activity of mind is distinguished from its practical activity; the one being exercised on things which cannot, the other on things which can, be changed. Again, a similar distinction prevails within the special province of each. Where truth is the object, knowledge stands opposed to sense; where good is sought, reason rises superior to passion. The one antithesis had been introduced into philosophy by the early physicists, the other by Socrates. They were confounded in the psychology of Plato, and Aristotle had the merit of separating them once more. Yet even he preserves a certain artificial parallelism between them by using the common name Nous, or reason, to denote the controlling member in each. To make his anthropology still more complex, there is a third antithesis to be taken into account, that between the individual and the community, which also sometimes slides into a partial identity with the other two.

Aristotle's treatise on the soul is mainly devoted to a description of the theoretical faculties—sense, and thought or reason. By sense we become acquainted with the material qualities of things; by thought with their forms or ideas. It has been already mentioned that according to our philosopher the organism is a system of contrary forces held in equilibrium by the soul, whose seat he supposes to be in the heart. We now learn that every sensation is a disturbance of this equilibrium. In other words, the sensorium being virtually any and every mode of matter, is raised from possibility to actuality by the presence of some one force, such as heat or cold, in sufficient strength to incline the balance that way. Here we have, quite in Aristotle's usual style, a description instead of an explanation. The atomic notion of thin films thrown off from the object of sense, and falling on the

organs of sight or touch, was but a crude guess; still it has more affinity with the discoveries of a Young or a Helmholtz than scholastic phrases about potentiality and actuality. That sensation implies a disturbance of equilibrium is, indeed, an important truth; only the equilibrium must be conceived as a balance, not of possible sensations, but of molecular states; that is to say, it must be interpreted according to the atomic theory.

Aristotle is more successful when he proceeds to discuss the imagination. He explains it to be a continuance of the movement originally communicated by the felt object to the organ of sense, kept up in the absence of the object itself—as near an approach to the truth as could be made in his time. And he is also right in saying that the operations of reason are only made possible by the help of what he calls phantasms—that is, faint reproductions of sensations. In addition to this, he points out the connection between memory and imagination, and enumerates the laws of association briefly, but with great accuracy. He is, however, altogether unaware of their scope. So far from using them to explain all the mental processes, he does not even see that they account for involuntary reminiscence, and limits them to the voluntary operation by which we recall a missing name or other image to consciousness.

So far Aristotle regards the soul as a function, or energy, or perfection of the body, from which it can no more be separated than vision from the eye. It is otherwise with the part of mind which he calls Nous, or Reason—the faculty which takes cognizance of abstract ideas or the pure forms of things. This corresponds in the microcosm to the eternal Nous of the macrocosm, and, like it, is absolutely immaterial, not depending for its activity on the exercise of any bodily organ. There is, however, a general analogy between sensation and thought considered as processes of cognition. Previous to experience, the Nous is no thought in particular, but merely a possibility of thinking, like a smooth wax tablet waiting to be written on. It is determined to some particular idea by contact with the objective forms of things, and in this determination is raised from power to actuality. The law of moderation, however, does not apply to thought. Excessive stimulation is first injurious and then destructive to the organs of sense, but we cannot have too much of an idea; the more intense it is the better are we able to conceive all the ideas that come under it, just because ideation is an incorporeal process. And there seems to be this further distinction between sensation and thought, that the latter is much more completely identified with its object than the former; it is in the very act of imprinting themselves on the Nous that the forms of things become perfectly detached from

matter, and so attain their final realization. It is only in our consciousness that the eternal ideas of transient phenomena become conscious of themselves. Such, we take it, is the true interpretation of Aristotle's famous distinction between an active and a passive Nous. The one, he tells us, *makes* whatever the other is *made*. The active Nous is like light raising colours from possibility to actuality. It is eternal, but we have no remembrance of its past existence, because the passive Nous, without which it can think nothing, is perishable. It will be seen that we do not consider the two kinds of Nous to differ from each other as a higher and a lower faculty. This, in our opinion, has been the great mistake of the commentators, of those at least who do not identify the active Nous with God, or with some agency emanating from God—a hypothesis utterly inconsistent with Aristotle's theology. They describe it as a faculty, and as concerned with some higher kind of knowledge than what lies within the reach of the passive Nous.* But with Aristotle faculty is always a potentiality and a passive recipient, whereas the creative reason is expressly declared to be an actuality. The difficulty is to understand why the objective forms of things should suddenly be spoken of as existing within the mind and denominated by a term carrying with it such subjective associations as Nous; a difficulty not diminished by the mysterious comparison with light in its relation to colour, an illustration which, in this instance, has only made the darkness visible. We believe that Aristotle was led to express himself as he did by the following consideration. He began by simply conceiving, that just as the senses were raised from potency to actuality through contact with the corresponding qualities in external objects, so also the reasoning faculty was moulded into particular thoughts through contact with the particular things embodying them; that, for instance, it was led to conceive the general idea of straightness by actual experience of straight lines. It then, perhaps, occurred to him that one and the same object could not produce two such profoundly different impressions as a sensation and a thought; that mind was opposed to external realities by the attribute of self-consciousness; and that a form inherent in matter could not directly impress itself on an immaterial substance. The idea of a creative Nous was, we think, devised in order to escape from these perplexities. The ideal forms of things are carried into the mind, together with the sensations, and in passing through the imagination, become purified from the matter previously

---

* So Trendelenburg, Brandis, Kampe, and apparently also Zeller. Grote speaks of it rather vaguely as an intelligence pervading the celestial sphere. Schwegler vacillates between the theological and the psychological explanation.

associated with them. Thus they may be conceived as part of the mind—in, though not yet of it—and as acting on its highest faculty, the passive Nous. And, by a kind of anticipation, they are called by the name of what they become completely identified with in cognition. As forms of things they are eternal; as thoughts they are self-conscious; while, in both capacities, they are creative, and their creative activity is an essentially immaterial process. It is the old confusion between form and function; the old inability to reconcile the claims of the universal and the particular in knowledge and existence. After all, Aristotle is obliged to extract an actuality from the meeting of two possibilities, instead of from the meeting of an actuality and a possibility. Probably the weakness of his own theory did not escape him, for he never subsequently recurs to it.*

Aristotle's work on reproduction is supposed by many to contain a reference to his distinction between the two Reasons, but we are convinced that this is a mistake. What we are told is that at the very first formation of a new being, the vegetative soul, being an exclusively corporeal function, is precontained in the elements furnished by the female; that the sensitive soul is contributed by the male (being, apparently, engendered in the semen by the vital heat of the parent organism); and finally, that the rational soul, although entirely immaterial, is also carried in with the semen, into which it has first been introduced from without, but where, or when, or how is not more particularly specified.† But even were the genetic theory in question perfectly cleared up, it would still throw no light on the distinction between active and passive reason, as the latter alone can be understood by the rational soul to which it refers. For we are expressly informed—what indeed hardly required to be stated—that the embryonic souls exist not in act but in potency.‡ It seems, therefore, that Mr. Wallace is doubly mistaken when he quotes a sentence from this passage in justification of his statement, that "Aristotle would seem almost to identify" the creative reason "with God as the eternal and omnipresent

---

* The last chapter of the *Posterior Analytics* sets forth a much more developed and definite theory of the process by which general ideas are formed. We think that it was composed at a considerably later date than the rest of the work, and probably after the treatise on the Soul, to which we should almost suspect an allusion in the word πάλαι (p. 100, a, 14), did philology permit. The reference can hardly be to the first part of the chapter (as is generally supposed); nor has the subject under discussion been touched on in any other part of the *Analytics*.

† Grote and Kampe think that Aristotle assigns a portion of æther as an extended, if not precisely a material, substratum to the rational soul; but the arguments of Zeller (p. 569) seem decisive against this view.

‡ *De Gen. An.* II. 3, p. 736, b, 15.

thinker;" * first, because it does not refer to the creative Nous at all; and, secondly, because, if it did, the words would not stand the meaning which he puts upon them.†

But if even so little as this remains unproved, what are we to think of the astounding assertion, that "Aristotle's theory of a creative reason, fragmentary as that theory is left, is the answer to all materialistic theories of the universe. To Aristotle as to a subtle Scottish preacher,‡ 'the real presupposition of all knowledge, or the thought which is the *prius* of all things, is not the individual's consciousness of himself as individual, but a thought or self-consciousness which is beyond all individual selves, which is the unity of all individual selves, and their objects, of all thinkers and all objects of thought.'"§ How can materialism or anything else be possibly refuted by a theory which is so obscurely set forth that no two interpreters are able to agree in their explanation of it? And even were it stated with perfect clearness and fulness, how can any hypothesis be refuted by a mere dogmatic declaration of Aristotle? Are we back in the Middle Ages that his *ipse dixit* is to decide questions now raised with far ampler means of discussion than he could possess? As to Principal Caird's metaphysics, we have no wish to dispute their theoretic accuracy, and can only admire the liberality of a Church in which propositions so utterly destructive of traditional orthodoxy are allowed to be preached. But one thing we are certain of, and that is, that whether or not they are consistent with Christian theism, they are utterly inconsistent with Aristotelian principles. Which is the "thought or self-consciousness" referred to, a possibility or an actuality? If the former, it is not a *prius*, nor is it the creative reason. If the latter, it cannot transcend all or any individual selves, for with Aristotle individuals are the sole reality, and the supreme being of his system is preeminently individual; neither can it unify them, for, according to Aristotle, two things which are two in actuality cannot be one in actuality.||

We now turn to Sir A. Grant, who, as was mentioned at the beginning of our former article, makes Aristotle a supporter of the late Professor Ferrier. We will state the learned Principal's view in his own words :—

"His utterances on this subject [the existence of an external world] are perhaps chiefly to be found in the third book of his treatise 'On

---

* *Outlines of the Philosophy of Aristotle*, p. [illegible]

† The word θεῖον, at any rate, does not mean "almost God," for Aristotle applies it to the intelligence of bees, and also to the heavenly bodies (*De Gen. An.* III. 10, p. 761, a, 5; *De Cœlo* II. 12, p. 292, b, 32).

‡ Principal Caird.

§ *Outlines*, Preface, p. viii.

|| *Metaph.* VII. 13, p. 1039, a, 4.

the Soul,' beginning with the fourth chapter. On turning to them we see that he never separates existence from knowledge. 'A thing in actual existence,' he says, 'is identical with the knowledge of that thing.' Again, 'The possible existence of a thing is identical with the possibility in us of perceiving or knowing it.' Thus, until a thing is perceived or known it can only be said to have a potential or possible existence. And from this a doctrine very similar to that of Ferrier might be deduced, that 'nothing exists except *plus* me,'—that is to say, in relation to some mind perceiving it."

After much searching, we have not been able to find the originals of the two passages quoted by Sir A. Grant. We have, however, found others setting forth the doctrine of Natural Realism with a clearness which leaves nothing to be desired. Aristotle tells us that former naturalists were wrong when they said that there could be no black or white without vision, and no taste without tasting; that is, they were right about the actuality, and wrong about the possibility; for, as he explains, our sensations are produced by the action of external bodies on the appropriate organs, the activity being the same while the existence is different. A sonorous body produces a sound in our hearing; the sound perceived and the action of the body are identical, but not their existence; for, he adds, the hearer need not be always listening, nor the sonorous body sounding; and so with all the other senses.*

This is not making the *percipi* of objects their *esse*. Again, in the eighth chapter he tells us that the soul is "in a certain way" (πῶς) all things, since all things are either sensible or cogitable; and then he proceeds to explain what is meant by "in a certain way." Sense and knowledge are distributed over things in such wise that their possibility is the possibility, and their actuality the actuality, of the things. They must, then, be either the things themselves or their forms. "*But the things themselves they are surely not*, for the stone is not in the soul, but its form." In the *Metaphysics*, Aristotle expresses himself to the same effect, but even more explicitly. Criticising the Protagorean doctrine, he reduces it to an absurdity by urging that if there were nothing but sensibles, then nothing at all could exist in tho absence of animated beings, for without them there would be no sensation. He admits that in the case supposed there would be neither feelings nor felt objects, since these presuppose a sentient subject; but adds, that for the substances (τὰ ὑποκείμενα) which produce the feeling, not to exist is impossible; "for there

---

* *De An.* III. 2, p. 426, a, 20; 425, b, 25 ff. What Aristotle means by saying that the εἶναι of object and sensation is not the same, appears from a passage in his tract on Memory (p. 450, b, 20), where he employs the illustration of a portrait and its original, which are the same, although their εἶναι is different.

is something else besides the feeling which must necessarily exist before it."* And immediately afterwards he clinches the argument by observing that if appearances were the only truth, there would be no independent existences, and everything would be relative, since appearances exist only in relation to some one to whom they appear. Now we need hardly say that this universal relativity was precisely what Ferrier contended for.

Sir A. Grant is on stronger ground when he uses the distinction between the two reasons as involving a sort of idealistic theory, because here Aristotle's meaning is much less clearly expressed. Yet, if our interpretation be the correct one, if the creative Nous simply means the forms of things acting through the imagination on the possibilities of subjective conception, Aristotle's view will be exactly the reverse of that contended for by Sir Alexander; thought, instead of moulding, will itself be moulded by external reality. In no case have we a right to set an obscure and disputed passage against Aristotle's distinct, emphatic, and reiterated declarations, that sensation and ideation are substantially analogous processes, taken together with his equally distinct declaration, that the objects of sensation are independent of our feelings. We think, indeed, that Sir A. Grant will find, on reconsideration, that he is proving too much. For, if the things which reason creates were external to the mind, then Aristotle would go at least as far as those "extreme German idealists" from whom his expositor is anxious to separate him. Finally, we would observe that to set up Aristotle's distinction between form and matter in opposition to the materialistic theories of the present day, shows a profound misconception of its meaning. Form and matter are nowhere distinguished from one another as subject and object. Form simply means the attributes of a thing, the entire aggregate of its differential characteristics. But that this does not of itself amount to conscious reason we are told by Aristotle himself.† On the other hand, the "matter" to which "some philosophers" attribute "an independent existence," is not his "matter" at all, but just the sum of things *minus* consciousness. The Stagirite did not, it is true, believe in the possibility of such a universe, but only (as we have shown) because he was not acquainted with the highest laws of motion. Yet, even taking matter in his own technical sense, Aristotle would have agreed with Professor Tyndall, that it contained the promise and the potency of all future life, reason alone excepted. He tells us very clearly that the sensitive soul is a somatic function, something which, although not body, belongs to body; and this we conceive is all

* *Metaph.* IV. 5, *sub fin.* † *De An.* III. 4, *sub fin.*

that any materialist would now contend for.* And having gone so far, there really was nothing to prevent him from going a step farther, had he only been acquainted with the dependence of all intelligence on nervous action. At any rate, the tendency is now to obliterate the distinction where he drew it, and to substitute for it another distinction which he neglected. While all functions of consciousness, from the most elementary sensation to the most complex reasoning, seem to pass into one another by imperceptible gradations, consciousness in general is still separated from objective existence by an impassable chasm; and if there is any hope of reconciling them it lies in the absolute idealism which he so summarily rejected. What we have had occasion repeatedly to point out in other departments of his system is verified once more in his psychology. The progress of thought has resulted from a reunion of the principles between which he drew a rigid demarcation. We have found that perception can only be understood as a process essentially homogeneous with the highest thought, and neither more nor less immaterial than it. On the objective side, both may be resolved into sensori-motor actions; on the subjective side, into groups of related feelings. And here, also, we have to note that when Aristotle anticipates modern thought, it is through his one great mediating, synthetic conception. He observes incidentally that our knowledge of size and shape is acquired, not through the special senses, but by motion—an *aperçu* much in advance of Locke.†

If there are any who value Aristotle as a champion of spiritualism, they must take him with his encumbrances. If his philosophy proves that one part of the soul is immaterial, it proves equally that the soul, taking it altogether, is perishable. Not only does he reject Plato's metempsychosis as inconsistent with physiology, but he declares that affection, memory, and reasoning are functions not of the eternal Nous, but of the whole man, and come to an end with his dissolution. As to the active Nous, he tells us that it cannot think without the assistance of the passive Nous, which is mortal. And there are various passages in the *Nicomachean Ethics* showing that he had faced this negation of a future life, and was perfectly resigned to its consequences.‡ At one period of his life, probably when under the immediate influence of Plato, he had indulged in dreams of immortality; but a profounder acquaintance with natural science sufficed to dissipate them. Perhaps a lingering veneration for his teacher made him purposely use ambiguous language in

* *De An.* II. 2, p. 414, a, 20. † *De An.* III. 1, p. 425, a, 13.

‡ See Zeller, pp. 602–606, where the whole subject is thoroughly discussed.

reference to the eternity of that creative reason which he had so closely associated with self-consciousness. It may remind us of Spinoza's celebrated proposition, *Sentimus experimurque nos æternos esse,* words absolutely disconnected with the hope of a continued existence of the individual after death, but apparently intended to enlist some of the sentiment associated with that belief on the side of the writer's own philosophy.

On the other hand, the spirit of Plato's religion survived in the teaching of his disciple under a new form. The idea of an eternal personality was, as it were, unified and made objective by being transferred from the human to the divine; and so each philosopher develops an aspect of religious faith which is wanting in the other, thereby illustrating the tendencies, to some extent mutually exclusive, which divide all theology between them.

It remains to observe that if even Aristotle's theism is inconsistent with the Catholic faith, much more must his psychology be its direct negation. "*The* Philosophy of *the* Philosopher" is as fatal to the Church's doctrine of future rewards and punishments as it is to her doctrine of divine interference with the usual order of nature.

The principal business of reason is, as we have seen, to form abstract ideas or concepts of things. But before the time of Aristotle it had already been discovered that concepts, or rather the terms expressing them, were capable of being united in propositions which might be either true or false, and whose truth might be a matter either of certainty or of simple opinion. Now, in modern psychology, down to the most recent times, it has always been assumed that, just as there is an intellectual faculty or operation called abstraction corresponding to the terms of which a proposition is composed, so also there is a faculty or operation called judgment corresponding to the entire proposition. Sometimes, again, the third operation which consists in linking propositions together to form syllogisms is assigned to a distinct faculty called Reason; sometimes all three are regarded as ascending steps in a single fundamental process. Neither Plato nor Aristotle, however, had thought out the subject so scientifically. To both the framing, or rather the discovery, of concepts was by far the most important business of a philosopher, judgment and reasoning being merely subsidiary to it. Hence, while in one part of their logic they were realists and conceptualists, in other parts they were nominalists. Abstract names and the definitions unfolding their connotation corresponded to actual entities in nature—the eternal Ideas of the one and the substantial forms of the other—as well as to mental representations about whose existence they were

agreed, while ascribing to them a different origin. But they did not in like manner treat propositions as the expression of natural laws without, or of judgments within, the mind; while reasoning they regarded much more as an art of thinking, a method for the discovery of ideas, than as the systematization of a process spontaneously performed by every human being without knowing it; and even as such their tendency is to connect it with the theory of definition rather than with the theory of synthetic propositions. Some approach to a realistic view is indeed made by both. The restless and penetrating thought of Plato had, probably towards the close of his career, led him to inquire into the mutual relations of those Ideas which he had at first been inclined to regard as absolutely distinct. He shows us in the *Sophist* how the most abstract notions, such as Being, Identity, and so forth, must, to a certain extent, partake of each other's nature; and when their relationship does not lie on the surface, he seeks to establish it by the interposition of a third idea obviously connected with both. In the later books of the *Republic* he also points to a scheme for arranging his Ideas according to a fixed hierarchy resembling the concatenation of mathematical proofs, by ascending and descending whose successive gradations the mind is to become familiarized with absolute truth; and we shall presently see how Aristotle, following in the same track, sought for a counterpart to his syllogistic method in the objective order of things. Nevertheless, with him as well as with his master, science was not what it is with us, a study of laws, a perpetually growing body of truth, but a process of definition and classification, a systematization of what has already been perceived and thought.

It was from the initiative of Socrates that logic received this direction. By insisting on the supreme importance of definition he drew away attention from the propositions which add to our knowledge, and concentrated it on those which only fix with precision the meaning of words. Yet, in so doing he was influenced quite as much by the spirit of the older physical philosophy, which he denounced, as by the necessities of the new humanistic culture, which he helped to introduce. His definitions were in truth the reproduction, on a very minute scale, of those attempts to formulate the whole universe which busied the earliest Ionian speculation. Following the natural tendency of Greek thought, and the powerful attraction of cosmic philosophy, an effort was speedily made to generalize and connect these partial definitions until they grew into a system of universal classification. It was when, under the influence of a new analysis, this system threatened to fall to pieces, that a rudimentary doctrine of judgment first made its appearance. The

structure of a grammatical sentence was used to explain how objective ideas could, in a manner, overlap and adhere to one another. Hence propositions, which, as the expression of general truths, were destined to become the beginning and end of thought, remained at first strictly subordinated to the individual concepts that they linked and reconciled.

With Aristotle they assumed a new importance. He looked on them as mediating, not only between concepts, but also between conception and reasoning. Still, neither as a psychologist nor as a logician did he appreciate them at their real value. A very brief consideration is given to judgment in his work on the soul, and we are left in doubt whether it is a function of Nous alone or of Nous combined with some other faculty. Setting aside the treatise ou Interpretation, which is probably spurious, and, at any rate, throws no new light on the subject, we may gather from his logical writings half a dozen different suggestions towards a classification of propositions, based partly on their form and partly on their import. In all we find an evident tendency to apply here also the grand fundamental distinction between the sphere of uniformity and the sphere of change and opposition. All propositions are either universal or particular; either positive or negative; either necessary or actual or contingent; either reciprocating or not reciprocating; either essential or accidental; either answering to the first question in the categories, or to one of the other nine. But nowhere is any attempt made to combine and systematize these various points of view.

In the theory of reasoning the simple proposition is taken as a starting-point, but instead of deducing the syllogism from the synthesis of two premises, Aristotle reaches the premises through the conclusion. He tells us, indeed, that reasoning is a way of discovering from what we know something that we did not know before. With him, however, it is really a process not of discovery but of proof. He starts with the conclusion, analyses it into predicate and subject or major and minor, and then, by a further analysis, introduces a middle term connecting the two. Thus, we begin with the proposition, "Caius is mortal," and prove it by interpolating the notion humanity between its two extremes. From this point of view the premises are merely a temporary scaffolding for bringing the major and minor into connection with the middle term; and this is also the reason why Aristotle recognizes three syllogistic figures only instead of the four admitted by later logicians. For the middle may either be contained in one extreme and contain the other, which gives us the first figure; or it may contain both, which gives the second figure; or be contained in both, which gives the third; and this is an exhaustive enumeration of the possible combinations.

We have here also the secret of that elaborate machinery devised for the very unnecessary purpose of converting syllogisms of the second and third figure into syllogisms of the first, which is one of the Stagirite's principal contributions to logic. For it is only in the first figure that the notion by which the extremes are either united or held apart is really a middle term, that is to say, really comes between the others. The distinction between perfect and imperfect syllogisms also serves to illustrate Aristotle's systematic division between the necessary and the contingent The method of proof by inclusion corresponds in its unconditioned and independent validity to the concentric arrangement of the supernal spheres; the second and third figures, with their conversions and reductions, to the sublunary sphere in its helpless dependence on the celestial revolutions, and its transformations of the elements into one another.

The rules which Aristotle gives us for the conversion of propositions are no doubt highly instructive, and throw great light on their meaning; but one cannot help observing that such a process as conversion ought, on his own principles, to have been inadmissible. With Plato the copulation of subject and predicate corresponded to an almost mechanical juxtaposition of two self-existent ideas. It was, therefore, a matter of indifference in what order they were placed. Aristotle, on the other hand, after insisting on the restoration of the concrete object, and reducing general notions to an analysis of its particular aspects, could not but make the predicate subordinate to, and dependent on, the subject—a relation which altogether excludes the logical possibility of making them interchangeable with one another.*

The antithetical structure of the whole system is reproduced even in the first syllogistic figure, where there is a similar opposition between the first mood, by which alone universal affirmatives can be obtained, and the remaining three, whose conclusions are either negative, or particular, or both. And the complicated rules for testing the validity of those syllogisms in which the premises are distinguished as necessary, actual, and possible, are still more obviously based on Aristotle's false metaphysical distinctions, and with the overthrow of those distinctions large portions of the *Analytics* lose their entire value for modern students.

On the other hand, a theory of reasoning based on the relations of concepts, instead of on the relations of judgments, necessarily leaves out of account the whole doctrine of hypothetical and disjunctive propositions, together with that of the syllogisms based on them, since the elements of which they are composed

---

* This point is well brought out in F. A. Lange's *Logische Untersuchungen.*

are themselves propositions. And this inevitable omission is the more remarkable because alternative and, to a less extent, hypothetical arguments form the staple of Aristotle's own dialectic; while categorical reasoning never occurs in it at all. His constant method is to enumerate all possible views of a subject and examine them one after the other, rejecting those which are untenable and resting content with the remainder. In other words, he reaches his positive conclusions through a series of negative principles representing a process of gradual elimination. The *First Analytics* is itself an admirable instance of his favourite method. Every possible combination of terms is discussed, and the valid moods are sifted out from a much greater number of illegitimate syllogisms. The dialectic of Socrates and Plato followed the same procedure. It was essentially experimental—a method of trial, elimination, and selection. On going back still further, we find that when there is any reasoning at all in Homer, it is conducted after the same fashion. Hector, in his soliloquy before the Scæan Gate, imagines three alternative courses, together exhausting the possibilities of the situation. He may either retreat within the walls, or offer terms of peace to Achilles, or fight. The first two alternatives being rejected, nothing remains but the third. This is the most elaborate example, but on many other occasions Homer's actors are represented as hesitating between two courses, and finally deciding on one of them. Disjunction is, in truth, the primordial form of all reasoning, out of which the other forms are successively evolved, and as such it is common to man with the lower animals. You are taking a walk in the country with your dog. You come to a stream and jump over it. On measuring the distance with his eye, the animal is afraid to follow you. After waiting a little he first runs up stream in search of a crossing, and, finding none, returns to look for one in the opposite direction. Failing there also, he comes back once more, and either ventures on the leap or makes his way home by some other route. Now, on considering the matter a little more closely, we shall find that hypothetical reasoning takes its rise from the examination of each separate alternative presented by a disjunctive premise. A plurality of courses being open to us, we consider what will ensue on the acceptance or rejection of each. The dog in our illustration thinks (after a canine fashion) that if he jumps he may fall in; if he does not, he will be left behind. Hector will not take refuge within the walls, because, if he does, Polydamas will triumph over him; nor will he offer terms of peace, because, if he does, Achilles will refuse them. Once more, categorical reasoning is developed out of hypothetical reasoning by the necessity of deducing consequences from a general rule. Hector must have argued from the known

characters of Polydamas and Achilles, that in certain circumstances they would act after a certain manner. We may add, that this progress of conscious reasoning is a reproduction of the unconscious logic according to which life itself is evolved. All sorts of combinations are spontaneously produced which, in consequence of the struggle for existence, cannot all survive. Those adapted to the conditions of life are selected, on trial, at the expense of the rest; and their adaptation or non-adaptation is determined in accordance with categorical laws. Furthermore, the framing of a disjunctive proposition necessitates the systematic distribution of possibilities under mutually exclusive heads, thus involving the logical processes of definition, division, and classification. Dialectic, as Plato understood it, consisted almost entirely in the joint performance of these operations which Aristotle regards as the immediate, but very imperfect precursor, of his own syllogistic method. You cannot, he says, prove anything by dividing, for instance, all living things into the two classes, mortal and immortal; unless, indeed, you assume the very point under discussion—which class a particular species belongs to. Yet this is how he constantly reasons himself; and even demonstrative reasoning, as he interprets it, implies the possession of a ready-made classification, for it will not allow any proposition into a demonstrative argument unless it predicates some essential attribute of a thing—in other words, some attribute already included in the definition of the subject; and a continuous series of such definitions can only be given by a fixed classification of things.

We have endeavoured to show that Aristotle's account of the syllogism is redundant on the one side and defective on the other, both errors being due to a false analysis of the reasoning process itself, combined with a false metaphysical philosophy. The same evil influences tell with much greater effect on his theory of applied reasoning. The fundamental division, corresponding to that between heaven and earth in the Cosmos, is between demonstration and dialectic or experimental reasoning. The one starts with first principles of unquestionable validity, the other with principles the validity of which is to be tested by their consequences. Stated in its most abstract form, the distinction is sound, and corresponds very nearly to the modern division between deduction and induction, the process by which general laws are applied, and the process by which they are established. Aristotle, however, committed two great mistakes; he thought that each method corresponded to an entirely different order of phenomena: and he thought that both were concerned for the most part with definitions. The *Posterior Analytics*, which contains his theory of demonstration, answers to the astronomical portion of his physics; it is the doctrine of eternal and necessary truth. And just as his ontology distinguishes

between the Prime Mover himself unmoved and the eternal movement produced by his influence, so also his logic distinguishes between infallible first principles and the truths derived from them, the latter being, in his opinion, of inferior value. Now, according to Aristotle, these first principles are definitions, and it is to this fact that their self-evident certainty is due. At the same time they are not verbal but real definitions—that is to say, the universal forms of things in themselves as made manifest to the eye of reason, or rather, stamped upon it like the impression of a signet-ring on wax. And, by a further refinement, he seems to distinguish between the concept as a whole and the separate marks which make it up, these last being the ultimate elements of all existence, and as much beyond its complex forms as Nous is beyond reasoned truth. Such a view was essentially unfavourable to the progress of science, assigning, as it did, a higher dignity to meagre and very questionable abstractions than to the far-reaching combinations by which alone we are enabled to unravel the inmost texture of visible phenomena. Instead of using reason to supplement sense, Aristotle turned it into a more subtle and universal kind of sense; and if this disastrous assimilation was to a certain extent imposed upon him by the traditions of Athenian thought, it harmonized admirably with the descriptive and superficial character of his own intelligence. Much was also due to the method of geometry, which in his time had already assumed the form made familiar to us by Euclid's *Elements*. The employment of axioms side by side with definitions, might, indeed, have drawn his attention to the existence and importance of judgments which, in Kantian terminology, are not analytic but synthetic—that is, which add to the content of a notion instead of simply analysing it. But although he mentions axioms, and states that mathematic theorems are deduced from them, no suspicion of their essential difference from definitions or of the typical significance which they were destined to assume in the theory of reasoning, seems ever to have crossed his mind; otherwise he could hardly have failed to ask how we come by our knowledge of them, and to what they correspond in nature. On the whole, it seems likely that he looked on them as an analysis of our ideas, differing only from definition proper by the generality of its application; for he names the law of contradiction as the most important of all axioms, and that from which the others proceed;* and his only other example is, that if equals are taken from equals the remainders are equal, a judgment the synthetic character of which is by no means clear, and has occasionally been disputed.

We cannot, then, agree with those critics who attribute to

* *Metaph.* IV. 3 *sub. in.*

Aristotle a recognition of such things as "laws of nature," in the sense of uniform co-existences and sequences.* Such an idea implies a certain balance and equality between subject and predicate which he would never have admitted. It would, in his own language, be making relation, instead of substance, the leading category. It must be remembered also that he did not acknowledge the existence of those constant conjunctions in Nature which we call laws. He did not admit that all matter was heavy or that fluidity implied the presence of heat. The possession of constant properties, or rather of a single constant property—circular rotation—is reserved for the æther. Nor is this a common property of different and indefinitely multipliable phenomena; it characterizes a single body measurable in extent and unique in kind. Moreover, we have something better than indirect evidence on this point; we have the plain statement of Aristotle himself, that all science depends on first principles, about which it is impossible to be mistaken, precisely because they are universal abstractions not presented to the mind by any combination†—a view quite inconsistent with the priority now given to general laws.

Answering to the first principles of demonstration in logic, if not absolutely identical with them, are what Aristotle calls causes in the nature of things. We have seen what an important part the middle term plays in Aristotle's theory of the syllogism. It is the vital principle of demonstration, the connecting link by which the two extreme terms are attached to one another. In the theory of applied logic, whose object is to bring the order of thought into complete parallelism with the order of things, the middle term through which a fact is demonstrated answers to the cause through which it exists. According to our notions only two terms, antecedent and consequent, are involved in the idea of causation; and causation becomes a matter for reasoning when we perceive that the sequence is repeated in a uniform manner. But Aristotle was very far from having reached, or

---

* Die Wissenschaft soll die Erscheinungen ans ihren Gründen erklären, welche näher in den allgemeinen Ursachen und Gesetzen zu suchen sind" (Zeller, p. 203). "Induction is the method of proceeding from particular instances to general laws" (Wallace, p. 13). "It seems to have been his idea that after gathering facts up to a certain point, a flash of intuition would supervene, telling us 'This is a law'" (Grant, p. 68). *Apropos* of the discussion whence this last passage is extracted, we may observe that Sir A. Grant is quite mistaken in saying that Aristotle "omits to provide for verification." Aristotle is, on the contrary, most anxious to show that his theories agree with all the known facts. See in particular his memorable declaration (*De Gen. An.* III. 10, p. 760, b, 27), that facts are more to be trusted than reasonings. The emphasis laid by Aristotle on concepts as distinguished from laws is noticed by J. H. v. Kirchmann, in his German translation of the *Metaphysics*, p. 13.

† *De An.* III. 6 *sub in.*, taken together with *Anal. Post.* I. 6.

even suspected, this point of view. A cause is with him not a determining antecedent, but a secret nexus by which the co-existence of two phenomena is explained. Instead of preceding it intercedes; and this is why he finds its subjective counterpart in the middle term of the syllogism. Some of his own examples will make the matter clearer. Why is the moon eclipsed? Because the earth intervenes between her and the sun. Why is the bright side of the moon always turned towards the sun? Because she shines by his reflected light (here light is the middle term). Why is that person talking to the rich man? Because he wants to borrow money of him. Why are those two men friends? Because they have the same enemy.

Aristotle even goes so far as to eliminate the notion of sequence from causation altogether. He tells us that the causes of events are contemporary with the events themselves; those of past events being past; of present events, present; and of future events, future. "This thing will not be because that other thing has happened, for the middle term must be homogeneous with the extremes."* It is obvious that such a limitation abolishes the power of scientific prediction, which, if not the only test of knowledge, is at any rate its most valuable verification. The Stagirite has been charged with trusting too much to deductive reasoning; it now appears that, on the contrary, he had no conception of its most important function. Here, as everywhere, he follows not the synthetic method of the mathematician, but the analytic method of the naturalist. Finally, instead of combining the notions of cause and kind, he systematically confuses them. It will be remembered how his excellent division of causes into material, formal, efficient, and final, was rendered nugatory by the continued influence of Plato's ideas. The formal cause always tended to absorb the other three; and the assimilation was still further promoted by his attempt to harmonize the order of demonstration with the order of existence. For the formal cause of a phenomenon simply meant those properties which it shared with others of the same kind, and it was by virtue of those properties that it became a subject for general reasoning, which was interpreted as a methodical arrangement of concepts one within another, answering to the concentric disposition of the cosmic spheres.

Owing to the slight importance which Aristotle attaches to judgments as compared with concepts, he does not go very deeply into the question, how do we obtain our premises? He says, in remarkably emphatic language, that all knowledge is acquired either by demonstration or by induction, or rather,

* *Anal. Post.* II., 12, p. 95, a, 36.

we may add, in the last resort by the latter only, since demonstration rests on generals which are discovered inductively; but his generals mean definitions and abstract predicates or subjects, rather than synthetic propositions. If, however, his attention had been called to the distinction, we cannot suppose that he would, on his own principles, have adopted conclusions essentially different from those of the modern experiential school. Mr. Wallace does, indeed, claim him as a supporter of the theory that no inference can be made from particulars to particulars without the aid of a general proposition, and as having refuted, by anticipation, Mill's assertion to the contrary. We quote the analysis which is supposed to prove this in Mr. Wallace's own words:—

"We reason that because the war between Thebes and Phocis was a war between neighbours and an evil, therefore the war between Athens and Thebes, being also a war between neighbours, will in all probability be also an evil. Thus, out of the one parallel case—the war between Thebes and Phocis—we form the *general* proposition, All wars between neighbours are evils; to this we add the minor, the war between Athens and Thebes is a war between neighbours—and thence arrive at the conclusion that the war between Athens and Thebes will be likewise an evil."*

On the strength of this Mr. Wallace elsewhere observes:—

"His [Aristotle's] theory of syllogism is simply an explicit statement of the fact that all knowledge, all thought, rests on universal truths or general propositions—that all knowledge, whether 'deductive' or 'inductive,' is arrived at by the aid, the indispensable aid, of general propositions. We in England have been almost charmed into the belief that reasoning is perpetually from particular to particular, and a 'village matron' and her 'Lucy' have been used to express the truth for us in the concrete form adapted to our weaker comprehension (Mill's *Logic*, bk. ii. ch. 3). We shall next be told, forsooth, that oxygen and hydrogen do not enter into the composition of water, because our village matron 'perpetually' drinks it without 'passing through' either element, and the analysis of the chemist will be proved as great a fiction as the analysis of the logician. Aristotle has supplied the links which at once upset all such superficial analysis. He has shown that even in analogy or example, which *apparently* proceeds in this way from one particular instance to another particular instance, we are only justified in so proceeding in so far as we have transformed the particular instance into a general proposition."†

Now, there is this great difference between Aristotle and Mill, that the former is only showing how reasoning from examples can be set forth in syllogistic form, while the latter is investi-

* Wallace's *Outlines*, p. 14. † *Ibid.*, Preface, pp. viii.-ix.

gating the psychological process which underlies all reasoning, and the real foundation on which a valid inference rests—questions which had never presented themselves clearly to the mind of the Greek philosopher at all. Mill argued, in the first instance, that when any particular proposition is deduced from a general proposition, it is proved by the same evidence as that on which the general itself rests, namely, on other particulars; and, so far, he is in perfect agreement with Aristotle. He then argues that particulars to particulars are perpetually made without passing through a general proposition: and, to illustrate his meaning, he quotes the example of a "village matron and her Lucy," to which Mr. Wallace refers with a very gratuitous sneer.* However, as we have seen, he is not above turning it against Mill. The drift of his own illustration is not very clear, but we suppose it implies that the matron unconsciously frames the general proposition: My remedy is good for all children suffering from the same disease as Lucy; and with equal unconsciousness reasons down from this to the case of her neighbour's child. Now, it is quite unjustifiable to call an analysis superficial because it leaves out of account a hypothesis incompatible with the nominalism which Mill professed. It is still more unjustifiable to quote against it the authority of a philosopher who perfectly agreed with those who disbelieve in the possibility of unconscious knowledge,† and contemptuously rejected Plato's opinion to the contrary. Nor is this all. The doctrine that reasoning is from particulars to particulars, even when it passes through general propositions, may be rigorously deduced from Aristotle's own admissions. If nothing exists but particulars, and if knowledge is of what exists, then all knowledge is of particulars. Therefore, if the propositions entering into a chain of reasoning are knowledge, they must deal with particulars exclusively. And quite apart from the later developments of Aristotle's philosophy, we have his express assertion, that all generals are derived from particulars, which is absolutely incompatible with the alleged fact, that "all knowledge, all thought, rests on universal truths, on general propositions; that all knowledge, whether 'deductive' or 'inductive,' is arrived at by the aid, the indispensable aid, of general propositions." To Aristotle the basis of knowledge was not "truths" of any kind, but concepts; and in the last chapter of the *Posterior Analytics*, he

---

* As if Mill wrote exclusively for Oxford tutors, and as if other philosophers had not constantly elucidated their arguments by concrete examples. One does not see why the village matron should be more deserving of contempt than Aristotle's Thebans and Phocians.

† That is, knowledge which has never been actualized.

has explained how these concepts are derived from sense-perceptions without the aid of any "propositions" whatever.

We are here confronted with an important and much disputed question, Was Aristotle an empiricist? We hold most decidedly that he was, if by empiricist is meant, what alone should be meant—one who believes that the mind neither anticipates anything in the content nor contributes anything to the form of experience; in other words, who believes knowledge to be the agreement of thought with things imposed by things on thought. We have already shown that Aristotle was in no sense a transcendental idealist. The other half of our position is proved by the chapter in the *Posterior Analytics* already referred to, the language of which is *primâ facie* so much in favour of our view that the burden of proof rests on those who give it another interpretation. Among these, the latest with whom we are acquainted is Zeller. The eminent German historian, after asserting in former editions of his work that Aristotle derived his first principles from the self-contemplation of the Nous, has now, probably in deference to the unanswerable arguments of Kampe, abandoned this position. He still, however, assumes the existence of a rather indefinable *à priori* element in the Aristotelian noology on the strength of the following considerations:—The first is, that according to Aristotle even sense-perception is not a purely passive process, and therefore intellectual cognition can still less be so (p. 190). But the passages quoted only amount to this, that the passivity of a thing which is raised from possibility to actuality differs from the passivity implied in the destruction of its proper nature; and that the objects of abstract thought come from within, not from without, in the sense that they are presented by the imagination to the reason. The pure empiricist need deny neither position. He would freely admit that to lose one's reason through drunkenness or disease is a quite different sort of operation from being impressed with a new truth; and he would also admit that we generalize not directly from outward experience, but from that highly-abridged and representative experience which memory supplies. Neither process, however, constitutes either an anticipation of outward experience nor an addition to it. It is from the materialist, not from the empiricist, that Aristotle differs. He believes that the forms under which matter appears are separable from every particular portion of matter, though not from all matter, in the external world; and he believes that a complete separation between them is effected in the single instance of self-conscious reason, which again, in cognizing any particular thing is identified with that thing *minus* its matter. The next argument is that the cognition of ideas by the Nous is immediate, whereas the process of generalization from experience

described by Aristotle is extremely indirect. Here Zeller seems to misunderstand the word ἄμεσος. Aristotle never applies it to knowledge, but only to the objective relations of ideas with one another. Two terms constitute an "immediate" premise when they are not connected by another term, quite irrespective of the steps by which we come to recognize their conjunction. So with the terms themselves. They are "immediate" when they cannot be derived from any ulterior principle; when, in short, they are simple and uncaused. Finally, the objection that first principles being the most certain and necessary of any cannot be derived from sensible experience, which, dealing only with material objects, must inherit the uncertainty and contingency of matter —is an objection, not to the empiricist interpretation of Aristotle's philosophy, but to empiricism itself; and it is not allowable to explain away the plain words of an ancient writer in order to reconcile them with assumptions which he nowhere admits. That universality and necessity involve an *à priori* cognition or an intellectual intuition, is a modern theory unsupported by a single sentence in Aristotle.* We quite agree with Zeller when he goes on to say that in Aristotle's psychology "certain thoughts and notions arise through the action of the object thought about on the thinking mind, just as perception arises through the action of the perceived object on the percipient" (195); but how this differs from the purest empiricism is more than we are able to understand.

It is remarkable that Aristotle, after repeatedly speaking of induction as an ascent from particulars to generals, when he comes to trace the process by which we arrive at the most general notions of any, does not admit the possibility of such a movement in one direction only. The universal and the individual are, according to him, combined in our most elementary sense-impressions, and the business of scientific experience is to separate them. Starting from a middle point, we work up to indivisible predicates on the one hand and down to indivisible subjects on the other, the final apprehension of both extremes being the office, not of science, but of Nous. This theory is equally true and acute. The perception of individual facts is just as difficult and just as slowly acquired as the conception of ultimate abstractions. Moreover, the two processes are carried on *pari passu*, each being only made possible by and through the other. No true notion can be framed without a firm grasp of the particulars from which it is abstracted; no individual object can be studied without analyzing it into a group of common

* It is a mistake to translate νόησις as the Germans do by Anschauung The Nous does not intuite ideas, but is converted into and consists of them.

predicates, the idiosyncrasy—that is, the special combination of which differentiates it from every other object. What, however, we wish to remark, is the illustration incidentally afforded by this striking *aperçu* of Aristotle's analytical method, which is also the essentially Greek method of thought. We saw that for our philosopher syllogism was not the subsumption of a particular case under a general law, but the interpolation of a mean between two extremes; we now see that his induction is not the finding of a law for the particular phenomenon, but its analysis into two elements—one universal and the other individual—a solution of the mean into the extremes; and the distinctive originality of his whole system was to fix two such extremes for the universe —a self-thinking thought in absolute self-identity at one end of the scale, and an absolutely indeterminate matter at the other; by combining which in various proportions he then re-constructed the whole intermediate phenomenal reality. In studying each particular class of facts, he follows the same method. The genus is marked by some characteristic attribute which one species—the prerogative species, so to speak—exhibits in its greatest purity, while the others form a graduated scale by variously combining this attribute with its opposite or privation. Hence his theory, since revived by Goethe, that the colours are so many different mixtures of light and darkness.

It has, until lately, been customary to speak as if all that Aristotle knew about induction was contained in the few scattered passages where it is mentioned under that name in the *Analytics*. This, no doubt, is true, if by induction we mean simple generalization. But if we understand by it the philosophy of experimental evidence—the analysis of those means by which, in the absence of direct observation, we decide between two conflicting hypotheses—then the *Topics* must be pronounced as good a discussion on the subject as was compatible with his general theory of knowledge. For he supposes that there are large classes of phenomena, including, among other things, the whole range of human life, which, not being bound by any fixed order, lie outside the scope of scientific demonstration, although capable of being determined with various degrees of probability; and here also what he has in view is not the discovery of laws, but the construction of definitions. These being a matter of opinion, could always be attacked as well as maintained. Thus the constant conflict and balancing of opposite forces, which we have learned to associate with the sublunary sphere, has its logical representative no less than the kindred ideas of uncertainty and vicissitude. And in connection with this side of applied logic, Aristotle has also to consider the requirements of those who took part in the public debates on disputed questions, then very

common among educated Athenians, and frequently turning on verbal definitions. Hence, while we find many varieties of reasoning suggested, such as Reasoning by Analogy, Disjunctive Reasoning, Hypothetical Reasoning (though without a generalized expression for all its varieties); and, what is most remarkable, three out of Mill's four Experimental Methods,* we do not find that any interesting or useful application is made of them. Even considered as a handbook for debaters, the *Topics* is not successful. With the practical incompetence of a mere naturalist, Aristotle has supplied heads for arguments in such profusion and such utter carelessness of their relative importance that no memory could sustain the burden, except in the probably rare instances when a lifetime was devoted to their study.

We have now concluded our survey of the first great mental antithesis, that between reason on the one hand, and sense and opinion on the other. The next antithesis, that between reason and passion, will occupy us a much shorter time. With it we pass from theory to practice, from metaphysics and logic to moral philosophy. But as we saw in our former article, Aristotle was not a practical genius; for him the supreme interest of life is still the acquisition of knowledge. Theorizing activity corresponds to the celestial world, in which there can be neither opposition nor excess; while passion corresponds to the sublunary sphere, where order is only preserved by the balancing of antithetical forces; and the moderating influence of reason, to the control exercised by the higher over the lower system.

The passions themselves and the means by which they can be either excited or controlled are described in Aristotle's *Rhetoric* with wonderful knowledge of human nature in the abstract, but with almost no reference to the art for whose purposes the information is ostensibly systematized; while in the *Ethics* they are studied, so to speak, statically, in their condition of permanent equilibration or disequilibration; the virtues and vices being represented as so many different aspects of those conditions. It is obvious that such an extremely artificial parallelism could not be carried out without a considerable strain and distortion of the facts involved. The only virtue that can with truth be described as a form of moderation is temperance; and even in temperance this is rather accidental than essential. Elsewhere Aristotle deduces the extremes from the mean rather than the

* For Analogy, see *Top.* II. 10, *sub in.*; Disjunction, II. 6, *sub in.*; Hypothetical Reasoning, II. 10, p. 115, a, 15; Method of Differences, II. 11, *sub in.*; Method of Residues, VI. 11, *sub in.*; Concomitant Variations, II. 10, p. 114, b, 37; V. 8, *sub in.*; VI. 7, *sub in.*; The Method of Agreement occurs *An. Prior.* II. 27, *sub fin.*; and *An. Post.* II. 13, p. 97, b, 7.

mean from the extremes; and sometimes one of the extremes is invented for the occasion. To fit justice, confessedly the most important virtue, into such a scheme, was obviously impracticable without reinterpreting the idea of moderation. Instead of an equilibrium between opposing impulses in the same person, we have equality in the treatment of different persons; which again resolves itself into giving them their own, without any definite determination of what their own may be.* It cannot even be said that Aristotle represented the best ethical thought of his age, and an indispensable stage in the evolution of all thought. The extreme insufficiency of his ethical theory is due to the fancied necessity of squaring it with the requirements of his cosmological system. For no sooner does he place himself at the popular point of view than he deduces the particular virtues from regard to the welfare of others, and treats them all as so many different forms of justice.†

Aristotle has sometimes been represented as an advocate of free-will against necessity. But the question had not really been opened in his time. He rejected fatalism; but it had not occurred to him that internal motives might exercise a constraining power over action. His freedom has nothing to do with the self-assertion of mind, its extrication from the chain of physical antecedents. It is simply the element of arbitrariness and uncertainty supposed to characterize the region of change and opposition, as distinguished from the higher region of undeviating regularity.

It is only in this higher region that perfect virtue can be realized. The maintenance of a settled balance between rival solicitations, or between the excess and defect of those impulses which lead us to seek pleasure and avoid pain, is good indeed, but neither the only nor the chief good. The law of moderation does not extend to that supremely happy life which is related to our emotional existence as the æther to the terrestrial elements, as soul to body, as reason to sense, as science to opinion. Here it is the steady subordination of means to ends which imitates the insphering of the heavenly orbs, the hierarchy of psychic faculties, and the chain of syllogistic arguments. Of theoretic activity we cannot have too much, and all other activities, whether public or private, should be regarded as so much machinery for ensuring its peaceful prosecution. Wisdom and temperance had been absolutely identified by Socrates; they are

---

* It may possibly be urged that the fifth book of the *Nicomachean Ethics* is of doubtful authenticity. Still the dilemma remains, that Aristotle either omitted the most important of all moral questions from his ethics, or that he treated it in a miserably inadequate manner.

† *Eth. Nic.* V. 3; *Rhet.* I. 6, p. 1362, b, 28; 9, p. 1366, b, 4.

as absolutely held apart by Aristotle. And what we have had occasion to observe in the other departments of thought is verified here once more. Notwithstanding his paradoxes, Socrates was substantially right. The moral regeneration of the world was destined to be brought about, not by Dorian discipline, but by free Athenian thought, working on practical conceptions —by the discovery of new moral truth, or rather by the dialectic development of old truth. And, conversely, the highest development of theoretic activity was not attained by isolating it in egoistic self-contemplation from the world of human needs, but by consecrating it to their service, informing it with their vitality, and subjecting it, in common with them, to that law of moderation from which no energy, however godlike, is exempt.

The final antithesis of conscious life is that between the individual and the state. In this sense, Aristotle's *Politics* is the completion of his *Ethics.* It is only in a well-ordered community that moral habits can be acquired; and it is only in such a community that the best or intellectual life can be attained, although, properly speaking, it is not a social life. Nevertheless, the *Politics,* like every other portion of Aristotle's system, reproduces within itself the elements of an independent whole. To understand its internal organization, we must begin by disregarding Aristotle's abortive classification (chiefly adapted from Plato) of constitutions into three legitimate—Monarchy, Aristocracy, and Republic; and three illegitimate—Democracy, Oligarchy, and Tyranny. Aristotle distinguishes them by saying that the legitimate forms are governed with a view to the general good; the illegitimate with a view to the interests of particular classes or persons. But, in point of fact, as Zeller shows, he cannot keep up this distinction; and we shall better understand his true idea by substituting for it another—that between the intellectual and the material state. The object of the one is to secure the highest culture for a ruling caste, who are to abstain from industrial occupations, and to be supported by the labour of a dependent population. Such a Government may be either monarchical or aristocratic; but it must necessarily be in the hands of a few. The object of the other is to maintain a stable equilibrium between the opposing interests of rich and poor—two classes practically distinguished as the few and the many. This end is best attained where supreme power belongs to the middle class. The deviations are represented by oligarchy and tyranny on the one side, and by extreme democracy on the other. Where such constitutions exist, the best mode of preserving them is to moderate their characteristic excess by borrowing certain institutions from the opposite form of government, or by modifying their own institutions in a conciliatory sense.

On a former occasion we dealt at length with the theories of art, and especially of tragic poetry propounded in Aristotle's *Poetics*. For the sake of formal completeness, it may be mentioned here that those theories are adapted to the general scheme of his systematic philosophy. The plot or plan of a work answers to the formal or rational element in nature, and this is why Aristotle so immensely over-estimates its importance. And just as in his moral philosophy, the ethical element, represented by character-drawing, is strictly subordinated to it. The centre of equilibrium is, however, not supplied by virtue, but by exact imitation of nature, so that the characters must not deviate very far from mediocrity in the direction either of heroism or of wickedness.

Notwithstanding the radical error of Aristotle's philosophy—the false abstraction and isolation of the intellectual from the material sphere in nature and in human life—it may furnish a useful corrective to the much falser philosophy insinuated, if not inculcated, by some moralists of our own age and country. Taken altogether, the teaching of these writers seems to be that the industry which addresses itself to the satisfaction of our material wants is much more meritorious than the artistic work which gives us direct æsthetic enjoyment, or the literary work which stimulates and gratifies our intellectual cravings; while within the artistic sphere fidelity of portraiture is preferred to the creation of ideal beauty; and within the intellectual sphere, mere observation of facts is set above the theorizing power by which facts are unified and explained. Some of the school to whom we allude are great enemies of materialism; but teaching like theirs is materialism of the worst description. Consistently carried out, it would first reduce Europe to the level of China, and then reduce the whole human race to the level of bees or beavers. They forget that when we were all comfortably clothed, housed, and fed, our true lives would have only just begun. The choice would then remain between some new refinement of animal appetite and the theorizing activity which, according to Aristotle, is the absolute end, every other activity being only a means for its attainment. There is not, indeed, such a fundamental distinction as he supposed, for activities of every order are connected by a continual reciprocity of services; but this only amounts to saying that the highest knowledge is a means to every other end no less than an end in itself. Aristotle is also fully justified in urging the necessity of leisure as a condition of intellectual progress. We may add that it is a leisure which is amply earned, for without it industrial production could not be maintained at its present height. Nor should the same standard of perfection be imposed on spiritual as on material

labour. The latter could not be carried on at all unless success, and not failure, were the rule. It is otherwise in the ideal sphere. There the proportions are necessarily reversed. We must be content if out of a thousand guesses and trials one should contribute something to the immortal heritage of truth. Yet we may hope that this will not always be so, that the great discoveries and creations wrought out through the waste of innumerable lives are not only the expiation of all error and suffering in the past, but are also the pledge of a future when such sacrifices shall no longer be required.

The two elements of error and achievement are so intimately blended and mutually conditioned in the philosophy which we have been reviewing, that to decide on their respective importance is impossible without first deciding on a still larger question—the value of systematic thought as such, and apart from its actual content. For Aristotle was perhaps the greatest master of systematization that ever lived. The framework and language of science are still to a great extent what he made them; and it remains to be seen whether they will ever be completely remodelled. Yet even this gift has not been an unmixed benefit, for it was long used in the service of false doctrines, and it still induces critics to read into the Aristotelian forms truths which they do not really contain. Let us conclude by observing that of all the ancients, or even of all thinkers before the eighteenth century, there is none to whom the methods and results of modern science could so easily be explained. While finding that they reversed his own most cherished convictions on every point, he would still be prepared by his logical studies to appreciate the evidence on which they rest, and by his ardent love of truth to accept them without reserve. Most of all would he welcome our astronomy and our biology with wonder and delight, while viewing the development of modern machinery with much more qualified admiration, and the progress of democracy perhaps with suspicious fear. He who thought that the mind and body of an artisan were alike debased by the exercise of some simple handicraft under the pure bright sky of Greece, what would he have said to the effect wrought on human beings by the noisome, grinding, sunless, soulless toil of our factories and mines! How profoundly unfitted would he have deemed its victims to influence those political issues with which the interests of science are every day becoming more vitally connected! Yet slowly, perhaps, and unwillingly, he might be brought to perceive that our industry has been the indispensable basis of our knowledge, as supplying both the material means and the moral ends of its cultivation. He might also learn that there is an even closer relationship between the two: that while the

supporters of privilege are leagued for the maintenance of superstition, the workers, and those who advocate their claims to political equality, are leagued for its restraint and overthrow. And if he still shrank back from the heat and smoke and turmoil amid which the genius of our age stands, like another Heracleitus, in feverish excitement, by the steam-furnace whence its powers of revolutionary transmutation are derived, we too might reapply the words of the old Ephesian prophet, bidding him enter boldly, for here also there are gods.

## ART. IV.—THE LATEST BOHEMIAN LITERATURE.

1. VRCHLICKY, J.: *Dojmy a Rozmary* (Impressions and Fancies); *Epicke Basne* (Epic Poems); *Bozka Komedie* (The Divine Comedy).
2. ZEYER: *Ondrej Cernysev* (Andrew Chernîshev). Prague, 1880.
3. HALEK: *Spisy* (Writings). Two vols. Prague, 1878.
4. SLADEK: *Básne* (Poems). Prague, 1875.

IN a previous article in this REVIEW* we endeavoured to trace the early history and literary progress of the Bohemians. Our notices were carried down to about thirty years ago, but it seems hardly fair to leave unmentioned the patriotic labours of this little nation in our own times. In few countries of Europe have more courageous efforts been made to support the national language, or with greater success. Some of the modern lyrical poets of Bohemia would do honour to any people, and we can only regret that their writings are in a language so little studied. To the majority of Englishmen the Bohemians and their literature are a dead letter. By one class of readers they are treated as Germans, and Prague as a German town; while others shudder at their supposed Panslavistic tendencies. The Englishman, in too many cases, in spite of his lofty professions and the milk-and-water philanthropy flowing in such copious torrents at Exeter Hall, views foreign politics through an entirely egotistic medium. His hatred of "Russian encroachments" prevents him from having sympathy with any other Slavonic race whatever. He has a vague idea that because their origin is the same, all these peoples speak a language mutually intelligible, and

* See WESTMINSTER REVIEW, October, 1879.

have a community of interest. Alas! had the Slavs in earlier days understood the importance of cohesion, their position in European politics at the present time would have been a very different one.

If we examine the Bohemian literature of our days we shall find that it bears the impress of the same agencies as our own and other Continental literatures. Lyrical poetry is the favourite form; such attempts as are made at the epic in the writings of men like Vrchlicky and Zeyer are only in fragments, and may be compared to Tennyson's "Idyls of the King." The age dare not trust itself to the composition of a great epic; for, as the English poet tells us,—

"Nature brings not back the Mastodon."

These lyrics are either glowing embodiments of a temporary passion or graceful little poems on more settled moods of the mind and aspects of nature. The Bohemian poets show considerable descriptive power, with strong subjective tendencies. We see this in the writings of Hálek and Mdlle. Pech (Eliska Krásnohoská). It is the *Waldeinsamkeit* of the Germans. We might have thought that the influence of our own Wordsworth could be traced, were not that poet almost unknown on the Continent.

A favourite form of the lyric among the Bohemian poets is the ballad, in which many of the national legends are successfully reproduced. The soil teems with these. The mine has only just begun to be worked, and this is the great age of "local colouring" and oral literature. Among our own people popular poetry, in the true sense of the word, is dead; we have nothing but the swashbuckler patriotism and mawkish sentimentality of the music-halls. No song writer of genius is living among us. Nor, indeed, does it seem possible that there should be one. The Bohemian peasants are to be congratulated upon not having passed yet into this stage. They have not yet become a prey to the

"Vulture whose wings are dull realities,"

as Edgar Poe says.

The drama appears to be but poorly cultivated among them, as indeed is the case with us, who have lost that

"Large utterance of the early Gods."

The social novel is the favourite form of prose fiction, in which this people exhibits a complete parallel to ourselves. Here and there a hardy person ventures upon a resuscitation of the historical novel, as in the "Ondrej Cernysev" of Zeyer, of which we shall speak more anon. In history, philology, and natural

science, we shall find many works which would do credit to the literature of any country; and the name of the world-renowned traveller, Dr. Emil Holub, must certainly not be passed over here. We can promise any of our readers who may possess the patience to master a difficult but highly interesting language in a richly synthetic state, that he will find much to reward him. We must not judge of the Bohemians by the accounts given of them by their enemies. While writing these lines we are reminded of a conversation we once had with a German Professor, who, expressing surprise that we took any interest in the subject, added contemptuously, "You know we Germans look upon these people as an inferior race, as you English consider the Irish."

Let the many honoured names which Bohemia has produced, both in early and in modern times, plead for her in the great European Areopagus. These writers, had they chosen to use the German language, with which the majority of them must have been well acquainted, might have attained a wider circle of readers: they have sacrificed something to a noble feeling of patriotism, and what at best are productions written by a man in a language not that of his childhood. They are but exotics, and must have the fate of exotics.

We have already, in a previous article, spoken of the great revival of Bohemian literature at the commencement of the present century. The path of nationalism in Cech poetry had been well pointed out by Kollar, Cclakovsky, Jablonsky, and Erben. Of the two former we have spoken at some length, and none of these poets properly belong to our period. Perhaps, however, we may venture to say a few words about Erben (born in 1811, died 1870), whose genius was kindled by the folk-tales with which Bohemia abounds. The influence of such works as Percy's "Reliques" and the "Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border" made itself widely felt throughout Europe, and much of the modern German ballad poetry has been created by it. Without it the Lenore of Bürger would never have been written. It has undoubtedly also acted upon Bohemian literature, and many of the pieces in Erben's collections entitled "Kytiče" (The Garland of Flowers) shew signs of it. Without a knowledge of English literature—and, we may add by the way, that some of them are great students of our language—the Cechs might make themselves acquainted with many of these finely dramatic and full-voiced productions. Thus, Grimm had already translated the gloomy ballad in which a whole history is told in a few lines:—

> "What gars your sword sae drip with blude,
> Edward, Edward?"

which has clearly inspired the clever poem of Erben, "The Daughter's Curse" (Dcerina Kletba).

> "Why art thou so pensive,
> Daughter mine?"
> "Coz jsi se tak zasmusila,
> Dcero má?"

In the story of the Vodnik, or Merman, we have a pretty legend about this mysterious being, frequently mentioned in Slavonic tales, about whom Mr. Ralston has written so pleasantly. The loves of immortal beings for mortals have been told in many of these quaint stories: they occur among the folk-tales of our own country. There can be no union between beings of eternal youth and the woe-wasted creatures of a day. The theme was never set to more beautiful music than by Mr. Tennyson in his grand "Tithonus." The first ballad in the interesting Bulgarian collection of the unfortunate brothers Miladinov tells us of the way in which the peasant Jovan Popov carried off the Samovila, and made her his wife, but how she escaped from him by a trick.

> "At once rushed up the Samovila
> And took the child,
> And said proudly to Jovan:
> 'Oh! hero Jovan Popov,
> What! did you think
> That you could keep a Samovila,
> A Samovila for your love?'"

The "Strange Guest" (Cizi Host) is a terrible story of a ghost mingling with a band of dancers at a wedding-feast, and carrying off the bride, reminding us of the now almost forgotten ballad of "Alonzo the Brave and the Fair Imogene" of Monk Lewis, which, unless we are mistaken, has had a Russian dress given to it by the poet Zhukovski. Fordun, the old Scottish chronicler, tells us that at the second nuptials of Alexander III. a skeleton was seen entering the mazes of the dance and disporting himself. But to return to Erben—there is great sweetness and national colouring in his productions, and their influence upon Cech poetry was good. It was turning the muse of the country in a right direction to recommend it to study these legends. If Cech poetry was to be worth reading at all, it must have a genuine Slavonic echo. Mickiewicz had felt this when he versified so many of the beautiful traditions of Lithuania. What a rich harvest Slavonic countries can yield has been only recently shewn. Chodzko does not hesitate to tell us that the Germans have appropriated many of them, as, for example, in the collections of the Brothers Grimm. Erben conferred a great benefit upon all Slavonic students by his inter-

esting collection of national tales (Sto prostonarodnich pohádck a povesti Slovanskych); he was, moreover, a sound scholar and an indefatigable antiquary. His "Regesta Diplomatica necnon Epistolaria Bohemiæ et Moraviæ," extending to the year 1253, his editions of Thomas Stitny, and "Harant's Journey to the Holy Land," are monuments of his industry. Besides these, he edited the second volume of the "Vybor," or selections from old Bohemian literature, which is indispensable to the students of this interesting language, and published a good translation of the old Slavonic chronicler Nestor.* It is by Erben that the modern Bohemian poets have all, more or less, been inspired.

Vitezslav Halek, born in 1855, who died in the prime of life in 1874, has left two volumes of poems. These were reprinted in 1879 under the editorship of Ferdinand Schulz. Halek presents a twofold appearance: first, as the writer of a series of narrative pieces of a half-dramatic character, reminding us of the idyls of Tennyson; secondly, as a lyrical poet. In the narrative poems he has much of the dreaminess and mysticism of Krasinki in such pieces as his "Irydion" and "Undivine Comedy" (Nie-Boska Komedja). He also reminds us of "Manfred" and "Faust." In his "Heirs of the White Mountain" (Dedicové Bilé Hory), he has chosen a patriotic subject, which must certainly find its way to the heart of every true Bohemian.

Jan Neruda, born in 1834, is still living, and is employed on the staff of a Cech newspaper. His first poetical production was his "Flowers of the Grave" (Hrbitovni Kviti), published in 1858. He is altogether a meditative and subjective poet, something of the school of Wordsworth, with whose writings, however, we cannot suppose him to be familiar. His "Book of Verses" (1868) contains some very sweet lyrics, but the most remarkable of his productions are the so-called Cosmic Songs (Pisne Kosmické). The following, to say the least, is a strange poem: we must remember that the moon being of the masculine gender in Bohemian, as in German and Russian, the personification is a little embarrassing in English:—

"The moon, a handsome youth,
With a bright glowing face,
Flies round the fair young earth
Like a dove round its mate."

We almost feel an influence of Victor Hugo or de Musset.

According to some Bohemian critics the greatest of their modern lyric poets is Adolf Heyduk, born in 1836, and still

* See the Article in this REVIEW, October, 1879, on Bohemian Literature.

living at Pisek. Much of his poetry has been inspired by the South of Europe. His lines entitled, "Longing for the South" (Touha po jihu) are very melodious, in a lengthened metre something resembling Longfellow's well-known lines on Nuremberg. Visions of Italy rise before him with its lagoons, its citrons, and pomegranates. It is the same feeling as Mr. Tennyson has expressed so well—

> "Yet waft me from the harbour-mouth,
> Wild wind, I seek a warmer sky,
> And I will see before I die
> The palms and temples of the South."

like Keats he feels

> "——— an inner languishment
> To sit upon an Alp as on a throne."

Very pretty, too, is the piece entitled, "The Bridge over the Lagoon":—

> "Thou art ever new, ever young, beautiful Venice,
> Since the lovely Adriatic washes thy white feet."

Some of the lines may well find a place beside those of Byron on the same subject, or the beautiful strains of Shelley:

> "Sea-girt city, thou hast been
> Ocean's bride, and art his queen."

M. Heyduk is clearly acquainted with both these poets, for they are celebrated in his verses. Byron's reputation has long been extended over the whole Continent. His poems are cosmopolitan, and have none of our insularity. It has often surprised us that Shelley has met with so little attention out of England. Petöfi, the Hungarian poet, if we remember rightly, has translated one of the most spirited of his lyrics, "The Fugitives." His "Forest-Flowers" (Lesni Kvítí) were inspired, he tells us, by wandering in the Sumava, or Böhmerwald. M. Heyduk, although a Slovak, has avoided the fallacy of using the Slovakish dialect, as has been done by Holly, Chodza, Sladkovic, and others. He is full, however, of patriotism, and in many of his poems boldly grapples with the insolence of the Magyars, who, being themselves a minority, fondly imagine to rule the Slavs. It is not a little curious to notice how many of the most prominent Magyars are in reality of Slavonic and German blood, which crops out distinctly in spite of the Magyarization of their names. Petöfi, the greatest poet produced by them, was of Slavonic descent; Kossuth is a Slovak; and under the "Turanian" name of Vambéry, the vehement Turcophile who is constantly trying to whip up our countrymen against the Russians, is concealed the more prosaic Bamberger. Again, Bloch has become

Ballagi, author of a very good German-Hungarian dictionary; and what are the names Kmety and Déak, if they are not Slavonic? In fact, the Magyar has been a little overpraised, and we have been told too much about his picturesque habits and fine "inborn capacity for government," whatever that curious expression of the Turcophile may mean, which possibly, being interpreted, signifies a disposition to live luxuriously on the earnings of other people. In more Western parts of Europe we have not yet got rid of the interesting person who has the "hereditary inborn capacity for government."

But, leaving politics, let us return to M. Heyduk, whose patriotism is very conspicuous in his last collection, "Cymbal and Guitar." Everywhere he tells us of the beautiful scenery, but melancholy conditions of life, which surround his Slovakian brothers. It is a genuine wail from this forlorn country trodden down by the iron heel of the Magyar. Among those especially patriotic are "Slovencina" (The Slovak Language) and "Slovensko, ty jeste spís" (Country of the Slovaks, dost thou still sleep?), and the indignant poem on the calumnious Magyar saying, "Tot nem ember" (the Slovak is not a man). To us it appears that this is just the language which one nation employs against another which it has injured. The Slovaks have given many proofs that they do not lack spirit. From personal knowledge we can bear testimony to the accuracy of the account of M. Reclus: "Les Slovaques sont aussi bien donés physiquement que leurs pères de la vallée de l'Elbe; en général grands, robustes, bien faits, agréables de figure, ils ont la tete moins forte que celle des Tchèques, mais leur pont est large et découvert bien encadré d'une chevelure abondante."* As stated in a previous article, we cannot but regret that the Slovakish dialect has been cultivated: it would have been far better for them to have adopted Cech as their literary language. By these endless divisions they only play into the hands of their enemies.

One of the most popular of the works of M. Heyduk is "Deduv Odkaz" (The Grandfather's Bequest). Here the grandfather is the genius of the country, who instructs the poet. The piece is allegorical, and in it the longings of the true artist for the ideal are expressed. The versification is easy and flowing, and the pictures from nature are faithful.

Some very elegant verses, showing a true feeling for nature, with feminine delicacy of expression, have been published by Mdlle. Henrietta Pech, who writes under the name of Eliska Krásnohorská. There is something in her poetry which reminds us of Mrs. Hemans, but her note is a much stronger and bolder

* "Géographie Universelle," iii. 340.

one. We cannot say that she has the verve of Mrs. Browning, our English Sappho of the "Sonnets from the Portuguese," and "Catrina to Camoens," but she has sympathies with every aspect of nature, and can reproduce her impressions. A warm-hearted and true poetess she is:—

> "Son cœur est un luth suspendu
> Toutes les fois qu'on le touche, il resonne."

As a rule, ladies have not, to any great extent, entered the ranks of the Slavonic singers. We have had the Countess Rostopchin among the Russians of this century. Madame Druzbacka adorned Polish literature about a hundred years ago, and Dalmatia can also boast of having produced a poetess.

Mdlle. Pech's first volume was published in 1870, and entitled "Z máje Ziti" (Life in May). She is frequently patriotic in the feelings she expresses, as in "Our Lost Paradise" (Nas ztraceny Ráj). "Thou, oh! my dear country, art my only pleasure" (Ty, vlaste draha, jedine ma lasko); and again, in the little piece entitled "In a Foreign Country" (V Cijine):—

> "Every stone is holy to me!
> Dear friend, I am a Cech."

Her "Poetical Pictures" (Basnicke Kresby) show great power of word-painting. "The Step in the Snow" (Stopa v Snehu) points an excellent moral. In "Ze Sumavy" she finds herself among the beautiful scenery which has been so well sung by Heyduk. Sumava is the name given by the Bohemians to the mountainous part of their country in the South West, which is, perhaps, better known among us Englishmen as the Böhmerwald. The name, which signifies "noisy" or "rustling," is said to have been given on account of the number of little lakes and streams which rush and gurgle in this delightful land of mountain and forest.* It is a veritable *μισγάγκεια*. In such a district the poetic feeling might well be kindled. Emerson might have written some of his most charming "wood-notes" among the pine-trees, the firs, and the beeches. It is also full of historical associations. In a pass near the little town of Domazlice (in German Taus) many sanguinary affrays took place in the early annals of the land. The mysterious Samo—whose origin no antiquaries have as yet satisfactorily traced—fought there for Slavonic independence in the first half of the seventh century: the Frankish army, under Dagobert, was repulsed there: in 1040

---

* We might well compare the pretty expression used by the Russian peasant, Zeleni Shoum, the green noise, to express the awakening of Nature in spring—what Bayard Taylor calls "the sweet unrest of spring." For a poem by Nekrasov on this subject, see his works, vol. iii. p. 59, St. Petersburg, 1864.

Duke Bretislaw triumphed over the Emperor Henry III., and the Hussites gained one of their great victories.* In fact, this Bohemian country neither wants scenery to describe nor heroes to celebrate; and Herr Grüber, in his recent work, "Die Kunst des Mittelalters in Böhmen," has shown us its archæological and architectural glories.

Before leaving this lady, we must not forget to mention that it is to her that we are indebted for a most valuable and appreciative criticism on the latest school of Bohemian poetry, which she has contributed to the Journal of the Cech Museum ("Obraz novejsího básnictvi ceského," 1877). We have not seen any other works by Mdlle. Pech, but from what we read in "Pîpin's History of Slavonic Literature" (II. 979), and M. Tieftrunk's work, we find that she is an indefatigable labourer to promote female education. In all her writings we find ourselves in the company of a woman of refined mind, who has the power of setting her thoughts to music.

M. Josef Vaclav Sládek (born in 1845), at present editor at Prague of the literary journal "Lumír," has published three volumes of original poems, besides many translations from the English and other languages. The influence of America, where the poet has resided during some part of his life, is shown in the broader and freer views with which his writings abound. He has seen the development of manly aspirations in a more ample domain than the Austro-Hungarian Empire, with its narrow and sectarian jealousies, and its military instincts can show him. His sympathies are with the peoples, and not with the antechamber gossip of court, and he has but little admiration for the

> "Red-coat bully in his boots
> That hides the march of men from us."

The poem "The Fight" (Bitva) is as severe a sarcasm and *reductio ad absurdum* of warfare as anything in Carlyle's "Past and Present," or Southey's lyric on the "Battle of Blenheim." The thousand men are lying dead upon the plain; the kings are having a banquet to celebrate the victory. In the poem, "The Cossack," he describes a chance meeting in the prairies:—

> "'Hail, dear brother,
> For thy brotherly salutation.'
> We leapt from our horses,
> And grasped each other's hand;
> 'Ah! brother, whence hast thou wandered
> So far into the desert?'
> 'I am a wandering singer from Bohemia—'
> 'I am a Cossack from the Ukraine.'"

* Cf. Reclus, "Géographie Universelle," iii. 416.

In the collection entitled "Sparks on the Sea" (Jiskry na Mori), we get very sweet little lyrics, reminding us of some of the best things of Whittier and Longfellow. Thus, how sad the picture of the desolate churchyard—

> "Hroby pusté, rozvalené
> Bez krize a bez kaméne."
> "Lonely ruined graves,
> Without a cross and without a stone—"

which will stand comparison with William Allingham's fine lyric, "The Ruined Chapel," which deserves to be better known than it is. A vigorous poem is the "List zkroniky XIX. Veku" (A Leaf from a Chronicle of the Nineteenth Century), in which the poet's sympathies with suffering humanity are very clearly seen. By the varieties of metre, which he handles so freely, M. Sládek shews how great are the capacities of his native language. In the lyric "Ku Predu" (Forward), in which he celebrates the Russian passage of the Balkan, his fellow-feeling with the great struggles of the Slavonic race is evident. This year, M. Sladek has reprinted some of his contributions to the journal "Lumír," which he still edits. Among these we have been especially pleased with the poem entitled "1621," the year after the Battle of the White Mountain, when the government of the Habsburgs exacted such fearful vengeance; and the idyl "Na podhraí." The influence of our English writers is perceptible in M. Sladek: in him we see a warm-hearted man and a true poet.

One of the most voluminous of this band of modern writers is M. Emil Bohus Frida, who uses the pseudonym of Jaroslav Vrchlicky. Considering that he is at present not twenty-eight years of age, having been born in 1853, and has produced so much, we cannot wonder at the pride with which he is regarded by the Bohemians, and the prophecies which have been uttered of his brilliant future career. For our few facts of the poet's biography we are indebted to the new "History of the Slavonic Literatures," written in Russian by MM. Pîpin and Spasovich.* The poet seems to have learned his love of nature from his uncle, a country pastor. He at one time intended entering the church, but was prevented by weak health, and taking the office of a tutor in a private family spent with them a year in Italy. Since his return to Prague he has acted as secretary of the Polytechnic School. Among his principal productions are the following:—"Mythy" (Myths), which he divides into two cycles. Some of

---

* "Istoria Slavianskikh Literatour," A. N. Pîpina and V. D. Spasovicha. St. Petersburg, 1881, ii..977.

these pieces appear to have been inspired by Mr. Tennyson's "Idyls of the King." Thus, in the first we have a story of the early heroic days of Prague. Then the legend of St. Procopius, on which subject, we must remember, there is an old poem, extracts from which are translated in Mr. Wratislaw's work, noticed in an earlier number of this Review. In the second cycle a wider range is taken, including many subjects of the ancient world. Just as Victor Hugo, in his immortal "Légende des Siècles" draws from the earliest stories of the Urwelt, so M. Frida treats of Israfel—the Israfel sung by the most erratic and melodious of singers, Edgar Allan Poe—

> "In heaven a spirit doth dwell,
> Whose heart-strings are a lute,
> None sing so wildly well
> As the angel Israfel.
> And the giddy stars (so legends tell)
> Ceasing their hymns, attend the spell
> Of his voice, all mute."

The "Birth of Sakuntala" treats of the graceful Indian legend, the subject of the play which has had so many translators, and of Goethe's well-known line:

> "Nenn' ich Sakontala dich und so ist alles gesagt."

In the lyric drama on the death of Æschylus, a fragment reminding us of Shelley's "Prometheus Unbound" and some of the strophes of his "Hellas," we have the Cyclops introduced as chorus. The opening verses fill our ears with a cadence of Victor Hugo's fine lyrics. The metre is identical. The piece abounds with grand passages. In "Sandalfon" we have the same legend poetized, which has also been handled by Longfellow. Everywhere the poet is in a dreamland of ideals: but the love of woman is the central power of his dreams. He would say in the words of his great master,

> "Les femmes sont sur la terre
> Pour tout idealiser,
> L'univers est un mystère
> Que commente leur baiser."

The miscellaneous collection, "From the Depths" (Z Hlubin), is inscribed to Vítezslav Halek, and seems to be inspired by the same scenery as kindled the fancy of the deceased poet. Traces of a deep grief are to be found throughout, for there must be something of cypress woven in every poet's crown. The influence of the modern romantic school is seen very forcibly in these poems, some of which are written in the Spenserian stanza, a metre which has been adopted but little on the Continent.

The poem, "Resignation," is a most sweet lyric, reminding us of the beautiful lines of Victor Hugo,

> "Oh! vous-avez trop dit au pauvre petit ange,"

in "Les Contemplations." We find occasional allusions to Shelley, with whose poetry we can well believe M. Frida to be acquainted. In his "Duch a Svet" (The Spirit and the World) we have some fine lyrics, the motive of which has been supplied by the Greek mythology. In the "Eclogues and Songs" we are very much pleased with the one commencing

> "Vidis, kterak nad horami jitro svitá."

It seems as sweet as anything in Keats' "Endymion" or his "Hymn to Pan;" or the Pagan drinking-song of poor Ebenezer Jones, whose fragments some friendly enthusiasts have essayed to restore. Among the "Epic Poems" (Epické Basne) we have been especially struck with his poem on the triumph of Cahjula, "The Spoils of the Ocean" (Korist Oceanu), a very vigorous performance. Should the life of the poet be spared to his countrymen, we boldly say great things may be hoped from him. It may be that his name will have to be classed with the grandest of Slavonic poets, with Pushkin and Mickiewicz. We have been very much struck in his writings with the extraordinarily rich imagination, worthy of Keats, and the vigour with which he can express his fancies. In the fulness of his vocabulary he reminds us of some of the best things of William Morris. He is apt to become imitative, as was to be expected in so young a man, and we are continually reminded of Victor Hugo, Alfred de Musset, and Theodore de Banville. The French poets have clearly been his first favourites, but we can trace the influences of Shelley and Swinburne also. These come out especially in his last volume, "Dojmy a Rozmary" (Impressions and Fancies), published at the end of last year, to take the hymn on the "Eternity of Poetry" alone. Space fails us to enumerate others of his works, but we must not pass by the capital translation of Dante's "Divina Commedia" in the *terza rima* of which two parts—Peklo (Inferno) and Ocistec (Purgatorio) have appeared. As far as we have looked at it, it seems to be well done, and is probably a fruit of the poet's stay in the delightful country of the Florentine, to whose honour Mr. Tennyson has just consecrated such a sparkling little poem. We know of only one other translation of this great national work in a Slavonic language—that by D. Min—into Russian. In conclusion, we shake hands heartily with M. Vrchlicky across the water, and congratulate Bohemia on possessing such a poet.

Shades of Dobrovsky and the good fathers who galvanized into life the half-moribund language, could you only look upon these modern sons of once discrowned Bohemia, you might see that your patriotic labours were not in vain. What is a nation without its distinctive language but a dull stammerer among the assembled peoples!

A versatile writer is M. Svatopluk Cech; he sometimes gives us fragments of epic poems, sometimes of lyrics. Last year saw the publication of a new volume of poems by him ("Nova Sbírka Versovanych Prací"). In one he celebrates the fate of Bohumil Havlasa, a writer of romances, who joined the Russians, as a volunteer, in the year 1877, and died in the Caucasus. A very spirited and striking poem is that addressed to the dagger (Handzar) which reminds us very forcibly of the fine lines of Lermontov.

> "I love thee, my steel dagger,
> My companion bright and cold."

According to many critics, Cech is the greatest poet of the modern school since the death of Halek. Unfortunately, we have not seen some of his poems, which are considered most remarkable by the Bohemian critics. Such are the "Snové" and "Adamitè"—the last dealing with a sect of fanatics of the fifteenth century. Besides poetry, M. Cech has also published three volumes of tales (Povídky Arabesky a Humoresky), collected by him from his various contributions to magazines. Many of these show considerable humour. The poet is at the present time joint editor of the magazine *Kvety* with Dr. S. Heller.

Another poet, by no means to be passed over in our brief sketch, which cannot pretend to do more than attempt to grasp the most salient details with reference to these authors, is M. Zeyer, who has just published a series of epic pieces called after the well-known Cech stronghold or acropolis "Vysehrad." The subjects are all taken from the old Bohemian legends such as they have been handed down by Cosmas. The first is on Libusa, the foundress of the city, concerning whom there are such strange stories in Dalimil, as we have mentioned in a previous article in this REVIEW, which dealt with the early Bohemian literature.* The second treats of the Green Knight (Zeleny vítez), and is dedicated to the memory of the poet's old nurse whom he may perhaps have found as full of these legends as the celebrated Anna Rodiovna, the nurse of Pushkin. The third is Vlasta, the leader of the Amazons in the War of the Maidens. The last is consecrated to Lumír, the Slavonic Ossian, who shares the

* October, 1879.

honours of Boiau in the "Slovo o polkou Igoreve," or Account of the Expedition of Prince Igor, the old Russian legendary prose poem. M. Zeyer has taken care to preserve the Slavonic metre, such as we find it in the Servian songs which Vuk Stephanovich has collected for us. Besides these poems, he is the author of a good historical novel of the school of Sir Walter Scott, entitled "Andrew Chernîshev," which deals with the period when Catherine II. ascended the throne, and the romantic episode of the conspiracy of Lieutenant Mirovich, concerning whose character—whether he was a bold adventurer or merely a dupe—there is much difficulty in forming an opinion. Last year saw the appearance of two other works from the pen of this indefatigable writer; the first a volume of sketches entitled "Romance concerning the Faithful Friendship of Amisa and Amil," and a strange book of Oriental tales, styled "Báje Sosany" (Legends of Sosana), in which the poet-novelist disports himself with an exuberance which is truly Eastern.

As with ourselves, the social romance or novel of domestic life has developed itself a great deal among the Cechs since the year 1860. The legends and tales current among the peasantry have also been carefully collected. The first to do this was Bozena Nemcova: her "Slovenske Povesti" had a very great success. She was followed by Madame Muzak, authoress of some of the most popular of the modern Bohemian novels. Her "Country Romance" (Vesnicky Román) has been translated into French. Excellent pictures of rural life have also been given by Vàclav Smilovsky (a *nom-de-plume* for Smilauer), who has written a great many novels, such as the "Old Organist" (Stary Varhanik), "Martin Oliva," &c., much in the style of Auerbach and Zschokke. Besides the work of M. Zeyer already mentioned, other attempts have been made to naturalize the historical novel—a form of literature which with us is almost dead, although a short time ago a courageous gentleman ventured to publish a tale of the times of the Byzantine emperors, with what success we have not heard. Such are the novels of M. Bohumil Cidlinsky, dealing with the earlier period of Bohemian history, and Vaclav Vlcek. It cannot be denied that both for the drama and the novel Bohemian history furnishes many striking episodes. To leave out the half-mythical period, we have the days of John of Luxembourg, who perished at Crecy, the glories of Charles IV., the religious struggles under Hus and Zizka, the terrible battle of the White Mountain, and the sad death of the Bohemian patriots in 1621. As we have previously said, this little country may claim to be one of the most interesting parts of Europe.

But even more than the historical novel the social has been

developed, in which many ladies have achieved a reputation as in our own country. It has often been remarked that the minute study of character is a peculiar gift of women, and those of Bohemia fully sustain the honours. Among them may be mentioned Madame Zofie Podlipska, sister of Madame Muzak, previously mentioned.

But we should be wholly unjust to the great development of Bohemian literature in our own days, if we were silent about the modern school of history, which may be said to have been founded by Francis Palacky (born 1798, died 1876), one of the great glories of his country. His monumental work, "History of the Bohemian People" (Dejiny Narodu Ceskeho), has been already mentioned in a previous article, and indeed is too well known to need discussion here. Those unacquainted with the Bohemian language can read it in German. It extends from the earliest times to the unfortunate year 1526, when Louis, the last independent King of Hungary, perished at the battle of Mohacs. Since this time, to her cost, Bohemia has followed the fortunes of the house of Habsburg. The great work of Palacky is indeed a monument of conscientious labour. His love of truth and marvellous accuracy are conspicuous on every page. To enable the Bohemians to resist the insidious work of their denationalization, which had been steadily pursued by their enemies during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, it was necessary to bring before them the great past which they had been taught to forget.* This Palacky has done, and his work has become a national monument. His care of this great labour only ended with his life. Among his latest work (in the years 1875–76) was the re-writing of some of the chapters, which had seemed to him imperfectly executed, owing to the want of original documents or the censorship of the Austrian Government.

Among these pupils of the great historian the first place must be given to Vaclav Vladivoj Tomek (born in 1818), now professor of Austrian history in the University of Prague. His chief production is a history of this city, of which the fourth volume has just appeared, carrying the narrative down to the election of Sigismund as King in 1436. In 1849 he published the first volume of a history of the University of Prague, but, as far as we have heard, it has never been completed. During last year Tomek gave to the world a biography of the Bohemian hero, Zizka. He appears throughout as a most accurate and painstaking writer, and a worthy pupil of his great master.

* Cf. "Pypin and Spasovich," ii. 948.

A voluminous writer on Bohemian history and literature is Alois Sembera (born in 1807), whose literary activity has extended over a long period. He is at the present time professor of the Bohemian language at the University of Vienna, and a colleague of Miklosich, to whose labours students of Slavistic are so deeply indebted. In one of his historical works Sembera has started the theory that the Western Slavs, the Cechs, Moravians, Slovaks, and Polabes were settled much earlier in the countries which they at present occupy than previous historians have been willing to allow. This, however, is a question which is very far from being settled. As a critic, Professor Sembera has appeared in the character of an iconoclast, and has made a great onslaught upon the genuineness of the early monuments of the Cech language, as referred to in a previous article in this REVIEW.

A most conscientious and enthusiastic worker in the field of historical research is Dr. Antonine Gindely, born at Prague in 1829. In order to collect materials for his publications, he travelled in various parts of Bohemia, Poland, Germany, France, Belgium, Holland, and Spain. The result of all this unwearied diligence has been the appearance of a collection of valuable historical works from his pen, indispensable to all students. Such are, the "History of the Bohemian Brothers," "Rudolph II. and his Times," and later, a "History of the Bohemian Revolt of 1618," which led to the fatal battle of the White Mountain and the fall of the independence of the Cechs.

The Brothers Joseph and Hermenegild Jirecek have won a reputation in Bohemian literature by many useful works. Thus, they have conjointly published a book in defence of the Kralodvorsky Rukopis, which is well worthy the attention of all those who wish to make themselves acquainted with the literature of this most vexed question. Joseph is now occupied in editing, in a cheap form, some of the most interesting monuments of early Bohemian literature. In 1880 Hermenegild published a valuable "Collection of Slavonic Laws;" here we have an almost complete series of the codes of the Slavs in the original languages. This work is of great value to the students of law and history; it forms a good supplement to the compilation of the Pole Macieiowski. Joseph Jirecek is also author of a valuable chrestomathy of Bohemian literature, with biographical and critical notices, which will enable a foreigner to form a very fair idea of what the Cechs have accomplished, and what intellectual rank they are entitled to take. We may, indeed, well be surprised at the productiveness of this small nationality. Joseph Constantine Jirecek (son of Joseph, born in 1854) was formerly a docent of the University of Prague, but is now in the employment of the Bulgarian

Minister of National Education. The latter has devoted himself to Bulgarian history and bibliography. So early as 1872 he published a "Bibliography of Modern Bulgarian Literature," a very useful book for the student in this by-path of Slavonic philology. Very little had up to that time been written on this neglected language which was available for Western scholars. A few articles in the Bohemian "Casopis" alone presented themselves, and the somewhat inaccurate grammar of the Brothers Cankof appeared as a phenomenon in European literature. But matters have mended since, and the valuable labours of Professor Drinov, a Bulgarian by birth, but who writes in the Russian language, have made us more familiar with the history of that unfortunate people. M. Joseph Constantine Jirecek has written a "History of Bulgaria," of which a German translation has appeared. But after the labours of Stritter, Gibbon, and Finlay, there is not much more to be added to our knowledge of the country.

Other writers worthy of mention are Joseph Emler and Karl Tieftrunk, both of whom have been co-operators with Dr. Gindely in his "Old Monuments of Bohemian History" (Stare pamiti dejin Ceskjch). The former has edited the second volume of the "Regesta Bohemica," and has been, since the year 1870, editor of the journal ("Casopis") of the Bohemian Museum. We have already, in a previous article in this REVIEW, alluded to the founding of this valuable publication, the pages of which, containing mines of information on Slavonic subjects, are of the utmost value to all students of these languages. Karl Tieftrunk is the author of several useful works, such as his "History of Bohemian Literature," from the earliest period down to the present time, and the interesting monograph on the opposition of the Bohemian States to Ferdinand I. in 1547. The "History of Bohemian Literature" is very carefully done, and gives, in a short compass, much valuable information, of which we have frequently availed ourselves in these pages.

Vincent Brandl and Beda Dudik have particularly occupied themselves with Moravian history and antiquities. The former, among other works, has edited the letters of Karl ze Zerotin, a Bohemian nobleman of the sixteenth century, who belonged to the sect of the Moravians, and was for some time in the service of Henry IV. of France, concerning whom he has left some interesting details. He was with this monarch at the siege of Rouen,* which was raised on the 20th of April, 1592. From some unexplained cause or other, we find that Zerotin left the

* See the interesting article of M. Léger in "Nouvelles Etudes Slaves."—"Quelques Documents Tchèques relatifs à Henri IV.," p. 247.

King's service. He remained faithful to Ferdinard II. during his struggles with his rebellious subjects, but for all that was subsequently compelled to leave his country on account of his refusal to quit the communion of the Bohemian Brothers. He accordingly retired to Breslau, in Silesia, where he died in 1636.

Beda Dudik, a Benedictine monk, and historiographer of Moravia, has published some valuable works on the history of that division of the Bohemian kingdom. We shall see throughout Cech literature that ecclesiastics have played a very prominent part, and, it is only fair to add, in many ways have shown themselves patriots and vigorous defenders of the national language. Dudik has published a history of Moravia, of which eight parts have appeared. Like the great work of Palacky, it was first written in German, but has since appeared in the Bohemian language. Extracts from the interesting diary of Zerotin have been edited by him in the "Mährische Geschichtsquellen." In one way especially he has been of great service to his country. It is well known by those who have studied Bohemian history that many valuable MSS. were carried off from Prague by the Swedes in the Thirty Years' War. Among these we may mention, by the way, the invaluable Gothic Gospels of Ulfilas, now preserved at Upsala. In 1792 the eminent scholar Dobrovsky, who shares with Bartholomew Kopitar the honour of having restored Slavonic philology, visited Sweden, and saw some of these manuscripts. Through the efforts of Dudik they have been restored to their original country, in number amounting to twenty-one, and are now preserved in the State Archives of Brunn. Among these is the interesting old poem on the "Legend of St. Catherine," many words in which are said to explain difficult passages in the "Kralodvorsky Kukopis," and to give testimony to its veracity.

Before leaving the writers of Bohemian history, it would be unfair to omit mention of Jakub Maly, the author of many important articles in the "Slovnik Naucny"—the Cech Conversations Lexicon—and of a good popular history of the Bohemian people, pleasantly written, and containing a great quantity of valuable information. He has long been a student of our literature, and has written a useful grammar of his native language for Englishmen, besides assisting in the translation of Shakspere, which has been produced by the joint labours of many Bohemian scholars.

In 1868 was published the second volume of the "Vybor z literatury ceske," a very important work, containing specimens of the old Bohemian authors. The first volume had been edited by the illustrious Schafarik, now dead. The second came

out under the direction of Erben, the poet and scholar, of whom mention has been made previously.

Valuable works on philology have been written by Martin Hattala (by birth a Slovak), who is now Professor of Slavonic Philology at the University of Prague. One of his most important productions is in Latin: "De contiguarum consonantium mutatione in linguis Slavicis." He is a defender of the genuineness of the Zelenohosky and Kralodvorsky manuscripts; and it must be confessed that the testimony of so ripe a scholar is very valuable. Two sound philologists are Drs. Gebauer and Geitler; the former has contributed some valuable papers to the "Archiv," edited by Professor Jagc, of St. Petersburg. In some of these he will probably have given offence to his more enthusiastic fellow-countrymen, by the avowed scepticism of his writings with reference to much of the early Bohemian literature, the authenticity of which is still a matter of dispute. The latter, born in 1847, is at present Professor of Slavistic at the University of Agram. He is one of the most promising of the younger band of philologists, and much may be hoped from him. He commenced the study of philology at the University of Prague under Alfred Ludwig—who has earned such a reputation for his translation of the Veda—and Hattala, and at Vienna under Miklosich and Müller. Having begun with a dissertation on the present condition of Comparative Philology in the "Casopis" in 1873, he published in the same year a work on Old Bulgarian Philology, in which he infers from the *polnoglasie*, or open vowels of the Russian language, that it shews many older forms than Ecclesiastical Slavonic—an opinion afterwards adopted by Johannes Schmidt in his well-known work "Zur Gesch. des indo-germanischen Vocalismus," 1876. In the year 1873, Geitter made a tour in Russian and Prussian Lithuania, that, like Schleicher, he might study that interesting language from the mouths of the people. He afterwards published the results of his travels in his "Litaûische Studien." In the year 1875 he visited Servia, Macedonia, and Mount Athos. His last labour is on the collection of Vercovich—the "Veda Slovena," which has caused such a stir in Slavonic circles. This work, entitled "The Poetical Traditions of the Thracians and Bulgarians," is said by MM. Pîpin and Spasovic, from whose history we have taken some of the facts of our notice of Geitler, to favour somewhat the pretension of these pieces to a great antiquity. We are unable in our article to find room for the names of the many writers upon moral and natural science; but it would be unpardonable to omit that of the great naturalist Purkyne, who died in the year 1869, as Professor of Physiology in the University of Prague. Nor must we pass by the eminent traveller, Dr. Emil Holub, whose explorations in

South Africa have recently earned for him such a world-wide reputation.

Throughout the whole period of the resuscitation of Bohemian Literature, the society called the Matice Ceska has worked conscientiously, printing its excellent journal, or "Casopis," four times a year, which is indeed a mine of erudition—a very thesaurus for the Slavonic student. It has also published many new works in the Bohemian language, and occasionally reprinted some of the older authors. *Floreat in æternum*, say we—long may it exist and may the number of its subscribers be augmented. It ought to be the effort of every patriotic Cech to increase its funds: and even some of our Western philologists might assist, for the Bohemian language is worth studying.

Verily, as we look over the goodly array of Cech volumes before us, we cannot but feel our sympathies aroused in the fullest degree. The poets alone form a goodly band: we need not fear that the race will die out yet. They have not been driven, as we are, to *rondeaux* and *ballades*. As Anastasius Grün has well said—

> "Erst dann fragt, wenn des Fragens,
> Bis dahin ihr nichts müd,
> Ob endlich ausgesungen
> Das alte ew'ge Lied."

We may well congratulate this little people—who form a Slavonic island, environed, and in too many places permeated, with Germanism—upon the noble stand they have made for their nationality. From the time when the cry was uttered, "We are still a nation," and the Bohemian Museum was founded—under very depressing circumstances, as mentioned in a previous article in this Review—there has been a steady intellectual development among them. They have refused to have their individuality stamped out and to be classified among Germans. During the last fifty years this small nation of seven millions at most, has produced such historians as Palacky, Tomek, and Gindely; such men of science as Purkyne; such philologists and ethnographers as Schafarik, Hattala, Geitler, and Gebauer; and such poets as Vrchlicky, Halek, Neruda, and Cech. It is not too much to say that there is no nation in Europe which so heartily deserves the sympathy of all liberal-minded Englishmen as this little Slavonic island, which threatens so often to be absorbed by the sea of Germanism around it. May the Cechs only be true to the glorious traditions of their ancestors, and they will pass triumphantly through the ordeal. Much may be hoped from a people that has made such a vigorous stand for its nationality.

## Art. V.—The Copyright Question.

VERY various have been the opinions expressed of late, both in periodical publications and in the evidence before the Royal Commission on Copyright, as to the "right" to "copy" printed books, especially as to how long the author ought to have the exclusive right to copy his own books, and even if he has any such exclusive right at all. The great authors of the day are apparently unanimous in believing that, in a state of society in which every other sort of human production—and some productions not at all human, as, for example, land—is secured to its owner indefinitely (that is to say, practically, as its value lasts), they also have a right to their own productions, and a right even to leave them as a heritage for their children, as other men leave the heritages they have obtained by the toil of their hands or their brains. They have given their evidence in favour of perpetual copyright, expressing themselves strongly as to their feeling of individual right in their own productions, and giving the sanction of their great names to a protest against that injustice of which the State is still guilty towards literature.

In spite of this, the Commission only felt called upon to recommend the extension of the copyright to a term of thirty years after the author's death, which is a period shorter by twenty years than that granted to authors in France, Russia, and Portugal; and shorter by ten years than that secured to authors in Italy. In the latter country there is also an additional right of royalty for forty years after the copyright has expired, and it is this *additional* right which has been quoted as an example which we might follow by *substituting* royalty for copyright, or making it succeed a period of copyright of only a few years' duration.

Authors in America appear to be as desirous as authors in England of obtaining that complete recognition of their rights which must include international copyright; but American publishers are still on the alert respecting their own interests. They are willing to grant copyright which secures to English authors only a royalty of five per cent. (as stated in the Bill brought before the Senate of the United States in 1872); or they are willing, as Mr. Conant tells us, to grant to English authors a copyright on works issued in the United States within thirty day of publication abroad, with the additional condition that the reprint must be wholly manufactured in the United States. It is to be observed that the stipulation of reissue within thirty days would cut off any practical advantage which might other-

wise accrue to authors from such a treaty. So speedy a reprint could only be secured by writers already successful, and certain to command a price for their works; and we know from the evidence before the Commission, that Transatlantic publishers have already found it to their profit, practically, to purchase a copyright in such works, by securing early sheets, and trusting to "the courtesy of the trade." Canon Farrar stated before the Commission that he had found it impossible to arrange for simultaneous publication in the United States of his "Life of Christ." It has since, however, been sold in vast numbers in America, without any profit to its author; and we cannot suppose that one month's grace would have protected him against this great injustice. The work would have ceased to be his property in the States before its success could have secured to him a publisher. And it is precisely in such cases as this that an author needs protection. The condition that the work must be wholly reprinted in America has actually nothing to do with the rights of authors. It is a question of tariff, of duty on imports, and should not be mixed up with the consideration of a producer's original right to his own productions. It has, indeed, been found by American publishers themselves to be of doubtful value, because it would add so much to the cost of the second issue. It has been suggested, therefore, by an American publisher (Mr. W. Appleton) that the publisher should have a right to decide this point as he pleases; which right, however, should not be extended to the author. Altogether, we cannot see that these offers to protect only what is already protected, justify the Americans in speaking of their "determination to do justice to authors, and to secure them in the full enjoyment of their rights." A full enjoyment of their rights would be unconditional International Copyright.

There are three points worth mentioning in the view taken by those who question this exclusive right of an author to copy his own books in his own country or elsewhere. The first is that they acknowledge the right of an author to his manuscript before publication; he may do what he likes with it, alter or destroy it at his pleasure. It is absolutely his property at that point. When, then, does it cease to be his, and become the property of the public? How can it do so without his consent? And why is he not free to make his own bargain and conditions with the public respecting the supply of his productions? If the public has no right to force him to produce, it cannot have a right to take possession or to dispose of what he has produced, except by agreement with him. If he puts too high a price on his works the public is not compelled to buy them; it has, however, no more right to compel him to part with his productions cheaply

against his will than it could have to compel him to *produce* against his will.

The second point is, that in no other species of property does the law require proof that the property will be used to the utmost advantage by the owner, that it will be manipulated to the interest of the public, and transmitted to the owner's immediate relatives, before it decides whether he is the owner or not. If such matters were brought forward for the consideration of a judge in a Chancery case, he would dismiss them as altogether beside the question. Yet these points were presented again and again by the Commissioners to the witnesses before them; and it was objected to the authors' claim to copyright that authors did not always keep copyright in their own hands. The third point is, that no one proposes to interfere to secure an author against losses, but only against gains. It is not suggested that in any of the numerous cases in which an author suffers from insufficient remuneration the public should be concerned in the matter; it is only in the rare circumstance of an author receiving large returns from his labours that these are to be cut off for the good of the community. This is surely a very one-sided affair altogether, a partnership in gains and not in losses, a way of saying, "your labours and disasters are your own, but I have a right to half your rewards;" indeed, we may say to *all* your rewards, for the author is spoken of as if he had no rights at all, and as if a partial law had interfered to bestow on him especial privileges. We hear about the public, and the printer, and the publisher, until we conclude that an author can have nothing to do with the making of a book; that print and paper are the only things wanted to furnish our libraries completely and satisfactorily. We know, however, that it is exactly the author's part which is wanted; the rest of the work is merely the medium by which *his* work can be distributed to his customers. For a long time he had no such medium, and, like the owner of a coal mine before the making of roads or the invention of railways, he was the possessor of wealth which he had no means of realizing. He made the literature of nations while himself starving, or existing miserably on patronage. At last, after unremunerative ages, a way is found of conveying this produce to the markets greedy for it, and then it is contended that he has no right to sell such produce at his own price, and that he must be thankful if he is allowed *any* preference before outsiders in the merchandize of it. Somehow, he is discovered to owe an immense debt to the world, while the world owes nothing at all to him.

The evidence before the Commission proved that very few books paid the author sufficiently—that is to say, enough to enable him to live upon his earnings; and that many books did

not pay at all. It proved also that without the protection of copyright it would have been impossible to produce a certain valuable series of scientific works, and that, even with this protection, one distinguished philosopher would have been compelled to give up the expense of producing further work if extraneous assistance had not enabled him to continue; but still the talk goes on as to how the author's profits are to be cut down for the good of the public. Law cannot create justice; it can only expound it; and sometimes it forgets its function. It first denies the natural rights of a class, and then—when it is graciously pleased to modify its own denial—it proceeds to discourse of its amiable partiality in so doing. It believes that fair play is its own to give or to take away, and is complacent about the limits of its own injustice. It was long since pointed out in a contemporary how Blackstone concluded his Commentaries on the relationship between husband and wife—a relationship grossly unfair to the woman, and which subsequent legislation has been compelled to modify on her behalf—by the remark (seriously meant), "So great a favourite is the female sex of the law of England!" In the same way an author's right to his own production is unjustly limited, and then termed a "monopoly," an especial favour granted to him; although, as Mr. A. Macmillan courageously remarked to the Commission, it is no more a monopoly than the possession of his own hands. It is simply a private production and personal property, and as such has a right to the full protection of the law.

There are two ways in which property may be made, or in other words, in which a particular thing may come to belong to a particular man. It may either be by appropriation or by production. The earliest form of property probably became so by appropriation, the purest form of property is made so by production, and the commonest forms of property owe their existence to a mixture of the two. In an excellent article on "Land-owning and Copyright," which appeared in last year's September number of *Frazer's Magazine*, a very good example of the primitive form of property-making is given in the picture of a hunter seated beside an ancient river appropriating to himself a bit of flint from the unappropriated abundance about him, and converting it into a weapon, or an implement of some sort. When once that bit of flint has been converted into an implement by the savage, all the laws of human justice, the laws of every country and every age, declare it to be his own, to do as he likes with, to use, to destroy, to barter, or to give away. If we take the implement from him against his will, we wrong him in his consciousness and our own. If, however, he dispose of it by amicable agreement to another man, it becomes

the other man's property in the same complete way. And so, passing on from hand to hand, the implement may continue to be the property of *someone* throughout the course of centuries, and the bit of flint be unappropriated no more. This is just and equitable. The flint in itself was worthless in its crudeness and its abundance. The ingenuity and the labour which the man put into it produced its value: he had therefore a right to his own production. Other kinds of property have, however, become acquired in other ways. Land belongs to nations by right of discovery; the mere luck of having found it first, or the disproportionate reward for having first gone to look for it, gives it for ever into particular hands. The reasonableness of this consists in the fact that it must belong to *somebody;* it is worthless unless subjected to human industry, and protected by fixed laws; to get the good out of it some particular persons, and not persons in general, must take it under their control; and therefore the first discoverer is the nearest approximation to the rightful owner to be found in the case.

But, again, lands obtained by conquest, by recognized injustice, or given as rewards to men whose services have long ceased to be, are still, by the protection of the law, in the hands of the resultant owners. Simple possession is even, in some circumstances, regarded as a proof of property; an old saying tells us that it is "nine points of the law." The fact then that a man *has* a thing, that he has been allowed to calculate on it as his own, perhaps to expend labour upon it, or to alter the conditions of his life to fit its existence, but especially the fact that he has it and that no one else can prove a better title to it, is considered a sufficient reason why he should be protected in the keeping of it. It is, however, universally admitted that finding or having a thing does not give so clear a claim of ownership as having made the thing or given something in exchange for it to the maker. If I pick up a watch in the street, it is, I suppose, mine until someone turns up who proves to me that he made or bought it; then it is his. And in the same way property is more purely and justly property in proportion as it owes its value to the labour of the producer and has not come by accident into his possession. Certainly the right of authors to their works can, from this point of view, contrast favourably with the right of freeholders to their land, of manufacturers to their produce, and of inventors to their inventions. Landowners, for example—especially such as do not farm their own land—have contributed little to the making of what they hold. The world is, in one sense, the poorer for their presence; for, if they had never been born, somebody else would have had what is now appropriated to them. They are monopolists as much as pro-

ducers, and only justify their existence by their cultivation of the land and the making of wealth for the world out of the capital they have borrowed from it. Manufacturers do not, perhaps, borrow so much. They put the labours of their hands into the raw materials which would be otherwise useless, and convert cotton into clothes, clay into houses. They go beyond improvement and come to alteration and adaptation. The world is, or ought to be, the richer for their existence, for the work and thought which they put into the materials passing through their hands. Inventors do still more for the wealth of mankind. They give to other men the ideas which shall convert their iron into gold, and their stones into bread. But can any of these classes be said to have as perfect a right to their own productions as have the men whose labours result in a "mere arrangement of words?" The land would exist without the landowners; if one manufacturer ceased to produce another would take his place; but if George Eliot had not written the "Mill on the Floss" no one else would have done it instead. Even inventors, like discoverers, are only, in one sense, "first-comers." Their fellows often step close on their heels, and would to-morrow have reached the fact which they themselves attain to-day. "That fancy that I had," says Emerson, "and hesitated to utter because you would laugh,—the broker, the attorney, the market-man are saying the same thing." America would have been discovered long before this if there had been no Christopher Columbus; the steam-engine would have been ultimately invented if there had been no James Watt; but without Shakespeare neither now nor at any time would the world have had "Macbeth." A great author may surely say, more than any other producer, "This is mine, made out of materials which all the world can use, but which never would have been put into this shape except by me."

It does not, like the property in an invention, take possession of an idea that might have come to another man, and so deprive him of it. The theories and facts that it propounds are free to all the world for quotation, repetition, and distribution. The materials from which it was formed are still there for the use of others; it gives the world something, and deprives it of nothing. Such production approaches creation as nearly as anything human can do, and should give, according to our laws of human justice, as absolute a right to property as can be found.

The reasonableness of property laws is often explained by the statement that unless the produce of a man's labour is protected he will cease to work. But this is not all the reason, nor even the best part of it. It is not only to induce the savage sitting by his ancient river to produce another axe when the first is

worn out that we should desire him to be protected in the possession of that first one. *It is also to prevent another man getting an axe that he has not worked for.* The state of society where honest men are not sufficiently protected is bad enough, but the state of society where thieves are encouraged is infinitely worse. We may want axes, but we want still more men who can make them. "It is more blessed to give than to receive" has been often enough translated into the cheap giving of modern charity; but it means also, "It is more healthy to work than to beg; it is more honourable to produce than to take." If we steal an axe, we are so much better by the axe and so much worse by many bad qualities gained and many good ones lost. If we make an axe, we are so much better by the axe, by the experience acquired, by the independence sustained, by the healthful exercise and the hopeful habit begun. The axe has given back to us in increased ingenuity, in developed muscle, all that it cost us in labour. The stolen axe brings us nothing with it except isolation from our fellows, a narrowing of spirit, and an enfeebling of body and mind.

In the present complex condition of civilization we cannot all make axes, but we can all make something; and we can take care, for our own sake, and by no means for the sake of those with whom we deal, to pay for all we have, not to pauperize ourselves even in the receipt of good things, much less to rob unwilling pockets in order to save our own purses. It is an excellent rule that is given to us in "Man the Reformer" for guidance amid the complex claims of our time. "We must clear ourselves each one by the interrogation, whether we have earned our bread to-day by the hearty contribution of our energies to the common benefit." It is doubtful whether anything ever does us good that we do not pay for in one way or another. Food without exercise, pleasure without effort, are well known to cloy and disagree. And if to receive free gifts is doubtfully good, what is it to take good things which the owner would sell and which we refuse to pay for? It is then for the sake of the public, as well as for the sake of the authors, that we demand some payment for great books; not altogether in the meaning of Mrs. E. B. Browning, when she tells us that all good work must be paid for, "chiefly by those who do it." And, if copyright is a right at all, it is strange that, while every unscrupulous broker may settle the fruits of his ruin-working speculations on his children's children to the twentieth generation, we continue to limit the rights of a Milton to his "Paradise Lost," and have, from time to time, the relatives or descendants of our great writers brought forward as in need of some trifling assistance, at a moment, perhaps, when the works of the great writers are being

sold to somebody's profit on every bookstall in the kingdom. To somebody's profit? Precisely; and the demand for the extension of an author's privileges is only a request that, so long as money continues to be paid for books, some of it should go to the producer's representatives.

The question of the author's right is, however, discussed by some persons as if he had no right at all, and protection must be granted to him only in proportion as it could be proved "expedient," not in the interests of himself, but of his readers. If an author could live and write without food, no matter at what personal suffering, and could be made to do so, we may infer that he would be so made in the interests of cheap literature. We want the axe of this savage seated by the river, and we would take it without scruple, laughing at his talk of justice, if it did not happen that we may want more axes in the future. Is it not *expedient* to give the fellow a trifle just to encourage him to go on making more? We are then, while granting what is absolutely necessary to keep literature alive—this is the apparent suggestion—to grind out of our human literary machines the greatest possible poetry at the least possible expense to the public; they must weave for us the grandest and noblest ideas out of the most sordid and bitter experiences; outside the pale of legal protection, and beyond the consideration of human justice, they are still to prate to us of the highest, the most perfect justice and humanity.

We are told that authors ought not to *want to be paid.* Certainly, when we consider their vast influence on public opinion and how little it has been used on their own behalf, we may conclude that they don't greatly want to be paid, that they are slow to push forward their just claims. That, however, does not free us from the obligation of wanting to pay them. It has been the custom to sneer at authors for accepting payment for their writings, and to speak of those who look for remuneration for literary labour scornfully as being "for hire." An author, however, who accepts payment is not necessarily for hire. I hire a workman to paint my drawingroom, but I don't hire Mr. Millais when I purchase one of his pictures. When an author brings us the voluntary produce of his brains, and we take it from him in exchange for something else that he requires, he cannot be said to have become our hired servant any more than we have become his. Man is a creature designed to give and take, but to do neither exclusively, except to his own loss or degradation; and there is no apparent reason why an author should be an exception to this rule. Indeed, the fact that he is a human being like the rest of us, with daily needs, limited powers, and an unendowed profession, proves the contrary. When he

has been engaged on the production of literature he cannot also have been producing other things; he gives the world the result of his labours and asks in return for some of the result of the labours of the rest of the world. To tell him that his achievements are beyond price is a poor excuse for giving him no price at all. He does not ask to be paid what they are worth, but only what they are worth to us, or, even less than that—what we can afford to give him in return out of our own productions.

When it is remarked that a man has an exclusive right to the books on his own shelf, but that if a friend proposed to copy one of the books he would be a "dog in the manger" to refuse him, we may answer that the whole secret of "property" is found in the difference between the author selling his labour of years for what it will obtain in the market, and the purchaser of one-thousandth part of an edition refusing to let a friend make extracts from it. The author has made the book what it is; the purchaser has not; the author has a right to keep it to himself altogether, or to receive his own price for it; and such a price can only be secured by the law of copyright.

The "dog in the manger" objection would apply equally to a farmer who out of a small quantity of grain produces much wheat. He cannot eat all the bread to be made from it himself. Is he then a "dog in the manger" because he refuses to share it without return with other men who have no bread, but who perhaps have produced implements or clothing more than they need? Again, when we are told that if we are to be forbidden to reproduce a Shakespeare we are prevented from what is in itself a harmless and laudable action in order that we may confer a boon upon Shakespeare and his fellows, we might as reasonably go on to say, "If we are to be forbidden to feed hungry men out of the farmer's surplus corn, we are prevented from what is in itself a harmless and a laudable action in order that we may confer a boon upon the farmer and his fellows." The answer to both is evident: "Let us compensate the author and the farmer for the labour put into the production, and we have a right to bestow the results of that labour upon others." If, as we are told, the author is "not strictly a maker but a shaper," nearly all our workers being so—some of them, indeed, being only bringers—let us not rob him of his shaping. We also have the materials at hand; let us shape for ourselves, and leave his formations untouched. If his work is nothing we can let it alone, but it is hardly logical to seize it by force, proving that we value it, and still say that it is nothing.

It is curious to remark how the opponents of Copyright speak of a "book," as if it had grown by the way-side, and the author

were merely an importunate beggar asking alms as you plucked it, and having nothing whatever to do with its production. For example, one of the Commissioners remarked, "I wish to know whether you think it most consistent with the doctrines of political economy, that every person should be able upon payment to publish a particular book, or that only one person should have it in his power to do so for a certain time?" The *particular* book is a definition almost amusing under the circumstances. Any man, as Mr. Spencer pointed out, may publish a book on any subject. "An author may write a novel; another man may write a novel;" but the *particular* book means the laborious result of a *particular* man's work; that man, therefore, and not the public, has a right to it. Again, we are told by the Commission and others, that the author is not forced to produce, and that therefore so long as he goes on producing by his own choice, he cannot complain of the treatment he receives at the hands of the public. To this objection the history of the world gives a sufficient answer; in the face of its recorded facts, it can never be held that the proof that men go on producing under conditions of injustice can justify the conclusion that those conditions are just.

Authors certainly will never be induced to strike for wages; they want work far more than they want to be paid for work. Even if they could be persuaded to place their pecuniary interest higher than their devotion to literature, there would be little hope of any good result. An author's produce differs from most other productions, insomuch as it has to be exposed in open market before its value can be known; and unless a man has already committed himself to an acceptance of the present condition of things by publishing successful books, the world will only laugh at him for withholding what is of no proved worth. Milton might have thrown his "Paradise Lost" in the fire, and Wordsworth have consigned the "Excursion" to the waste-paper basket, without much protest from the world of their times. A book can only command a high price after it is beyond the author's power to bargain with his public.

Why, however, should we wish to bargain so closely with the author? Is this a form of cheap philanthropy by which shilling literature is to be produced for the public at the loss of the writer? Printers, bookbinders, publishers, and booksellers, will, we know, all be paid for their share in the production of each volume; therefore its price can only be lessened by cutting off the pay of the originator. He is more easily dealt with than the others, because his work is done once and for ever. If we can steal his axe, it may become the parent of innumerable axes

without further dealings with him, and we can afford to laugh at his helpless indignation.

To philanthropists recommending such a course, it might, nevertheless, be suggested that individuals should not be robbed for the benefit of nations, and that a people who can afford to build town-halls for their municipal authorities at the cost of hundreds of thousands, and to give sums of money in four numbers for single pictures for a national collection, might grant ungrudgingly £10,000, if need be, to provide a cheap Shakespeare for the nation, and so—when it became an evident public benefit to secure a copyright—secure it without pilfering the author's property. It is true that the best work has not been done for pay; that even among men who have earned a living by literature their greatest works were not their most lucrative ones; and this, outside the question of justice, is surely a sufficient reason for doing nothing to lessen the value of copyright. Copyright hardly touches the most ephemeral productions of literature —the magazine and newspaper articles; and it is these that are sure to be paid for; it is these that answer to the supply and demand of the market like any other product; prolonged copyright enhances the value, not of this sort of literature, but of the lasting sort; and if we want a man to write for to-morrow rather than to-day, there is the more need for us to secure that to-morrow his work shall be his and not somebody else's. The life of great authors is greatest and longest after their death. Then it is too late to pay. But a protected copyright, besides adding to the immediate value of a work whose principal success is to come in the future, may also be a provision for beloved heirs, to whom, very probably, the author has little else to leave.

If it has been thought somewhat of a harsh saying, that literature and the fine arts should be left, like tea and sugar, to find their own price in the market, what shall we say of the justice which, after so leaving them, endeavours to deny, and successfully limits, their right to such a price to-day? We preach—from our own pinnacle of pure self-interest—of the necessity of teaching our authors to be disinterested; but would it not be fair to ask first, whether, in this age in which literature is considered to have become at last a marketable commodity and even a commercial success, we find our writers pandering to tastes of the age for luxuries more freely than their brethren of the past pandered for necessities. Do we not find reticence and dignity with those who could open our purses at will? Did George Eliot pour book after book upon us with no other aim than that of securing price after price? Did she not rather wait, with intervals of years, till ripe work was ready for our reading? Does Tennyson, secure of a public for all he writes,

lavish on us quantity instead of quality? Are not our greatest writers to-day freer than the writers of any other day to follow their own behests, our masters instead of our servants, our benefactors instead of our pensioners? And is it not a satisfaction to us all to know that they have, in their own lifetime, reaped the fruit of their labour and enjoyed the work of their own hands? Theirs was the planting, let us grudge them not the harvest. The past ages could not starve a man and the present age cannot bribe him to good work. He will do it whether we pay him or not.

> "Whosoever writes good poetry
> Looks just to art. He does not write for you
> Or me, for London or for Edinburgh;
> He will not suffer the best critic known
> To step into his sunshine of free thought
> And self-absorbed conception, and exact
> An inch-long swerving of the holy lines.
> If virtue, done for popularity,
> Defiles like vice, can art, for praise or hire,
> Still keep its splendour, and remain pure art?
> Eschew such serfdom. What the poet writes,
> He writes; mankind accepts it if it suits,
> And that's success; if not, the poem's passed
> From hand to hand, and yet from hand to hand,
> Until the unborn snatch it, crying out,
> In pity on their fathers' being so dull.
> And that's success too."

But a success that we can none of us wish our poets of the future to pay for in the present by poverty and dependence. Are we indeed such a nation of shopkeepers that we must bargain with Shakespeare for a cheap Hamlet, and haggle with Milton about the ownership of "Paradise Lost"?

---

## ART. VI.—THE INTERNATIONAL MEDICAL CONGRESS AND THE PROGRESS OF MEDICINE.

1. *International Medical Congress: Abstracts of the Communications to be made in the various Sections.* Seventh Session. London: 1881.
2. *Reports of the Meetings of the International Medical Congress in the Daily Papers and the Weekly Medical Journals, August 1st to 9th.*

AT a time when every pursuit of life is more or less cosmopolitan, it would be curious if medicine, the most cosmopolitan of all things, did not celebrate its Universal Fraternity. The spirit of the age was upon it, and so the great

Congress has come, has spoken, and has gone, leaving behind the story of a great success. This story has been told from every point of view, philosophical and scientific, professional and social, and nothing has been left unsaid about its session. It was a success so pronounced as to make it an event of great and kaleidoscopic interest; and it is remarkable how from different standpoints and distinct lines of thought, the present seems to have been regarded for medicine as an ending of one epoch and the beginning of another—a passing from the old to the new.

This was especially noticeable in the "general" addresses to the Congress at large. The aims of the presidential addresses of the various sections were probably of necessity too restricted, and their tendencies too immediately practical, to admit of any very elevated or extended exposition of the actual condition and of the prospects of medicine. At the opening meeting, the President, Sir J. Paget, struck this note when speaking of the future. He said, "It will not be easy to match the recent past. The advance of medical knowledge within one's memory is amazing, whether reckoned in the wonders of the science not yet applied or in practical results in the general lengthening of life, or, which is still better, in the prevention and decrease of pain and misery, and in the increase of working power." Prof. Virchow, in his Address on "The Value of Pathological Experiments," although he kept strictly to his text, said, "We have reached the point which denotes the boundary between ancient and modern medicine." Prof. Huxley, in tracing the essential foundations of medicine in the biological sciences, observes the disappearance of older definitions of life, and says, respecting the new, "henceforward, as it appears to me, the connection of medicine with the biological sciences is clearly defined." M. Pasteur revealed by unimpeachable experiments (certainly epoch-making) new and far-reaching prospects in the prophylaxis of infectious disease. Speaking of the "changes which surgery has undergone during the last ten years," Prof. Volkmann says, "Great and unparalleled in the history of medical science have been those changes. Problems, thousands of years old, have been solved, or are, at any rate, approaching a sure solution; the desires of our fathers have been fulfilled beyond their hope and expectation." And the paper of Dr. Maurice Raynaud—written, but not read, by him, for it was his last tribute to medicine—defines the philosophical position of Scepticism in Medicine, and affirms the "moral certainties of medical science" in our time.

To-day, then, medicine looks back upon a generation of progress which has never been rivalled, which is indisputable, and can be distinctly measured. It has never been able to do so much for the relief of sickness and restoration of health. It possesses new

powers both of investigating and treating disease. Its knowledge is greater, more positive, and more comprehensive. Its experience has never been so thoroughly tested, classified, and formulated into lesson and rule. At the same time there are not wanting warning voices to check any flight of airy conceit. The wits and satirists of to-day ply the same jests with the same stings of truth as in the times of Aristophanes and Martial; and the philosophy of our age in its great doctrine of the 'survival of the fittest' endorses the opinion of Plato, that medicine should tend the men of good constitution and leave the weak and feeble to die out. Sir W. Hamilton asked bitterly whether medicine had made any progress since Hippocrates taught, and its modern developments are stigmatized as "barbarisms of civilization." Nor is it only among satirists and philosophers that such scepticism is found. Dr. Maurice Raynaud, in his altogether admirable paper on "Scepticism in Medicine," remarking that "the list of sceptical philosophers contains so many names of doctors," asserts that "between scepticism and medicine there has always existed a certain natural affinity." Some of the most eminent physicians of our own day express the same unbelief, and find a ready justification in the historical records of inflammation. This must always have been the first study of medicine; and yet our treatment remains essentially that of the Egyptian papyri of the fourteenth century B.C. Much of our most recent advance can only be described by an Irishism, as backward, from the practice of our fathers to that of Hippocrates. Maxims he enunciated, which have been discarded by after ages, are now proclaimed as truths. Indeed, the very essence of modern progress seems to be, the more direct recognition and reliance upon the *vis medicatrix naturæ*, he affirmed—νούσων φύσεις ἰητροί. No better definition than this could be given of the duty of the physician, to favour the natural effort towards recovery. Many leading physicians of to-day renounce all pretensions to cure, and affect to do little more than place the patient in the most favourable condition for recovery. They often seem to practise in the spirit of the aphorism of Celsus, *optima medicina est non uti medicina.* Fashions in medicine wax and wane almost with the moon, and would seem to be governed by some mysterious law which regulates the cycle of their return. Theories, more or less bewitching, come and go like clouds. The very progress of medicine is mechanical rather than philosophical, of instrument rather than of principle. No great master has arisen to give to it a philosophical order and unity, and write down its fundamental laws. Other sciences in their advance have freely given to it their aid in theory and analogy, discovery and invention. It has ploughed with their

heifers and worked with their tools. New forces have been placed in its hands, new faculties lent for its use. Its students have devoted health and life to the cultivation of minute portions of its domain. Masses of facts have been accumulated, and experience has been piled in huge heaps. Undoubtedly we know more of disease, but can we do more for its cure? So often have we to confess our impotence, so little is there that we can accomplish, that the question *will* come, "Are our cures due really to our art rather than to the *vis medicatrix* of old? Are even the foundations of medicine as a science yet laid? Is our boasted progress development or but mere accumulation?

It is certainly advisable to make sure before we speculate upon an advance, that the ground on which we stand is something like *terra firma*. Can we then assume that our position is so assured that the ensuing age will progress, in part at least, upon the lines in which we move? Will the future be the glorified sequel of the present? Do we possess truths of medicine which, imperfect and fragmentary as they may be, are yet, as far as they go, positive and lasting? Now, it is often asserted that medicine is not a science, and cannot at best be more than an enlightened empiricism—that it cannot, therefore, be presumed to be established upon any stable basis—and that, having no fundamental principles on which it may securely rest, the empiricism of to-day may be contradicted and superseded by the empiricism of to-morrow. But if it will not answer to any very rigid definition of a science, it is none the less scientific, both in spirit and doctrine. If there is not a science of medicine, medicine is certainly rooted and grounded in science. In truth, medicine is but part of the science of biology, and may be in some sense described as an applied science of biological doctrine. It rests upon the two large divisions of biology—anatomy and physiology; and its own peculiar studies of pathology and therapeutics are but specialized parts of physiology. The processes of pathology are all physiological, and are the ordinary sequences of certain causes which interfere to induce some deviation from normal conditions. That they stand in such a relation to the life of the being as to constitute "disease," is but an accidental, and not an essential circumstance. To quote Comte,* "The state of disease is not a radically different condition from that of health. The pathological condition is to the physiological simply a prolongation of the limits of variation, higher or lower, proper to each phenomenon of the normal organism; and it can never produce any entirely new phenomenon." There is no real border between them—not even the assumption that the

* "Positive Philosophy," Book V. chap. i.

processes of pathology are retrogressive, since the bulk of those of physiology are of the same essential character. Also some pathological processes are of the reverse type—*e.g.*, the increase in the muscular tissue of the heart in compensatory hypertrophy. Moreover, the most positive teachings of empirical medicine are always suspected until they are endorsed by these biological sciences. They form the ultimate court of appeal to which its questions are referred for decision, and clinical experience is rather the judgment-seat than the judge. So that if the name and dignity of a science are denied to medicine, it is indisputably based upon and governed by science. In such degree, then, as the doctrines of medicine are corroborated by biological facts, they may be taken as representing scientific truths. Much of modern physiological teaching may be swept away by the advancing tide of knowledge; but in so far as medicine embodies its permanent truths, in that degree will it also be permanent. Whether, therefore, it be termed a science or not, there is clearly such a thing as scientific medicine. Call it an art only, yet it can have no sound basis or positive knowledge unless it is informed by the scientific spirit. For "art, in any but its infant state, presupposes scientific knowledge; and if every art does not bear the name of a science, it is only because several sciences are often necessary to form the groundwork of a single art. So complicated are the conditions which govern our practical agency, that to enable one thing to be *done*, it is often requisite to *know* the nature and properties of many things."* Medicine is an art, but it is much more, and, as in some respects a science of other sciences, it has even been denominated a philosophy. Hippocrates seems to have considered that medicine could not be strictly termed a science, but it is hardly to be denied that it takes both the form and spirit of a science from the modern development of biology. So that we may accept its present position as durable, its progress as real, in so far as they represent biological truth.

Medicine, however, has always presented these two aspects—the scientific and the empirical. They are two natural supports on which it rests, two inherent forces by which it progresses. Whatever doctrine may in different ages have predominated, these have always been present. The contentions between the philosophical school of Cos, practising from its observations in anatomy and physiology, and the empirical school of Cnidos, practising from its observations of the operation of remedies, have been perpetuated to our own time, because they embodied these two essential factors in all true progress of medicine. It is not the difference between the man of theory and of practice, of

* J. S. Mill, "System of Logic," Introduction.

study and action, for there is an empiricism in theory as well as a science in practice. The difference lies deep in the very nature of the things of medicine. While there is so much of the unknown in its study, there must be empiricism in its practice. It has often to attempt to solve problems of which it is almost entirely ignorant, and must therefore blindly follow any indication of success it may chance upon. Knowing little or nothing of certain processes of disease, it is guided by broad results, and that is empiricism. Knowing from previous investigation something of certain other processes, it is guided by its knowledge of their causation, and that is scientific medicine. The dissensions of bygone schools, based upon these two standpoints, have arisen from mistaking a part truth for the whole. Medicine is both empirical and scientific, and not either alone. Nor can it be said that there is any prospect of its ever changing this dual character, of losing its empiricism in a perfected science.

It cannot be admitted that the existence of empiricism is the reproach of medicine, or that it indicates the absence of all scientific principle, without which there can be no genuine advance. In all applied science a certain amount of empiricism necessarily exists, and the "empirical philosophy" defines its legitimate position. That there is more in medicine than in other sciences, is due to the fact that it has to deal with matters of which so little is known. And its peculiar offence in medicine arises from the importance to man of the interests involved—himself—in which he naturally thinks that scientific certainty would be so very preferable.

In appraising the present worth of empirical teaching, it may be said that it represents some truth, but what the truth exactly is we do not know. It is truth in the ore, seen only in the dim gleam of granules in the midst of much dross. The metal is there, although we may not be able to say positively what it is. No inferences then can be drawn concerning the advance of medicine from the lessons of empiricism, except from the bare fact of their existence. They afford no other indication of the next step. One may look a short way ahead and see whither the beaten path of scientific inquiry is tending, but the progress of empiricism is a leaping from stone to stone across an untrodden country, not seeing where the next step will fall. And in this way gifted men of clearer sight have gone far in advance of their times, and have lighted upon facts which the toilsome road-making of science has taken long to reach. These are the fathers, the seers, of medicine, who have seen truths, the reasons of which only generations long after them have discovered.

But it may be objected, Does not all history refute the proposition that the facts of empiricism have a certain, if indefinite,

value? How can they be admitted as representing in any degree truth, when age after age has so industriously and successfully busied itself in demolishing the affirmations of its predecessors. Can we possibly accept facts solely upon the teachings of empiricism, when we reflect that in other times they have been as implicitly believed, and as plausibly maintained, only to be upset and derided by after generations. The history of medicine however confirms, rather than refuses, such credit to empirical results. It shows that the teachings of genuine empiricism have always had a basis of truth, that they have only been disproved in so far as the truth was incomplete. Every prominent school of the past is represented in our doctrine by some form or degree of the truth which gave them life. They have passed away, not because they had no truth in them, but because they had only a small part of truth, and mistook it for the whole. But this is only the common way of mankind. We are so dazzled by the sudden blaze of light shining in dark places, that we are unable for the time to perceive its limits. The new truth demonstrated in some things is applied to all problems as a universal and natural solution. However absurd and extravagant the past tenets of sound empiricism may seem, they always contained an element of truth, which, fractional and disguised as it may have been, gave them a vitality which preserved them until they were absorbed in larger, clearer truth. The swift revolutionsof the circling years have winnowed the chaff from the grain, and have left for us the accumulated store.

From the very birth of recorded medicine we can trace its unbroken lineal descent in truths, first taught empirically, which we now hold. The great doctrine of Hippocrates, that the primary seat of disease is in the fluids of the body, has maintained, under the name of the "Humoral Pathology," a more or less prominent place in all succeeding ages. And the most recent tendencies of modern progress have changed its aspect rather than its position. The Empiric has never failed out of medicine, and indeed must always remain while its art is compelled to practise in advance of its science. The Methodics, with their principle of *strictum* and *laxum*, are represented by the increased or diminished vascular tonicity which forms so large an element in modern doctrine and treatment. The spirit of the Eclectics and the Sceptics is as emphatic and powerful amongst us as in the sects which bore these names. The mediæval Arabians were alchemists rather than physicians, but their idea of a philosopher's stone seems, according to certain chemists, to be on the point of realization in the resolution of all the elements into modifications of but one. In the Renaissance, the chemiatric school, following Sylvius, who said

that diseases are derangements of a fermentative process in the body resulting in excess of acid or alkali, are with us in the very name of a zymotic (ζυμη) class of disease. The series of the digestive processes are distinctly of the ferment type. And the acid secretions of gout, and the alkaline discharges of cholera, serve to remind us of facts dimly seen by them, and not very clearly by ourselves. What has been called the 'iatro-mathematical' school, which, after Borelli, interpreted vital motion by mechanical principles, would find many illustrations from the teaching of modern medicine.' These principles are recognized as a substantial element in the processes and functions of the organism, and are a prime agency in the relief and cure of many affections. The "archeus" of Van Helmont was in reality the *vis medicatrix* which eminent physicians in all times have relied upon as the great agent of cure. Stahl gave to this force an entity which we still speak of in his term *anima*, or in that of his later works, *motus tonico-vitalis*. And after him Hoffman, as "nervous action," and Haller, as "irritability," gave to science the very expressions it still employs. These various ideas were the essence of the empirical practice of the times in which they respectively flourished. They were the kernels of truth enclosed in thick husks. So that history decidedly supports the proposition that there is in empirical results an inner nucleus of fact, however thickly it may be enveloped in worthless coverings, and however impossible it may be to guess what is its nature from the appearance it may for the time present.

It is obvious that if medicine has thus taken up the position of a biological science the fact is full of promise for its future. Whatever may be said of other sciences, that of biology is manifestly but in its youth. Its very birth as an integral science could only follow a certain maturity in other physical sciences which necessarily precede it in the great hierarchy. And if medicine has no scientific existence apart from biology, its future is of necessity bound up in that science. And just as biology is compelled in great measure to wait for the progress of its ancillary sciences, so has medicine to wait for the progress of biology. In the words of Prof. Huxley's address, "there could be no real science of pathology until the science of physiology had reached a degree of perfection unattained, and indeed unattainable, until quite recent times." The science of medicine is thus also in its early youth. It is but now awakening to its birthright in the realm of science. So there can be no wonder that its scientific progress has been hitherto so tardy and dubious. As fundamentally a department of biology, it could not advance in front of the entire science. By its researches it undoubtedly contributes to the progress of biology, but medicine can only be

itself in advance of biology by virtue of its empiricism. Now, however, its growth must be progressive and substantial, since it is animated by the living spirit of science. Theoretically at least, every physician is a trained biologist, and every dose of drugs a biological study.

Empiricism necessarily knows no law. Recognizing law, it ceases to exist. No glimpse of its future can therefore be obtained. Only with the advance of biology its possible area will be more and more circumscribed; and with better means to test and investigate its assertions, they will be the more quickly reduced to scientific expression. But its knowledge must always be temporary in its character and undergoing an unceasing transformation into science. It constantly discovers new material for science to digest and absorb. The immediate future of scientific medicine, however, may with some assurance be prognosticated from its present. So far as there is truly a science of medicine now, so far may it be foreseen what it will be. It must advance upon the lines laid down in the laws already known. Other laws, deeper and more fundamental, may be discovered which will give another bent to its progress. But in part at least it will certainly develop in the direction of the laws now demonstrated. To the extent in which these laws form part of a science of medicine will they take part in constructing its future.

Animated by a spirit of its own, and guided by laws of its own, medicine has thus an independent existence as a practical science—not of course independent of biology, but taking rank as one of its distinct and integral divisions. Intimately related to its sister-divisions, and freely giving to and borrowing from them, it yet lives and works in a sphere of its own. Thus it takes up from the world around fitting materials for its growth. It selects means and instruments from every art, and adapts them to its own use. It borrows theory, analogy, and illustration from all sciences, and constructs a philosophy of its own. It grows into a form and organization which are its natural development. Rightly to estimate, therefore, both its present and its probable future, it is necessary to observe how this essential vitality is manifested in its whole body—how the same mood of the same spirit has actuated every part—and how the fundamental science of medicine is seen in the symmetrical progress of them all. And if the recent progress of medicine can be sketched in barest outline in this manner, it will afford some suggestions of what the near future will be. To determine in what direction it is most active now is to obtain strong presumption of the lines of its immediate advance. A simple scheme for such an inquiry would seem to be, to notice cursorily how medicine has advanced within the last generation, by

(α) development from within of its own art and science, (β) adaptation and absorption of means and principles of other arts and sciences, (γ) the simple adoption and application of material from external sources. Not that this is assumed to form any philosophical analysis of its progress, based upon any essential mode to which it must conform—or that it particularly determines the conditions of its growth or offers any very precise conclusions. Much of the most valuable and characteristic increase in medicine has issued from the co-operation of all these processes, and cannot be ranked in any rigid classification. Any such analysis must be to a large extent but general, indefinite, and approximative. But it has the advantage of observing the working of the spirit of medicine rather than its mere effects, and of exhibiting the unity underlying its divers manifestations. In this view we catch glimpses of medicine as an independent entity working out its own ideas, in its own ways, and with its own means. Appearing as a science developing its own constitution, it demonstrates a fact too frequently doubted. As a living science such a view may be said to show three normal processes of its growth which are always in operation—*development*, *assimilation*, and *accretion*.

It is neither necessary nor expedient to fix any precise period which shall limit the ken of our observation. There is no epochal date from which modern medicine reckons. The one essential point for our purpose is to ensure that the energies which are now most active should be noted. And as each generation bears a stamp of its own impressed upon it by its predominant forces, it forms a natural term for the scope of an inquiry like this. But it need by no means be arbitrarily adhered to. The aim of this study is to observe the effects and development of the forces which are at work in the medicine of the present in order that their tendencies may be inferred, and it will but seldom lead us farther back than the last decade. The more recent these developments may be, the more significant are they of the outline of the immediate future.

In a paper like this, it is, of course, impossible to mention all, or even the greater part, of the developments and tendencies of recent medicine. All that can be done is to attempt to mark the most prominent and influential, and to observe their relations and the direction they seem likely to take. And with these the object must be illustration rather than description or demonstration. Again, its fundamental oneness with physiology gives to medicine a share in every physiological advance. Essentially parts of the same science, every fact and doctrine of the one has intimate relations with the other. The progress of the one is more or less immediately the progress of the other. It is only neces-

sary, therefore, in observing the progress of medicine, to notice such matters as belong to that part of biology which is allotted to medicine, or, as perhaps it may be called in its scientific aspect, abnormal biology.

Incomparably the most important of the three essential processes of growth in medicine before described is that of development of its art and science by its own forces, with its own means, in its own ways. It is alone the necessary sign of real progress, the test of its existence as a science. Without such self-development it could have no independent being. It is the indisputable mark of inherent self-contained vitality. All other increase is more or less adventitious, heterogeneous and symmetrical. To recognize medicine working out its own destiny under its own laws, is to give it rank as a true science.

And happily its largest growth has been of this character. Although its problems are quite the most complicated, and its studies the most intricate known to mankind, it has laboured upon them with signal success. And if it has not created a stately fabric of law and order like other physical sciences, it is rather because its material does not admit of such treatment than that medicine itself lacks the scientific spirit. The best definition of disease the world has known is that of Socrates, *ταραγμος σοματος*, and of the variation of these 'disturbances' there is simply no end. No two cases of disease are alike, as no two men are alike in feature, disposition, and constitution; and the individual gives an individual stamp to every case. "It is not only that the living human body is, in both its material and indwelling forces, the most complex thing yet known, but that in our practical duties this most complex thing is presented to us in an almost infinite multiformity" (Sir J. Paget's Presidential Address). Thus, every dose of a drug must be to a certain extent an experiment, however clear the diagnosis of the disease may be, and however definitely the action of the drug may have been determined. But the laws which medicine has defined, and upon which it works, are as positive as those of any other science. The doubt and indefiniteness arise from its not having the means of measuring the force and exact application of these laws in any particular case. Not its science, but its means, are at fault. There is thus an element of vagueness in its dogmas and results which can probably be never eliminated. But as far as it can apprehend the extent in which its laws may operate in any given case, so far is it purely scientific.

Here, again, we meet the objection that medicine can make no true progress, because it has no basis of elementary law on which to rest; that its laws are not primary and fundamental, and must therefore be liable to change in the advance of its science.

It has no general principles, it is said, for the common foundation of its body of doctrine. Such a foundation is certainly essential for a safe and permanent superstructure. Has, then, our generation done anything in laying down these fundamental laws? Now, it must be admitted, that as a department of biology, it can only have an essential basis in life. As Professor Virchow emphatically remarks, "what is necessary for all branches of the great medical science in common is the *comprehension of life.*" So that until life itself is defined, the prime factor in medicine remains undefined. But if life cannot be directly apprehended by medicine, the processes and results in which it is manifested are all more or less tangible to science. It is now thought of less as a property of certain organs or tissues (as in Bichat's 'tripod of life') than as an indefinite force underlying the whole organism. If it cannot be defined as a physical force, it is practically as a physical force that it is seen working in the body. Medicine has, then, undeniably a scientific basis of elementary law and structure in pathology, which explores as physical processes all the deviations and aberrations of life. Again, to quote Professor Huxley, "pathology is a branch of biology—it is the morphology, the physiology, the distribution, the etiology of abnormal life." And, further, "pure pathology is that branch of biology which defines the particular perturbations of cell-life, or of the co-ordinating machinery, or of both, on which the phenomena of disease depend." This study, which shows what the 'disturbances of the body' are in themselves, in the cells and tissues and function of the part involved, is a definite and positive foundation for the science of medicine: and in laying this foundation in broad deep lines, much can be shown to have been done in this generation.

Every question in medicine presents three steps. First, What *is* the disease?—a question of pathology. Next, How is it made known during life? what are its signs and symptoms?—a question of semeiology. And lastly, How is it to be treated?—a question of therapeutics. In all these studies absolutely scientific progress has been made in our time; in all law and order have increasingly prevailed; and while there are abundant signs of crudity and imperfection in modern doctrine, there is much that can be counted upon as positive knowledge. There is not a disease of which we do not know more than did our fathers.

In *pathology*, our generation has been signalized by the promulgation of Virchow's great doctrine—*omnis cellula e cellulâ.* More or less directly, it has been the seed-truth of the largest portion of recent progress. Great and important in itself, and in its influence upon biology generally, it has little less than revolutionized pathological study. It strikingly illustrates the

essential identity of medicine with biology, and is, indeed, a biological law first demonstrated in the department of pathology. It is one of those fundamental laws which, once proved, are established for all time as an axiom of science. By its advent, vague theories of disease were displaced by a basis of demonstrable fact. Assumptions of "dyscrasiæ," or of "nervous irritability," which were supposed to explain the phenomena of disease, were dispelled; and the reign of pathological anatomy as the efficient explanation of morbid processes was universally acknowledged.

This reign has been prolific of all good for the advancement of medicine. The ultimate structure of the tissues and organs in which disease prevailed was exposed, and the very form-element often determined. A distinct structural basis was given to our knowledge which yielded a precision and definiteness such as no other conception could. If not the disease itself, it was certainly the morphological result of the disease. A world of new light was thus thrown upon the clinical recognition of morbid processes. Forms of disease which were semeiologically indistinguishable, but pathologically distinct, were discriminated and individualized. Specific varieties of the same type of disease were recognized from their commencement and distinguished throughout their course. Many constant phenomena previously remarked were strikingly elucidated. Large and important classes of morbid processes hardly recognized hitherto were clearly demonstrated. What are termed the "new growths" and the "degenerations" are practically the pathological gain of our time. The processes of every disease have been investigated with almost unexcepted increase of our knowledge. And its influence upon prognosis is still more remarkable. Indeed, it may be said that, in spite of the great advance in clinical study, prognosis has been absolutely dependent upon pathological anatomy for certainty and definiteness. The Prorrhetics of the school of Cnidos, and the Prognostics of Hippocrates, seem almost to have anticipated all progress up to this era of pathological study. It cannot, perhaps, be said to have advanced semeiology by supplying it with new signs for the recognition of disease, but it has given exact interpretation of signs observed. Pathological anatomy and semeiology are not synchronous, but are separated by the point of death.

But it has always been felt that, great as is the advantage of this idea of disease, and fundamentally correct as it may be, it does not explain some of the most essential phenomena. It discloses clearly the seat of disease, determines its structural element, but only shows the active process by inference and deduction. The working of the disease in life is only seen by its effects in death. And these effects do not afford adequate

information respecting important questions. Much of the morbid process is left quite in the dark. There is certainly more in disease than can be seen through the microscope. So the question comes, Is it not possible to get nearer to the essential disease. Can it not be observed at work in the living structure?

Considerations of this kind have of late years appeared to turn back the finger on the dial of medical philosophy to the ancient doctrine of humoral pathology, which seeks for the causes of disease, or at least its very first effects, in the fluids of the body. This doctrine cannot displace the anatomical study of pathology, but will rather be superimposed upon it. And although it may be essentially the faith of early medicine, it necessarily wears an aspect of the feeling and knowledge of our own day. But it is probably less a revulsion from the purely cell-and-tissue teaching of pathology than a partial manifestation of a subtle change which appears to be at present stealing over the entire spirit of medicine. This may, perhaps, be shortly expressed as a change from a spirit of analysis to a spirit of synthesis or constructiveness. In every department of modern medicine the analytical method has for some years past been supreme. Every question has been divided and subdivided until its essential part has been reduced to a mere vanishing point. In pathology varieties and differences have been described almost beyond count. A definite type of disease has been split up till nothing of its typical form is left. In the search for the morbid element the substantive disease has been lost. In diagnosis symptoms have been refined and signs exaggerated beyond all recognition. Diseases which consist in the association and correlation of a certain group of symptoms have lost their identity in an excessive predominance given to a single pathological sign. Therapeutics has been in principle reduced to the treatment of one or two urgent symptoms, and in the absence of any very definite symptoms to no treatment at all. Now, there is of course no question that the analytical method is the true and indispensable means of scientific investigation. Its domination in medicine has been simply a reflection of the times. The great and rapid progress of physical science excited in this kindred study a like spirit of inquiry. The use of instruments of scientific research, chiefly the microscope, stethoscope, and thermometer, gave to it a definite physical basis it greatly needed. And so habituated has it been to look at disease exclusively through these media, that it can hardly recognize anything that is not also purely physical. There can be no doubt that to this spirit the immense progress of recent times is chiefly due. No other method of investigation

could have done so much for medicine or have given to it such positiveness. But medicine is more than investigation of disease merely, and after the puzzle has been taken to pieces to see what it consists of, it has to be put together again. So that a more constructive spirit has of late years passed over medicine in its every part. It seems to have been felt that the purely analytical method of study is not adequate for all the requirements of medicine. In laying stress upon certain parts of a disease, it lost sight to a great extent of the whole. The conception of the disease was lost in the prominence given to certain symptoms. Such prominence may be just and natural in the relation of these symptoms to others. But the disease itself is something more than symptoms—more than any number of symptoms together. It is rather the action and reaction of the "vital powers" upon the morbid lesions than any mere collocation of symptoms. And of this aspect of disease, the analytical method, with its efficient means of physical investigation, took little or no note. It is something beneath the signs and symptoms with which this mode of inquiry busied itself. Thus there seems to have arisen in later years a disposition to regard disease in a larger and more comprehensive manner; to view more prominently the relation of morbid tissues and functions to the organism generally; to emphasize less the variations than the constitutional form of the disease; to recognize in some way or other the indefinable "life" which is hardly known to pathological anatomy. From such a synthetic spirit of study the revival of the humoral pathology, which is the mood of latter-day medicine, appears to have sprung. This doctrine restores pathology to clinical research, from which it was practically divorced by the anatomical study of disease. And if they can be united in practical investigation, a greater boon could hardly have been conferred upon medicine.

Hitherto, therefore, recent progress in pathology has been due almost exclusively to microscopic study. Organic chemistry has not probably realized the expectations it excited some years ago; and although its researches are regarded with hope in reference to pathology, it seems hitherto to have occasioned some disappointment. Pathology has doubtless received substantial and important aid from this science, but on the whole it seems rather to be travelling away from than drawing near to chemistry. Only the ultimate results of morbid processes can as a rule be recognized by chemical tests too far removed from the processes themselves to throw much light upon them. Their application to pathological conditions is also so ambiguous that no safe deductions can be drawn therefrom. To physiology chemical

inquiry has rendered far more assistance. Again, from therapeutics pathology has received little aid. This is presumably on account of the backward state of our knowledge of the operation of drugs. If a definite physiological action could be with common certainty attributed to a drug, and the mode of estimating its action clearly known, therapeutics might cast much light upon morbid processes. From one or two modern instances of this character such elucidation seems to be a promise of the near future. One might look for considerable aid, more or less direct, from physics, till it is remembered that in philosophical order pathology is a refinement of physiology, which itself takes upfrom physics that which it needs for its study and research.

Speaking broadly, it may probably be said that the great advance of our time in pathology consists in the establishment of a basis of elementary morbid lesions occurring in every organ and part of the body. This also appears to be derived from the large constructive spirit that has been noticed as prevalent in the medicine of to-day. The same morbid processes are seen in different structures of the body, with primarily the same effects. The effects are modified only by the function, and character of the tissue, of the part involved. These processes are the primary operations of pathology. The abnormal increase of connective tissue in the structure of any organ, for instance, ends in contraction, compression, and obliteration of the structural elements, with consequent loss of function. Inflammation occurring in any tissue leads to effusion, extravasation, and suppuration. All the elementary processes of pathology may be seen in different tissues and organs producing the same effects. Only the effects are manifested in a manner peculiar to each part. Embolism in the brain and in the lung causes in both a suspension of function, which is declared in the one by paralysis, in the other by dyspnœa. With the same fundamental lesions the disease is the same essentially, although wholly distinct in appearance. And since the great bulk of disease can be resolved into these fundamental processes, there is constituted a scientific and durable foundation for pathology, which is of the highest value and significance for philosophical medicine. The importance of such a constructive process can hardly be exaggerated, and all recent advance seems to develop along these lines. Diseases of different organs, which, until these essential elements were demonstrated, appeared to have nothing in common, are now seen to be results of the same process. Thus, a great tendency may be observed at work towards the codification and unification of disease, and the resolution of complex forms into the simplest elements. It is the spelling out of disease in the very alphabet of pathology.

Among these general pathological processes inflammation must

always take the first rank, both from the frequency and extent of its occurrence and the importance of its effects. It has always been in the annals of medicine a chief object of study. And it is remarkable, as showing the limitations of histological research—that with positive means of study the positive itself is not always attained, or that there is much more in pathological study than mere observation—that in our time theories have chased one another across the pathological stage on this well-studied subject. Just as Virchow's doctrine based upon his cellular pathology, superseded all previous theories, so Cohnheim's views have later still supplanted his.

Pathology as a science has also made in late years a great advance in the discovery of the microphytic origin of certain specific diseases. The very fact that this class of disease is specific, always presenting the same phenomena, shows that there must be a cause also specific, single, and organic. This cause has been sought for in air, earth, and water, in the products of putrefaction, in the fluids of the body affected, and in a general theory of *contagium vivum.* And in a demonstration of this theory, it has at length been found. Several of these affections have been shown to be caused by the development of minute organisms within the system. It is affirmed that septicæmia has been traced to *septic bacteria,* relapsing fever to the *spirilla,* ague to the *bacillus malariæ,* leprosy to the *lepra bacilli,* tuberculosis to the *tubercle micrococcus,* splenic fever to the *bacillus anthracis,* while the condition termed "chyluria" is caused by a nematoid known as the *filaria.* The fatal "wool-sorters' disease," which has so long baffled inquiry, has been demonstrated to be due to the *bacillus anthracis,* conveyed in the hair of animals that have died from the same cause, and communicated in the process of sorting. The multiplication of such organisms in the blood, and their consequent aggregation in the spleen, supplies a satisfactory explanation of the salient phenomena of this class of disease. It is naturally inferred that other affections of this type have a like origin, although it has not been as yet disclosed by investigation carried on by the light of these discoveries. Further inquiry, however, has elicited much of the greatest interest. It has been shown in one case at least that while the constitutional disturbance may be to a great extent attributed to the process of propagation of these organisms in countless myriads, a lethal virus is formed, which may be isolated, and produced even in a solid form. This substance, free from the bacteria which gave rise to it, produces the characteristic effects of the disease in the course of which it was formed. Similarly a substance has been obtained which induces all the effects of simple fever. Here then is *materies morbi* isolated and in very

substance. The part which the minute organisms play seems from all analogy to be that of a ferment; but in any case they are probably the efficient cause of the disease.

The question, of exceeding interest and importance, whether these divers micro-organisms are modifications in any manner of one primary root-form, or are of entirely specific growth, has been a discussed of late with great acuteness, and confirmatory experiments have been adduced on both sides. If not of identical descent, they are undoubtedly closely allied one to another. These studies are all due primarily to M. Pasteur, whose researches have yielded so much immediate material profit that one thinks of him as of the orange tree standing in all the glory of blossom and fruit at the same time. His address was as fascinating in the unerring sequence of experiment as in the unbounded prospects of preventive medicine foreshadowed, and the masterly unravelling of some of Nature's most occult secrets. Well might Mr. Simon say in his address to the Section of Public Medicine: "Never since the profession of medicine has existed, has a field of such promise been before it." Apart from the immediate value of such researches as these, and the light they throw upon kindred questions, they are of the highest import for scientific medicine.

But besides the advance which pathology has made of late years in great movements like these, there has been steady and substantial progress in the sedulous and laborious study of every form of disease. It would be obviously quite out of place to mention them here in detail. In one or two directions, however, the spirit of recent pathology is so well illustrated that they cannot be altogether omitted. This is strikingly the case with nervous diseases. A generation ago but little was known of the pathology of these affections. They were supposed, in great part at least, to be fundamentally variations of an immaterial principle, as "nervous irritability," and to have little basis in tissue changes. But as, one after another, morbid lesions were found for divers affections, nervous diseases were gradually brought into the common domain of pathology. Structural changes in the nerve-centres have been traced in all respects similar to general changes elsewhere, and with the same results of altered function. And these changes have been connected with certain signs by which they are recognized clinically. Thus, paralysis and convulsions, formerly regarded as distinct diseases, are now recognized as symptoms occurring in a variety of affections of the nervous system. And although neuro-pathology is still behind other parts of the science, it has at least established the great point that its basis is to be sought in organic changes of tissue substantially identical with morbid changes in other parts. Even in psychological medicine insanity has been so far demon-

strated to be the result of definite cell-change as utterly to disprove the idea of an immaterial basis. There are still "functional" diseases and "neuroses" in which no tissue-change has been seen which is not rather the effect than the cause. But with constant research, the efficient cause is so frequently found in some distinct lesion that it seems doubtful whether there is such a thing as purely "functional" disease. Cerebral physiology itself is too ambiguous to afford much aid. Indeed, in view of the specific characteristics of man, physiology can only prosecute much of this study in the field of medicine. Even if "mind" is nothing but the "aggregate of the functions of the brain," and "'will' the resultant of these functions," physiology knows very little of it. But in no department of pathology has so little progress been made as in what are termed the general diseases of the system. And this would seem fairly attributable to the intensely localizing tendency of recent research. Diseases of the blood elements have received, however, certain definite explanation. Gout, in the study of which, from the time of Sydenham, English medicine has always been pre-eminent, has been strikingly elucidated in its chemical results, though but slightly in its pathological processes. Diabetes has been beautifully studied as a question of physiology, but little as a disease. Of tetanus, chlorosis, and scrofula, little more is known than the descriptions of Hippocrates tell. It may be that in some development of humoral pathology as now understood these secrets lie hidden.

In days when the comparative aspect of all kinds of science is so well studied, it appears strange that in pathology it has been neglected. In view of the physiological solidarity of man and animals this method seems bursting with promise on every hand, especially in affording a distinction between "natural" and "acquired" disease. Also in the simpler and more easily determinable habits of food and life of animals, relations between faults of diet and hygiene, and their results in morbid changes, can be better traced. The necessity of broad and elevated views of medicine at the present day is forcibly suggested by the observation of Dr. Wilks, that philosophers (particularly Buckle) have long since remarked this gap in medical science. So fruitful and extensive does this field of research appear that it may be safely said that the lecture of Sir J. Paget on "Elemental Pathology," one of the earliest studies in this direction, will ever remain one of his most classic works.

In the study of the *signs and symptoms* of disease great and wide progress has been made in our generation. It, too, has received untold benefit from the anatomical mood of pathology which till lately so exclusively prevailed. A definite value and explanation have been given to symptoms, and signs of disease have received their true meaning. A direct effect of disease has been observed

as the natural centre for a group of symptoms, which, without such explanation, were isolated and unintelligible. But this mode of pathological study has so multiplied lesions that clinical observation is at a loss to give them due recognition. Also many important elements of disease are unread by merely anatomical research ; and, on the other hand, some of its most definite lesions have little semeiological import. Thus, in recent years, broad, constructive processes have been extensively at work. While local lesions have been clearly defined, the "constitutional" effects have been more observed; and these effects, always recognized as they have been by signs to which a purely empirical value was attached, are now measured with the certainty of scientific observation. "If men could be satisfied with pure knowledge, the extreme precision with which in these days a sufferer may be told what is happening, and what is likely to happen, even in the most recondite parts of his bodily frame, should be as satisfactory to the patient as it is to the scientific pathologist who gives him the information" (Huxley's Address). The relations of the topical disease to the whole system are thus determined, which is usually the main inquiry in each case. In great measure also it may be said that what used to be termed the "vital powers" are thus estimated.

Essentially constructive processes of this kind, determining the effects of a morbid condition upon the system generally, are the schemes of investigation represented by the stethoscope, ophthalmoscope, thermometer, and by urinoscopy. The study of disease by these means, if not of our generation only, has been elaborated and formulated in our time to an extent undreamt of by their authors. They note the relation of the morbid lesion to the life, how far the local or specific element of disease has affected the general powers of the system. No case of disease can be thoroughly known without the employment of these instruments. There is thus constituted a broad basis of medical knowledge which is common to every form of disease. And a certainty and precision is afforded to certain signs which must in all cases be inquired into, but which, before the use of such means, were the most vague and undefinable in medicine. By urinoscopy, for instance, the tissue-waste of the body is estimated with precision by the amount of urea excreted. The presence or absence of each of the multifarious constituents of the urine has a definite pathological significance, while the occurrence of abnormal substances positively diagnoses disease. The position of albuminuria in present teaching illustrates recent progress in laying down this broad semeiological basis. In place of the three varieties of kidney disease to which first Bright attributed it, a large number of widely differing conditions are recognized in which it is seen. These conditions vary from some

compatible with perfect health to others indicating the gravest organic lesions; and although of special significance in local disease, it occurs so generally in all serious affections as to constitute an invaluable test of constitutional derangement. Similarly, the stethoscope, complemented by the sphygmograph, reveals, with almost the clearness of ocular demonstration, the condition of the thoracic organs, and traces its relation to disease of other parts. Thus, the state and force of the respiration and circulation are defined with a certainty which must always be important with such essential factors in a question of disease. The use of the ophthalmoscope, both in special and general medicine, is probably the great triumph of this generation. It brought a new world of disease to light, and placed the eye in the hands of surgery as completely as any accessible part of the body; while the remarkable tolerance of surgical interference evinced by this organ, and the simply physical character of the function of the greater part of its structure, have given to surgery some of its happiest and most certain results. But now the physician has taken up the instrument, and employs it for the recognition of constitutional disease, which can often be detected in these delicate tissues earlier than in other parts of the system. A special value has also been attached to the observation of the retina from its anatomical relations, as almost a simple expansion of the brain substance. Again, the application of the thermometer, if more restricted in its scope, yet affords a wide range of observations of the most definite character, which are full of instruction in every variety of disease. Both in diagnosis and prognosis it is frequently indispensable as the basis of a correct opinion; and many affections have a typical thermometric scheme, which at once declares their character and progress, while deviations from this type evince the intensity and dangers of the attack. Electricity also materially contributes to this more precise determination of the general effects and conditions of disease; and other means, of smaller and more limited scope, assist to build up a broad basis of semeiology. This is of the utmost value to medicine, since it supplies a positive estimate of the vital powers and of the constitutional relations of local disease, which are fundamental factors in every case, and could otherwise be only vaguely guessed. These relations were noticed by Dr. M. Raynaud in his paper; when speaking of Pasteur's latest experiments, he asks, "What is this 'receptivity' which M. Pasteur brought about? What is it at bottom, if not that force of resistance which exists in every living being, differing according to the species, and also according to the individual? Is it not, in the main, the same thing as the *vis medicatrix naturæ*? Whatever we may say to it, it is one of the dominant forces of medical science. This force of vital

resistance, this more or less receptivity of the disease, will be always the indispensable auxiliary to the doctor. . . . . The incomparable difficulty of our art is the necessity of apportioning a just share to this element in the cure of disease." No case of disease can proceed far without encroaching upon the powers and functions of the system at large; and they must be included in any correct estimate of the case.

This progress in the definition of the signs and symptoms of disease may be described as progress in purely clinical research—*i.e.*, in the first and most essential function of medicine. It is the recognition of the morbid processes during life, and the determination of their import. But it is more than the interpretation in life of pathology. If, on the one hand, pathology has disclosed lesions for which clinical study had to find the name and place of a disease, the latter study recognized affections of which pathology knows nothing. Thus, in our day, it has differentiated certain essentially distinct "continued fevers," and observes "clinical" varieties of the same pathological disease, which are for all practical purposes distinct. This alone would vindicate medicine from any charge of want of scientific life.

In *therapeutics* our generation has witnessed a notable step in advance. Probably the most important step of its history, it may also be apparently ascribed to the analytical spirit which has possessed medicine for some time past. It consists in the substitution of a definite physiological aim in a remedial measure for the vague observation that "it does good." The one is of course the action of scientific, the other of empirical, medicine. Instead of administering a drug because general favourable results have been remarked from its use, a distinct purpose to induce a distinct physiological effect has been adopted. This principle is the necessary result of the clearer definition of disease and of the action of drugs. When the aggregate of symptoms presented by a disease was analyzed, one generally assumed a causal relation to the others which singled it out as the object of therapeutic attack. Or, again, the urgency of certain symptoms, or the irremediable character of the essential lesions rendering other treatment of no avail, gave a purely symptomatic aim to the entire plan of treatment. The principle of this method is, that no true progress in therapeutics can be made if more than one drug is employed, since a favourable result can be attributed to no single drug—so that only a single drug is to be administered for a single intention. And where no definite therapeutic indication can be observed no drug is to be used. This is the modern justification of "expectant" treatment. But disease is seldom a single pathological condition, with a single essential symptom,

which a single remedy can relieve. And the latest tendency in therapeutics is rather to revert cautiously and partially to the combination of remedies, still following pathological indications, but not submitting the whole plan of treatment to a single dominant symptom. And this tendency may be plausibly referred to the more constructive or synthetic mood which seems of late to have come over medicine. It may be well illustrated in the modern treatment of consumption, which, graphically described by Hippocrates, and prominent among the diseases of all ages, has ever reflected the ruling spirit of the time. In place of the sedative treatment, which sent sufferers to a moist, relaxing climate, like Madeira, a stimulating and bracing plan of open-air life is adopted, in cold breezy places like the Engadine. The former was the treatment of symptoms—*e.g.*, the cough, which was much relieved by the warm, moist climate; the latter is the treatment of the essential disease, by improving the constitutional powers. Of the value of the one-drug treatment of disease there can be no doubt, nor that it is strictly scientific and has largely contributed to the advance of therapeutics. It is essentially the definite basis of therapeutics, and in appropriate cases gives the chief successes of medicine. But where disease is a complex condition, the treatment must also be complex. And even when a single cause can be defined, its effects and results give to the affection a complex character.

The essential aim of therapeutics may be stated as being the induction of a physiological process for the remedy of disease. The more nearly this induced process assumes a definite chemical or dynamic form, the more positive and direct is its action. And recent advance has greatly tended towards the statement of many therapeutic problems in chemical or mechanical terms. At the same time, the influence of the nervous system is so constant and direct in every process of the body, that these problems must always be distinctly physiological, and cannot be stated as purely chemical or mechanical. Its very constancy, however, practically neutralizes this nervous element as an interrupting influence in many cases, by its presence alike on either side of the equation, both in cause and effect. But if therapeutics has been thus simplified in one direction, it has made use of more complicated physiological processes in another. Some of its most certain and remarkable effects are obtained by acting upon the nerve-centres in the brain and spinal cord by which these effects are normally induced. Nervous influence is thus subordinated to, in place of disturbing, therapeutic plans. Very striking in this connection are the results which Dr. J. Chapman obtains by the precisely localized and measured action of heat and cold upon the central nervous system. And as physiology seems fast to be

tracing more and more of the processes of the system to cerebral centres, a noble prospect for scientific therapeutics is disclosed.

This growing identification of therapeutics with physiology is also seen in the hygienic treatment of disease. Not only are hygienic measures used for general purposes of advantage, but distinct applications of hygiene are employed for a distinct physiological effect. Schemes of dietetics, for instance, are not only used with negative, precautionary aims, but with positive remedial intentions. By the prevalence of certain climatic conditions, natural or artificial, physiological states of the body are induced, and may be calculated upon as distinctly curative. Exercise may be so ordered that particular secretions and processes shall be stimulated, while others are unaffected. This mode of treatment has very largely displaced the use of drugs. It is not only simpler and more free from objection, but it is certainly more philosophical. A striking example may be mentioned in the treatment of mania of late, in which an enlightened and strictly enforced regimen has almost superseded "chemical restraint," just as the latter itself superseded mechanical restraint. It is noteworthy also that physiological therapeutics has greatly diminished the expectation of, if not the desire for, specifics. The definite action of a definite remedial measure has all the characters of a "specific," except ignorance of the mode of its operation.

It is worthy of note that against general specific diseases, as the exanthemata, therapeutics has produced no definite remedy. In these, if in any disease, with a single specific cause, it might have been expected that specific treatment would have been found. The antiseptic wave of thought that has spread over present-day medicine has suggested the use of "internal antiseptics" in diseases of this class. Salicylates, sulphites, quinine, and carbolates have all been used with this aim. This theory has also been supported by the bacterial origin of some of these affections, which has recently been demonstrated. In such a case these drugs are distinctly used as "germicides." But although a certain success has attended their administration, it has not been so marked as to class them in any way as specific remedies, or even to afford much confirmation to the principle upon which they are given.

The advance of chemistry has produced some new remedies of importance. These, however, have not been derived from its "organic" section. Nor has any connection been traced between the chemical composition of the essential principle of a secretion and a chemical remedy. Chemical stimulants and depressants have been demonstrated for every organ, but they have been explained by no law of chemical or physical constitution. The rule established by Rabuteau, that the therapeutic energy of

soluble metallic salts is in direct ratio with the atomic weight of the metal contained in the salt, suggests probabilities of the enunciation of such laws in the future. In many ways this is full of philosophical promise in therapeutics,

It cannot be said that electricity has been as successful in the remedial as in the diagnostic section of medicine. Yet much greater expectations were at first entertained of it in the former than in the latter. Its seeming analogy, if not identity, with the vital energy, and the demonstration of its presence in the organs of the body, gave strong ground for such hope. The subject has been well investigated, and a very precise code of electro-therapeutics has been established; and clear results of considerable value have been obtained. But, on the whole, the feeling seems to be one of disappointment with regard to its influence upon disease. And the most recent progress has, perhaps, tended still further to curtail large anticipations of benefit to be derived from its use, at the same time that it more clearly and positively defines the good of which it is capable. It has certainly been shown that whatever "life" may be, it is not electricity. It cannot, therefore, be expected that electricity will take a much higher place in medicine if it is simply a physical and not an essentially physiological force.

Within late years important advance has also been made in the principles of administration of drugs. The first axiom is, of course, that they should be applied to the part they are designed to effect as directly as possible, or, as Prof. Huxley graphically puts it, "to introduce into the economy a molecular mechanism which, like a very cunningly contrived torpedo, shall find its way to some particular group of living elements, and cause an explosion among them, leaving the rest untouched." By the subcutaneous injection of the active principle of drugs, which is a recent improvement, the effect is more localized, producing less constitutional disturbance than in administration *per orem.* Moreover, the remedy acts more quickly, gets sooner into the general circulation, and avoids the risk of decomposition before absorption, which is incurred by admixture with the digestive fluids. The inhalation of suitable substances by smoking in a pipe or cigar is another illustration of the principle of the direct application of remedies. Physiology has cast such doubt upon the absorbing power of the skin as greatly to restrict external treatment by lotions and ointments.

Mention may here perhaps be best made of the employment of anæsthetics, which has formed a special study of our time. A great number of chemicals have been used more or less extensively, and their physiological effects closely compared. A certain, albeit infinitesimal, number of deaths while the patient has been

under the influence of anæsthetics, has given warning of an element of danger attending their use. But, small as this fatality may be, it is alarming as being a risk expressly introduced by surgery for no immediate surgical purpose. And chloroform has hitherto had to bear the brunt of this discredit. By the method of "mixed narcosis"—the subcutaneous injection of narcotics before the administration of the inhalant—a smaller quantity of the latter is required and happier results obtained. The more correct principle of "local anæsthetization," in which the disturbance of the system is avoided, has been successfully adopted by means of the freezing effect of the ether spray. But the physical and mental quietude induced by inhalation must always keep for it a place in appropriate cases.

There is no philosophical distinction between medicine and surgery. It is a distinction of art, not of science. Special mention of surgery, therefore, would hardly be necessary here, if it had not itself made remarkable scientific progress, and communicated to its twin-art impulses of great importance. It is commonly observed that the tendency of modern surgery is to become more conservative—that is, to dispense with the knife and rely more upon the recuperative and compensatory capabilities of the body. In this it has distinctly approached medical practice, and the line of demarcation between the two branches of the healing art is decidedly becoming more and more faint. While surgery, on the one hand, is falling back to a greater extent upon the ordinary powers of the system, medicine, on the other, is tending towards the adoption of manipulative measures. There are many diseases under the care of the medical side of the art, in which slight operative procedure is commonly required. Whole departments, both of study and practice, take up an intermediate position, one foot on medicine and one on surgery. Obstetrics and affections of the eye, ear, larynx, and skin, all are of this character. And in the general study of disease the two branches are inseparably blended. This is well seen in the instruments which late years have brought forth. The aspirator, for instance, for the removal of fluids from cavities without an opening being left, is as much used in "medical" as in "surgical" cases. In fact, as the object of all instrumental means, both of diagnosis and treatment, is to bring within manipulative reach diseased structures, such an artificial distinction must gradually disappear in the progress of the art of medicine.

By the invention and improvement of means of this kind, our generation has made much disease of internal structures to be seen, felt, and handled. Thus there has arisen a large body of special knowledge and practice around many organs. The eye, ear, larynx, for instance, have respectively a peculiar art and

science. And it is not to be expected that pecialisms of this character will die out of medicine. As the study of each organ increases in extent and profundity, and the treatment of its diseases and defects in complexity and delicacy of procedure, special talent and culture will always be recognized. The specialism of learning, not of art, is to be deprecated in medicine. In the essential identity of its science in every department is the integrity of medicine maintained. Recent progress in the "special" developments of practice has been sound and sure, in so far as it has traced its researches upon common pathological principles—a fact forcibly suggested by the discussions of the various Sections of the Congress.

In "conservative" surgery, the first thought is naturally directed to the conservation of the blood in operations. This is effected in a variety of ways. Operations are performed upon limbs from which almost every drop of blood has been forced back into the body by Esmarch's bandage. In vascular structures the same object is realized by the use of the *écraseur*, or a knife heated by galvanism. Modern jealousy concerning the loss of every drop of blood, compares strikingly with former practice, which employed bleeding to subdue or prevent inflammation attendant upon operations. Another development of conservative surgery of late years is in the excision of diseased joints, for which at one time the whole limb would have been condemned. By this means an arm or leg has been preserved with a degree of impairment of movement which renders it only less useful than the pre-diseased limb. The most happy circumstance in relation to this conservatism in surgery lies in the fact that it has sprung from straightforward and natural progress in principle and detail, rather than from any great discovery, or "wave of feeling,' or brilliant advocacy of genius. It indicates the greater reliance upon the restorative powers of the system which now obtains, and the disposition to rule each case by the condition of the patient rather than by any hard and fast rules of art. Few things so emphatically attest the integral and fundamental advance of surgery.

Subcutaneous operations—*e.g.*, section of bones and ligaments—is also a development of such conservatism. This mode of operation, however, introduces another great principle of modern surgery—viz., the rigid exclusion of the surrounding air from the wounded surfaces. The fact that noxious elements are commonly present in the atmosphere has enforced the universal adoption of antiseptic measures. Whether they are minute organisms or not is a matter of keen discussion, which divides both theory and practice. The affirmative, as adopted particularly by Lister, entails the employment of most elaborate

and multifarious means to ensure the exclusion of these morbific bodies; while those who adopt the negative are content with neutralizing, if not destroying, any possible septic poison by the simple application of antiseptics to the wound. The philosophical spirit in which this question is discussed is bright with promise for the future of surgery. The response of appeals to practice is somewhat oracular, and may be readily interpreted as favourable to either side. Experiments under simpler conditions than can be obtained in the body, concerning the action of bacteria upon the animal fluids, decidedly corroborate the idea that they are the active agents in the production of putrefactive processes in wounds. Pasteur, and lately Tyndall, have certainly proved that bacteria induce decomposition changes in liquids containing organic matter, which, when kept free from bacteria, remain unchanged for any length of time. But since it is admitted that the healthy tissues have a resistant power which precludes the development of these organisms in or upon them, such experiments suggest a caution how conclusions derived from an artificial experiment are transferred to the natural processes of the body. To that extent the question is still *sub judice*. The point up to which substantial agreement subsists is, that the use of antiseptics renders innocuous certain poisonous matters which are met with in a wound exposed to the air. The effect is practically the same. if the purification of the air is attained by thorough sanitary measures. This is strikingly seen in the comparison of the results of the antiseptic treatment in English and in German hospitals. In the former, the best statistics of the most complete antisepticism are hardly better than those of ordinary practice, because the sanitation of the wards is so efficient. In some of the largest and best known German hospitals, on the other hand, the most eminent surgeons had almost given up operating, because "hospital diseases" were so rife on account of inefficient sanitation. And here the use of elaborate antisepticism, as practised by Lister, at once abolished these diseases, and restored to the operator his art. Professor Volkmann's address seemed unable to exhaust the praises of antisepticism in surgery. He said, "By rescuing from the domain of chance the results of our labours, as far as they depend on operations and the treatment of wounds—and this will always remain the chief and especial work of surgery—the antiseptic method has elevated surgery to the rank of the latest experimental science. Never has a discovery been made in surgery which has even approached this in its benefits to humanity in general." And further on, "To-day we may say, with the deepest conviction, that the surgeon is responsible for every disturbance which occurs in a wound; that it is his fault

if even the slightest reaction or redness is developed in it, or if an amputation is not healed by first intention." So that the great boast of surgical progress is, that it has well-nigh eliminated from the prospect of every case the accidental and extraneous forms of disease which not only imperil the very life, but at least check and modify the process of healing so as greatly to impair the results of the operation. Under the protection of efficient sanitary measures and antiseptics, the surgeon is enabled to plan his line of procedure undisturbed by any menace of danger which is not directly involved in the operation itself.

Since, therefore, the natural processes of healing are more within the command of surgery, operations of an increasingly formidable character have been carried out. Operations which were a generation past denounced as fatal and not to be thought of, now confer life and health and comfort upon thousands. The mortality has greatly diminished, and the operative art has taken up a definite and scientific position which was previously unknown to it. Such triumphs of surgery are simply too numerous to name in this place. Perhaps the most striking of them are the extirpation of deep-seated and important organs, such as the pancreas, spleen, kidney, and thyroid gland; and even, in cases recently reported, the removal of six inches of the stomach and pylorus by the great surgeon Billroth, and of three feet of the small intestine by a Strasburg surgeon, both with perfect recovery. The formidable operation of cutting for stone is now practically abolished by an elaborate method of crushing and removal *per vias naturales*. An organ so thickly beset with the most delicate anatomical and physiological relations as the larynx, has been more than once successfully removed, and an artificial substituted for the natural voice-organ. Wounded joints, which would no long time ago have condemned the limb, are now freely opened, and successfully treated. But in nothing, perhaps, is this bold advance better shown than in abdominal surgery—operative procedure in which has always lain under the ban of being the last desperate resource. Now, men talk of the singular tolerance of surgical injury which the peritoneum shows. The successful removal of ovarian tumours is a triumph second to none in the history of surgery, and uterine tumours are fast submitting to surgical prowess. The oft-quoted calculation made by Lord Selborne concerning the operations in this class of disease of one surgeon only—Mr. Spencer Wells—may be repeated, as it so strikingly exhibits the benefits surgery may confer. He said that by the first 500 cases 10,000 years had been added to the lives of European women; and Mr. Spencer Wells has since stated that his succeeding operations had, upon the same data, given 10,000 more. Another kindred

advance of modern art, as scientific if not as important as those above mentioned, is seen in plastic surgery. The operation of skin-grafting is in the best spirit of surgical science; and the transplantation of the cornea of a recently removed eye to replace the dimmed cornea of disease, is a more remarkable instance of the same character.

In the various "special" departments of surgery like progress has been made. The mechanical skill and spirit of the age have given to medicine instruments which have created a new science for many parts. The ophthalmoscope for the eye, the laryngoscope for the larynx, the otoscope for the ear, have placed these organs practically in the hands of the surgeon. Thus disorders are directly seen and treated, and faculties are restored and preserved, which would previously have been lost. But with this increasing cultivation of specialism, the integrity of medicine is maintained by the greater recognition of broad scientific principles as the only true basis in every speciality. They are refinements of surgery, and not in any way independent of it. All real progress has demonstrated the more clearly the essential oneness of local affections with those of the system at large. The character of recent progress in medicine is therefore well seen in this point also—viz., a greater precision of diagnosis, combined with the reduction of its multitudinous distinctions to broad fundamental principles.

β. Even a very slight and fragmentary notice, such as this, of our generation of medicine, proves incontestably that it has increased by the truest and most essential form of growth—that of organic and symmetrical development. It has been a growth of its own science by its own inherent powers. Its claim to the status of a living science is therefore demonstrated; and the very completeness and extent of this growth renders unnecessary any protracted notice of the increase of medicine by the assimilation or the mere accretion of material borrowed from without. It would also lead into matters too purely technical. Yet these two modes of growth are so essentially a part of the real progress of medicine, and mark such substantially distinct powers of its life, that they must not be altogether unnoticed.

The bulk of the material taken up by medicine from without is necessarily in a state of constant change. Some of it is gradually transformed until it becomes part and parcel of the very structure of medicine. Other portions are rejected as superfluous. While a considerable proportion preserves the condition in which it was first employed, and is neither on the one hand adapted for use, nor on the other thrown off. It is interesting to trace in certain things the various processes of assimilation, as the vitality of medicine changes them from the simple form in

which they are first taken up to the final stage of absorption. There is thus no precise line of demarcation between the various processes, and they are to be seen in all stages. But the broad rule presents itself that where material adopted from without is so modified and altered to fit it for its new service as to have apparently become a very part of the tissue of medicine, it may be said that it has been assimilated. If such a mode of growth is not of so high an order as that of self-development, it yet attests the possession of faculties which are the attributes alone of a science of independent organization.

The great mass of the means and material of medicine is in this condition of more or less complete assimilation. Its life is too restless and earnest to allow any promising addition to its power to lie for long untouched. No sooner is such a matter taken up than a close inquiry is instituted into its worth, and adaptations and modifications quickly follow. A new drug is brought into notice and tested, and if of any value is speedily put into various forms and used in many diseases. An instrument is devised, and if approved by experience, its principle is modified and applied in a hundred ways. A theory floats in the air, and is found to cast light upon dark spots, and soon receives little alterations which illuminate obscure corners and odd crevices. The antiseptic theory now so prevalent is frequently appealed to for explanation of all manner of problems, and thus receives a different aspect—now bacterial, now chemical, now humoral—to give colour to its divers applications. In this class, therefore, are to be placed those drugs which have been tested and approved, the action of which has been satisfactorily investigated. And in this direction considerable progress has certainly been made of late years. The ideal mode in which such knowledge is to be obtained, is of course as a physiological experiment—a certain drug has a certain effect, and this effect is desiderated in certain affections. But although this scientific method has been employed occasionally, as by Fraser in the therapeutic use of Calabar bean, and by Lauder Brunton in the case of amyl nitrite, the chemical effect is more often first observed empirically, and afterwards explained by scientific inquiry. There can be no doubt, however, that the former is the true method of therapeutic science, and it must increasingly prevail in the advance of medicine. The isolation of the active principle of a drug is also a decided approximation to scientific precision, which increasingly obtains. The clinical gain, however, is by no means beyond doubt in many cases, since the entire drug is often seen to act with more advantage than the simple alkaloid, even when the alkaloid is practically the therapeutic power of the drug. Whether this is due to the chemical

or molecular condition in which the active principle is present in the plant, or to the modifying influence of other slightly powerful substances, is not clear. There are many cases, for instance, in which cinchona is preferable to quinine, and nux vomica to strychnia.

Regarding the source of recent additions to our list of drugs, it is noticeable that while the vegetable kingdom supplies the great bulk of them, the animal kingdom which used to be the favourite repertory of medicaments has almost entirely disappeared. Chemistry has of late years given us most important remedies, and is certainly rich with promise of more. It has not, however, succeeded in the hope, once so freely expressed, of manufacturing substances of known chemical composition, such as quinine, by the short and direct processes of the laboratory, in place of the expensive and tedious method of plant growth. Nevertheless, its most recent researches still encourage such a hope.

In the enlightened practice of hydropathy a great power has always been recognized, but it cannot be said that its therapeutic function has as yet been established. Even in Germany, where baths have been most freely and extensively used in the treatment of disease, no clear rules for their employment have been developed. Their operation is so very complex, materially affecting all the processes of the body, that no very definite physiological indications of their remedial value have been forthcoming. The undisputed power they have must, however, preserve for them an important place in future therapeutics.

Gymnastics as applied to medicine has been examined with renewed care of late years, and striking results have been obtained; quite distinct from its beneficial effect as exercise, or the culture of physical powers, it has a decided remedial value in many affections. Many nervous and muscular disorders, and others in which it would seem that the main defect is in the controlling power of the brain, are certainly benefited by such treatment. Often the brain can be thus educated so as to establish a normal functional action in the place of one that is aberrant or altogether wanting. As a child learns to walk, or an aphasic again to speak and write his mother-tongue, so can the same process be often adopted with advantage in cerebral affections by what may be termed the somatic education of the brain. At all events, there is clearly a power in gymnastics which cannot be left unemployed in the progress of medicine. And as the ancients philosophically taught, there is, akin to this power, a beneficial effect in music upon certain disorders which is now and then in our day asserted with substantial proof.

Climatology is another study which has of late received a special medical development. As yet, however, little more than suggestions, probable but not demonstrated, have been derived from this source. But in view of the great and immediate influence of climatic conditions upon disease, and of striking circumstances in the mode of appearance of certain types of disease, which are also obviously determined by climatic conditions, it seems unquestionable that many secrets of the causation of morbid processes are involved in this study. Industrious and elaborate investigation has as yet, however, only yielded negative results. Barometric, magnetic, and hygrometric observations have all been more or less silent as to the origin and prevalence of disease. Certain thermometric limits have been traced, outside of which some diseases—*e.g.*, yellow fever—do not appear. But these even have not been at all explained. Residence at certain altitudes has been proved to be of great benefit in some lung affections, but it has not been proved whether this is not more due to the Arcadian conditions of living and the purity of the air, than to the slight reduction of barometric pressure in the atmosphere. The artificial production of rarefied and condensed atmospheres has, however, been successfully employed, chiefly in Germany, in respiratory affections. And the results have been so favourable that it would seem that only the cumbrousness of the instruments (large chambers into which the patient goes bodily, or miniature, but not at all small, gasometers) has prevented its general adoption.

In a mechanical age like ours, medicine has necessarily made substantial progress in the production of instruments of research, diagnosis, and treatment. Never before were instruments of such scientific precision and complexity employed in its service: and the purpose for which they are designed is almost uniformly as strictly scientific. There is hardly a function in the whole economy which may not be more or less definitely and positively measured by means of instruments of precision. Without them medicine could have no determinate knowledge of, or power over, disease.

γ. The last of the three modes of growth in medicine that have been here recognized is that of accretion, or the simple taking up into its body of certain materials from without, and effecting but slight, if any, modification in them. They are tested and approved, but are employed in the simple condition in which they were first taken up. Except, then, as an essential process in medicine, this mode of increase needs but little notice. Under this head are to be found all the items of the progress of medicine which are not included under those pre-

viously noticed. And while it is, perhaps, only to be distinguished from growth by empiricism by a certain, if indefinite, scientific knowledge of each particular matter, it is none the less a fundamental condition of growth in medicine. It is the stage of probation through which all material has generally to pass before absorption; or rather, it is the stage in which additions to the body of medicine, that have been proved of value, remain without further development. It comprises drugs which are used with beneficial effect, but to which no particular place or value in medicine has been assigned. Methods which have been employed with advantage, but have not received a distinct medical function to discharge; instruments of decided utility, but which have not been adopted as part of the regular procedure of practice; theories which look very like truth, but have not been positively demonstrated. The great characteristic of this category is its state of incessant flux and change. New material is constantly added, old and superfluous thrown off; some developed into completely assimilated part of medicine, others simply confirmed, but unmodified, unadapted. As it may be said to be the zone in immediate contact with the outer world, it is the part of medicine which first feels the impact of external influences. It thus receives new impulses from all the cognate sciences, and is affected by every prevailing wind and doctrine of the scientific world. Upon the sensibility and vigour, therefore, of the faculties which are exercised in this form of growth, medicine must largely depend for extraneous support. And happily it has never had such free intercourse and intimate relations with the outer world, or been less shackled by pedantic and artificial restrictions.

Speaking generally, then, it may be said that the broad tendency of our generation of medicine has been constructive or synthetic in contrast with the infinitesimally analytical spirit of its earlier years. The prevalence of pathological anatomy as the dominant influence in medicine so divided and subdivided disease as utterly to confound any general scheme of classification, and its definiteness and clearness discredited the vague ideas and knowledge of therapeutics. But with the advance of physiology and the development of medicine, due greatly to physiological means of investigation, wider and deeper principles were given to every branch of its study, In pathology the great mass of disease has been reduced to a basis of elementary morbid lesions, modified only by the function and structure of the organ in which they appear. In semeiology the measurement of the extent of impairment of the vital processes supplies the basis for a definite estimate of every case of disease. In therapeutics

general constitutional treatment increasingly supplants the tinkering of one or two symptoms only. And when the affection can be resolved into a single radical symptom, the remedy often attains the positiveness and completeness of a physiological demonstration; while still broader principles of hygiene frequently supersede entirely all other therapeutic measures. And there can be little doubt that therapeutics will increasingly become less a matter of drug-administration and more of physical and mental hygiene.

Another great tendency of recent medicine is towards a thorough and comprehensive system of prophylaxis. It recognizes more and more that its care is for health as well as disease, to prevent as well as to cure. It traces the beginnings of disease in more or less avoidable violations of the conditions of health. And naturally this tendency must grow till it becomes the largest and most important part of medicine. It ought obviously to rule every stage of life, from the beginning to the end. Even before birth it can watch over and influence the new life through the mother. There is not a state or condition of existence in which it has not both warning and protection to offer against incidental evils. It is indisputable, for instance, that an immense amount of disease, infirmity, and misery would be avoided if medicine were given its due place in marriage questions. By the recognition of certain elementary rules of life, constitutional taints of disease may be held in check or altogether eradicated. Nor will the most punctilious observance of common health laws be too irksome or onerous as they gradually become almost the first part both of the education and conditions of existence of even the poorest citizen.

In what is termed "public hygiene" results of the most striking and important character have already been obtained. Even by the rudimentary practice of sanitation, which yet alone obtains, the most terrible forms of disease have been banished from amongst us. The plague and leprosy have practically disappeared in every civilized country. From the same cause other diseases have assumed a much milder form. The virulent type of dysentery which Sydenham described has gone, and surgeons of our own time speak of the mitigated form in which syphilis prevails as compared with their earlier acquaintance with it. With efficient sanitary manners, of which those now in use are but the alphabet, diseases caused by specific poisons, as small-pox, typhoid, hydrophobia, &c., will in all probability entirely disappear. In relation to sanitary police, diseases range themselves under two heads, those having an adventitious origin extraneous to the body, and those arising from causes within and pertaining to the human

system. And as the knowledge and practice of hygiene advance, the former class of diseases must be greatly diminished and their virulence mitigated, and in some bright future perhaps they will be wholly exterminated. And it is to this class that the greatest mortality has always been attributable.

Nor can there be any doubt that a true hygienic code of living contains the promise of longevity. And since it directly tends to the conservation of the natural vigour and functions of the body in the individual, it would follow that its culture by the community at large would also improve the national health and promote its length of life. As yet, indeed, the prolongation of the average term of life in the nation is due rather to a certain reduction in the infant mortality than to an actual addition to the average life. The large number of deaths of children under the age of one year has been, and in many parts of the country is now, absolutely scandalous. Their diminution is always among the first achievements of a scheme of public hygiene. In all conditions of life, however, vice and dirt must be ever the prolific source of disease. Moreover, the higher tension of a more crowded and restless age must of necessity generate disease of special types. The new demands which the development of civilization makes upon human energies and faculties, will also give rise to new affections, until, at least, the body becomes habituated to the new conditions of existence. And as the diseases we attribute to the aggressions of civilization upon man's powers are insidious and progressive, they are often chronic and intractable. But since in such cases the causation is usually directly traceable, the remedy, whether prophylactic or curative, will also be direct and positive. They need not, therefore, affect our hope of a future of better health and less disease. The fact that hereditary diseases change their form in descent from generation to generation, shows that they arise from a subtle faulty condition of the constitution, which can be combatted by prophylactic medicine alone. And as few people are free from some lurking tendencies to a special disease, the advantage in the aggregate of efficient hygienic culture must be incalculable. In no way can a generation do so much for its posterity as by transmitting to it impulses of better and longer life.

Such prospects as are thus opened up for medicine are of the noblest and most important character. They clothe it with the dignity of the guardianship of at least the physical future of the human race. It is however, with this development of medicine that the intensely realistic spirit now prevalent is least fitted to deal. With so much of science it has too little philosophy. Emphatically as the science of medicine may repudiate all animistic views of life, its art must practically recognize them in

some sense as representing a force in addition to, if not independent of, the definable forces of man's nature. Even if it is regarded merely as the aggregate, the focus, of other known physical forces, it is, as such only, different and distinct from them all. And probably no admonition could be more timely and pertinent in the present mood of medicine than that of the venerable Helmholtz, of Berlin (*Brit. Med. Journal*, Aug. 1878), "Our generation has suffered under the influence of spiritualistic metaphysics; the coming one will have to be on its guard against materialistic philosophy."

---

## ART. VII.—DEAN STANLEY.

1. *Christian Institutions: Essays on Ecclesiastical Subjects.* By ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY, D.D., Dean of Westminster, Corresponding Member of the Institute of France. Second Edition. London: John Murray. 1881.
2. *Church and Chapel, Sermons on the Church of England and Dissent.* Edited by the Rev. R. H. HADDEN, B.A., Curate of St. Botolph, Bishopsgate, with Introduction by ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY, D.D., Dean of Westminster, London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1881.

THESE two works are amongst the very latest of the many productions of their accomplished and lamented author. The first, indeed, is the last volume which he gave to the world, and the Editor of the second informs us that the share which the Dean had in it occupied him within a few days of the illness which removed him hence.*

"'Each human soul,' as the Dean remarked in his sermon on the death of Lord Palmerston, 'gifted above the souls of common men, leaves, as it passes away from this lower world, a light peculiar to itself. As in a mountainous country, each lofty peak is illumined with a different hue by the setting sun, so also each of the higher

---

* *Vide* Prefatory note. Subsequently to the publication of "Christian Institutions," the Dean published in *The Edinburgh Review* for April an article on "The Oxford Movement and the Life of Bishop Wilberforce," and another in *Macmillan* for August on "The Westminster Confession." We have seen it stated that the last literary work in which he was occupied was a short critical article on the late F. W. Robertson, which will appear in an early number of *Scribner's Monthly Magazine*. The same impression of *The Times* which contained the obituary notice of the Dean contained also an article by him on the Revised Version of the New Testament, which must have been one of his last compositions.

summits of human society is lighted up by the sunset of life with a different colour. Whether the difference arises from the materials of which it is composed, or from the relative position it has occupied, a new and separate lesson is taught by it of truth or of duty, of wisdom or of hope.' "*

Many are the lessons which may be learned from the life and character of the remarkable man who has just been taken away from us; but it is far too soon to attempt to draw out these, or to form any judgment on the influence on his day and generation of this distinguished ecclesiastic, writer, and orator; or on the effect of his loss on the future of that party within the Church Establishment of which he was the head; but while heartily joining in the almost universal tribute of veneration and respect for his memory which his death has called forth, we avail ourselves of the opportunity which the publication of his latest utterances gives (which, independently of his lamented decease, we should probably have availed ourselves of) to bear once more our testimony against the illogical, inconsistent, and morally indefensible position of the Broad Church party itself. In so doing, we shall speak of the illustrious dead—as it is always our aim to do, whether of the dead or the living, with perfect frankness, but we hope also with the deepest admiration and even affection, so far as affection can be felt for one with whom we had not even the slightest degree of personal acquaintance—for a character to apply to the Dean himself, his own favourite quotation from his much-loved master, "rich in the combined and indivisible love of truth and goodness."†

It has been truly said of the Dean that—

"Though a man of such broad sympathies, and so accustomed by instinct and habit to see the soul of good in things evil, he was nevertheless a man who never flinched from combat when that seemed to be required. He was a gallant knight-errant, who was almost always at the head of a forlorn hope; but the soul of bravery dwelt in that small and delicate body, and it was combined with personal endurance whenever duty made its demand."‡

Some seventeen years ago we had the good fortune to witness a memorable—perhaps the most memorable—instance of the Dean's chivalry; when, like another Athanasius, he stood up *contra mundum*, in the Lower House of "that curious debating society called Convocation," to plead the cause of law and justice,

* "The Oratorical Year Book," 1865, p. 324.

† We have seldom heard the Dean preach or read any of his publications but the sermon or the writing contained this quotation.

‡ By the Rev. J. Page Hopps, at the Great Meeting, Leicester, in a sermon on "The Teachings of Dean Stanley."

assailed in the person of the man whom he called "the despised and persecuted Bishop of Natal." The lapse of time which has occurred since that event has not dulled our recollection of the pleasure and admiration with which we listened to the speaker. The fire and energy of his delivery as a debater—very different to his quiet but ever impressive manner as a preacher—made us wish that such debating power might find its appropriate place in the House of Lords; and as there are yet bishops in that House, we regret that one was never amongst them whose voice, whenever lifted up, would have been lifted up in the cause of wisdom and justice.

Many as are the works by which the Dean is known to the world, few even of the reading world know how voluminous a writer he was. Twenty years ago the list of his publications, mostly sermons and occasional pamphlets, filled many pages of the catalogue at the British Museum. Since that time his contributions to reviews and magazines have been many. Not a few of these he has given to the world in a separate form. It is to be hoped that a careful selection from the remainder will be given us by whoever he has trusted with his papers. His greater works will ever remain among the treasures of British literature, not only for the poetical charm of his style, which made him, after Macaulay's removal, the greatest living master of the English language—a place now filled, to our minds, by Cardinal Newman; nor merely for "the fascinating eloquence, diversified learning, and picturesque sensibility," which even Lord Beaconsfield, in his studied attack on the Dean, admitted he possessed;* but chiefly for their display in every page of that "love of truth and goodness" which was the passion of his life. Amongst the biographers of his age he stands above all his fellows unrivalled. His "Life of Arnold," without any of the faults and vulgarities of Boswell's "Johnson," has all its merits, and it possesses a quality which we can no way so well describe as in Macaulay's celebrated phrase: "The peculiar charm which belongs to the narrative of the disciple whom Jesus loved." The love of the master and the scholar was as great as it was mutual. In the deeply interesting sketch Mr. Augustus J. C. Hare has given us of the cousin "whose life was long interwoven with his own," there is a letter from the Dean's mother, in which she tells her sister that "Dr. Arnold always felt that Arthur took in his ideas, received all he wished to put into him in the true spirit and meaning, more than any boy he had ever met with. Mrs. Arnold always delighted in watching his countenance when Dr. Arnold was

* Speech at Oxford, Nov. 25, 1864.

preaching."* It is, in fact, Stanley's intense love for Arnold that has led to the suspicion, often expressed, and still more often felt, that the Arnold of the "Life" is not the Arnold who lived and moved at Laleham, Oxford, and Rugby, but a transfigured and idealized Arnold; and looking at some of the instances of sternness and harshness of opinion and conduct which the "Life" and the still more imaginative portrait by Mr. Hughes soften but cannot hide, we are led to believe that this suspicion has its foundation in fact.

As a word-painter of historical scenes he more nearly than any other writer of our time approaches the supreme excellence of Macaulay. The account of the last days of Edward the Confessor and of the consecration of Westminster Abbey, in that† which, perhaps, of all his works, next to the "Life of Arnold," shows that labour of love which springs from the writer's deep interest in and devotion to his subject, is not unworthy to be compared with the Trial of Warren Hastings, or the Landing of the Prince of Orange; and the sketches of the battles of Cressy and Poitiers‡ can only be excelled by those of the siege of Londonderry, and of the battles of Sedgmoor and Killiecrankie by the older and greater master. Students of the Old Testament will ever feel indebted to the author of "Sinai and Palestine" and the "Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church" for his vivid descriptions of scenery and events, which much facilitate the right understanding of the sacred text. Nor will the student of the New Testament be unwilling to admit his obligation to the "Sermons and Essays on the Apostolical Age," and to the "Critical Notes and Dissertations on the Epistles to the Corinthians," though no less an authority than Dr. Martineau—whom the Dean truly calls "the most refined and venerable of Unitarian ministers"§—pronounces that work to be inferior to that of the Dean's friend and colleague, the Master of Balliol, inasmuch as Dr. Jowett has striven, not unsuccessfully, to bring before his readers the Apostle Paul as he really was while yet amongst men, while the Dean has, perhaps unconsciously, endeavoured to reproduce him as a Christian of the nineteenth century.||

---

* "Arthur Penrhyn Stanley." By Augustus J. C. Hare. *Macmillan's Magazine*, Sept., 1881, p. 360.

† "The Memorials of Westminster Abbey."

‡ In "The Historical Memorials of Canterbury," which, according to Mr. Hare, "of all his books was perhaps the one that gave him most pleasure to write"—*ubi supra*, p. 365.

§ "Church and Chapel," Introduction, p. 37.

|| In "Studies of Christianity." We quote from memory, but we give faithfully Dr. Martineau's meaning, though not his words. In reference to Dean

We cannot dismiss the Dean's writings without referring to one not, we think, generally known—his "Lecture on the Study of Modern History," addressed to a London audience mainly composed of clerks, shopmen, and warehousemen. It is a model for any who wish to gain the power of interesting an audience—uneducated or half-educated—on a subject on which it is difficult to engage their attention. Four courses were, he said, open to him: he might view the subject through, so to speak, the eyes of a great age, or a great event, or a great man, or a great place; "some scene where great events have been performed, where great men have lived and died, where by the thousand threads of local associations, we are insensibly brought within the recollections of the past, and introduced into its very presence . . . ." "and here," he continued, "I feel sure that you will anticipate me in the selection of the place which I shall take as my instance. Whatever might be the mode by which I should enforce or illustrate the study of modern history elsewhere, *here* I can have no doubt that it ought to be by the study of London."

Those of our readers who are familiar with Stanley's "Arnold" will not fail to remember the combined lessons in history and geography which Arnold was in the habit of giving to his pupils.* In like manner, Stanley, in this lecture, combined in a forcible and vivid sketch the topography of London with the history of the events of which it has been the scene. He concluded in a manner peculiarly his own:—

"When I think of the overwhelming greatness of this city, when I look upon the faces of the rising generation now gathered before me, it is impossible to believe that the noble works of modern history are finished. There are still needed, and there may be still achieved, for London and for England, good deeds, as vast in dimension, as grand in design, as abbey or cathedral that ever yet was raised. Out of the vast masses of your and our poorer brethren, through the examples and exertions of those I am now addressing, the true Temple and Church of God must be built up and renewed amongst us. In that great work may you and all of us be enabled to bear a part, by those only means which, under God, can accomplish it—by those only means which history and revelation alike enforce upon us—by hope and

---

Stanley's "Sinai and Palestine," a most valuable elementary book for schools and young persons has been taken from it, and published by Murray under the title, "The Bible in the Holy Land."

* "Arthur finished his studies at home with an analysis of the Peninsular battles, trying to understand the *pro* and *con* of a battle."—Letter of Mrs. Stanley, *Macmillan*, p. 362. See "The questions which every one ought to ask himself if he wishes to understand anything about any battle whatever." "Battles of Cressy and Poitiers," *ubi supra*.

humility, by patience and forbearance, by the energy of Christian faith and the comprehensiveness of Christian love."*

What the home influences were which surrounded Stanley we know from the brief memoir of his parents, which is among the most interesting of his biographical sketches, and the reminiscences of Mr. Hare.† His mother we take to have been what William Wilberforce called his own mother, "a Christian of the Archbishop Tillotson School." The archbishop, we know, was one of the great objects of her son's admiration. She was a woman of great intellectual powers, and in the true meaning of the word "educated" her children, especially on historical subjects; "encouraging them to form their own opinions, and to have theories as to how such and such evils might have been forestalled or amended."‡ His father, seemingly without feeling any strong call to the ministry, had taken orders and the family living of Alderley. His eldest brother filled the office of Whipper-in to the Liberal Party; and, probably through his influence, Lord Melbourne, then Premier, most unexpectedly to Mr. Stanley, offered him the See of Norwich, vacant by the death of Bishop Bathurst, after a tenure of, if we recollect rightly, nearly half a century. Through his old age and its consequent infirmities, Norwich was then one of the lowest and most Bœotian of English Sees. In the course of a not very long episcopate Bishop Stanley raised it to one of the best governed of our dioceses.

From his father Arthur Stanley learned those Whig principles which years afterwards enabled him to declare that he was a "Whig of the Whigs and a Liberal of the Liberals." In breadth of religious sympathy and a desire for the widest possible religious communion, the son resembled his father. Bishop Stanley's recognition of the dreaded Unitarians as members of the one household of faith led to his being charged with being a "Socinian," This, however, did not prevent him standing up along with another Whig prelate—Bishop Maltby, of Durham—in defence of that memorable measure of peace and justice, the Dissenters' Chapels Bill, against the furious and bigoted opposition of Bishops Blomfield and Philpotts. From him the Dean derived that hatred to the stringent form of subscription to the articles and formularies of the Established Church which

* The lecture was delivered to "The Young Men's Christian Association" in Exeter Hall, January 31, 1854, and published by James Nisbet & Co. In its separate form it has, we think, long been out of print. In any collection of the Dean's writings it is to be hoped that it will be included. As an illustration of the Dean's habit of repeating himself, conf. the peroration quoted in the text with that written twenty-one years later, of the sermon on Lord Palmerston—*ubi supra*, p. 328.

† "Memoir of Edward, Catherine, and Mary Stanley."

‡ *Macmillan*, p. 355.

was compulsory on all candidates for ordination until 1865. To the unconcealed disgust of the Primate, Archbishop Howley, Bishop Blomfield, and others of his brethren, Bishop Stanley used to present petitions for a relaxation of the burden of this obligation; and, on one occasion, if not on more, he formally brought the subject to the attention of the House of Lords, in a speech which his son has preserved in the volume of his father's charges and addresses, which he long ago published.*

When the practical operation of this subscription was brought before the Bishop, he showed a dexterity in dealing with the matter which reminds us of a celebrated passage in Pascal's letters,† and of some of the subsequent proceedings of his son. The Bishop had appointed to a post of ecclesiastical importance a clergyman in his diocese and a Canon of his Cathedral, whom he valued both as a man and a clergyman—the late Charles Wodehouse. Some forty or more clergymen remonstrated against the nomination, on the ground of the objections which Mr. Wodehouse had expressed to the pseudo-Athanasian anathemas. "The course which the Bishop took," continues his son, "is worth recording. He refused to receive their memorial, unless each one of them separately stated the sense in which they accepted the questionable passages. They retired; and it need hardly be said that the memorial was no more heard of."‡

The clergyman here alluded to, "the gentle, genial spirit who was for years the soul of the Norwich close," was another of the liberalizing influences which affected the youth and early manhood of Arthur Stanley:—

"Without brilliant or powerful qualities, no one," says the Dean, "more completely represented the best characteristic type of an English clergyman. He was, first, a thorough gentleman, inside and outside, to the heart's core and to the fingers' ends, combining much of the old-fashioned courtesy of other days with the easier, freer movement of our own time. With this was united a deep, tranquil religious fervour, coloured visibly, though not exclusively, by the Evangelical revival of his earlier days at Cambridge, not uninfluenced either by the burning zeal of the great Quaker family, whose chief pontiff, Joseph John Gurney, resided close to Norwich, and with whom Mr. Wodehouse lived on terms of affectionate intimacy."

---

* "Addresses and Charges of the late Edward Stanley, D.D., Bishop of Norwich." London: J. Murray.

† "'Tell me pray'—said Pascal to his Jansenist friend—'if you admit the *proximate power.*' He smiled and replied coldly, 'Tell me yourself in what sense you understand it, and I may then inform you what I think of it.'"—"Provincial Letters," Letter I.

‡ From the Dean's sketch of Mr. Wodehouse, reprinted in "The Athanasian Creed," p. 99, *et seq.*

This excellent person, while he was still very young, was forcibly struck by the subscription to the articles and formularies required of those who would become clergymen. "Three points in particular seemed to him especially indefensible. The form of absolution in the visitation service,* the address to priests in the ordination service, and, above all, the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed. . . . . . From a very early period in his clerical life he set himself to obtain some redress of this grievance.' His efforts were without success. . . . . He used to say to a friend [the Dean is evidently the friend alluded to] "My dear——, I have no genius; I have no scholarship to fight this battle. I have only one weapon, and that is the resignation of my preferment." So long as Bishop Stanley lived he would never allow Mr. Wodehouse to use that weapon, but the Bishop died, and the Canon, "after a struggle of nearly forty years, ultimately resigned his ecclesiastical position and preferment, and with it the home and sphere in which else he might have lived and died, useful to all around him, and beloved and honoured to the end." We have referred at length to this departed worthy of East Anglia to "point our moral," and in order to contrast the course he pursued with that taken by the Dean, who held similar, or even stronger convictions, on the same and other kindred subjects. Had Stanley followed the course taken by Wodehouse, his ecclesiastical position would have been lower, but his moral dignity would have been almost immeasurably enhanced. We must briefly allude to one other point of coincidence between Bishop Stanley and his son. Both held in contempt the clerical pretensions, whether episcopal or sacerdotal, of which of late years we have heard so much. The Bishop, about the years 1842—3, was selected to preach at St. Paul's the anniversary sermon of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. We had the privilege of hearing him. He availed himself of the occasion to pour in no measured terms his scorn and contempt on the idea of "the Apostolic Succession," which within a few years had been refurbished and brought out by the Tractarian leaders. He spoke of the idea that the orders of the clergy have come down to them "through a long and doubtful series of Arian and Popish Bishops," quite in the spirit, and almost in the words we have quoted from Macaulay, and which he attributes to his converted coal-heaver or tinker.†

* Which, as Cardinal Newman in his "Apologia" has shown to be taken, *verbatim et literatim*, from the form used in the Roman Church. For the Dean's views on this subject, *vide* the Essay on "Absolution" in "Christian Institutions," p. 131.

† In the well-known passage in his Essay on Ranke's "History of the Popes."

When Stanley went to Rugby, he came under the predominant influence of his life. "Thenceforward," says a writer unfriendly to both master and pupil, "his best life blood was infected with Arnoldian poison." In the preface to his first important work he thus alludes to Arnold :—

"If there are fewer references than might have been expected to the name of one to whom, though not living, this, as well as any similar work which I may be called upon to undertake, must in great measure be due, it is because I trust that I may be allowed to take this opportunity of vindicating, once for all, for the scholars of Arnold, the privilege and pleasure of using his words and adopting his thoughts, without the necessity of specifying in every instance the sources from which they have been derived."*

Stanley derived his antipathy to clerical subscription to articles and formularies from his father and Canon Wodehouse. The influence, the example, and the sophistries of Arnold led him to adopt unsound notions as to the obligations involved in the act of subscription, and determined him to an evasive conformity. To justify this remark and others of a similar character, which we shall hereafter make, we must remind our readers of some of Arnold's expressed views on this question. The eighth of the Thirty-nine Articles is in these words—"The Three Creeds, Nice Creed, Athanasius's Creed, and that which is commonly called the Apostles' Creed—ought *thoroughly* to be received and believed ; for they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture."

And yet, in reference to this article, a man, in all other respects so sincere and so truthful as Arnold, could bring himself thus to write :—

"*I do not believe* the damnatory clauses in the Athanasian Creed, under any qualification given of them, except such as substitute for them propositions of a wholly different character. *But I read* the Athanasian Creed, and have, and would again subscribe the Article about it, because I do not conceive the clauses in question to be essential parts of it. . . . . I do not imagine that the Article about the Creed was intended in the least to refer to the clauses."†

We have heard it said that "Stanley had not an ounce of logic in his composition"; and, no doubt, there were both in him and in Arnold many deviations from logical consistency. Nothing can be more arbitrary and groundless than the two assumptions that the damnatory clauses are not essential parts of the Creed, and that the Article was not intended to refer to them. "They are," as Dr. Martineau has pointed out, "not only inseparably

* Preface to "Sermons and Essays on the Apostolical Age."
† Stanley's "Life of Arnold," vol. ii. pp. 120, 121.

interwoven with it, beginning, middle, and end, but logically constitute the substantive affirmation of the whole document of which the statement of the Catholic Faith is but a dependent and subordinate member."* And what reason is there to suppose that they are not referred to in "the thorough reception and belief" which the Article says ought to be given to the whole Creed, and his assent and consent to which proposition Arnold had given and was ready to give again.

Stanley, at the time of his ordination, was full of mental difficulties as to subscription, "overwhelmed," was his own language, "by considerations, not of difficulties of practice, but of subscription." His doubts were quelled, and his course decided by a letter from Arnold,† in which he defended—

"The acceptance of holy orders by men who cannot yield an active belief to the words of every part of the Articles and Liturgy as true" [on the ground that] "without this latitude the Church could by necessity receive into the ministry only men of dull minds or dull consciences; of dull, nay, almost of dishonest minds, if they can persuade themselves that they actually agree in every minute particular with any great number of human propositions; of dull consciences, if exercising their minds freely, and yet believing that the Church requires the total adhesion of the understanding, they still, for considerations of their convenience, enter into the ministry in her despite."‡

The logical retort to this, as has also been pointed out by the distinguished man we have before quoted, is this: "All clergymen must declare their full assent to the Articles and Liturgy: in doing this, they either honestly believe them throughout, or they do not; if they do, they are men of 'dull minds;' if they do not, they are men of dull consciences."§ It could only be under the influence of sophistries such as these that the author of "Christian Institutions" could have retained his offices and emoluments in the Establishment. But if, in this respect, Arnold's influence on Stanley was, as in the same respect the influence of Keble and Coleridge was on Arnold himself,‖ injurious to the simplicity and clearness of his conscience, it is the only respect in which Arnold's influence was injurious to him. From Arnold he learned "the great philosophical and Christian truth," which, to Arnold, seemed "the very truth of truths," and the reflection of which appears in every page of Stanley's writings—viz., "that Christian Unity and the perfection of Christ's Church are inde-

---

* Martineau, "Miscellanies," vol. i. pp. 65–79; and see vol. ii. p. 356. The whole exposure of Arnold's sophistries is well worth reading.

† *Macmillan*, p. 363. ‡ "Life," vol. ii. p. 173.

§ Martineau, "Miscellanies," vol. i. pp. 78, 79.

‖ "Life," vol. i. p. 21; "Martineau," vol. i. pp. 66, 67.

pendent of theological opinion; consisting in a certain moral state, and moral and religious affections, which have existed in good Christians of all ages and all communions, along with an infinitely varying proportion of truth and error."*

Stanley also derived from Arnold those views as to the literal inspiration of and the human element in the Bible which are indicated in Arnold's well-known letter to Coleridge:—

"Have you seen your uncle's letters on 'Inspiration,' which, I believe, are to be published? They are well fitted to break ground in the approaches to that momentous question which involves in it so great a shock to existing notions; the greatest, probably, that has ever been given since the discovery of the falsehood of the doctrine of the Pope's infallibility. Yet it must come, and will end, in spite of the fears and clamours of the weak and bigoted, in the higher exalting and more sure establishing of Christian truth."†

The development of these views will be found in the three sermons on "The Bible: its Form and Substance," preached by the Dean before the University of Oxford (now, we believe, out of print), in the Lectures on the Jewish Church, and in the very characteristic article on the "Revised Version of the New Testament," to which we have before referred.‡

When Stanley went from Rugby to Oxford,§ he came under other influences, especially of one not to him of so personal a kind as the influence of his father and Arnold, but which affected the University generally—that, namely, of John Henry Newman. We do not mean that Stanley was ever in the least degree one of Newman's disciples; but, being at the University, he could not escape the influence which that remarkable man exercised over it.

Mr. J. A. Froude, in his very interesting "Reminiscences of the High Church Revival,"‖ tells us that "the Church of England has travelled far since 1820;" and if his account of its state prior to that time be true, there was certainly a necessity for its locomotion.

"Religion," says Mr. Froude, "as taught in the Church of England, meant moral obedience to the will of God. The speculative part of it was accepted, because it was assumed to be true. The creeds were reverently repeated; but the essential thing was practice. People went to church on Sunday to learn to be good, to hear the commandments repeated to them for the thousandth time, and to see them

* "Life," vol. i. p. 359. † Ibid. vol. i. p. 358.

‡ *Times*, weekly edition, July 22, 1881.

§ Stanley won a scholarship at Balliol in 1833, and went into residence at Oxford in 1834.

‖ In *Good Words*, from Jan. to July, 1881.

written in gilt letters over the communion table. About the power of the keys, the real presence, or the metaphysics of doctrine, no one was anxious, for no one thought about them. It was not worth while to waste time over questions which had no bearing on conduct, and could be satisfactorily disposed of only by sensible indifference. . . .

"Doctrinal controversies were sleeping. People went to church because they liked it, because they knew they ought to go, and because it was the custom. They had received the creeds from their fathers, and doubts about them had never crossed their minds. Christianity had wrought itself in the constitution of their natures. It was a necessary part of the existing order of the universe, as little to be debated about as the movements of the planets or the changes of the seasons."

Into this quiescent state the leaders of the High Church Revival broke like thieves in the night.

"They were to tear up the fibres of custom by which the Establishment, as they found it, was maintaining its quiet influence. They were to raise discussions round its doctrines which degraded accepted truths into debatable opinions. . . . . Worst of all, by their attempts to identify Christianity with the Catholic system, they provoked doubts in those whom they failed to persuade about Christianity itself. But for the Oxford movement, scepticism might have continued a harmless speculation of a few philosophers. By their perverse alternative, either the Church or nothing, they forced honest men to say, 'Let it be nothing, rather than what we know to be a lie.' A vague misgiving now saturates our popular literature; our lecture-rooms and our pulpits echo with it; and the Established Religion, protected no longer from irreverent questions, is driven to battle for its existence amongst the common subjects of secular investigation."*

The tone of these remarks painfully reminds us of what Thurlow said to a deputation of Presbyterian divines: "Gentlemen, I am for the Established Church, not that I care for one —— religion more than another, but because it is the Established Church, and if you can get your —— religion established, I will be for that too."

Mr. Froude also gives us, amongst his experiences, some particulars of the *modus operandi* by which the leader of the Tractarian party converted him, the son of an archdeacon and the brother of another leader of the party, and whose early literary work was that of a contributor to the "Lives of the Saints," into the author of the "Nemesis of Faith,"† the hero of whom, on the eve of his ordination, thus gives vent to his feelings:—"So I may live to be like Burnet, or Tillotson, or Bishop Newton, or Archdeacon Paley. May I die sooner."

---

* *Good Words* for January, 1881, pp. 20, 21, 23.

† We believe this novel of Mr. J. A. Froude has long been out of print.

Newman himself evidently"—says Mr. Froude, and a similar observation has been made by Dr. Martineau* and others—"was early at a loss for the intellectual grounds on which the claims of Christianity to abstract belief could be based," and after describing the effect on himself and others of Newman's preaching, he continues:—

"Another sermon left its mark upon me. It was upon evidence. . . . I was something more than surprised when I heard Newman say that Hume's argument against the credibility of miracles was logically sound. . . . Hume goes on to say that he is speaking 'of evidence as addressed to the reason; the Christian religion addresses itself to faith, and the credibility of it is therefore unaffected by reason. What Hume said in irony Newman accepted in earnest. Historically, the proofs were insufficient, or sufficient only to create a sense of probability. Christianity was accepted by a faculty essentially different. It was called faith; but what was faith, and on what did it rest? . . . . I could not tell. . . . . To remove the foundation of a belief, and to substitute another, is like putting a new foundation to a house. The house itself may be easily overthrown in the process. . . . .' Revolutions are not far off when men begin to ask whence the Sovereign derives his authority. Scepticism is not far off when they ask why they believe their creed. We had all been satisfied about the Gospel history; not a shadow of doubt had crossed the minds of one of us; and though we might not be able to give a logical reason for our certitude, the certitude was in us, and might well have been left alone. I, for one, began to read Hume attentively, and though old associations prevented me from recognizing the full force of what he had to say, no doubt I was unconsciously affected by him."†

The 14th of July, 1833, the day on which Mr. Keble preached in the University pulpit his Assize Sermon "On National Apostacy," was, Dr. Newman tells us, always considered and kept by him as "the start of the Oxford movement." Stanley won his Balliol Fellowship in the November following; he was ordained in 1839, when already a Fellow of University. It was not until 1841 that Newman, to use his own phrase, felt "that he was on

* "Miscellanies," vol. ii. p. 346, *et seq.*

† *Good Words* for March, 1881, pp. 165–7. The sermon referred to is the sermon on "The Usurpations of Reason," No. 4 in Newman's "Oxford University Sermons," edition 1872. It was preached Dec. 11, 1831, about three years before Stanley went into residence at Oxford. The passage alluded to by Mr. Froude is at p. 60, and is in these words: "Hume, in his 'Essay on Miracles,' has well propounded a doctrine which he misapplies. He speaks of those dangerous friends or disguised enemies to the Christian religion 'who have undertaken to defend it by the principles of human reason.' 'Our most holy religion,' he proceeds, 'is founded on *Faith* not on *Reason*.' This is said in irony; but it is true as far as every important question in Revelation is concerned, and to forget this is the error which is at present under consideration:" and conf. pp. 185 and 195, 275, 276, of the same volume.

his death-bed as regarded his membership of the Anglican Church." Stanley, therefore, was at Oxford during all the time that Newman's influence was at its height, and Stanley was no doubt unconsciously affected by it. "The perverse alternative," to repeat Mr. Froude's phrase, "either the Church or nothing," was put to him, and as his was too powerful a mind to submit to Church authority, he was therefore exposed to what Dr. Newman regards as "the all-corroding, all-dissolving scepticism of the intellect in religious inquiries."* We think we can trace in Stanley's treatment of the question of miracles the working of the influence which Mr Froude describes as the result on him of Dr. Newman's startling announcement from the University pulpit, that Hume's argument against miracles was after all logically valid. Though it was made before Stanley went up to Oxford, its influence was still at work when his residence began, if indeed it can be truly said to have yet ceased.† Stanley's lectures on the Jewish Church, of which Mr. Hare justly boasts "that they have done more than anything that ever was written to make the Bible a living reality instead of a dead letter,"‡ amidst all their transparency of style, breadth of view, and the freedom of treatment of their subjects, are remarkable for the haziness and timidity with which the miraculous element in the Old Testament histories is treated. "The most advanced Biblical critic of 1820—the halcyon days, according to Mr. Froude, of the English Establishment—would, he tells us, have closed the "Speaker's Commentary" with dismay or indignation."§ And such a one would have regarded with the same feelings the freedom with which these lectures, again to quote Mr. Hare, describe "Abraham as a Chaldean Sheikh of the desert, Rachel as a Bedouin chief's daughter, and Joseph as the royal officers are exhibited in the Theban sculptures, and the free spirit in which the story of David is handled. But when a miraculous event is to be dealt with, the lecturer shows a reticence as remarkable as it is unsatisfactory. In treating of the Exodus, the reader is informed that the Israelites were on the other side of the Red Sea, but he is left quite uncertain how they came there. In the same lecture on Elijah (the masterpiece of the second volume), it is remarked "that Elijah was a man of like passions with ourselves; such is the view with which we ought to approach even the grandest of

---

* "Apologia," p. 379.

† The six latest of the University Sermons in which similar views are expressed were preached after Stanley came to Oxford, between 1839 and 1843. The first edition of these sermons was published in 1843.

‡ *Macmillan* for September, p. 365.

§ *Good Words*, February, 1881, p. 101.

the ancient prophets;" while of his recorded translation into heaven the Dean quietly observes, "In this inextricable *interweaving of fact and figure,* it is enough to remark how fitly such an act closes such a life. . . . . By a sudden stroke of storm and whirlwind, or as *we almost literally say* of the martyrs of old, by chariots and horses of fire, the servants of God pass away." In like manner in other histories we are left at a loss to know whether the Dean supposes the words "fire from the Lord," mean anything more than a common thunderstorm. Of the prophecy of Jonah, the Dean says that it is of unknown authorship, of unknown date, of disputed meaning, but of surpassing interest. The miraculous event in the story—the swallowing of the prophet by the whale—is thus treated:— "Higher and higher, higher and higher, the sea surges against them *like a living creature* gaping for its prey. The victim is at last thrown in, and its rage ceases." To give one other illustration. The lecture on Elijah contains this striking passage on the visit of the prophet to the widow of Zarephath, and the restoration of her son to life:—

"The horrors of famine, the shadow of the death-bed, are the divine conciliators of the deadliest feuds. In the history of the Church, no less than of the individual soul, man's necessity is God's opportunity for healing the widest differences. These reconcilements may be but for the moment; the iron grasp which has been forced open by those sudden efforts closes again. Yet the grasp becomes less tenacious. The end of the golden wedge has made itself felt. It was a true feeling of the Jewish Church, if it were not a true tradition, which saw in the restoration of the widow's son to life a pledge of the future that was to arise out of this double act of toleration."

What force are we to give to the words of "the restoration of the widow's son to life?" Did the writer mean to imply his belief in *the fact* of the restoration? or does he simply mean the narrative which records it? The lesson to be derived from "the double act of toleration" remains the same—whether or no the restoration of the child be a fact, or whether the only truth in the story was the hospitable treatment of Elijah by a Gentile woman in the hour of a common extremity.

"If the trumpet give an uncertain sound who shall prepare himself for the battle?" The pupils of an Oxford professor of ecclesiastical history had a right to a very certain sound from their instructor, to prepare them for what is one of the battle fields of religious warfare in this day—the credibility of the miraculous portions of the historical narratives of the Old and New Testaments. That certain sound, we, with all our admiration for Dean Stanley, confess he did not give, and he must in this respect remain classed amongst those thinkers and writers whom Archbishop Whately

called "Children of the Mist." One of our earliest and most brilliant contributors, he, in fact, who wrote the first article in the first number of the WESTMINSTER REVIEW spoke of another Oxford liberal divine in words which, *mutatis mutandis*, we do not hesitate to apply to Dean Stanley.

"He was a sound philosopher; but an unsound believer. He had more faith in the moral nature of man than in the three creeds. His writings are in a wise and lofty spirit; but they are not in the spirit of the Catechism and the Prayer Book. It is vain to blink the fact that the man was a heretic; and the heretic was too much of a true man to be fit for a Church of England dignitary, if we take the Church of England itself for a standard. Here is his weak point. The Church demands orthodoxy of all, especially of its dignitaries. Technically, the reply is good, that Dr. Stanley subscribed to the Thirty-nine Articles. But what is it morally? Dr. Stanley would have been a greater man had he renounced his offices in the Establishment and their emoluments. He might have risen to martyrdom; he only sank into his deanery."

To justify these assertions we rely on the Dean's last published volume, "Christian Institution," to which we now turn.

Dr. Newman once confessed that "freedom from symbols and articles is abstractedly the highest state of Church communion, and that technicality and formality are inevitable results of public confessions of faith." Arnold's dream, which Stanley shared, was that it was possible to reproduce in the nineteenth century this highest state "of Church communion, which was the result of the peculiar privilege of the Primitive Church." They seemed to have believed that it was possible now and in England to realize the "New Atlantis" as it appeared to the poetical imagination of Francis Bacon. There, we are told, Christianity was established by the unassisted teaching of a volume in which were written—

"all the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments. Although devout and learned above all other people, these mere Biblicists of the 'New Atlantis' were destitute of all tenets whatever on many of the subjects most insisted on among other Christians, such as original sin, baptismal regeneration, the efficacy of the sacraments, and the like;

* The contributor to whom we refer is the late Wm. Johnson Fox, once minister of South Place Chapel (Unitarian), Finsbury, afterwards M.P. for Oldham. The original of the passage we have adapted appeared under his well-known signature *Publicola*, in *The Weekly Despatch*, Dec. 19, 1847. It referred to the appointment of Dr. Hampden, Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, to the See of Hereford. It will be found reprinted in the "Life of Bishop Wilberforce," vol. i. p. 420, note. As to Fox's connection with the WESTMINSTER REVIEW, see "Autobiographical Recollections of Sir John Bowring," p. 73.

and they had never discovered in their language, nor attempted to invent any terms in which to define either the mysteries of the Divine Nature, or those of the human nature of the Divine Redeemer, or those of His real presence in the consecrated elements, or, in short, any theological system whatever.*

But Dr. Newman also owned that, however loth, her rulers were obliged to confess that the Church grew too old to enjoy the free, unsuspicious teaching with which her childhood was blest; and that her disciples must, for the future, calculate and reason before they acted."†

Hence, according to Dr. Newman, "the inevitable necessity for public confessions of faith and other formularies"—and hence also, we say, the impossibility of restoring in the old age of the Church the peculiar privilege of its first ages. If the views put forth in "Christian Institutions" could become generally prevalent something like the dream of "The New Atlantis" could be realized. The book was written, we are told by Mr. Hare, "chiefly to disabuse people of the fancy of Roman Catholic and High Church divines, that they can discover in the early Church their own theories concerning the Papacy, the hierarchy and the administration of the sacraments."‡ The key-note of the book is struck in the first paragraph of the Preface.

"Underneath the sentiments and usages which have accumulated round the forms of Christianity, it is believed that there is a class of principles—a religion, as it were, behind the religion which, however dimly expressed, has given them whatever vitality they possess. It is not intended to assert that these principles were continuously present to the minds of the early Christians, or that they were not combined with much heterogeneous matter which interfered with their development. But it is maintained that there is enough in them of valuable truth to give to these ancient institutions a use in times and circumstances most different from those in which they originated. If this be shown to be the case, the main purpose of these essays will have been accomplished. The sacraments, the clergy, the Pope, the Creed, will take a long time in dying, if die they must. It is not useless to indicate a rational point of view from which they must be approached, and to show the germs, which, without a violent dislocation, may be developed into higher truth."§

The fundamental proposition on which all these essays rest is "the total unlikeness of the first, second, or third centuries to anything which now exists in any part of the world—*i.e.*, the negation of primitive antiquity as one of the notes of the

* See Sir James Stephen's "Essays on Ecclesiastical Biography," p. 465. Edition 1875.

† Newman's "History of the Arians," Original edition, pp. 37, 38, 39. Pp. 41, 42, Edition 1871.

‡ *Macmillan*, p. 368. § Preface, p. 1.

Church. The Dean elsewhere enlarges this proposition in this manner—

"The Apostolic traditions and the records of the New Testament contain no such fixed form as any of these theories (*i.e.*, Roman, Anglican, or Puritan, on the sacraments, the clergy, and the creed) would demand; that if here and there we find the germs of that which was developed in later centuries into gigantic proportions, yet in the Apostolic age they coexisted in such a chaotic, uncertain, conflicting state, that any attempt to reproduce them now as they existed then, would be to evoke an apparition from which Roman and Presbyterian, and Independent and Anglican, would alike recoil with horror."*

Concurring generally as we do with the Dean's opinions on the subjects of the sacraments, the clergy, and the creeds, we cannot reconcile with common honesty the fact of any clergyman who holds these opinions remaining a minister of the Establishment, discharging the duties of his office, and receiving its emoluments. To justify this strongly expressed opinion, we proceed to compare the Dean's latest utterances, as given in these essays, with the doctrines and formularies of the Church of which he lived and died a minister.

The logical condition of the argument is thus clearly stated by Bishop Wilberforce, in letters to some of his clergy, whose teaching was inconsistent with the Church's standards:—

"The Church has defined her doctrines in her Liturgy and Articles. These definitions are to us the test of soundness. . . . The question for us is not, Are these doctrines true; but Are they the doctrines of the Church of England? . . . If *your* view of the truth is *not* the view of the Church of England formularies you have subscribed, you cannot, without an implied falsehood, which must put your soul in peril, bear the commission of a teacher in her communion."†

Independently of the special and more limited obligation arising out of the fact of subscription, there is the universal prior and paramount obligation in every man, be he lay or cleric, to say only the thing he truly means; that obligation is certainly enhanced in the case of a minister, "the instructor of the people's conscience and the messenger of their prayers." It is a misfortune, when the example and influence of men of ability and position like Stanley, tend to produce a state of things like that which existed in France prior to 1789; and which, to quote a well-known anecdote, a great lady thus complacently described,

* Introduction to "Church and Chapel," p. xxiv. Conf. Preface to "Christian Institutions," p. 6.

† "Life of Bishop Wilberforce," vol. i. pp. 405–407. The Dean ("Church and Chapel," Introduction, p. 33) says, "It has been too much the custom to regard the Church of England as chiefly represented by its Prayer Book and Articles." But who or what else represents the Church?

"our clergy, to be sure, are all perjured; but, then, how charmingly liberal."

The opinion that the sacraments, the clergy, and the creeds may entirely pass away out of the Church system has never before been so coolly expressed, and such a possibility so calmly contemplated by any clergyman, whether of High or Low opinions; and if, and when, they so pass away, what will remain of that Church which was the object of the Dean's passionate admiration? The first essay on Christian Institutions is devoted to baptism—"the oldest ceremonial ordinance that Christianity possesses; the only one inherited from Judaism." The form in which baptism is now administered has superseded the simpler "form of that in the name of the Lord Jesus only"—"the essence of the material form is gone."*

We turn to the "Order for the Ministration of the Public Baptism of Infants" in the Prayer Book, and we learn from the opening exhortation the object of the rite. It is "that the child may mercifully be granted that thing which by nature he cannot have"—*i.e.*, "Baptism with water and the Holy Ghost, and reception into the Church." In the prayer immediately following after the statement that by Christ's baptism in the river Jordan water was "sanctified to the mystical washing of sin," there follows a petition that God "will mercifully look upon the child, wash him, and sanctify him with the Holy Ghost, that he, being delivered from God's wrath, may be received into the Ark of Christ's Church." This petition is varied in form in the next prayer—*i.e.*, "that he may receive remission of his sins by spiritual regeneration." The administration of the rite is followed by the well-known declaration—"Seeing that the child is now regenerate." To complete our statement of the Church's doctrine, we must add the clause in the Nicene Creed—"I believe in one Baptism for the remission of sins." This is the language of the Church's formularies: we turn to the Dean's essay; there we learn that Baptism is "a ceremony undertaken long before or long after the adoption of Christianity has occurred." "The long and tedious controversy" of the Gorham case as to the meaning of the word "regenerate" in the service, "would have been unintelligible to Justin Martyr or Clement of Alexandria," and has now "drifted into the limbo of extinct controversies."

"Regeneration," we are told, is "the growth of a second character, always recurring, though at times with a more sudden shock. With us these changes are brought about by a thousand different methods—education, affliction, illness, change of position in life, a happy marriage, a new field of usefulness; every one of these gives us some

* "Christian Institutions," pp. 5, 8, 12.

notion of the early baptism in its better and more permanent side, and in every one of these that better side of the early baptism may be reproduced."*

These opinions may be true, but surely no "mind not sophisticated"† believes that they represent the true intent and meaning of the expressions used in the Baptismal Service, and attributed to them by its framers, or that the Dean's views agree with those of any large number of the ministers or members of the Church.

Many curious notions (the Dean continues) which congregated round the ceremony have almost entirely passed away. "There was the belief in early ages that it was like a magical charm, which acted on the persons who received it, without any consent or intention of either administrator or recipient. . . . . There was also the belief that it wiped away all sins."‡ Surely the notion of a magical charm exists in full force in the declarations that the unconscious child is "regenerate," is "grafted into the body of Christ's Church;" and what meaning did the Dean give to the prayer for remission of the child's sins, or to the clause in the Nicene Creed which states the object of Baptism. "Again," we read in the Catechism, "that, being by nature born in sin, and the children of wrath, we are by Baptism made the children of grace," which, we presume, in other words, means "that thing which by nature we cannot have." The twenty-seventh Article also, it will be remembered, declares that "the baptism of young children is in any wise to be retained as most agreeable to the institution of Christ;" but the Dean tells us—

"That the origin of infant baptism 'lay deep in early Christian feeling, that the fact of belonging to a Christian household consecrated every member of it, whether baptized or not; the Apostle (1 Cor. vii. 14) urged that, because the parents were holy, therefore the children were holy. They were not to be treated as outcasts; they were not to be treated as heathens; they were to be recognized as part of the chosen people. This passage, whilst it is conclusive against the practice of infant baptism in the apostolic age, is a recognition of the legitimate reason and permanent principle on which it is founded. . . . . If the New Testament has no example of infant baptism, neither has it any example of adult Christian baptism; that is, of the baptism of those who had been already born and bred Christians. For such, it is added 'a baptismal service is an artificial formality.' . . . . Infant baptism is a recognition of the good which there is in every human soul. It declares that in every child of Adam, whilst there is much evil, there is more good; whilst there is much which needs to be purified and elevated, there is much also which in itself shows a capacity for purity and virtue. In those little children of Galilee, all

* "Christian Institutions," p. 11.
† *Vide* Macaulay, "History," chap. xiv. vol. iii. p. 473.
‡ "Christian Institutions," pp. 12, 13.

unbaptized as they were, not yet even within the reach of a Christian family, Jesus Christ saw the likeness of the kingdom of heaven; merely because they were little children, merely because they were innocent human beings. He saw in them the objects, not of divine malediction (*i.e.*, what the Catechism calls 'children of wrath'), but of divine benediction. Lord Palmerston was once severely attacked for having said children are born good.* But he, in fact, only said what Chrysostom had said before him. . . . . Infant Baptism thus is the standing testimony to the truth, the eternal significance of what is called 'natural religion,' of what Butler calls 'the constitution of human nature.'"†

In the "Phases of Faith" Mr. Francis Newman tells us that when the period arrived for taking his bachelor's degree, and it was requisite again to sign the articles, he found himself embarrassed by the question of infant baptism; he was unable to conceal from himself that he did not believe the clause we have quoted from the twenty-seventh Article, and he was on the point of refusing his degree. With an uneasy conscience he persuaded himself to subscribe; but—

"this humiliating affair," he continues, "showed me what a trap for the conscience these subscriptions are; how comfortably they are passed while the intellect is torpid or immature, or when the conscience is callous; but how they undermine truthfulness in the active thinker, and torture the sensitiveness of the tender-minded. As long as they are maintained, in Church or University, those institutions exert a positive influence to deprave or eject those who ought to be their most useful and honoured members."‡

It is melancholy to see this description of the operation of an insincere subscription and an evasive conformity realized in their effect on such a mind and character as that of Dean Stanley. The five following chapters are devoted to "the Sacrament of Lord's Supper, unquestionably, the greatest religious ordinance of the world." It is treated under the heads of—Its primitive institution—Its continuance in the Apostolic age, and in the two centuries that followed—and as the Eucharistic sacrifice. The two last chapters of this series are given to the questions of the "Real Presence" and the force and meaning of the words, "The Body and Blood of Christ." The historical portions of this discussion are in the Dean's best style. His avowed aim is to take his readers out of "the midst of modern controversy into a

* "The noble lord, the Member for Tiverton, undertook a labour left unaccomplished by Voltaire; and, when he addressed the Hampshire peasantry, in one short sentence he overturned the New Testament, and destroyed the foundations of the Christian religion."—Mr. John Bright's Speech in the House of Commons, 22nd of December, 1854.

† "Christian Institutions," pp. 23-25.

‡ "Phases of Faith," p. 9. Edition 1874.

better, simpler, higher atmosphere." He takes as his historical basis the account of the institution in the first Epistle to the Corinthians,

"which belongs to a date long anterior to any of the Gospels. What St. Paul tells us about the Last Supper is a fragment of the Gospel history which all critics and scholars will at once admit. . . . . We have enough in this to build upon. No one doubts it. Every one may construct from it a Christianity sufficient for his belief and his conduct."*

He brings before us most vividly "the one original scene from which the ordinance sprung, and enables us to see it, stripped of all the many theological and ecclesiastical incrustations which have hidden from modern view its original spirit and purpose.

Its great characteristic is that it is—

"the glorification of the power of memory. . . . . Each one, as at the Lord's Table we think of the departed and think also of any friendless one to be comforted, of any institution needing help, of any suffering one to be cheered, may hear the voice, whatsoever it may be, nearest and dearest, or highest and holiest, in the other world, saying '*This do in remembrance of me*'—recalling of the past is the moral, mental, spiritual means by which 'the Last Supper' became 'the Lord's Supper.'"†

To make the Lord's Supper a simple commemoration destroys at once all the superstitious ideas which have grown round it. With them go also many of the puerilities of which of late years we have heard so much. The practice of "Evening Communion," said to have originated with the High Church party, though now condemned by some of them as the "Sin of the Age," is primitive, for "it was not, as with us, in the early morning or at noonday, but in the evening, shortly after sunset; not on the first day of the week, nor the seventh, but on the fifth, or Thursday, that the Master and his disciples met together. . . . . The remembrance of the hour still lingers in the name when we call it a Supper—the Lord's *Supper*; and still more in Germany, the Holy *Evening Meal*—for such it was."‡ The "Mixed Chalice," which now so much vexes ecclesiastical minds, is also primitive, but simply because in the original institution, and in accordance with the universal practice of the ancient world, in the cups, or rather, bowls which stood on the supper-table, "the wine of Palestine was mixed with water," and "to drink wine without water was like drinking pure brandy now," or "taking syrup or lemon-juice without water." § The use of the wafer is equally "primitive," for the "bread broken" was "one of the large

* "Christian Institutions," pp. 30, 31. † *Ibid.* p. 38.
‡ *Ibid.* p. 31. § *Ibid.* pp. 32, 49.

thin Passover cakes of unleavened bread, such as may still, at the Paschal season, be seen in all Jewish houses. A cake rather than a loaf, from its brittleness; to break it was easier than to break a loaf,"* "and the expression 'breaking' is far more natural and applicable."

The Dean, indeed, refers to a bas-relief in St. Ambrogio's, at Milan, which appears to give primitive sanction to practices the revival of which the greatest advocates of primitive practice and Catholic antiquity have not yet recommended. "Two maidens appear; we can hardly tell whether they are real or allegorical; but, if allegorical, they would not have been introduced unless they might have been real: 'Irene, da calida'—'Agape, misce mi' (Peace, Give me the hot water—Love, Mix it for me)." In like manner as the wine was mixed with the water, so the bread was probably served up with fish.

"In ancient times a meal of bread was not thought complete without fish, whenever it could be had; 'bread and fish' went together like 'bread and cheese' or 'bread and butter in England;' and the early representations—belonging to the second and third centuries—of the Lord's Supper, in the Catacombs, almost always include fishes, sometimes placed on the cakes of bread, sometimes on a platter by themselves. These disappear after the fifth century."†

Another feature of the Last Supper was a thick sop, which was supposed to be like the Egyptian clay, and in which the fragments of the Paschal cake were dipped. A portion of this sop would appear to have been given to Judas Iscariot.‡ But all questions which have arisen as to the materials of which the memorial was composed, or the proportions in which they should be mixed, "were far, very far, behind its founder, or far, very far, beyond Him."§

Time and space fail us to accompany the Dean through the history of the various accretions which have grown over the simple ordinance of Christ, and of which he says—

"Possibly the materialism of the ecclesiastical sacristy, keeping pace with the materialism of the philosophic school, may so undermine the spiritual element of this, almost the only external ordinance of Christianity, as to endanger the ordinance itself; possibly the carnal and material may so absorb and obliterate the spiritual that it will be necessary, in the name of religion, to expect some change in the outward forms of the sacrament, not less incisive than those which in former ages, by the general instinct of Christendom, swept away those parts which have now perished for ever."‖

* "Christian Institutions," pp. 32, 48. † *Ibid.* pp. 50-51.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 32, and see John, chap. xiii. and the gloss on it in the Communion Service.

§ *Ibid.* p. 34. ‖ *Ibid.* pp. 128-9.

This theory of the sacraments is certainly not that of the Church, as expressed in its articles and formularies; neither, so far as we know, is it held by any considerable number of its ministers or members. If it is not so easy, as in the case of Baptism, to contrast the Dean's language as to the Lord's Supper with that of the Prayer Book, it is because on the subject of that sacrament the Church itself speaks "with the stammering lips of ambiguous formularies." The Dean delightedly points out that "in the spirit of compromise and conciliation which pervaded all their work, the framers of the formularies, though determined to keep the Zwinglian doctrine (as to the presence of Christ in the sacrament) intact, yet often so expressed it as to make it look as much like Lutheranism as possible;" and in the same strain he refers to "the combination of the two tendencies in the words of the administration of the Eucharist," and he continues:

"excellently well done was it, we may add, to leave this standing proof in the very heart of our most solemn service, that the two views which have long divided the Christian Church are compatible with joint Christian Communion—so that here at least Luther and Zwingli might feel themselves at one; that the Puritan Edward and the Roman Mary might, had they lived under the Latitudinarian, though Lutheran Elizabeth, have thus far worshipped together."*

Whatever may be the liberality or comprehensive spirit of the Anglican Prayer Book, there can be no doubt it assumes as beyond question the permanent continuance of the two Sacraments in their present form. And to us it seems impossible to reconcile the Dean's theory of the possible disappearance of the Sacraments, or of a change in their form, with the plain words of the Prayer of Consecration, "that Christ did institute, and in his Holy Gospel did command us to continue a perpetual memory of His precious death until His coming again," or with the passage in the First Epistle to the Corinthians,† on which the statement in the prayer is founded.

Those who read this volume, and who also may remember the Communion Services at Little Portland Street Chapel some twenty years ago, and the addresses by the late John James Taylor and by Dr. Martineau, of which specimens are given in the second series of his lately published "Hours of Religious Thought," which made those services so interesting and impressive, will see that Dean Stanley would have been more in his right place in Portland Street, taking part in that service, than in

---

* "Christian Institutions," pp. 100-102.

† xi. v. 23. In the Revised Version the word "proclaim" is very unnecessarily substituted for the plainer English words "shew forth."

Westminster Abbey, administering the Lord's Supper according to the use of the Church of England, his conformity with which, holding the views he did, could not be otherwise than evasive.

"It is evident," we read in the Prayer Book, "unto all men diligently reading the Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the Apostles' times there have been these orders of Ministers in Christ's Church: Bishops, Priests, and Deacons."*

The Dean, however, takes a different view.

"It is certain," he says, "that the officers of the Apostolical, or of any subsequent Church, were not part of the original institution of the Founder of our religion; of Bishop, Presbyter, and Deacon, of Metropolitan, Patriarch, and Pope, there is not a shadow of a trace in the Four Gospels. It is certain that they arose gradually out of the pre-existing institutions either of the Jewish Synagogue or of the Roman Empire, or of the Greek Municipalities, or under the pressure of local emergencies. It is certain that throughout the first century and for the first years of the second—that is, through the later chapters of the Acts, the Apostolical Epistles, and the writings of Clement and Hermas, Bishop and Presbyter were convertible terms; and that the body of men so called were the rulers—so far as any permanent rulers existed of the Early Church. It is certain that, as the necessities of the time demanded, first at Jerusalem, then in Asia Minor, the elevation of one Presbyter above the rest by the almost universal law, which even in republics engenders a monarchical element, the word 'Bishop' gradually changed its meaning, and by the middle of the second century became restricted to the chief Presbyter of the locality. It is certain that in no instance were the Apostles called 'Bishops' in any other sense than they were equally called 'Presbyters' and 'Deacons.' It is certain that in no instance before the beginning of the third century is the title or function of the Pagan or Jewish Priesthood is applied to the Christian Pastors."†

The three orders, therefore, are not of Divine, nor Apostolic, scarcely even primitive origin. Of the three, that of Deacon is the most original, "being invented, as it were, for the special emergency in the Church of Jerusalem;" the Presbyters were the "Sheikhs," the elders—those who by seniority had reached the first rank in the Jewish Synagogue. The Bishops were viewed under another aspect—the "Inspectors," the "Auditors" of the Grecian Churches. Believers, like the Duke of Argyll, if indeed, he retains his early belief in the "Divine right of Presbyterianism,"‡ will be shocked to learn that, "as it is sure that

* Preface to the "Ordination Services." But the late Bishop Wilberforce once said, "In the Apostolic times there was only one order in the Church, the Episcopate."—"Speeches on Missions," p. 195.

† "Christian Institutions," pp. 187, 188.

‡ This, or something perfectly analogous—we quote from memory—was the title of the Duke of Argyll's first publication.

nothing like modern episcopacy existed before the close of the first century," so it is certain "that nothing like modern Presbyterianism existed after the beginning of the second." In short, "by the patient unravelment of modern scholarship," it is proved that "no existing Church can find any pattern or platform of its government in those early times."* Is there, then, any sense in which the institution of Christian ministers can be said to have a Divine origin?

"Not," replies the Dean, "in the sense of its having been directly and visibly established by the Founder of Christianity—but yet there is such a sense. It is this—that not in His earthly life, not in His direct communion with man, not as part of the original manifestation of Christianity, but (so to speak) as a Divine after-thought, as the result of the complex influences which were showered down upon the earth after its Founder had left it, as a part of the vast machinery of Christian civilization, were *the various professions of Christendom formed, and amongst these the great vocation of the Christian Ministry*."*

In the same free spirit, the "power of the Keys" is discussed in the chapter headed 'Absolution." The texts on which the popular theory and practice of absolution and remission of sins are grounded—

"no more relate to it than the promise to Peter relates to the Popes of Rome; or than Isaiah's description of the ruin of the Assyrian king, under the figure of Lucifer, relates to the Fall of the Angels; or than the two swords at the Last Supper relate to the spiritual and secular jurisdiction; or than the sun and the moon in the first chapter of Genesis relate to the Pope and the Emperor."

And we are encouraged to believe that—

"as alchemy has disappeared, to give place to chemistry; as astrology has given way to astronomy; as monastic celibacy has given way to domestic purity; as bull-fights and bear-baits have given way to innocent and elevating amusements; as scholastic casuistry has bowed to the philosophy of Bacon and Pascal, so will the belief in the magical offices of a sacerdotal caste vanish before the growth of manly Christian independence and generous Christian sympathy."‡

Holding, equally with the Dean, these liberal views and expectations, we must say that, contrasting them with the statements of the Prayer Book as to the Divine origin and appointment of the clergy and their powers, we are disagreeably reminded of what the late Henry Drummond said of a recent primate of All

---

* "Christian Institutions," pp. 187, 188, 189, and the authorities referred to in the notes.

† *Ibid.* pp. 195, 196.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 197; and as to the secular origin of Christian usages generally, conf. pp. 182, 183.

England: "If the gentleman denies his orders, and repudiates his commission, it is hardly worth while to pay him £15,000 a year for doing so. It might be done much cheaper."*

It was our fortune, on a Trinity Sunday many years ago, to hear Dean Stanley preach in the Temple Church a sermon which, as at the time we remarked to a Unitarian friend, who assented to our remark, he should not have delivered in the Temple Church, but, stopping short of Temple Bar, preached in Essex Street Chapel.† We are reminded of this sermon by the chapter in "Christian Institutions" on "The Creed of the Early Christians."

"The framework of all the creeds," according to the Dean, "is the simple expression of faith used in the baptism of the early Christians. It is taken from the First Gospel, and it consists of 'the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost;'" but he admits that "it is not certain that in early times this formula was in use. The first profession of belief was only in the name of the Lord Jesus. Still the professions of belief in the threefold name soon superseded the earlier and simpler form, and in the second century had become universal. What, then," asks the Dean, "is the Biblical meaning of these words? The Athanasian Creed," he tells us—like Dean Swift's celebrated "Sermon on the Trinity"—"throws no light whatever on their signification. They are used like algebraic symbols, which would be equally appropriate if they were inverted, or if other words were substituted for them. What, then," he asks, "is meant in the Bible—what in the experience of thoughtful men—by the name of 'The Father'? In one word," is his answer, "it expresses to us the whole faith of what we call *natural* religion; and as in the name of the Father we have *natural* religion, the faith of the *natural* conscience, so in the name of Son—the second sacred name by which God is revealed to us—we have *historical* religion, or the faith of the Christian Church. . . . . God in history, God in the character of man, God, above all, in the person of Jesus Christ. But there is yet a third manifestation of God, and that is *spiritual* religion. As the name of the Father represents to us God in Nature, as the name of the Son represents to us God in history, so the name of the Holy Ghost represents to us God in our own hearts, and spirits, and consciences."

We then have this remarkable illustration:

"There are in the sanctuaries of the old churches of the East on Mount Athos sacred pictures intended to represent the doctrine of

* We quote from memory, and faithfully give Mr. Drummond's meaning, though not his exact words. He, it will be remembered, was either an angel or an apostle in the Church calling itself "The Catholic Apostolic," but commonly called "The Irvingite."

† The first Unitarian chapel built *eo nomine* in London, of which Theophilus Lindsey and Thomas Belsham were successively the first ministers.

the Trinity, in which, as the spectator stands on one side, he sees only the figure of our Saviour on the Cross, as he stands on the other side he sees only the Heavenly Dove, as he stands in the front he sees only the Ancient of Days, the Eternal Father. So it is with the representations of this truth in the Bible, and, we may add, in the experiences of religious life; and the conclusion of the whole matter is this: Wherever we are taught to know and understand the real nature of the world in which our lot is cast, there is a testimony, however humble, to the name of the Father; wherever we are taught to know and admire the highest and best of human excellency, there is a testimony to the name of the Son; wherever we learn the universal appreciation of such excellence, there is a testimony to the name of the Holy Ghost."*

Thus is Unitarianism attempted to be hid behind the flimsiest veil of speech. These hazy views were considered by the Dean to be the assent which he had professed to give to the Article which declares that "the three Creeds ought *thoroughly* to be received and believed." The same haziness is apparent in one of the latest, if not the very last, of his writings. Referring to the Revised "Version of the New Testament," he says:—

"But the question will arise in many minds, is there any change in the doctrine presented by the New Version? To this question the answer is No and Yes. There is no change in any of the great doctrines which all Christians alike hold—the importance of charity, of mercy, of judgment, the transcendent and divine beauty of the character in the Gospels, and the force of the incidents and arguments in the Acts and the Epistles, are beyond any possibility of alteration from a new reading or a new collocation of phrases. But if it be asked whether *some of what are called doctrines* are placed in a new light, then the answer must be in the affirmative. . . . . Some of the great scholastic doctrines have lost their chief supports, and that sometimes by variation of interpretation, more often by variation of reading."†

It is refreshing to turn from obscure and evasive views like the Dean's to the latest utterances of the venerable Nonconformist minister—the Dean's appreciation of and admiration for whom appear in his expressions we have quoted. Speaking lately to an assembly of his colleagues in the ministry, who

---

* "Christian Institutions," pp. 266-7 and notes, and conf. p. 12 and note, pp. 268, 270, 275, 279, 280, 284. The Dean's proposal as to the Athanasian Creed was eminently characteristic. He would have relaxed its use in public worship, but retained it in the Prayer Book for the sake of its "theological value, as rectifying certain erroneous statements, and as excluding from the essentials of the Catholic faith the larger part of modern controversy."—"Essay on the Athanasian Creed," p. 85.

† Article on the "Revised Version of the New Testament."—*Times*, Weekly Edition, July 22, 1881.

had formerly been his pupils, and as President of a college whose original principle is that of freely imparting "theological knowledge, without insisting on the adoption of particular theological doctrine," Dr. Martineau called on his hearers to consider—

"The total disappearance from our branch* of the Reformed Churches of all *external authority* in matters of religion. The Catholic prediction, so often made when Luther threw off the restraints of ecclesiastical tradition, has at length come true; and the yoke of the Bible follows the yoke of the Church. The phrases which we have heard repeated with enthusiasm, that 'the Bible, and the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants,' that 'Scripture is the rule of faith and practice,' are indeed full of historical interest, but for minds at once sincere and exact have lost their magic power. . . . . Our attitude towards Scripture thus becomes the same as that which has long been familiar to the Society of Friends, simply assuming that the Spirit of God, which in the old time wrought their elements of sanctity into the pages of the Bible, lives and operates for ever in the human soul, renewing the light of Divine Truth and kindling eternal aspirations, so that the Day of Pentecost is never past, and there is still a tongue of fire for every Evangelist."

Again:—

"Another great change, though gradual and timid in its advance, has for us reached its completion within our own memory—the disappearance from our faith of the entire *Messianic mythology*. I speak not merely of the lost argument from prophecy, now melted away by better understanding of the Hebrew writings, or of the interior relation, under any aspect, of the Old Testament and the New; but of the total discharge from our religious conceptions of that central Jewish dream which was always asking, *Art thou He that should come, or look we for another?* and of all its stage, its drama, and its scenery. . . . . From the person of Jesus everything *official* attached to him by Evangelists or divines has fallen away: when they put such false robes upon Him they were but leading Him to death. The pomp of royal lineage and fulfilled prediction, the prerogatives of King, of Priest, of Judge, the Advent, with retinue of angels on the clouds of Heaven, are to us mere deforming investitures misplaced, like court dresses on the 'Spirits of the Just;' and He is simply the Divine Flower of Humanity, blossoming after ages of spiritual growth, the realized possibility of life in God."†

We fully believe that if Dean Stanley could have afforded to speak out all he really thought, he would have spoken to the same

* That is, the Unitarian.

† "Loss and Gain in Recent Theology." An Address to former Students in Manchester New College. By James Martineau, LL.D., D.D. Pp. 9, 10, 13, 14.

effect as Dr. Martineau. It has been said of Stanley, with as much truth as point, that he really was as great an iconoclast as Theodore Parker, but that he was a poetic iconoclast; "he spiritualized all the dogmas, for he spirited them away. He did not flatly deny them, but he transformed and transfigured them till they had not a fragment of what is specifically orthodox left in them."*

The fact that a man so pre-eminently sincere, upright, and in all other respects outspoken, so dealt with the Church's formularies and standards of doctrine, and yet retained his place among its ministers, is a damning proof of the evils, not only of requiring subscription to articles and formularies from men of immature minds, but of a Church whose theology and whose prayers are founded on and regulated by Law, and whose endowments and social prestige and influence tempt men to an evasive conformity, when

"The infusion of insincerity into the highest action of the soul reduces it to one of the lowest, and makes us *dead* members of the Church to which we seem to belong.†

"The case would be bad enough"—it has lately been well said‡—"if there were no personal interests involved. It becomes a dreadfully bad case when it is remembered, and it is impossible to forget, that very large personal interests are involved. Those who show themselves anxious to qualify and explain away the words they have used, and to prove that they mean either very little or something different from what is commonly supposed, are, in effect, defending themselves in the possession of great and substantial advantages. . . . . It is at least an unhappy feature in the position of affairs that personal interests of an important kind are so intimately bound up with and dependent upon the assent and belief which are first professed and then so considerably qualified or nullified. The case is one which can hardly fail to exercise an unfavourable influence upon the national morality. By many it will be interpreted in the worst sense that can be put upon it, and will be held to warrant the assertion that the religious guides and teachers of the people are not so delicately sensitive and disinterested in this matter of subscription, or their defence of it, as they ought to be."

It is sad to think that such a man as Dean Stanley should have exposed himself to such taunts. We neither forget nor undervalue his long, eminent, and, in the end, successful services in the struggle for a relaxation of the terms of subscription.§ Still the fact remains that he, not only at the time of his ordina-

---

* The Rev. J. Page Hopps—*ubi supra.*

† Dr. Martineau, in "Why Dissent?" p. 17.

‡ By Dr. Vance Smith, in *Macmillan's Magazine.*

§ Carried out by the Statute of 1865.

tion, declared his unfeigned assent and consent to the articles and formularies, but later in life repeated that assent as he took successive steps in the path of preferment, and that assent and consent were never repudiated or revoked.

The posthumously published Introduction to "Church and Chapel," and the "Sermon on the Church of England" in the same volume, will add little to their writer's reputation. They are signal instances of what has been called that constant iteration in all his teachings, which was apt to become tedious—viz., the magnifying of liberalism or latitudinarianism—and of the principle of a National Establishment. Establishment was to him, indeed, a far more fundamental "note of the Church" than any special doctrine, discipline, or ritual. The only point of difference which ever made him wanting in fairness, liberality, and candour to an opponent, was opposition to the Establishment. Towards the friends and supporters of the Liberation Society he was as unfair, illiberal, and uncandid, as would have been any squire or rector of the period which, according to Mr. Froude, was the Golden Age of the Church of England. We never read the Dean's Glorifications of the English Church, without being reminded how in this respect he has very far departed from the teaching of his Master. "Our Church bears, and has ever borne, the marks of her birth. The child of regal and aristocratic selfishness and unprincipled tyranny, she has never dared to speak boldly to the great, but has contented herself with lecturing the poor."*

---

## Art. VIII.—Women's Rights as preached by Women.

*Women's Rights as preached by Women Past and Present.* By A Looker-on. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1881.

THEOLOGICAL, political, and social reformers may be classified or characterized from many points of view, but there is one in particular from which they are most frequently judged, and from which, according to the mental bias of the judge, praise or blame is awarded them—often in no measured terms. We refer to that special point of view from which reformers are pronounced advanced or backward, bold or timid, the unflinching exponents of principles, in season and out of season, or the conformists to what is often contemptuously

---

* "Arnold's Life," vol. ii. p. 331.

called expediency. The now numerous advocates of Women's Rights belong to one or to the other of these two classes, and in an able and interesting pamphlet by "A Looker-on" the cautious exemplifiers of "expediency" are rather unmercifully dealt with. The pamphlet is in two parts, called, respectively, "Past" and "Present." In the "Past" we are introduced to a rediscovered heroine—"Sophia, a person of quality," who, as a precursor of Mary Wollstonecraft, published in 1740 a remarkable little book, with the quaint title, "Woman not inferior to Man; or, a short and modest Vindication of the natural Right of the Fair Sex to a perfect Equality of Power, Dignity, and Esteem with the Man." (Printed for John Hawkins, at the Falcon, in St. Paul's Church Yard, MDCCXL.) "A Looker-on" tells us that Sophia's "mind is logical and daring; her style quaint and original; and although, occasionally, she somewhat fails in command over her temper, she is very truly a person of quality in a far higher sense than that in which she herself claims to be such. She lacks the judicial calmness which distinguishes her greater sister (Mary Wollstonecraft), who views the question of Women's Rights from the high standpoint of the moral advantages to the whole human race which must necessarily follow in the train of justice. Sophia starts at once from the point of view that women are deprived of their rights through man's prejudice, selfishness, and quite unwarranted pride. 'If,' she exclaims, 'this haughty sex would have us believe they have a natural right of superiority over us, why don't they prove their charter from Nature by making use of reason to subdue themselves?'"

Sophia thinks that men and women alike are too nearly concerned in the decision of the question of woman's equality with man to be even admitted as witnesses at the trial, much less as judges, "and therefore," she says, "we must be obliged to appeal to a more impartial Judge; to one incapable of siding with either side, and, consequently, unsuspected on both. *This* I apprehend to be *rectified Reason*, as it is a purely intellectual faculty, elevated above the consideration of any sex, and equally concerned in the welfare of the whole rational species, in general and in particular."

Though Sophia might have found it difficult to give a satisfactory definition of what she meant by "*rectified Reason*," it is evident that by means of it she so sharpened her intellectual vision as to be able to descry the position which is being achieved by her sex a cnetury and a half after her death. She says:—

"If from immemorable time the Men had been so little envious and so very impartial as to do justice to our talents, by admitting us

to our right of sharing with them in public action, they would have been as accustomed to see us filling public offices as we are to see them disgrace them; and to see a lady at a bar or on a bench would have been no more strange than it is now to see a grave judge whimpering at his maid's knees, . . . . or a peer of Great Britain playing with his *garter*. . . . . Men" (she says), "by thinking women incapable of improving their intellects, have entirely thrown them out of all the advantages of education, and thereby contributed as much as possible to make them the senseless creatures they imagine them. . . . . Besides, let it be observed, what a wretched circle this poor way of reasoning among the Men draws them insensibly into. Why is learning useless to us? Because we have no share in public offices. And why have we no share in public offices? Because we have no learning. They are sensible of the injustice they do us, and are reduced to the mean shift of cloaking it at the expense of their own reason."

"It is interesting to observe," as pointed out by "A Looker-on," "that, while thus claiming education for her sex in the name of 'rectified Reason,' Sophia anticipates a portion of the progress realized in our own century." She says: "Our sex seem born to teach and practise physic; to restore health to the sick and to preserve it to the well. Neatness, handiness, and compliance are one-half of a patient's cure, and in this the *Men* must yield to us."

"A Looker-on" next refers to Sophia's greater sister and successor, Mary Wollstonecraft, who, we are told, "is something more than the most illustrious champion of the equality of women's rights with those of men, though this were distinction enough. But Mary founds her claim upon a higher equality than this: she has a profound belief in the equality of all humanity before the moral law. . . . . Her complaint is that from women are withheld the rights belonging to the whole human species; rights which she, like Sophia, believes they must enjoy, when improvable reason is allowed to be the dignified distinction which raises man above the brute creation. . . . . The very constitution of civil government has," she says, "put almost insuperable obstacles in the way to prevent the cultivation of the female understanding, 'yet virtue can be built on no other foundation.'"

"It is not surprising," continues "A Looker-on," "that, keeping for ever in view her grand principle of the equal rights of all the children of the same parent, Mary has not one word to say of the so-called 'rights' of *property*. She troubles herself no more with such arguments than with the remark of 'a lively writer' (whose name she cannot remember), and who obtains but a passing word of contempt for having inquired: *What business women of forty have in the world?*"

Here, in the short paragraph last quoted, we discover the gist

and inspiration of "A Looker-on's" pamphlet: he, or she (we say "or she," for in these days the sex of authors is becoming undistinguishable), is horrified by the proceedings of those advocates of the legal claims of women who demand for each of them possessing the property qualification, which if possessed by a man would confer on him the suffrage, the privilege of voting for members of Parliament.

On the 7th of June, 1866, the late Mr. J. S. Mill presented to the House of Commons a petition, signed by 1,500 ladies. The petition set forth that the possession of property in this country carries with it the right to vote in the election of representatives in Parliament, that the exclusion from this right of women holding property is therefore anomalous, and that the petitioners pray that the representation of householders may be provided for without distinction of sex. Shortly after this petition was presented we observed*—"This claim, that, since women are permitted to hold property, they should also be permitted to exercise all the rights which, by our laws, the possession of property brings with it, is put forward in this petition on such strictly constitutional grounds, and is advanced so entirely without reference to any abstract rights or fundamental changes in the institutions of English society, that it is impossible not to feel that the ladies who make it have done so with a practical purpose in view, and that they conceive themselves to be asking only for the recognition of rights which flow naturally from the existing laws and institutions of the country." In connection with the effort denoted by this petition Mr. Mill introduced into the House of Commons a Bill intended to give unmarried women possessing the property qualification the Parliamentary franchise. This movement, thus initiated, has been vigorously and persistently supported by a considerable number of the most intelligent women of England, a fact frankly attested by "A Looker-on," who says:—

"All who have studied the speeches delivered at the Women's Suffrage meetings which have taken place during the past fourteen years, must have gladly noted how much of logic, wit, and truth, and how little of mere verbiage, has fallen from women's lips on those occasions. It might, no doubt, be said, that the majority of the female orators were picked women, exceptional alike in capacity and education; but, whatever the explanation of the fact may be, I think that all impartial judges would admit that the ladies have generally shown themselves superior both in wit and arguments to their male opponents; that they have displayed a quite special aptitude for debate, and have proved themselves able to rival male politicians in the adoption of those tactics

* WESTMINSTER REVIEW, No. 61, January, 1867, p. 63.

which are the recognized methods of political success. And it is especially noteworthy that in none of the able addresses, and still abler replies spoken by women, can one detect any trace of that sentimentalism which it was customary to assume that they would introduce into political life. I might almost go so far as to say that they have introduced neither sentiment nor imagination into the question" (p. 21).

A movement, headed by Mr. Mill, and steadily carried on by a large body of women with the calm dignity, energy, ability, and business-like skill ascribed to them by "A Looker-on," must possess great intrinsic claims on public attention, and cannot fail to command the cordial respect and interest of the great majority of all who are truly anxious to promote both the political and social improvement of the English people. "A Looker on," however, disapproves this movement altogether, and occupies eighteen octavo pages in denouncing it as a practical abandonment of the great principle contended for by "Sophia" and Mary Wollstonecraft—the essential equality of the sexes—and a "degrading retrogression signalised by the sanction given to Mr. Forsyth's attempt to confirm and perpetuate the political subjection of married women by statutory law." It is always an advantage to have the mind's eye of every reformer steadily fixed on the broad general principle for the realization of which he is working; for it ought always to be his guide and inspiration; and there can be no doubt that many such workers for an instalment only of that which the general principle in question declares due, too often lapse into forgetfulness of the full extent of their claim, in consequence of their complete mental absorption in the work immediately before them. This consideration makes us grateful to "A Looker-on" for holding up aloft the flag of the general principle—equality of the sexes, and warning his, or her, co-workers of the danger of ignoring it, while concentrating their thoughts and energies (it may be too exclusively) on the endeavour to enforce a concession of some small part only of the whole which that principle exacts. In favour of the doctrine and method espoused by the author, probably all has been said that can be said, and the position assumed is certainly maintained with remarkable ability, the writer's arguments being often illumined with flashes of humour, which do as much, perhaps, as the arguments themselves, to win the reader's acquiescence. The following passage is a clear and concise expression of the author's objection to the movement in question:—

"It is because we hold it to be essential to the just government of the human race, that the mind and heart of the mother of the race should have full expression in the councils of her children, that out-

siders like myself regret that representative women should have abandoned Mary Wollstonecraft's demand for full justice towards her sex, and substituted for it the mere reiteration of the narrow claim that a political privilege enjoyed by a large number of their countrymen should be conceded to a favoured few of their countrywomen. They do well to demand the suffrage: the right to be heard is the first step towards the acquirement of their fitting place in the human family; but it is grievous that they should stoop to demand it on the paltry plea that the material superiority over their less fortunate sisters which they already possess—the property, which, in the case of spinsters and widows, is not a fiction but a reality—is liable to the same form of direct taxation as the property of men. . . . . From the day of their first public meeting, down to the recent demonstrations in Manchester and London, the 'cry of the women' has never been raised in the name of the dignity and rights of womanhood. They have not said to their brothers: '*Respect in us the distinctive qualities of heart and mind, the special aptitudes, intelligence, and aspirations of our sex.*' Their cry has been and is: '*Respect our property: let not the sex of the possessor interfere with the sacred rights of property.*' One might fancy the leading ladies to be lineal descendants of the celebrated 'Northern Farmer,' and that their carriage-wheels echo in their ears the *refrain* sounded in his by his horse's hoofs: 'Proputty, proputty, proputty!'"

But, to whatever extent this charge may be justifiable, it is certainly groundless in respect to the great leader of the movement in question—Mr. J. S. Mill: his admirable book on "The Subjection of Women" effectually shields him from the possibility of such an imputation. In the opening page of that book he affirms "that the principle which regulates the existing social relations between the two sexes—the legal subordination of one sex to the other—is wrong in itself, and now one of the chief hindrances to human improvement, and that *it ought to be replaced by a principle of perfect equality*, admitting no power or privilege on the one side, nor disability on the other." We may add the expression of our belief that, at any rate, 99 out of every 100 of the women who have taken an active part in the Women's Suffrage Movement have read that book, have been mainly guided as co-operators in that movement by its teachings, and that, along with its distinguished author, they have looked on the limited claim set forth in the "Ladies' Petition" as a method of enforcing the concession of *a small instalment* of their rights—or, in other words, of inserting the thin end of the wedge, which they confidently expect to drive home by-and-by.

Under one name or another the world of humanity is ever divided between Reformers and Conservatives; men of action and men of repose; of claimants and possessors; of those who attack

and of those who defend the existing order of things: in short, of reformers and the opponents of reform. The manifold struggles between these two great parties are constantly proceeding with only brief intervals of rest; but during these intervals temporary compromises are effected, and these become fresh and ever higher vantage ground for new attacks. Thus compromises become the means by which region after region of the vast domain of conservatism is successively detached and annexed to the ever-increasing republic of true liberty and civilization. Compromises are, in fact, the successive incarnations of the spirit of progress, and those who denounce and stigmatize them as abdications of principle and pusillanimous yieldings to expediency, do but reveal their own impatience or excess of ardour—seemingly forgetful of the calm measured steps of Nature's processes of evolution.

When Mr. Mill introduced the original Women's Suffrage Bill, which would have conferred the suffrage on the comparatively small number of spinsters and widows who possess the requisite qualification, the demand for that small instalment of the great debt still due to women by the State was in our opinion both a legitimate and judicious one. It was "asking only," as we said at the time, "for the recognition of rights which flow naturally from the existing laws and institutions of the country." But, now, fourteen years have elapsed since that demand—not yet acceded to—was made; and, meanwhile, public opinion on the subject has so far developed and matured that what would then have been acceptable as a first concession of voting-power to women, will seem, we believe, to most thoughtful persons, a compromise too inadequate and insignificant for acceptance now; the more especially as—it is to be hoped—a minister, supported by the very large Liberal majority which supports Mr. Gladstone, can have no difficulty at the present time, if he deals with the subject at all, in extorting for women an amount of justice much more ample than that which would have been gratefully accepted, and which would have been representative of the state of public opinion, in 1867. Moreover, the literate ladies of this generation are not likely to ignore the significant lesson conveyed in the story of the Sibylline books.

We regret our inability to concur in the opinion of "A Looker-on" respecting the aim and method of procedure of the "Women's Movement." The leaders of that movement ask, we are told, "that the suffrage be accorded to them 'on the same terms as it is, or may be, accorded to men.' Wherefore?" demands the writer; and then observes:—"If the Rights of Women be not an empty phrase, women have no cause for such reverence for the law as it is, or even as it may be, so long as it is framed exclu-

sively by men." We freely admit that the extraordinarily various, and even bizarre qualifications which confer the Parliamentary franchise on Englishmen, are not likely to command the admiration of anyone intent on devising, *de novo*, a system by which the admission of women to the franchise may be most advantageously regulated; and, certainly, we do not think such a reformer would be disposed, in constructing his system, to imitate the heterogeneous one now in operation. But it seems to us neither necessary nor desirable to devise a new system; and, if it were, such a system would certainly be framed exclusively by men in the first instance, and, whether afterwards retaining its original form, or modified from time to time, it would continue to exist by the authority of men only for an indefinitely long period —at least until women become members of the House of Commons, and obtain a majority there. Hence "the leaders of the Women's Movement" must either "ask that the suffrage be accorded to them on the same terms as it is, or may be, accorded to men," or they must themselves be prepared to propose the terms on which they are willing to accept it. Now, we are of opinion that to adopt the latter plan would be to render their acquire ment of the suffrage at all very problematical—at least, until social changes in England so vast as to be at present wholly unforeseeable and incalculable shall have come to pass; whereas, the adoption of the former plan is, we think, the indisputably right road to success, is in every respect eminently practicable, and is, therefore, the one which wisdom and common sense alike indicate should be chosen for "the Women's Movement."

Some women who have taken up the cause of their sex seem to think they will hasten their success by assuming an attitude of antagonism towards men whom they denounce as their selfish and cruel oppressors. Sophia is a notable leader of this class of reformers; but their achievements are not in proportion to the noise and vehemence of their attacks. Others, while agitating for reform, without asking the help of men, proceed in a quiet and more dignified manner; but both abstain from inviting the co-operation of men, and actually exclude them from their meetings! At their last great meeting at St. James's Hall no man was allowed to be present, we believe, in the body of the hall; and any male creature who was permitted to enter the narrow gallery had to pay 2*s*. 6*d*. for the privilege. With all due respect to those who adopt this method of procedure, we feel constrained to say that, alike in spirit and conduct, it is a grave mistake. As a matter of fact, the interests of men and women in this matter are not antagonistic or divided, but harmonious and identical. Every man who has really studied the question knows quite well that every advantage

gained by women from an increase of physical, intellectual, and moral development, and from that greater individuality and personal independence which would come of their complete political enfranchisement and equality with men before the law, would be at least shared by the two sexes equally, and that, indeed, men would probably be the chief gainers. We believe that in England at the present time the number of men who are convinced of the necessity of the complete legal and social emancipation of women, and who earnestly desire it, greatly exceeds the number of women having a like conviction and desire, and we are confident that in proportion as the "leaders of the Women's Movement" encourage and ensure the co-operation of their brethren, will their success become increasingly great and rapid.

For the reasons just given, we are of opinion that it is especially expedient that the "leaders of the Women's Movement" should in all their proceedings insist implicitly or explicitly that the interests of the two sexes are identical; and, as one form of affirming this conviction, should ask that the suffrage be accorded to them "on the same terms as it is, or may be, accorded to men." If they do this, the claim of spinsters and widows having the property qualification will be included in the larger claim of all women, whether married or single, having that qualification; and it is to be hoped that in due time the importance and dignity attaching to the responsibility of having the Parliamentary franchise will induce women about to marry to abstain from surrendering their property, when they have any, into the hands of their husbands, and thus to retain the qualification for exercising the franchise, their marriage notwithstanding. And, following up their success in this respect, they will do well to continue their agitation in the direction men have already taken. "A Looker-on" remarks:—"Their vigorous assertion of the principle of manhood suffrage did undoubtedly extort from their rulers a far wider extension of household suffrage than the limited demand would have done." And the writer justly adds:—"But the same is true of every successful reform movement." And why should not the women who feel themselves qualified to exercise the franchise, and who do not possess the property qualification, imitate the men who by their efforts obtained the household suffrage? Indeed, as men have already begun to agitate for manhood suffrage, women would act most judiciously, because they would thus greatly increase their chance of success, were they to combine and concentrate their strength for the one object of inducing men, on every occasion when they advocate in public meetings or through the press for an extension of the suffrage, to advocate it for each adult human being, irrespective of sex; to inscribe on their

banner not only manhood but womanhood suffrage; to associate women with them throughout every phase of their agitation, and thus practically declare their recognition of the solidarity of the claims and interests, as well as the essential equality and dignity, of the two sexes. Co-operating in this way, men and women reformers will exemplify anew and on a vast scale the truth of the maxim, "Union is strength;" whereas, if English women, in their struggle for political enfranchisement, desert the well-beaten paths which English men have trod in pursuit of their own political freedom, and striking out new paths for themselves, endeavour to acquire the franchise in accordance with some principle or method which may be scientifically admirable, but which is wholly unsupported by English customs or precedents, they will enormously and needlessly increase the difficulties between them and the goal towards which they are struggling, and, we fear, the time, also, which has yet to elapse before they reach it.

# INDIA AND OUR COLONIAL EMPIRE.

*INDIAN AFFAIRS.*—In reviewing Indian events of the past few months, it is gratifying to have to record an occurrence which cannot but exercise a tranquillizing influence on the politics of the North-west frontier. The long-expected encounter of Ayub Khan and Abdul Rahman has resulted in the defeat and flight to Herat of the former, and the shifting westward of an arena of conflict which had undoubtedly approached within uncomfortable proximity of our advanced posts on the Khojak. Ayub Khan's position in the recent battle of Chilzina was one of considerable strength, being protected on the right by a rocky spur, and through the centre by the ramparts and ditch and buildings of the old city of Kandahar. His forces, too, were more numerous than those of his adversary, though they were probably less disciplined and reliable, while, as regards artillery, the two armies appear to have been about equal. The action, after three or more hours' duration, seems to have been virtually decided by the treachery of the Cabuli and Herati regiments, whom, probably in mistrust of their fidelity, Ayub was holding in reserve in the rear, and who fired on the Ghazis and Kandaharis in their front, causing these to break and run. Ayub and his chiefs managed to escape to Herat, leaving twenty-one guns in the Amir's hands. Kandahar has opened its gates, and both it and the surrounding villages have been plundered, with more or less thoroughness, in revenge for their aid to Ayub's cause.

It would be easy to deprecate much importance being attached to this event. Abdul Rahman has shown but little talent as a general: the fate of the fight was attributable wholly to the defection and treachery of a portion of the enemy's force, and a grand and obvious strategic opportunity has been lost in the failure to pursue a routed and demoralized foe, who had lost his artillery, but who will now probably have time to recruit a fresh army among his numerous adherents in Western Afghanistan. Still, the victory appears to us, on the whole, of no slight importance. Our old foe, who had taken advantage of our retirement from Afghanistan again to endeavour to enforce by arms his pretensions to the crown, has been decisively vanquished by the ruler whom we had deliberately placed on the throne,

and with whose cause we had further identified ourselves by subsidies of arms and money. The anti-English party in Afghanistan—a party ever ripe and powerful for mischief, whether to us or to our nominee—have been signally discouraged; and Abdul Rahman will undoubtedly have grounds for claiming, and will probably receive, the increased confidence and support of the Indian Government.

To forecast the future movements of Ayub Khan is not easy. It must all depend on the success with which Abdul Rahman's advance on Herat is attended, and how far he may be supported among the west country men, and by his own adherents and troops from Afghan Turkestan. There is one card, however, which Ayub might play, and which England will do well to take heed of. He may turn his gaze down the valley of the Heri Rud, whither the Russians are fast advancing, and, in despair of retrieving his position, seek counsel from that Power. Russia is, indeed, securing a strong position on the joint border-land of Persia and Afghanistan, and, which is far more important, is taking the very best means to consolidate the same by the construction of a railway, equally serviceable for commercial purposes in peace, and for soldiers and fighting material in time of war. This railway, which starts from Krasnovodsk, on the Caspian Sea, has, according to the latest accounts, been completed for a distance of 218 versts, as far as Bami, and will doubtless be further prolonged along the northern face of the Attok, or "mountain skirt," probably towards Sarakhs, and then, by way of the Tejend or Heri Rud Valley, to Herat. Till its ultimate destination be reached, its commercial importance cannot be very great. The products of Northern Khorassan will not offer an abundant return to the Moscow merchants who, we are told, have been eager to seize the earliest opportunity of pushing their manufactures in this new market. But the nearer the railway approaches Herat the more is its financial success assured. For centuries past Herat has been a great commercial mart for the products of Bokhara, Khiva, Persia, Afghanistan, Beluchistan, Turkestan, and India; and its exceptional advantages as a meeting point for the routes from those various States, the strength of its fortifications, and the remarkable fertility of its valley, have ever combined to make it a most tempting possession in the eyes of Asiatic conquerors. Everything, therefore, unites to attract the Russians thither: trade, and the opportunity of controlling the destinies of Persia, of repressing the Turkomans, and of securing a strong base for that steady advance towards the southern seaboard of Asia which, in spite of political disclaimers and assurances, and changes of Czars and Ministers, has been pursued for over a century with an undeviating perseverance worthy of an honester cause. It is to Herat, therefore, rather than to Kandahar

to Western rather than to Eastern Afghanistan, that the eyes of the spectators of the great Central Asian game will now begin to be directed. Our national policy in the meantime is clear. From our post of observation at Quetta, we can watch the political board without necessary interference with the intestine differences and petty quarrels of the Pathans, and yet be prepared jealously to interpose should any decided move on the part of Russia or Persia threaten the independence of Afghanistan.

It is satisfactory to turn from the exciting but anxious scene of foreign politics to the progress of events within our own dominions. The demand for some form of representation is making itself again heard; and this subject, which, till lately, was condemned as a dangerous crotchet, is gradually being recognized as a possible problem of administration. The experience of the great municipalities, to which the elective principle has been most liberally conceded, is full of promise. When the Calcutta Corporation, for example, was remodelled, few people believed that it would work well. It was feared that the elected members would be inferior, both in intelligence and in willingness, to the officially appointed members; that they would be unwilling to do commonplace, unconspicuous work; that they would seek the favour of the ignorant ratepayers by cutting down expenditure on useful or sanitary undertakings, while they would be wasteful of the public money upon personal objects. A very able report by Mr. Harrison, the head of the Calcutta Corporation—himself a Bengal civilian, and appointed by the Government—shows that, in the metropolitan municipality, at any rate, these forebodings have, happily, turned out to be unfounded. His statistics prove that in every branch of municipal work—whether at general meetings, or town councils, or in committees—the members elected by the ratepayers have been more regular in attendance than those nominated by the Government. In fact, the elected members seem to have attended, on an average, twenty-seven meetings, against an average of sixteen meetings attended by the nominated members. "It is evident," says Mr. Harrison, in his excellent narrative of the work done, "that the elected Commissioners cannot, as a body, be charged with any want of interest in their duties. Those who have taken the trouble to master the system of administration of so large and important a city, feel that the work is of so much interest as to reconcile them to a considerable sacrifice of time and convenience." The elected members not only attend more regularly than those nominated by the Government, but they seem to do so for precisely the same motives of public spirit, and that desire to see civic business well conducted, which form the glory of our own municipal system in England.

As regards the nature of the work done, the most ardent apostle of municipal reform would have little to complain. Sewage and drainage; tidal ditches covered over and turned into roads and footpaths; foul tanks filled up; the conservancy carts sent into the heart of the almost impenetrable *bastis*, or agglomerations of hovels, which used to form the pest-centres of Calcutta; better arrangements for the registration of births and deaths, and for the thorough lighting of the town by gas—these are some of many useful works which the new Corporation, with its elective element, has most strenuously carried out. Its employment of the public money has not only been wise, it has also been economical. The new Commissioners have reduced the house-tax, cut down every supernumerary appointment, and effected a large annual saving by correcting old abuses, by introducing reforms in the markets, and in other branches of metropolitan administration. This report gives us the results of the largest experiment in elective representation which has yet been made in India; and we are glad to see that those results are in the highest degree satisfactory.

In strange contrast with this record of progress are the outbreaks of ill-will which occasionally still take place between the Hindus and Mussulmans. Not many months ago, in the Sealdah quarter of Calcutta itself, the Muhammadans killed a cow, the sacred animal of the Brahmans, in such a way as to outrage the Hindu population. In the Bhagalpur district of Bengal, with its railway stations and abundant signs of material civilization, the feeling between the followers of the two creeds became so bitter that the Hindus shut up their shops, and refused to hold any intercourse with the Muhammadans. This case of wholesale religious "Boycotting" for a time seemed beyond the power or the prudence of the local officer, and had to be laid before the Government. In North-western India, and especially in some of the Native Territories, such ebullitions of animosity assume a more serious form. Recently, in the feudatory State of Bhawalpur, the conflict of creeds almost led to an insurrection; "but happily," says a leading Native paper, "under the wise counsels of the British authorities, the outraged Hindus were quieted." Within our own dominions the two parties make a dexterous use of every weapon of the law to procure the discomfiture of their opponents. Thus, in the important city of Multan, the Hindus lately petitioned against the sale of beef by the Muhammadans, and asked facilities for the sale of *jhatka* mutton—that is to say, sheep killed by one stroke, according to Hindu rites. The following summary of their petition to the local British authorities deserves to be reproduced; for it is only by reading such documents that we can really understand the lava-like burning substratum of religious feeling upon which rests the calm surface of

British Rule. The Hindus not only claim that the Muhammadan population of Multan shall have no butchers' shops for the sale of beef, but they support their claim by a series of constitutional arguments drawn from the records of our own administration. Their memorial urges :—

"1. That the sale of beef in the City of Multan is in contravention of the orders issued in 1849 by the Board of Administration for the Punjab.

"2. And that in these orders no exception has been made in favour of sale of cooked beef in the town.

"3. That the sale of cooked beef in the town enhances, rather than diminishes the gravity of the offence against the religious notions of the Hindus.

"4. That the shops which have been selected for the sale of beef are on public thoroughfares, and are surrounded on almost all sides by the houses and shops of Hindus, who will, it is feared, be compelled to leave their houses and shops, as the idea that beef is being sold and cooked near to them is utterly repugnant to the Hindu feelings.

"5. That your memorialists have every reason to believe that agreeably to the orders issued by Government, the sale of beef is prohibited in all the towns and cities of the Punjaub, and that the orders of Government have nowhere made any exception in favour of the sale of cooked beef.

"6. That since the issue of orders by the Board of Administration for the Punjab, prohibiting the sale of beef, no Order or Act has been passed by Government legalizing the sale of beef in the City of Multan.

"7. That no Muhammadan should have dared to open a shop for the sale of beef without the sanction of competent authority. But no such authority was, it is believed, ever given. If some of the bakers have been selling beef by stealth, then the offence against existing orders of Government must be visited with accumulated punishment. It should certainly not have the force of a precedent.

"8. That no Hindus have or can possibly acquiesce in such a proceeding. One Hindu official and one Hindu resident of Multan—who make up, according to the mistaken language of certain authorities in Multan, "some native gentlemen of Multan"—have approved of the order of the sale of beef. These gentlemen are not natives of Multan, and cannot be looked upon, in any sense, as representing the Hindu community of Multan on this important subject. Your memorialists think these gentlemen must be wanting in their duty towards the British Government in not correctly representing to the authorities the general feeling of the entire Hindu community on this all engrossing subject of the day."

The following is a free translation of the placard issued, on the other side, by the Muhammadans :

"*O True Believers and brothers in faith.—The Great and Holy Allah has commanded in the good words of Holy Koran 'Alma-ul Mushrikin Nijas.'*"

"Therefore, hundreds of woes be upon those who eat wet things out of the hands of Hindus (which are equal to filthy urine) and do not avoid and discard them, and thus falsify their Nawáz (prayers), Roza (fast), Wuzu (semi-bathing) and ablution, and commit sin; for it is, according to the above verse, prohibited to eat things touched by them. Prayers of such men as do not follow the verse and who eat forbidden things, and thus pollute themselves, their clothes, furniture and crockery, are never accepted. And besides this, the faithful brethren lose their respect and honour. And it is a great shame that

while Hindus consider Muhammadans as dogs, and neither eat nor drink from their hands, and hate them so much that if they give a Muhammadan anything, they throw it as if to a dog from a distance, the Muhammadans with both hands outstretched should, like beggars, put it in their mouths.

"Woe be upon him who for the sake of sensual enjoyment disregards his honour and the fear of God.

"May the Lord of the Universe be pleased for the sake of the honour of the greatest amongst the prophets, to grant out of His mercy, kindness and charity, that all of us may shun them as they shun us."

The general results of the Indian Census, taken in February last, have been telegraphed to England. They establish the accuracy of the Census of 1871, the first ever attempted for all India; and they show that the whole population has increased by 12¾ millions, or 5 per cent., during the decade. It now stands at 252 millions for all India. But this general statement gives a very imperfect insight into the local increment of the people. For while in the southern provinces, which have suffered most from famine, the numbers have stood still, or even receded, in the less thickly peopled parts, the increase has been at an enormous rate. Thus, the British Presidency of Madras shows a diminution of 2 per cent.; while the Native State of Mysore, which felt the fullest effects of the long-continued dearth of 1876-79, has 17 per cent. fewer inhabitants now than it had ten years ago. The Bengal population has increased by about 10 per cent., in spite of the milder scarcity of 1874. But the great increase is in the outlying under-peopled districts of India, where the pressure of the inhabitants on the soil has not yet begun to be felt, and where thousands of acres are still awaiting the cultivator. In Assam the increase has been 19 per cent.—largely due to immigration; in the Central Provinces, with their tracts of unreclaimed jungle, 25 per cent.; in Berar (adjoining them), 20 per cent.; while in Burma—which, most of all the British provinces, stands in need of inhabitants—the ten years have added 35 per cent. to the population, equivalent to doubling the people in about twenty-five years.

## THE COLONIES.

We wrote last quarter of the wholesome initiation taken by the Colonies in opening the question of low tariffs throughout the empire. Since then the movement in favour of what is euphemistically termed Fair Trade, has, both in the advocacy and the opposition it has excited, elicited repeated reference to the markets and areas of supply offered by our extensive empire. The working men in their Trades Union's Congress, no less than the enthusiasts in their Fair Trade League, have advocated reliance on our Colonial Empire. In the section of

Economic Science, at the meeting of the British Association at York, the same idea found scientific echo. Mr. Chamberlain at the Trinity House, and Mr. Gladstone at the Mansion House, have both laid special stress on the value the Colonies are to us at the present, and on the vital importance of maintaining close commercial connection with them. In the *Nineteenth Century* for July, the present condition of the question was ably summarized. All this is evidence that by their own intrinsic weight colonial affairs are claiming that public recognition in England which is their due. The one great need is, that throughout the empire the conviction shall become paramount that it is for each man's own interest that exchange of commodities, at all events among all Englishmen, shall be as little fettered as possible. Let each man and place produce that for which, for the time being, his and its opportunities are best suited, and the best prosperity will ensue. Those colonies which avail themselves of this principle will enjoy the conditions most favourable for prosperity and growth.

The continued brisk development of *Canada* is matter of congratulation, not only for Canadians, but also for the traders and manufacturers of these islands. The causes and the effect of this prosperity are already apparent in action on this side of the Atlantic. This revival has extended even to British Columbia; and throughout English North America there is nothing but progress to report. The harvest has been up to the average; and Canada will thus suffer none of that loss which will be felt in the United States, owing to the harvest being there considerably under the average. The energetic construction of railways, and the opening up of new rich lands are affording only too much profitable employment for the present population. In many places there is actual dearth of necessary labour. Farmers in Ontario were offering as much as 9*s.* a day without effect. And the dearth of labour for the saw mills is seriously affecting the great lumber industry. Similar accounts come from British Columbia and Nova Scotia. And in Newfoundland 6*s.* a day was being paid to labourers on the new railways. This activity is fast attracting population, not only from Europe, but from the United States as well; and there will probably be a growth during the next few years of enormous magnitude.

A curious feature is, that in spite of the recently instituted high tariff, imports are increasing. Wealth is being produced so rapidly in this opening up of new lands that time is not left to Canadians either to manufacture for themselves or to notice that the high tariff is simply impeding this creation of wealth. To aid all this there are persistent and growing reports of gold discoveries; chiefly from the Saskatchewan and North-Western territories. It is no wonder that we

notice money becomes rapidly cheaper; and that 5 or 6 per cent. is now given where, not so long ago, 9 or 10 was the ordinary price.

The export of meat to England is attracting attention of two kinds. It is true proposals are many for new companies to carry on this industry or trade; but it is also a subject of common comment that meat shows a steady tendency to rise in price. In Toronto, beef had risen to 8*d.* a pound; exporters were experiencing great difficulty in obtaining stock for export; and, altogether, there seemed little prospect of any considerable export trade at present, *unless prices remained high in England.* There is further news of importance for English agriculturists. The fruit crop is, in many places, a failure. Peaches and apples are especially bad in many parts. We learn, too, that while in some places floods have destroyed large amounts of hay, in others droughts have been followed by extensive and most destructive bush fires. English farmers will notice that they are not the only farmers that suffer from the unkindliness of seasons.

The tour of the Governor-General is likely to prove of much benefit to the Dominion. It is, as it were, an authoritative advertisement of the opening up of the great North-West area. People, all the world over, have followed the details of this tour, and have heard of the great capabilities of the new district. To register and distribute such knowledge must be specially necessary, if we agree with the *Times'* correspondent, that the Hudson Bay traders and trappers "cruelly misrepresented and libelled a magnificent country, in order that settlers might be deterred from coming to it and sharing their profits."

Perhaps one of the most generally interesting features of this Vice-regal tour has been the picture given of the Indians. Bradford people have been surprised to learn that the Indians had generally adopted European clothes; and had, to that extent, created a new market for cloth. Within the Canadian frontier, the Red Indian has been metamorphosed into a pseudo-European. He now lives in comparative comfort and peace; and the race, in its declining years, enjoys surroundings which the English nation may well be proud to have provided. The recent troubles and serious massacres by Indians in the United States, appearing in newspapers side by side with these happy pictures of the Canadian Indians, visited by the Governor-General, gives fresh point to the comparison often drawn between the rival policies. An American book, with the ominous title, "A Century of Dishonour," has recently told us that the people of the United States have now spent a hundred millions sterling in attempting to govern some 300,000 Red Indians; and that the result is all failure. We are told that most of this money has gone into the pockets of carpet-baggers. This is the American account. We must rather look

to the fact that the rigid constitution of the United States has no place for any but full citizens. The Indians in the United States are, as it were, *dedititii;* but the Indians in Canada are "subjects of the Queen." In the one case, all they gain is by indulgence; in the other, by right. In the United States, the affairs of the Indians fall to the "despotic" charge of a bureaucracy that in years gone by was too political to be efficient. In Canada, the affairs of the Indians are in the responsible charge of a department of Government that is administrative and permanent, and rigidly severed from politics.

The Canadian Fisheries continue to attract notice. The latest development is that of canning lobsters in Prince Edward's Island. In the last four years this industry has sprung up, and to such effect that last year the output was two million tins. The consequence has been a sudden and serious falling off in the supply of lobsters. Stringent regulations, limiting the fishing to eighty days in the year, and the size to lobsters over eight inches in length, appear ineffectual altogether to stay this falling off. This is not on the whole matter for grief; it may well be doubted whether canned lobsters are a food that it is economically desirable should become cheap and plentiful. The health and the efficacy of the workman depends greatly on the wholesomeness of the food-luxuries he consumes.

The Fishery Question, so far as France is concerned, will shortly demand some final settlement. Of late, fresh aggression has been reported on the part of Frenchmen purporting to be qualified representatives of French sovereignty over portions of the shore of Newfoundland on which rights of casement have been granted to the French by special treaties. This claim of sovereignty is inconsistent with these rights and these treaties; and it is a question which should be settled forthwith, in the interests of all concerned.

The accounts from the *West Indies* are much concerned with a reappearance of yellow fever. But, generally speaking, in the English Colonies it has failed altogether to become epidemic. It is probable that this fact is largely due to the active sanitary reforms that have been carried out in every colony. These were a special care of the Governor of Barbados; but it is our sad duty to record that one of the first victims to fall to the fever when it appeared in Barbados was the Governor's wife. The whole community was deeply grieved, and although Mrs. Robinson had not been even a year in Barbados the expression of personal sorrow at her death was widespread and great.

In *British Guiana* the cases of yellow fever have been very few;

and there, as elsewhere, the chief serious result has been the consequent interruption and interference with communications between the various colonies. Quarantine regulations have naturally become very stringent, and very serious inconveniences have resulted to commercial intercourse. This is a more serious matter now than ever it was, because of the increase in coasting and inter-colonial steamers. When the yellow fever passes away, with the advent of colder weather, the value of these increased facilities of inter-communication will again be felt. The serious labour difficulty was largely due to the fact that each island had to depend on its own local supply of labour. The negro had no opportunity to travel from island to island seeking the wages of labour: he consequently developed a customary disinclination to leave home. This evil will disappear before the advent of continuous steamer communication.

The Government of *Jamaica* has published a very full account of the island. The "Jamaica Handbook for 1881" is only too complete and full a work of its kind. It is, indeed, a detailed description of all connected with Jamaica, rather than a handbook. But the bare list of the subjects dealt with as in some form existing in Jamaica, suffices to show the reality and extent of the resources on which Jamaica may count in future years. The variety of natural products, from cattle and jalap, and from fish to dye-woods, which Jamaica produces, is not only extensive, but also important, and may well attract the notice of those in England seeking an opening for their capital, or work for sons not given to success in bookwork competitions.

The *Times* has lately published full letters from a correspondent in the West Indies. Two of these gave details as to Jamaica; then, local inquiries yield a full crop of interesting facts and descriptions which go far to prove that Jamaica is at the present as prosperous—if we regard the prosperity of the greatest number of her population—as ever Jamaica was; and that the prospects of advance and of greater prosperity were never brighter.

An idea, long mooted, appears to be now assuming practical shape. Jamaica, with its magnificent scenery and grand winter climate, is well fitted to be a health resort for many classes of invalids. In the United States, perhaps, more than in Europe, there are many who desire change and nerve-rest: and the recently started lines of steamers between Jamaica and the United States have brought many such to the West Indies. Many visitors arrive, too, each winter from England. Hitherto, however, it seems there were but two first class hotels in the whole Island. One of them was in Kingston, and the other up at Mandeville.

But they were both small, and both invariably full of local people. A company has now been floated to establish a big hotel near the port, and an affiliated sanatorium away in the mountains. There is no reason why Jamaica should not reap great advantages from its winter climate and its scenery.

Of our other outlying colonies, *Hong Kong* has already reduced to intelligible figures the results of the April Census. There happens to have been a census taken in Hong Kong so lately as the year 1876. Consequently, we are able to judge in detail of the growth during the last five years. We see recorded rapid and steady progress and great prosperity. The harbour facilities for loading and unloading have been largely improved, in answer to the calls of a largely increased commerce: there has been, rapid increase in the number of local industries and manufactories; the number of persons employed in industries, in trades and in intellectual work has steadily grown. The population has increased from 139,000, in 1876, to 160,000 in 1881. The rateable wealth has grown *pari passu;* and the revenue has followed suit. No new taxes have been imposed. These facts should have special value at the present time; for they tell of a community advancing and prospering in every desirable way which imposes *no import duties whatever.*

The colony of *Western Australia* shows signs of incipient growth after the fashion of the other Australian colonies. This is, no doubt, due to a novel influx of population bent upon active work and enterprise. For this reason we hear of railway extension and a new loan. Fiscal reform is finding favour; and there seems a prospect that the monotony of annual deficits will be broken. The customs tariff is to be lowered, and revenue sought from property and excise duties. No colony in Australia has as yet attempted to make of itself a free port. And yet, judging by the instance of Hong Kong, any colony which would attempt such a policy would have great prospect of remarkable success. If Western Australia were to open up some good harbour, and declare her ports free, she would at once reap the inestimable benefits of direct steamer communication with all parts of the world. And as the colony is nearest of all in Australia to the populated centres of civilization, the results would not only be at once apparent but of much immediate material profit.

There was opened in July, in *South Australia*, with all due ceremony, yet one more Australian "Exhibition of all Nations." It seems evident that business people, at all events, are of opinion they reap benefit

from these international fairs. The present Adelaide Exhibition has received no support from the State, and is, nevertheless, pronounced a great success. Due so entirely to private initiative, it was even opposed at one time by the traders of the town; but public opinion decided that the collections gathered for Sydney and Melbourne might as well be placed on view in Adelaide before their final scattering; the exhibitors were willing, and this successful exhibition is the result.

In this province of South Australia there are abundant signs of much industrial activity. Agricultural, mining, brewing, and shipping companies have been started. Evidence of this new-born activity is the great interest just now taken in public works. The authorities have completed, and opened with appropriate ceremony, the Torrens' Lake. This provides the capital with a sheet of water nearly two miles long, which will considerably relieve the aspect and increase the comforts of this city of the hot and dusty plains. The new Government is pushing the construction of railways, though it has discountenanced the land-grant system of payment.

The population of this colony is increasing fast. During the last five years there has been an increase of no less than one-third; a remarkable instance of rapid growth, which cannot fail largely to add to the importance of the colony. Export manufacturers in England will note this growth with pleasure, when they bear in mind that South Australia wisely retains a low tariff.

There are signs, too, of continued advance in *Tasmania*. Mining has assumed a more steady character; there is less of speculation, and more of real work. The results recorded from time to time are good and of great promise. The consequence is a new and wide-spread demand for increased facilities of communication. Roads, bridges, and even railways are now to be undertaken; and a coasted steamer service will shortly be established to bays and landing-places hitherto in remote and unknown wilds.

The programme of the new Government in *Victoria* is good; there remains only the problem of its realization. The land tax, which has hitherto been in reality a tax on squatting, is to be rendered a real land tax, by a readjustment extending its operation to all landed property. The selectors' area, under the Homestead Act, is to be increased from 320 to 640 acres. Royal Commissions are also promised, to inquire into the working of the Education Act and the Tariff. The former question is the one "burning" question still to the front in Victoria. The other is a question of grave importance to

the whole community. At the meeting of the British Association at York this last September, a paper was read in the Statistical Section, comparing the last ten years' growth of Victoria and New South Wales. This paper showed, from recorded figures, that all the developments or objects sought to be obtained in Victoria by the high tariff had been obtained, at the least, in equal degree, under the low tariff in New South Wales. There remains the certain fact that in all other respects New South Wales has advanced much more rapidly than Victoria, and bids fair at no distant date to become the premier colony of the Australias.

The present Victoria Ministry is a heterogenous collection of men who are leaders in no party. The continuance of their rule depends on the forbearance of the two main parties and not on their own popularity or power. The premier has wisely stated he will "avoid all questions affecting the balance of power between the various political parties." The Constitutional party have decided, in true accord with their title, to give the new Ministry a fair trial. This decision has largely assisted in the triumphant return of all the Ministers seeking re-election, with one exception. Mr. D. Gamson, appointed Minister for Lands, has failed to get himself re-elected. This is probably an advantage to the Ministry. His political antecedents mark him as a dangerous debater and keen critic in Opposition, rather than as a successful or conciliating member of a Coalition Ministry.

Mr. Haddon has communicated to the *Times* a long history of the Reform Movement in Victoria; he is certainly somewhat justified in congratulating himself on the eventual success of the scheme to which he originally attached himself. But he fails altogether to see that the present arrangement is not necessarily of a permanent character. It is not necessarily one which must meet with success. The two Houses are now co-ordinate, and the Upper House has become distinctly and avowedly representative. The claim to this position made on previous occasions by the Council has been one main cause of dead-locks. The main pretext of opposition has been, all along, that the Lower House in disposing of Money Bills would not brook the interference of the Upper House—interference justified on the part of the Upper House, on the plea that it alone represented property, and, therefore, was chiefly concerned with questions of taxation. This evil will scarcely be remedied by the new Reform, which establishes the Upper House on a more popular and more openly representative basis. It may be that this more popular character of the Council may keep it more in consonance with that public opinion which is supposed to be supreme in the Assembly. This is, of course, an incentive to peace. But what seems more likely is that the Upper

House, as now constituted, will prove so powerful an ally to the constitutionalists in the Lower House, that agreement will be maintained, not by the Council giving in to the Assembly, but by the Assembly giving in to the Council. As we showed last quarter the result of the new Reform has been that 100,000 electors possessing property are represented in each House. In the Lower House, besides these, there are the representatives of 80,000 more electors possessing no property qualification. The sole chance of political peace and compromise lies in the permament ascendency of the 100,000 in all matters. This would be great gain to every Victorian, but it will practically counterbalance manhood suffrage; and it remains to be seen whether such a result will be allowed to exist. If not, then the dead-locks will become more serious than before, because the Upper House will feel more justification for maintaining its own view now that it is founded on a basis only one degree less popular than that of the Lower House.

The account from the mines, and especially from the new gold-fields, in *New South Wales*, tell a uniform tale of improved prospects. There is thus a decided revival in the mining interest, which will have effect not only on the supplies of precious metals, but yet more directly in urging along this thriving colony on its career of prosperity.

English farmers will learn with satisfaction that the export of wheat from Australia shows no signs of any rapid increase, and that prices are high. Local grown wheat was fetching 5*s.* in the Sydney market. In regard to meat, the Orient Company are offering every facility for its carriage to England; and the order has gone forth for all their steamers to be fitted with ice rooms. The breeding and preserving "foreign meat" has now grown into a regular industry; but the question remains that meat, of the kind and condition necessary for his industry, is difficult to find, and exhibits a steady tendency to rise in price.

The Royal Princes have at last parted from their Australian hosts; and though their visit has been purposely regarded as strictly private, they have fulfilled, even so, with great success, their constitutional *rôle* as lesser representatives of the unity of the English nation. It is to be hoped that the Prince of Wales may some day be enabled to judge for himself of the loyal hospitality and the wonderful prospects and progress of the Australias.

In *New Zealand* we hear of continued activity in the construction of railways. Here the Government has adopted the land-grant system of payment. It seems certain that this method of alienating Government land is of a far more profitable character, if we regard the future,

than the indiscriminate selling at £1, or even less, per acre, to any and all who will buy. The object of either method is to invite the settlement of population on the land. And, by encouraging the railway and the population to come to the land together, guarantee is given that facilities shall exist between the new settlers and the outer world. This is the one guarantee requisite in the opening up of new unoccupied lands; and in the absence of this, many a free selector in Australia has found his isolated homestead a ruinous investment. The soil may have been first rate; he may have possessed personal industry and agricultural skill; but if there was no way of getting his produce to market his efforts were, of course, fruitless.

New Zealand is the colony, *par excellence*, of special settlements. The population is fed, not so much by a stream of individual immigrants, each landing to set to work by and for himself, but by groups organized into committees, even before leaving the shores of Europe. This has always been a main feature in the settlement of New Zealand. Several new ventures of the kind have been started lately in the North Island. The success of the method is amply attested by the results. Previously unorganized districts are suddenly converted into thriving agricultural areas; and the consequence has been that settlers, in their special settlement, arrive at a competency sooner than the majority of independent immigrants.

New Zealand is at last able to enjoy the luxury of a surplus. Government is enabled, most wisely, to commence a reduction of import duties. A beginning has been made in the clothing and implements of the wage-earning classes. This fact is of significant importance to our home manufacturers, and should lead them to endeavour to do all they can to maintain their business connection with this thriving colony. The population has been actually doubled in the last ten years.

The late Conference at Sydney is bearing fruit through all the Australian Colonies. Each of the self-governing colonies, in accordance with the resolutions adopted at that Conference, has now passed an Act placing restrictions on the influx of Chinese. It was remarkable that all opposition in any colony to such an Act was stifled completely by an altogether extraneous influence—the dread of smallpox. There has been almost a panic on this score throughout the Australias; and this has had a powerful political effect in urging public opinion to oppose the immigration of Chinese, because of the fact that their habits of life rendered them specially obnoxious to the disease.

New Zealand is also following the action of the Australian Colonies in the starting the frozen meat industry. It is evident that from the Australias there will soon come to England a sudden and large store

of frozen meat. But if this has any decided effect in lowering prices in England the majority of these establishments must fail. By the time they do so, meat will have advanced considerably in price in the Colonies themselves, and the industry will cease to obtain its supply of raw material at present prices. Moreover, this industry of freezing meat must interfere with those of "tinned meat" and tallow—the latter, at all events, a great and permanent industry. It seems that, putting all things together, the price the English farmer now obtains for his meat will not be lowered at all by the operation of this industry of sending frozen meat from Australia. The profits of the middleman may suffer; but even that result will in all probability be but of temporary duration.

In the *Cape Colony* English influence is again in the ascendency: the threatened antagonism between the two European races is passing away. The idea of Boycotting English goods, which at one time commended itself to the Boer sympathizers, and which would have so seriously hampered them in the industrial race, has happily remained a mere idea.

There are numerous signs of industrial and commercial activity. But there is too little capital in the Colony at present to provide for all this newborn and ambitious energy. With the advent of peace and population years of great progress are possible in the near future. Railway extensions are naturally to the fore; and there is news of special importance in the bright prospects afforded by the recent survey of the new coal-fields.

There is, however, ground for serious dissatisfaction at the continued endeavours of certain leading men to foster an idea of local independence for the whole of South Africa. It is, indeed, impossible that such an idea could be realized without the consent of the powerful and increasing English element. Nevertheless, it should be well known in South Africa that, if severed from the material and moral aid of an empire, the European communities in South Africa could only exist by the forbearance of the native races; and that is a condition of existence which would not be lasting.

The independent spirit and energy which late events have called out in Kimberley and in the Eastern Province, point to these two districts as centres that are rapidly equalling the Cape Town centre in importance and force. It is not surprising that we hear new mention of an old scheme favourable to a separation of East from West.

In Basutoland peace has been nominally secured; but this has not been the result of any unmistakable assertion of the supremacy of Europeans; and in so far there is no certainty whatver of its

lasting, fears are openly expressed in the Free State that the Basutos, inspired by the belief that they have beaten the English, may at any moment attack the Free State.

In the Transkei, and the native districts generally, there is much unrest. Kreli and his tribe are boastful and hostile. Apprehensions are rife as to the future. One certainty is impressing itself on all, and that is, that in the end the Imperial authorities or the Colonists will have to inaugurate some definite system of native rule. Considering the high value South Africa already is to us in England as a market, it does seem remarkable that public opinion has not yet been more urgent to provide for the due control and government of the natives. The establishment of a new English Crown Colony to relieve the local authorities and the local men of the administration of those territories where natives largely predominate—of the Transkei and Basuto districts—would appear to offer the only sure prospect of permanent amelioration. The authority of the Queen as head chief must be set up and maintained; the English Government has plenty of administrative talent and experience at its command; the new Colony would at once become entirely self-supporting; the neighbouring European populations at once relieved of a present burden and a perennial source of apprehension and trouble. If we would advance our own trade; if we would civilize and humanize these nations, we must first of all *govern* them.

The recent course of affairs in Zululand are fresh evidence of the desirability of some such policy. Sir Garnet Wolseley's arrangement of several independent chieftainships has failed, as we foresaw at the time, to overcome that innate love of the Zulu for fighting. The strange desire has revived to return Cetewayo to his Zulus. In England we have been almost amused at the strenuous exertions of professional humanitarians, backed by the kindly though mistaken opinions of a small clique in Natal, to set aside the teaching of obvious facts, the strong opinion of the great majority of colonists on the spot, and the calm judgment of statesmen in England, and to restore the head and forefront of the Zulu fighting machine. Sir E. Wood has been forced to visit Zululand to investigate the causes of growing disturbance. He has promptly recommended the extension of English authority over the Zulus. There are to be English resident magistrates in each division, and a hut-tax to support this first step of civilized administration. This is all evidence that the stern logic of fact is forcing all to see that the best government for the native districts is the supremacy and administration of a civilized power of overwhelming prestige and resources. This, as we have long ago said,

is the sole means of securing that peace which is the one necessary condition of progress in civilization and prosperity.

In the *Transvaal* sufficient time has not yet elapsed to prove how far the Convention is as yet understood, or how far its words will be endorsed by the action of the people. The Boers seem slow to grasp its meaning; nor is this strange in a country so sparsely populated, and by a people not celebrated for brilliancy or learning. The question must remain some time in doubt as to whether, when the Boer mind, as a whole, has understood the terms of the Convention, these terms will be accepted by the Boer nation.

# Contemporary Literature.

## THEOLOGY.

AT the invitation of the Committee of the Congregational Union Society to deliver a course of lectures on Church History,[1] Mr. Guinness Rogers proposed to himself to present a general survey of the position of the various Churches which are influencing the religious thought of our country and our generation. To effect his purpose he found it necessary to examine with some minuteness the leading ecclesiastical controversies of the time. His point of view is, of course, that of a Congregationalist, and of a Congregationalist committed to the struggle for complete religious equality. Congregationalism has been defined as the democratic form of Church government, and is naturally antagonistic to prelatical Episcopacy and sacerdotal Presbyterianism. Congregationalism once played an important part in English history. It triumphed at Naseby and Worcester; it had Cromwell and Milton for its chief representatives. According to the Bampton Lecturer of 1871, as cited by Mr. G. Rogers, Congregationalism has not been without its influence even on the Church of England, as is shown in the assertion or reassertion within that Church of the ecclesiastical rights of the laity. Mr. Rogers' scheme of religious reform rejects all external confederation, rejects even a dogmatic basis of union, and advocates a co-operation of all Christian communities, with a view to the practical evangelization of the English people. His general survey of the controversies of our time is remarkable for an earnest, yet dispassionate appreciation of the characteristics of the different religious movements that he describes—the Plymouth brethren being, we believe, the only community noticed in his work which he judges with extreme severity. As a controversialist, Mr. Guinness Rogers seems to us to write with a studied desire to avoid giving unnecessary offence, yet with a frankness which proves that he does not flinch from avowing his honest convictions. His language is that of an educated man, and, as he does not affect the theological dialect, we have read his book with patient acquiescence, if not with a secret sense of grateful relief. The field traversed by Mr. Rogers is so extensive that we can only give illustrations of his treatment of the subject which he has selected for the "Sixth Congregational Union Lecture." Naturally opposed to the sacerdotal principle, he points, in his review of "The Age and the Churches," to the evidences of a growing disapprobation of ecclesiastical exclusiveness, referring, for instance, to Sir T.

[1] "The Church Systems of England in the Nineteenth Century, with the Sixth Congregational Union Lecture." By J. Guinness Rogers, B.A. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1881.

Dyke Acland's rebuke of priestly pretensions, and to the vote of the House of Lords in favour of Lord Harrowby's amendment, in virtue of which the Dissenting minister is admitted into the churchyard. While he welcomes this denial of the claim of the Episcopal Church involved in this decision, he is careful to observe that the restriction of the services to those which are "Christian and orderly" is a violation of the principles for which Nonconformists have always contended. The Evangelical revival, under the histrionic Whitfield, the overbearing Wesley, and Newton, "a swearing sailor and a profligate slave-trader turned into a devoted minister of Christ," is fairly delineated both in its favourable and unfavourable aspects. The Oxford School, the pioneer, Alexander Knox, and the leaders of that school, Keble, Pusey, Newman, are described with clear discernment of their excellences and demerits. With his estimate of the Broad Church, as represented by Arnold and Whately, there seems no fault to be found. While he allows that these eminent men had Scripture and reason on their side, it is impossible, he adds, to deny that the formularies of the Church favour their adversaries rather than themselves. If the "non-natural" interpretation was advocated by Mr. Ward, the author of "The Ideal Church," it is admitted that the responsibility of the first move in that direction rests with the Evangelicals, who assuredly received the baptismal formulary in a non-natural sense. In dealing with this part of his subject Mr. Rogers reminds us that Mr. Gorham, though he succeeded in his suit, did not obtain the approval of the Court. The *experimentum crucis* of Dr. Newman in Tract XC., on the other hand, proved a signal failure. The principle for which he contended, that of a *quasi*-Catholic interpretation of the Thirty-nine Articles, was not granted, and he "did not draw back, but gave it up." Mr. Rogers, in describing the logic with which this principle was defended, says with unusual asperity that the reasonings of Dr. Newman "savour only of the hyper-subtlety of Jesuit casuistry," &c. It is a noteworthy fact, that Dr. Newman expressly retracts the argument on which he undertook to prove that the terms "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits" used of the "sacrifices of masses" in Article XXXI. did not apply to the sacrifice of the Mass. "I do not see, then," writes the Cardinal, in the latest edition of the Tract in 1879, "how it can be denied that this Article calls the Sacrifice of the Mass itself, in all its private and solitary celebrations, from year's end to year's end and *toto orbe terrarum*, a blasphemous fable." To recommend their views to the Church, Mr. Rogers submits that, according to their own showing, certain writers of the Oxford School had recourse to expedients variously known as "Economy," "Reserve," "Phenakism"—that is, Quackery or Imposture. These expedients, however, appear to be practised by members of the extreme Latitudinarian party in our own day, men who transform the Christian doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body into the Pagan idea of the Immortality of the Soul, or the Catholic doctrine of Everlasting Damnation into some fanciful hypothesis of universalism, annihilation, or an oscillating succession of states of sin

and suffering, holiness and felicity. Of the three parties in the Church, wittily called Platitudinarians, Latitudinarians and Attitudinarians, we do not see that any one of the three can escape censure for paltering with the truth, or, if the phrase be preferred, for resorting to the processes known as Economy, Reserve, and Phenakism. The account given of the Ritualistic controversy by Mr. Rogers seems to us intelligible, considerate, and just. We are disposed to agree with him, too, when he says that "the Judicial Committee may have rightly understood the interests of the Church, but it is much more questionable whether they have given a true interpretation of the law. To ordinary readers the Ornaments Rubric seems to warrant the use of the robes which Ritualists love." Again, Mr. Rogers would seem to be right when he sums up: "For practical purposes the Public Worship Act has proved little better than a mere fiasco." The Mass in masquerade, he insists, continues; but with more of the Mass and less of the masquerade, the ritual, of course, being intended to educate the people in the doctrine of the Real Presence. According to the late Bishop of St. David's, "several of the clearest directions of our own rubric are disobeyed and the Roman Observance substituted for that appointed by our own Church. And this, it would seem, is the ritual which a certain section of the Broad Church argue must be retained in order to prevent the establishment of perfect religious equality in this country." The Established Church, it has been estimated, does not represent the belief of one-third of the people. How can it be allowed to give expression to the faith of the nation? Canon Liddon proposes that the final decision in all ecclesiastical matters shall be vested in an Ecclesiastical Court; the Supreme Court of Appeal being reconstituted so as to consist of bishops elected by the Episcopate, &c. &c., with a final appeal from its decisions, at least in matters of faith, to the whole body of the English bishops. Mr. Guinness Rogers may well ask, Where is such a demand likely to gain any supporters? The remedy which he recommends is to be sought in an appeal to Parliament, which must always, he contends, be the governing power of a Church by law established. To us this remedy seems to be absolutely monstrous; monstrous because a considerable number of the men composing the hypothetical tribunal are Jews, heretics, infidels, and, therefore, morally unfitted for the task, and monstrous because there are very few of that number who are theologians. We should as soon think of submitting the problems of Life and Mind, of Science and Philosophy, Astronomy, Chemistry, Biology, Evolution, Cosmic Emotion, Idealism, or Conservation of Energy to the judgment of the House of Commons, or that of the Lords, as of submitting the questions of the Inspiration of Scripture, Eternal Punishment, Prevenient Grace, the Filioque Clause, or the Multiformity of Deity—which, we believe, is *Broad-Church* for the Trinity in Unity—to such a heterogeneous and theologically-incapable tribunal as that which Mr. Rogers, perhaps only hypothetically, proposes, to force on his opponents the distasteful alternative of Disestablishment.

When a man talks of "doing homage in the world-wide fane of God," or of worshipping in the "Cathedral of Immensity," we shrewdly suspect that he never goes to Church at all. In Mr. Geldart's case we are not far wrong. He was sometime curate of St. George's, Everton, but has found a "sweet and safe asylum and refuge" from Conformity in the Croydon Free Christian Community, or Church, as it calls itself. His little book contains fourteen sermons[2] advocating a vague, indefinite Christianity, celebrates the "Universal Spirit," "Universal Sacraments," and the "Viewless Infinite;" extolling "the golden glories of the love of God," and doing homage to "the mysterious charm of the life, and the matchless magnificence of the teaching," of Jesus. Mr. Geldart naturally rejects the doctrine of the Atonement, and "the Atonement's corner-stone, the doctrine of Eternal Torment."

Mr. Geldart does not stand alone. Those who wish to read the arguments which are adducible in favour of this rejection, at least, as far as the doctrine of the non-perpetuity of torment is concerned, may be referred to Mr. John M. Patton's "Death of Death,"[3] and Mr. F. Nutcombe Oxenham's "What is the Truth as to Everlasting Punishment?"[4] According to Mr. Patton, "eternal punishment" means "punishment taking place in eternity;" and eternal destruction from the presence of God does not preclude the ultimate restoration of the objects of that punishment to the favour of God their Creator. Mr. F. N. Oxenham, who must not be confounded with his Catholic namesake, has entered the lists against Dr. Pusey, whose armour appears to be not absolutely impenetrable, but who, in our opinion, is perfectly correct in maintaining that the doctrine of eternal punishment is the doctrine of the New Testament. We cannot, however, argue the question here. Mr. F. N. Oxenham's work seems almost to exhaust the argument which supports the opposite view. His work abounds in learned citations.

The three works that we shall next notice have a common relation and, with some reservation, a common purpose. The six lectures delivered by Mr. Richard Armstrong, from we know not what pulpit, and collected in a volume entitled, "Latter-Day Teachers," are written to enforce the value of the Theistic conception.[5] From the admissions of John Stuart Mill, Matthew Arnold, and Theodore Parker, the author draws inferences favourable to his view of the existence of a living personal God; from Canon Farrar's works, while largely dissenting from his method and conclusions, he selects a highly-coloured state-

---

[2] "Faith and Freedom." Fourteen Sermons. By E. M. Geldart, M.A., formerly Scholar of Balliol College, Oxford; some time curate of St. George's, Everton, &c. London: Trübner & Co. 1881.

[3] "The Death of Death," &c. By an Orthodox Layman (John M. Patton). Revised Edition. London: Trübner & Co. 1881.

[4] "What is the Truth as to Everlasting Punishment?" In reply to Dr. Pusey's late treatise "What is of Faith as to Everlasting Punishment?" By the Rev. F. Nutcombe Oxenham, M.A. London: Rivingtons. 1881.

[5] "Latter-Day Teachers." Six Lectures by Richard Acland Armstrong, B.A. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1881.

ment of the consummate meaning of "that which Christ taught by every breath he drew." Refusing to accept, as a true portraiture of Christ, a likeness which presupposes the historical character of the Gospels, he constructs, not an ecclesiastical nor a pure *evangelistic* Jesus, but a Jesus of Nazareth—pure man, with that divinity which is in all mankind. Like the Rev. Charles Voysey, in his "Discourses on the Lord's Prayer," he rejects the doctrines of the Atonement and Eternal Punishment; but, unlike Mr. Voysey, he insists on the devout recognition of Jesus as an element of true religion. Mr. Voysey can concede only that there is in Christian dogma a better portion, but his Paternoster sermons are in part designed to show the irreconcileability of "the manifest teachings of the prayer with that dogma." His theory, unlike that of Mr. Armstrong, leaves no room "even for Jesus Christ." This exclusion disconcerts an ardent admirer of the author of the "Sling and the Stone," the eighth instalment of which contains these discourses;[6] and in "A Letter" to the theological Giant-killer[7] he remonstrates with him on this omission. The "Letter," though it exaggerates the claims of Jesus, may serve to rectify Mr. Voysey's excessive antagonism. The author, however, when he declares that Jesus was the Messiah whom the Jews were expecting, offers a vulnerable front to the Sling and the Stone of his too impetuous friend. The Messiah whom the Jews expected was very different from the Messiah of the spiritual type of Jesus. The Letter-writer is too fond of referring to the somewhat apocryphal story of Newton and the falling apple, but he is entitled to ask Mr. Voysey where he found that Anselm, whom he places with a laxity not, however, without precedent, among patristic writers, believed and maintained that the offering made by Christ on Calvary was made to the Devil. So far from Anselm holding any such hypothesis, we believe he was the first expressly and unreservedly to condemn this strange speculation of the ancient Fathers on the supposed rights of Satan to a ransom.

The Rev. J. R. Giles and Mr. Voysey take a very different view of the claim of this Prince of the Power of the air to put in an appearance in the Lord's Prayer. In "A Letter addressed to the Archbishop of Canterbury,"[8] Dr. Giles contends for the rendering of the Authorized Version which recognizes the "principle of evil," and not "the malignant spirit" of the Revised Version. We are unable to exclude the suspicion that Dr. Giles is influenced in favour of his abstract interpretation by a subconscious rationalistic antipathy to the robust theology which would "place prominently before the minds of children the idea of Satan, or the Devil" (p. 10). The heretical preacher, formerly vicar of Headlaugh, comes much nearer the truth,

---

[6] "The Sling and the Stone." Vol. VIII. On the Paternoster. By the Rev. Charles Voysey, B.A., &c. London: Williams & Norgate. 1881.

[7] "A Letter to the Rev. Charles Voysey." From a Christian Theist. London: Provost & Co.

[8] "The Evil One, or the Revisionists Revised; in a Letter addressed to the Archbishop of Canterbury." By the Rev. J. A. Giles, D.C.L., Rector of Sutton, Surrey, and formerly Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford. London: Reeves & Turner. 1881.

than the present rector of Sutton, when he remarks, that we "cannot get rid of the Devil from the New Testament, without destroying and extinguishing the very figure of Jesus Christ." Some of our readers, perhaps, require to be told that the Greek words in question may, without violation of grammar, be translated indifferently Deliver us from evil, or Deliver us from the Evil one. The neuter τὸ πονηρὸν occurs in Rom. xii. 9; the masculine ὁ πονηρὸς in Matt. xiii. 19, and (in the accusative case) in St. John ii. 13. The personality of the Devil, however, was taught by Jesus himself. Dr. Giles allows that the early Fathers used the expression in the Lord's Prayer as equivalent to "Deliver us from the Evil One;" and Wettstein, as translated by Mr. Voysey, informs us, "in the prayer of the Jews it runs thus: And let a good spirit rule within me and not an evil one." And in other prayers:—"Deliver us and save us from our wicked enemy and from evil accident." The Revised Version cannot be shown to be incorrect. The rendering it gives has the support of eminent scholars; among them, if Mr. Voysey's list be correct, of Erasmus, Beza, Kinnoel, Fritzsche, Meyer, and Wegscheider, all of whom understand the words in dispute to apply to deliverance from the Devil. Dr. Giles proposes some other corrections of the Revised Version. In Matt. xi. 12, his own rendering, "plunder the kingdom of heaven" is no improvement on "take it by force." In 1st Epistle John iii. 2, his translation, "if it be made manifest," instead of "when Christ shall appear," is unquestionably correct.

"The Gospel of St. John," by Mr. R. Govett,[9] is the work of an amateur theologian, a devout Trinitarian, but deficient in knowledge of the subject which he has selected for critical elucidation. The gospel which bears the name of the Son of Zebedee was, he informs us, probably written at Ephesus between the years A.D. 70 and 80—a chronological determination which he will find no competently instructed person now accepts. The Quakers, in his opinion, are antichrists, for, by "preaching up of the light within every man, they are led to make light . . . . of the Person of Christ." Some of them, it seems, had said that they would own Christ only as he was before the world was made, and to refute these heretics he cites our old friend John Bunyan. "Then," said John Bunyan, "you deny that Jesus Christ has been born of Mary! For His birth of Mary was something that took place some four thousand years after the Creation." Another orthodox determination of time which, we presume, Mr. R. Govett shares with the author of the "Pilgrim's Progress"! His Trinitarian predilections are well exhibited in the imposing assertion: "At Jesus' baptism the Trinity in Unity appears;" and his remarkable talent for improving the occasion when, alluding to the descent of the Holy Spirit on the Son of God, he exclaims:—"How appropriate, morally, that the Dove should abide upon the Lamb!" Orthodox, however, as is the new commentator on St. John's Gospel, there is (p. 455) an interpretation of Genesis vi. which will startle his

[9] "Exposition of the Gospel of St. John." By R. Govett. Vol. I. London: Bemrose & Son.

more conservative readers. He thus comments on Psalm lxxxii. 6:— "Here are beings called gods. They wrongfully became men. . . . . The Psalmist refers, I believe, to the angels who fell in Noah's day through love to women." The present volume of Mr. Govett's "Exposition" terminates with the tenth chapter of the fourth gospel.

If we place Dr. Milligan's volume on "The Resurrection of Our Lord"[10] on a higher level as regards literary power, we cannot commend it as an attempt to vindicate the historical reality of that alleged event on philosophical grounds. Jesus, we are told, did not rise with the same body as that with which he died, but with a supernatural body, which enabled him to appear suddenly and vanish suddenly, with a rapidity beyond that of ordinary locomotion. This supernatural body was, however, so far natural, that he sat at meat and ate fish, and presumably bread, if not honeycomb, and had the print of the nails in the hands and feet and side. It is Dr. Milligan's refining explanations, *not* the acceptance of obvious interpretations, that "evade the difficulty." Pearson, in what used to be a textbook in the more rational of our universities, interprets the words and actions of Christ as "an argument of the vegetative and nutritive faculty," and quotes Ignatius and Augustine in corroboration of this view. Nor are we better satisfied with Dr. Milligan's scientific illustrations. When naturalism is invoked in support of supernaturalism, and the "electric spark" and "molecules of wire" are drawn upon to support the hypothesis of "the existence of such a body as is now spoken of," the Faith that "laughs at impossibilities and says it shall be done," is virtually surrendered. To solve the theological conundrum: If the Lord did not rise with the very body with which he died, was he still the same Lord? raises the question of personal identity; and, for an interesting illustration of the identity of certain animals, we are referred to two small books in the "Nature Series," entitled, "Transformation of Insects" and "What is a Frog?" Sir Henry Tyler is reported to have asked (August 23) in the House of Commons, "whether it was correct that Dr. Aveling had stated that the principles of the frog were condemnatory of God?" Now we know not what principles a frog can have who carries things as far as this; but, as Dr. Aveling and Dr. Milligan appear to take opposite views of this amphibious theologian's religious principles, we shall leave them to quarrel over the opinions of the pious or impious batrachian and decide the question as best they may. Dr. Milligan has scarcely more success in his attempt to demolish the "Vision hypothesis," that is, the solution of the problem of the Belief in the Resurrection of Jesus by the theory of his subjective appearance. In the first place, he has not given due prominence to the preliminary conditions of the origin of this faith, as indicated by anti-supernaturalists, conditions which lie in the Messianic idea, in its determination to the person of Jesus, in the character of Jewish dogma, in predictions of the Old

[10] "The Resurrection of Our Lord." By William Milligan, D.D., Professor of Divinity and Biblical Criticism in the University of Aberdeen. London: Macmillan. 1881.

Testament admitting of application to Jesus, the Messiah, and in probable expressions of Jesus announcing a future return. The visionary appearances were the sequel to a pre-existing faith, not the ground of the faith, which rather evoked the visions giving that faith its complete corroboration. Mary Magdalene was certainly a woman of excitable temperament, but faith in the Resurrection of Jesus was not the consequence of the devotion of a nervous female, and of this alone, as Professor Zeller has pointed out. Paul was an enthusiast, an ecstatic, a man subject to visions, trance-epilepsy probably; but the Resurrection of Jesus had taken place, *in his mind*, before the appearance of the risen Lord (1 Cor. xv. 8), which was its external correspondent. Baur, whose evasion of the difficulty Dr. Milligan does not fail to turn to account, never supposed that the Resurrection was an objective occurrence, and though no doubt St. Paul imagined that the appearance of Jesus to himself was an external reality, we should be but poor psychologists if we did not detect the visionary when he could not detect himself, if we did not pronounce the appearance "a fact of the inward life." Like Santa Teresa, he saw Christ with the eyes of the soul more distinctly than he could have seen him with the eyes of the body; and, unlike her, conceived that he beheld him corporeally present before him. There is much more which we might say on Dr. Milligan's view of the evidence for the Resurrection; but we must be content to refer our readers, sceptics or believers, to his ingenious pleadings for the reality of the occurrence.

A learned German treatise by a Swiss Divine, "on the primitive perfection and the Fall of Man" takes up an intermediate position between the old theological and the modern philosophical view of man. The residuum of truth in a doctrine, disengaged from all legendary accretions, may be readily discernible, but the disengaging process destroys the authority of the Church, and the revelation of which the Church is the reputed keeper. Admitting that "the religious consciousness" confirms the doctrine of the Church on the nature of man, in its totality, the admission is of little value to orthodoxy, since Adam is declared to be a mythical being, and the "Real Man" is only attainable by the double process of divesting the myth of its historical drapery and transforming the abstract "First Man" of the inspired record into the living concrete man of our actual experience. Herr Rüetschi, however, recognises in Christian Theism the supreme religion. The dualism of man's nature—at once sensual and spiritual—forms a problem which demands solution. Jesus, he says, has seized and solved this problem. The conquest of the lower nature is effected through love to God in Jesus Christ. Through this love in Christ the profound contradiction in human nature is abolished; and this abolition it is which constitutes the atonement or reconciliation. Here again we have rationalized Christianity; and a rationalized Christianity is, we submit, no true Christianity. A Christian philosophy it may

---

[11] "Geschichte und Kritik der kirchlichen Lehre von der ursprünglichen Vollkommenheit und vom Sündenfall," &c. Von Rudolf Rüetschi. Pfarrer, u.s.w., zu Münchenbuchsee, Canton Bern.

be; but a Christian theology it is not. If there was no First Adam, there is no Second Adam, in any but a metaphysical or non-natural sense.

A new translation of "The Prophecies of Isaiah," by the Rev. J. M. Rodwell,[12] the translator of the Koran and the Book of Job, deserves our respectful recognition. Based on the common Masoretic Text, it is faithful to the Hebrew original; though, as the author admits, occasionally rough and bold. It is without note, or comment, or critical division. It retains the parallelisms, which are a distinguishing feature of all Hebrew poetry; it conserves the local and circumstantial colouring, as in chaps. xxxiv. xxxv., where we read "Lilith," the female spectre of the night, instead of "the screech owl," "the narcissus," instead of "the rose;" and where "the mirage becomes a lake," instead of "the parched ground shall become a pool." While commending Mr. Rodwell's carefully executed version of the great Hebrew prophet, we cannot but regret that he still adheres to the hypothesis of unity of authorship; and, while he allows that the prophecies, down to the minutest particular, have immediate reference to passing events, contends both weakly and inconsistently, as we think, that "they also contain implied references, and a capability of application to coming events in the history of the Jewish people and of humanity at large."

In the first volume of Mr. E. Byron Nicholson's "New Commentary on the Historical Books of the New Testament,"[13] we have valuable illustrative matter, gathered from many sources. The ground occupied by Mr. Nicholson is intended to be strictly neutral; but such is the extreme difficulty of the task which he has imposed on himself that he has done well to disarm objection, as far as possible, by the preliminary avowal that there are "certain features in this Commentary which, unless explained, might be interpreted by one party or the other as a violation of the writer's profession of neutrality." The volume before us consists of the Authorized Version of the text of St. Matthew's Gospel, occasional corrections of erroneous renderings, explanatory notes, discussions on long-contested enigmas, an introduction, and appendices. The work gives evidence of careful study, extensive reading, and thoughtful preparation. It does not profess to be a work of profound erudition, but appears to be suited to the higher class of general readers. In examining Mr. Nicholson's corrections, or elucidations, we often find ourselves in agreement with him; and where we cannot agree with him, we are quite aware that he can sometimes adduce authority in favour of his views. In St. Matthew i. 22, 23; xxi. 4, 5; xxvi. 56, the formula, "All this was done," and the accom-

---

[12] "Prophecies of Isaiah." Translated from the Hebrew. By J. M. Rodwell, M.A. Cambridge, Rector of St. Ethelburga, London. Translator of the Koran and the Book of Job. London: F. Norgate. 1881.

[13] "A New Commentary on the Historical Books of the New Testament." Vol. I. The Gospel according to Matthew. By Edward Byron Nicholson, M.A., late Scholar of Trinity College, Oxford; Principal Librarian and Superintendent of the London Institution; author of "The Gospel according to the Hebrews," &c. London: Kegan Paul & Co. 1881.

panying quotation, are attributed by Mr. Nicholson to the angel and to Jesus. In the second instance, St. Mark is appealed to for confirmation of this view, but there is no reason why we should not suppose the Evangelist to refer to v. 54. In the third instance, the words of St. John xii. 14–16, are far from favouring Mr. Nicholson's construction. In St. Matt. xxv. 3 the word translated *lamps* has been supposed by others, as well as by himself, to mean exclusively *torches*. But is not our author too absolute when he rules that the Greek word cannot be translated lamps? In Acts xx. 8, the "many lights" in the upper room where Paul was preaching could hardly have been *torches*. Mr. Nicholson sets a higher value on the "Gospel according to the Hebrews," than we can do. His book is not satisfactory to us, because we believe neutrality, in many cases, to be impossible, or uncritical. His suggestion of an expedient for reconciling the contradictory statements of the first two Evangelists as to the residence of Joseph and Mary, recall the devices of antediluvian orthodoxy, and to attenuate the Greek word for "eternal," or "everlasting," into "of ages," is to restrict its meaning, and so surrender the point in dispute.

Mr. Rhys Davids' selection of Buddhist Texts[14] appears to have been made with rare discrimination, if we may judge from the interesting character of the volume which he offers as a sample of a "Holy Scripture" not our own. According to our translator the most essential, the most original, and the most attractive part of Gotama's teaching is to be found in "The Noble Eightfold Path." Of the seven Suttas which Mr. Rhys Davids has translated the principal is entitled "The Foundation of the Kingdom of Righteousness." "The Book of the Great Decease," which he believes to have been written about 420 or 400 B.C., is defined as the Buddhist representative of what among Christians is called a Gospel. "The Legend of the Great King of Glory" is a kind of wonderful fairy tale or gorgeous poem in which an attempt is made to describe in set terms the greatest possible glory and majesty of the greatest possible king, in order to show that all is vanity save only righteousness. The description of the royal city and its wondrous palace reminds the translator of the similar but simpler and more beautiful poem in which a Jewish author some three centuries afterwards described the heavenly Jerusalem. Notwithstanding this admission of a vague resemblance we are happy to say Mr. Rhys Davids does not recognise an historical connection between the New Testament and the Buddhist Scriptures. Such resemblance he rightly considers is due not to any borrowing on the one side or the other, but solely to the similarity of the conditions under which the two movements grew. The "Introductions" which illustrate the Texts are replete with valuable information. It is quite evident that the original creed was not monotheistic. "Never in the history of the world had a scheme of salvation been put forth so simple

---

[14] "The Sacred Books of the East." Translated by various Oriental scholars, and edited by F. Max Müller. Vol. XI. Buddhist Suttas, translated from Pali by T. W. Rhys Davids. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1881.

in its nature, so free from superhuman agency, so independent of, so even antagonistic to the belief in a soul, the belief in God, and the hope for a future life." Properly the Gods were degraded forms liable to dissolution. Brahma himself was evanescent, and could only find salvation by walking along "The Eightfold Noble Path." The Brahma of modern times, the God of some of the best of the later Hindus, had not then come into existence, though Buddhism continued to express a belief in external spirits. The true Nirvana was not originally a life of happiness in a heaven beyond the skies, but a state of mind due to earnest thought, the eradication of evil passions, and a change of heart, to be reached on earth. Of The Blessed One, of Buddha himself, it is written:—

"And ere long he attained to that supreme goal of the higher life for the sake of which men go out from all and every household gain and comfort to become houseless wanderers. Yea, that supreme goal did he, by himself, and while yet in this visible world, bring himself to the knowledge of, and continue to realize and to see face to face. And he became conscious that birth was at an end, that the higher life had been fulfilled, that all that should be done had been accomplished, and that after this present life there would be no beyond." —*The Book of the Great Decease*, p. 110.

---

## PHILOSOPHY.

"I propose in the following pages to give the chief conclusions reached by Modern Science on the central questions of religion, morals, and society—to state, in a word, the general creed of Science; and, as the scientific faith may still be fallible, or of unequal degrees of credit, I propose, in the second place, to offer some comments and criticisms on some of its more doubtful articles, with a view to their reconsideration or revision." These words introduce the reader to an opportune and ably-written work,[1] which will assuredly be a help to many who are groping their way amongst the ruins of effete systems to some new ground of assurance and contentment. The work is divided into three parts, entitled respectively "The Creed of Science, Religious and Moral," "The Gospel and the Social Creed of Science," and "The Future of Religion and Morals." In the first book the author reviews the hypotheses advanced by Laplace and later theorists to explain the genesis of the physical worlds, discusses the theory of Natural Selection, and devotes several chapters to Anthropological topics, such as the moral nature of man, the doctrine of Automatism and the question of Immortality. In the second book Pessimism is weighed in the critical scales and found wanting, and the attainability of Happiness having been placed beyond doubt, the individualistic and

---

[1] "The Creed of Science: Religious, Moral, and Social." By William Graham, M.A., Author of "Idealism: an Essay, Metaphysical and Critical." London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1881.

socialistic roads to it are compared, and their respective advantages and disadvantages fairly balanced. Then, in the closing book, we have modern materialism brought before the bar of the Speculative Reason; the God-idea revised in conformity with the demands of the modern spirit, and the strong and weak points of the Evolution Ethics indicated in two concluding chapters. It will be clear from this brief table of contents that no theme of first-rate importance is omitted; and yet the treatment is so lucid that a very slender acquaintance with either Science or Philosophy will be found sufficient for comprehending the force of the arguments employed. The cardinal defect, according to our author, in the prevailing scientific philosophy, is the omission of the idea of Purpose. Since the publication of the "Origin of Species" the notion of Final Cause has been banished from Biology; and the Evolution Philosophy of Mr. Herbert Spencer, although admitting an Unknowable Power, does not credit it with any conscious or unconscious aim. The real issue we have now to face, says Mr. Graham, is—Did, and does, Chance or Purpose make and rule the world? The philosophy of Evolution is presumed to reply "Chance," and by so doing is alleged to flout the speculative instinct of all ages. The danger incurred by thus defining the philosophic issue is that of treating Chance as a positive, and not as a negative, term, a risk which we think our author has not escaped. "Purpose" is a sufficiently clear conception, its comprehension only requires interrogation of personal consciousness, but what significance can be attached to the word "Chance"? Now, in ignoring a Cosmic Purpose, the evolutionist merely refrains from expressing an opinion about the why and wherefore of the world as a whole; he is simply agnostic on that profoundest, and perhaps really inscrutable, question—What is the ontologic essence of Causality? Our author, at least, should think long and seriously before he attempts to constrain the scientific philosopher to such a confession of faith; for he himself holds that the ultimate reality of the universe is devoid of personality and every form of consciousness. No doubt there are metaphysical systems (that of Von Hartmann, for instance) which endeavour to combine the notions of unconsciousness and will, of the Unconscious and rational Purpose; but, although Mr. Graham is probably influenced by these ingenious speculations, we do not gather from the present work that he has fairly faced the difficulties, well-nigh, if not quite, insuperable, which must thereby be encountered. On the question of free will, he adopts what we consider the sound position, and gives an able rendering of the Determinist creed; but on the subject of individual immortality, somewhat inconsequentially we think, is inclined to accept the verdict of an unanalysed feeling. He attaches high importance to the irrational craving for continued existence, whilst very frankly acknowledging that physiological psychology renders the retention of memory an untenable supposition. We question whether this chapter will be quite satisfactory to the ordinary believer, but the metaphysician proper will assuredly be disappointed, Although Mr. Graham rejects every creed that pretends to be no more than Phenomenalism, he in fact takes but little pains to reach a consistent

Ontology. We would suggest for his future consideration the difficult *crux* of the *principium individuationis.* We believe meditation on that problem would be fruitful at his present stage of thought. There is plenty of evidence in the book that its author's present mental attitude is transitional. Familiar with metempirical systems, and keenly alive to the drift of positive inquiry, he has not yet, we believe, wrought out a whole of thought which is even satisfactory to himself. This opinion is forced upon us not less plainly in the practical than in the theoretical part of the work. Mr. Graham at once welcomes and yet dreads the advances of the Evolutionary Ethics. He still hankers after a transcendental morality, and is evidently fearful lest scientific analysis, psychological or sociological, should weaken the sense of obligation. "In fact, if virtue is not to be attacked at a vital point by being resolved in the last analysis into selfishness; if morality is to be regarded as other than a useful invention, to abate social jar and friction; if moral rules are not to be brought to the level of police regulations; then there are some qualifications or concessions that must be made by the evolution moralist over and above those made by Mr. Spencer, in his recent remarkable work, 'The Data of Ethics.'" What these "qualifications or concessions" are, however, is not very clear; but the passage cited betrays a curious incapacity for comprehending the work referred to. It would hardly be too much to say that almost for the first time morality has been placed beyond the dissolving power of analysis, and stripped of its arbitrary and conventional character by Mr. Spencer's "Data of Ethics." It is always well, however, that the doubts and difficulties of genuine truth-seekers should be fully stated and pressed home. And it is for this reason we welcome Mr. Graham's volume, written as it is in a spirit equally removed from that of the mere dialectician and of the professional partisan pledged to a foregone conclusion.

There is a good deal in Dr. Winchell's book[2] with which we cordially agree, and also much to which we think very grave exception may be taken. It consists of a number of essays with somewhat loose connection, treating of very varied matters, the drift of the whole being in truth far from obvious. We have first a review of the "Psychic Histories" of various peoples, then a discussion of the Doctrine of Causality, followed by a "Conspectus of the Rationale of Christian Belief." This brings us to the end of Part I. Then follow some more "Thoughts on Causality" and an answer to the question, "Is God cognizable by Reason?" Part III. treats of "God and Religion in Nature :—Illustrations of Intentionality, and of other Biblical Teaching." There is evidence of extensive reading, and it is plain the writer has reflected much on the present position of science with reference to the popular creed, but we fail to obtain a clear view of the author's religious philosophy. Dr. Cocker, "Professor of Moral and Mental Philosophy in the University of Michigan," seems to be a great authority with our author, two of the chapters being

---

[2] "Science and Religion." By Alexander Winchell, LL.D. London: Strahan & Company, Limited.

*critiques*, and for the most part endorsements, of that writer's opinions. Readers more conversant than the present reviewer with the history of science will doubtless comprehend the following reference, which is not cleared up in the course of the work itself. "The author's present conviction is that the doctrine of the derivation of species should be accepted; and that the most tenable theory of the causes, instrumentalities, and conditions of this derivation is that propounded, in 1868, by Professor Edward D. Cope." Mr. Herbert Spencer's views of inherited instinct and the organization of experience are curtly condemned as "unfounded in reason and science," instinct and intuition being apparently regarded as something præternaturally ingrafted in the animal nature. It is gratifying to find that, despite his orthodox predilections, the author cannot literally accept the description of the formation of the world, in the book of Genesis, as inspired science. At the same time, by a little manœuvring, a curious coincidence may be effected, as likewise in the case of the apostolic account of the end of all things and the dissolution of the heavens according to the modern physicist.

Mr. Weir's Introduction to the "Critique of Pure Reason"[3] is an excellent little book, very freshly written, and with a good understanding of the scope of the famous treatise. The relation of Kant to his predecessors is very neatly stated in the opening chapters, and, considering the small compass of the book (112 short pages in all), as much has been achieved in the way of putting a novice in a position for entering upon the first-hand study of the master, as could well be expected. Mr. Weir has come well-prepared to his work, and he shows himself at times capable of independent criticism, as well as possessed of a faculty for appreciating the suggestions of the commentators, and a power of clear exposition. The note on p. 36, with respect to Ueberweg's misapprehension of Kant's doctrine of Space and Time, is very just; it has always been a considerable puzzle to us how so able a student of philosophic systems could have so grossly failed to comprehend one of the cardinal points of the Critical Philosophy. Our satisfaction with Mr. Weir's volume would be much misinterpreted if taken to imply an expression of opinion that his little book is of itself sufficient to enable the student to grasp the full meaning of *Criticism*. It gives a more detailed and serviceable account than will be found in the current histories of philosophy; but its author would, we believe, be the first to scout the idea that the powerful speculative movement initiated by the "Critique of Pure Reason" could be comprehended by the aid of this little volume alone. It professes to be an "Introduction," and that description must be literally accepted.

In a work on "the Principles of the Aristotelian Philosophy, and the meaning of Phantasy in the same,"[4] Professor Forschhammer

---

[3] "The Critical Philosophy of Kant: being an Introduction to the Study of the 'Critique of Pure Reason.'" By Archibald Weir, B.A. London: W. Swan, Sonnenschein & Allen. 1881.

[4] "Ueber die Principien der Aristotelischen Philosophie und die Bedeutung der Phantasie in derselben." Von J. Forschhammer, Professor der Philosophie in München. München: Adolf Ackermann. 1881.

endeavours to obtain further corroboration of his curious creed, that the Imagination is the ground-principle of the World-Process according to a sound philosophy. We had occasion recently to notice a *brochure* from the same pen, endeavouring to fortify this position by citations from Spinoza and Kant; and now the propounder of this bold hypothesis invokes the Master of Ancient Philosophy as a witness to his faith. The author does not attempt to prove that Phantasy is distinctly enounced by Aristotle as the principle of Being, Becoming, and Thought, or of the World-Process in objective or subjective reference; but he thinks it possible to show that every Aristotelian principle contains a "moment" which makes its essence or its activity like the essence and activity of Phantasy (when taken in the widest sense), and likewise that a certain unity can hereby be given to Aristotle's doctrine of Metaphysical Elements. The treatise falls into two parts: the former summarizing the First Principles of Aristotle's Philosophy, —Form, Matter, Substance, Soul, Phantasy, and the Cognitive Faculty—the latter dealing specially with the subject of the Synthetic Principles in Aristotle's conception of the world. Of this second part there are three sections:—(1) Art, or general analogy in the Aristotelian explanation of the world; (2) The Principle of Form and End, or Phantasy as Supreme Principle of the Aristotelian explanation of the world; and (3) Objectivity in Aristotle's philosophy. The superficial incoherence of Aristotle's philosophy is removed if we imagine as immanent in Nature an All-pervading Artist, who works and creates according to the analogy of conscious artists, producing the genuinely existent, particular existencies or substances. And, just as the human artist must have an aim, so must this Universal Artist concealed in Nature have a definite end in view. The question then is, What is this unconsciously-working artist? What is the essence of this living art objectively revealed to us? It can be no other than the activity of Phantasy. Think away the person of the artist and leave only his aim and activity, and we have found the central principle of all existence according to Aristotle. The book is valuable and will be useful to students desiring to render coherent their detailed knowledge of the Aristotelian speculations. Towards the close some interesting remarks are made with reference to the contrast sometimes assumed between Ancient and Modern Philosophy, in respect of the objectivity of their conceptions. It is here briefly shown that Aristotle has no pre-eminence over the moderns in this respect, that even such seemingly subjectivist thinkers as Descartes and Kant attain an objectivity as decided as that of the ancient thinker. In truth no proper philosophy can ignore either object or subject. "There is no philosopher's stone, if the philosopher be lacking."

Twenty-seven years have elapsed since the translation of Feuerbach's "Wesen des Christenthums" was presented to the English public by one who was afterwards to occupy so distinguished a place in the National Literature. The book has just been reprinted, and appears as Volume XV. of Messrs. Trübner and Co.'s "English and Foreign

Philosophical Library."[5] It is hardly necessary to remark at this late date on the excellence of this translation. Apart from the subject matter, few readers would suspect that they were perusing a work originally written in a language so idiomatic as the German. The publishers were doubtless well advised in determining on a reprint, the value of the work being unquestionable, and present views of religion not rendering so drastic a treatment of certain old-fashioned dogmas superfluous. At the same time, it must be added that there is much in the book that has an unfamiliar air, and it is hardly conceivable that such a book could be now published for the first time. The intellectual atmosphere, charged with incomprehensible ecclesiastical figments, breathed by a Strauss or a Feuerbach, has certainly changed, but the freer atmosphere of our own time is undoubtedly largely due to their efforts to purify it. That a treatment so little tender of superstitions invested with æsthetic halos should have found favour with one of our most brilliant writers of fiction is a fresh proof that fondness for rational criticism is not inimical to the higher exercise of the imagination.

The new volume of the "Philosophical Classics for English Readers"[6] supplies a real want in English Literature, a clear and sufficient account of the life and work of Johann Gottlieb Fichte. The preparation of such an introduction could have fallen into no abler hands than those of the Professor of Owens College, Manchester, who has already shown his comprehension of the Kantian movement in his Shaw Lectures on the Philosophy of Kant. The present volume is well conceived; the first half of the book furnishes an interesting account of the private struggles and stirring public events of Fichte's youth and manhood, then follows a short but clear statement of the antecedents of the Fichtean speculation, made more intelligible by contrast with the English style of thinking, and a careful exposition of the *Wissenschaftslehre* in its earlier and later forms. The chapter entitled "General Idea of Fichte's Philosophy" will be found of considerable use to the English student. In this chapter Prof. Adamson contrasts in a manner that goes straight to the mark the psychological method with which we are so familiar at home and the transcendental key-note so powerfully struck by Kant and his successors. Berkeley is taken as a representative of the English School, the justificatory remarks being made—"Berkeley's doctrine has been considered in some detail, partly because no subsequent English thinking seems to have advanced beyond his position, partly because one can discern very clearly in him the *principles* upon which the English philosophy has always proceeded." In this we cordially agree; our orthodox philosophy being undoubtedly a psychological idealism, a point of view to which one naturally comes by

---

[5] "The Essence of Christianity." By Ludwig Feuerbach. Translated from the Second German Edition, by Marian Evans, translator of Strauss's "Life of Jesus." Second Edition. London: Trübner & Co. 1881.

[6] "Fichte." By Robert Adamson, M.A., Professor of Logic in the Owens College, Victoria University, Manchester. Edinburgh and London; William Blackwood & Sons. 1881.

treating mental problems exclusively by the methods of physical inquiry. And our author puts his finger on the blot of this seemingly sufficient philosophy when he says:—"the psychological method has simply thrown out of account or neglected the fundamental fact, that of self-consciousness"—that stubborn fact which is ever left as an uncomprehended residuum at the close of the most searching empirical analysis. Now, what is ignored and suppressed in our English ways of thinking is the starting-point in German Transcendentalism. "The philosophy of Fichte starts with the demand that the facts of experience shall be examined as facts of self-consciousness. They exist only for a thinking being, and their significance or interpretation for the thinking subject is the substance of philosophy." A true philosophy will endeavour to re-think Experience, a complex of completed thoughts and of infinite aspirations. The great problem is the unification of the seemingly unrelated portions of experience—"For the experience to be interpreted is *one*, and the whole interpretation is but the exposition of the significance of experience for self-consciousness, which is also one." It was the merit of Fichte to place himself at once at this central point, to make the undifferentiated Ego his point of departure, to evolve experience from the transcendental unity of apperception. This had been also the dream of Kant, but Kant had painfully to reach it as a goal, whereas Fichte, having the Kantian analysis in his grasp, could at once assume the standpoint of a speculative dogmatism, the critical sifting having been so thoroughly performed. Positing the absolute subject as a necessary *datum*, Fichte gradually unfolded a system which not only supplied a whole of knowledge, which Kant had rather divined than grasped, but went beyond Kant in more completely harmonizing the theoretical and practical reason, never divorcing the practical from the speculative, but tracing both to a common root. "Form" adherence to the idea of the transcendental method; determination to accept nothing, whether as fact, law, or notion, which is not deducible from self-consciousness and its necessary conditions—such is the spirit of the Fichtean philosophy; and from it follows the demand for systematic unity of conception, for a single principle out of which the multiplicity of experience may be deduced, and therefore for a single, all-embracing philosophical science." This science is the famous *Wissenschaftslehre*, the leading points of which Prof. Adamson admirably expounds. The Professor digresses to take note of the contrast between the Monism of Fichte and of Spinoza. The unities of the two systems may be sufficiently distinguished as objective and subjective respectively. Spinoza constructed the Universe from without, Fichte from within. With both the particular could only be understood when regarded *sub specie æternitatis*, but Spinoza's Eternal Ens was parted by a gulf from the personal Ego, whereas the later thinker defined to the reason the undeveloped thought of a still older mysticism, which probably "builded better than it knew" when it enounced: "I and my Father are one." In a concluding chapter Prof. Adamson devotes a few pages to a consideration of the philoso-

phical problem which lies before us at the present day. This problem is no other than the reconciliation of the spiritual evolutionism, which obtained its first clear expression in Fichte, and modern scientific realism, which attemps to construct experience from without by careful observation of coexistences and sequences. The weakness of the German transcendentalism, from Fichte to Hegel, lay in contemning the external order, as it is a mark of the shortsightedness of the current scientific philosophy to ignore a subjective metaphysic. Without quarrelling about terms, the possession of organs of intellectual intuition or what not,—it is certain that the full insight which philosophy desires is only obtainable by planting ourselves at the speculative centre, and giving eyes to the blind facts, which are but catalogues of events until brought under the sway of an internal principle of order, whose place can never be filled by a logical canon sufficient for regulating "the operations of the understanding subservient to the estimation of evidence."

---

## POLITICS, SOCIOLOGY, VOYAGES, AND TRAVELS.

"LAND REFORM," as it is compendiously called, takes the first place in all political programmes at present. "Co-operation in Land Tillage" is therefore an attractive title,[1] but we cannot profess to be satisfied with the author's treatment of his important subject. "M. A." perceives clearly enough the difficulties of the agricultural labour question, and the inadequacy of the two most popular solutions of the difficulty—tenant-right and peasant proprietorship. His own remedy for distress and discontent is the universal adoption of co-operative farming. England should be divided into farms of 1,000 acres, each employing forty co-operators. The capital required, say £5,000, should be divided into 1,000 shares, and the shareholders should form four classes, the highest class holding fifty shares each, the lowest class four shares. Boys, or extra hands, employed on the farm would thus have a chance of becoming shareholders as soon as they could save £20, and of working up from the lowest class to the highest. The ordinary management of the farm should be in the hands of elected officers. "M. A." describes at great length the advantages which would be secured by adopting his plan, and the special modifications which would be required if it were applied to Ireland, India, and the British Colonies. But throughout the exposition, which extends over more than 400 pages, there is a want of vital connection between the theory and the facts of the case. Speculative estimates of profit and imaginary pictures of prosperity do not help us to understand how and by what steps universal co-operation can be substituted for existing arrangements. How the "Land Department," which figures largely in the scheme, is to be constituted; how

---

[1] "Co-operation in Land Tillage." By "M. A." London: Cassell, Petter, Galpin & Co.

existing rights in the land are to be disposed of; how farmers and labourers are to be induced to put their capital into co-operative farms—we cannot exactly make out. Every statement is introduced by, "it is anticipated," "it is estimated," "it is here maintained," or some such formula. If "M. A." wishes to prove that co-operative tillage is possible and desirable, he must be content to begin at the beginning, to discard anticipations, and to show in clear practical detail how his principle can be applied under existing conditions, without the aid of an omnipotent Land Department; he must take time to understand the political econmists before he sets them aside; and he must learn to express himself in a concise and intelligible manner. We have seldom read anything more diffuse and bewildering than the parts of this book which are devoted to the question of Free Trade. "M. A." seems to think that the labouring man gains more by protective duties, in his capacity of producer, than he loses in his capacity of consumer. At the same time, he thinks we are so far committed to Free Trade, that we cannot draw back without incurring the contempt of civilized mankind. He therefore propounds a scheme of mitigated Free Trade, which appears to us neither more nor less unreasonable than those which have been advocated of late by a section of the Conservative party.

Mr. Barnard's little book[2] shows us co-operation actually at work in various parts of the world. His first chapter contains an account of the Building and Loan Association of Philadelphia. Co-operative banking has been extensively and boldly developed in the United States; and it is encouraging to learn, from Mr. Barnard's survey, that the Loan Associations are managed on sound principles, and with remarkably satisfactory results. The Artisans' Association, for example, which was founded in 1869, has done busines to the amount of over $6,000 a month; its working expenses are only about $800 a year; and each original share, on which $1 a month has been paid from the beginning, has earned a profit of $72. Some losses have been made in cases where mortgaged house property has been thrown on the hands of the Association; but the profits exceed the losses. The machinery of these useful institutions appear to be of a very simple and effective nature; and the whole of Mr. Barnard's description should be carefully studied by all who are interested in promoting thrift among working people in this country. Passing from America to Europe, Mr. Barnard gives us, in a lucid and sympathetic style, much valuable information about Building Societies, Co-operative Stores and Factories, Insurance Societies, and Provident Dispensaries. He has not gained his knowledge of these institutions merely from books; he has seen with his own eyes how the little sums set aside from the hard-won earnings of the poor are collected and combined to beneficent ends; and he has always some touch of minute description which gives life and interest to his narrative. To English readers the most novel parts of Mr. Bernard's book are the description of the

[2] "Co-operation as a Business." By Charles Barnard. New York: Putnam. 1881.

Philadelphia Association, already referred to, and the account given in Chapter VII. of the Credit Union, or "People's Banks," instituted in Germany by Herr Schulze. It is not difficult to understand why "Schulze-Delitzsch" has always been denounced by Socialist agitators like Lassalle. By promoting thrift, and extending a knowledge of finance, by giving the working man a chance of becoming a capitalist, the "People's Banks" are gradually disentangling the knot which militant Socialism is eager to cut. Among ourselves, the Social question is not so pressing as it is in Germany; but we are beginning to be conscious of great economic problems which await solution. We can safely recommend Mr. Barnard's book to all who are interested in the condition and prospects of labouring people.

It may be remembered that a Mr. Peters offered, about a year ago, to give two prizes for essays on "Liberalism in England, and its demoralizing effects on our national religion and liberties."[3] How many competitors sat down to dilate on this inspiring theme we are not told; but the two successful essays have been published, and "all who have constitutional principles at heart," are earnestly invited to assist in circulating them. There is certainly a good deal to be said against Liberalism. A great party can only exist by making room for many varieties of opinion; and its creed is sure to be full of inconsistencies which betray its composite origin. It would be interesting to inquire what is exactly the bond of union between Puritans and Secularists, Whigs and Jacobins, Sentimentalists and Statisticians. It would be useful as well as interesting to show how imperfectly most politicians understand their own principles, what excesses of party tyranny may be committed in the name of liberty, and how easily the supremacy of the people may resolve itself into the irresponsible rule of a few adroit managers. But, loyal as we are in our attachment to "constitutional principles," we cannot say that these important points are adequately treated in the essays before us. Mr. Haines, to whom the first prize has been awarded, has produced a composition which might very well be made down into twenty or thirty leading articles for the provincial Conservative Press. He approves of the Reform Act of 1867, but he is filled with alarm by the prospect of Household Suffrage in the counties. He strings together all the charges, personal and political, which swelled the "indictment" against Mr. Gladstone's Government in 1874. Are we never to hear the last of the Collier scandal, Mr. Lowe's five quarters of Income Tax, and Mr. Baxter's inhuman treatment of the dockyard cats? The sum of Mr. Haines's argument is that the Liberal leaders are, without exception, greedy and unscrupulous hypocrites, and that Liberal principles mean deliberate destruction at home and pusillanimous desertion of duty abroad. If he would only give himself time to think, he would perceive that this loud invective does not express his own or anybody else's real opinions. He is only repeating, with violent emphasis, in the style of a fifth-rate preacher, propositions which no sane man really believes. We con-

[3] "Liberalism in England," etc. Essays by W. T. Haines and W. V. K. Young. London: W. H. Allen & Co. 1881.

demned this kind of political argument (if argument it can be called) when it was used against Lord Beaconsfield's Government last year. We are, therefore, free to condemn it when it is used against our own side.

Mr. Young, to whose essay the second of Mr. Peters's prizes has been awarded, writes a peculiar dialect of English, abounding in newly coined words, such as "evoluted" and "irradicators." His Conservatism is of a more Orange complexion than Mr. Haines; his criticism of Liberal principles does not call for extended notice.

An anonymous pamphlet,[4] on the House of Lords, embodying articles which have appeared in the *Pall Mall Gazette*, adds an effective weapon to the armoury of "destructive Liberalism." The writer has classified the votes of the Lords for the period 1831-80, and the results thus obtained are really remarkable. Every reader of this record must be struck by the utter ineffectiveness of the control supposed to be exercised over our legislation by the Upper House. The Lords never have their own way, never impress their own opinion upon a law in its ultimate shape. All positive power they are content to leave to the Commons, reserving only to themselves the right of obstruction and mutilation. It is quite proper that three whole sections of this pamphlet should be devoted to Irish affairs. The Lords have always taken a special interest in Ireland, and their obstinate adherence to the doctrines of Protestant and landlord ascendancy has given the English Government a good deal of trouble. We do not agree with the writer in thinking that the Lords were wholly responsible for the agitation and outrages of last winter. The Compensation Bill was a measure novel in its character and very inadequately explained by the Government which introduced it. If the Lords had occupied their proper constitutional position, they might easily have vindicated their action in rejecting it. But they had acted so consistently, from selfish motives, in dealing with the demands of Irish tenants that they could not complain of the resentment aroused by their rejection even of a questionable measure. We recommend this brief record of facts to the special attention of public-spirited members of the Upper House. The Duke of Wellington saved the House of Lords by inducing the Tory peers to admit that they had no power to resist a House of Commons, fairly representing the nation. We have now arrived again at a critical point. By surrendering in detail what they have already surrendered in general terms, the Lords may yet avert subversive change. If they resolved to accept the substance of every Bill sent up to them, and to avoid mere mutilation of Liberal measures, they might still reserve to themselves a position of greater usefulness and dignity than the position which they now occupy.

A question on which the House of Lords is accustomed to make periodical display of its enlightenment and argumentative power, is the question of marriage with a deceased wife's sister. From a pamphlet

---

[4] "Fifty Years of the House of Lords." London: Macmillan & Co. 1881.

by Mr. J. B. Gale,[5] it appears that the same question has come up recently for discussion in the United States, and that the Protestant Bishops there have, by a majority of 24 to 20, decided in favour of the erroneous reading of Lev. xviii., which is the favourite *cheval de bataille* of our English prelates. Marriage with a deceased wife's sister is perfectly valid by American law; but Bishop Doane, of Albany, has written a pamphlet to prove that it is contrary to "God's law of marriage." This position he supports by what he calls a catena of authorities. Mr. Gale has followed the Bishop along the line of his catena; and the result of his examination is to show that even if it be assumed that this is a question to be decided by texts and citations, the balance of authority is on the side of those who maintain that affinity is no bar to marriage.

Mr. Matthew Arnold has done a welcome service to English readers by presiding over the republication[6] of Burke's letters, speeches, and tracts on Irish affairs. The value of the book might have been increased by a more extended historical introduction, but even without note or comment, these eloquent utterances of a great Irishman are full of seasonable instruction.

From the Ireland of the eighteenth century we turn to "Ireland in 1881."[7] Mr. Boyd Kinnear has lately travelled through the central, southern, and western parts of the island. He is struck, as all observant travellers are, by the great diversity prevailing between one district and another. He finds landlords and agents on the whole far less oppressive and less unpopular than the League would persuade us. He is astonished by the industry of those small farmers whose idleness is so bitterly denounced by Mr. Bence Jones and others. The backward state of agriculture he attributes entirely to want of security, and to the fact that English lawyers have failed to give due importance to the Irish custom of hereditary tenancy; and he shows very clearly how the partial recognition of customary rights in 1870, the attempt to make "compensation for disturbance," do instead of fixity of tenure, and the reckless borrowing consequent on the acquisition of a new pecuniary interest by the tenants led directly to the agitation of 1879. For the excesses of that agitation Mr. Kinnear holds that the Government are largely responsible. The Arms Act was not necessary, but its withdrawal was regarded as a sign of weakness. Mr. Gladstone's declaration, that the country was within measurable distance of civil war, was utterly unfounded; but it gave the Irish agitators their cue. There was no Irishman in the Cabinet; and the Government would say nothing of its intentions with regard to the Land Question. Under these circumstances, the Land League "took up the Government of the country exactly at the point at which the Ministry had laid it down."

---

[5] "Affinity no Bar to Marriage." By J. B. Gale. Troy, New York: W. H. Young. 1881.

[6] "Letters, Speeches, and Tracts on Irish Affairs." By Edmund Burke. Edited by Matthew Arnold. London: Macmillan & Co. 1881.

[7] "Ireland in 1881." By J. Boyd Kinnear. London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1881.

We admit that Mr. Kinnear makes out a strong case for the general legality of the objects of the League; but we think he has gone much too far in approving the means by which its objects were attained. Practical politicians should not be asked to believe in an association which is managed by an irresponsible clique, who receive large sums of money, of which they give no account. Nor does Mr. Kinnear convince us, that Boycotting is analogous to the punishment inflicted on a man who is cut by his friends or expelled from his club. The essence of Boycotting is not mere social avoidance; it is the unspoken suggestion that murderous violence is likely to be used against the person avoided, and against any who are bold enough to hold communication with him. A man who is under a "social ban" does not go in bodily fear; but a man who is Boycotted avoids dark roads, and barricades his house at night. We are disposed to agree with Mr. Kinnear's unfavourable opinion of the Coercion Act, but he seems again to go much too far when he says that the suspects now in prison have been arrested for crimes "capable of proof and trial before the ordinary tribunals." In cases connected with land, the ordinary tribunals are wholly ineffective. No doubt we must make large allowance for Irish jurymen, but nothing is gained by shutting our eyes to the fact that they commit wholesale perjury in a manner which makes the administration of justice impossible. In estimating the probable effects of the Land Act of this year, Mr. Kinnear allows considerable weight to the arguments of those who have maintained that no system of divided ownership can be regarded as a final settlement. While he deprecates the banishment of improving landlords, he attributes the utmost importance to the framing of further measures of reform which will reduce the inordinate size of estates, and add to the number of small owners.

"The New Politicus"[8] is, as its author admits, a bold experiment. Mr. Radcliffe undertakes to prove "that, whether Christianity be true or false, an endowed Christian Church, by law established, is based upon an expediency amounting to necessity." And he has thrown his proof into the form of a Platonic dialogue between the ghost of Bacon and a politician, name unknown. Even in the hands of its creator, the Platonic dialogue tends to run into monologue. Socrates has it all his own way, and his opponent or disciple almost forfeits the reader's respect by the readiness with which he ejaculates, "Certainly," "That is so," "You prove your point very clearly," at the conclusion of each paragraph. Mr. Radcliffe has not improved upon his model in this respect, but he has caught something of the ease and humour of his great original; and his argument, if not quite conclusive, is clearly developed and happily expressed. He adduces a series of examples to prove that disciplined religious enthusiasm has always been an important factor in national greatness. He appeals again to history to show that Christianity makes men unselfish, and disposes them to serve their country and their kind with devoted

[8] "The New Politicus: A Dialogue concerning the necessity of a State Religion." By F. R. Y. Radcliffe, Barrister-at-Law. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1881.

energy; and he reminds us that its success is largely due to the fact that it presents men with a graduated scale of motives—offering to the highest minds a sublime idéal, and to minds of a lower type a well-constructed system of rewards and punishments. From all this it follows that the statesman is not to exclude or ignore religion, but to "conclude a truce with this noble ally." So far, we are quite in agreement with Mr. Radcliffe. It is unscientific to draw, as some politicians do, a hard and fast line between politics and religion. But the "truce" proposed might be concluded as between independent powers, neither of which wishes to exercise direct control over the other. This is not Mr. Radcliffe's ideal; for the ghost proceeds to argue that by endowing the Church the statesmen may secure a more independent and highly qualified class of religious teachers than a voluntary Church could supply. Instead of coming in at this point with his monotonous "Certainly," the politician might have inquired whether a minister, appointed and maintained by outside authority, has as much influence with the people as a pastor chosen by themselves; and whether it is the fact that members of voluntary Churches give much more in proportion to their means for religious objects than members of Established Churches. Without considering these points, the author of the "Novum Organum" goes on to assert that an Established Church provides a definite nucleus for the religious aspirations of common people, an embodiment of religious sentiment independent of sects, and a representative worship. To a writer with Bacon's, or Mr. Radcliffe's, command of language it is easy to invest these propositions with an attractive plausibility. But the question at issue is begged by the use of such words as "national" and "representative." The Church of England has deliberately excluded some of the most characteristic sections of English religious opinion, and has therefore ceased to be national in the full sense of the word. A really national Church is not at this moment possible, and we do not see that anything is gained by giving a national status to one of the sects, even if it be a sect which spreads itself loosely towards every point of the theological compass. Mr. Radcliffe seems to think that the national status cannot be taken away without shattering the Church into a thousand fragments. But the Church would continue to exist after Disestablishment; if it parted into fragments, that would only prove that the sections of which it is composed are held together, not by religious sympathy, but only by their common connexion with the State. Mr. Radcliffe seems to us to surrender the whole Church-and-State platform when he describes the Church as a voluntary association. The Church is established on the theory that it is the duty of every citizen to belong to it. If it is not a matter of civic duty, but of choice between competing voluntary associations, should not the competitors start fair?

The recent attempt on President Garfield's life, and the particulars already ascertained in regard to the career of the depraved office-seeker Guiteau, have called universal attention to the evil system which has converted the Civil Service of the United States into an

engine of party corruption and party tyranny. Mr. Dorman B. Eaton is one of those who are labouring zealously to abolish the "Spoils System,"[9] and to establish a "Merit System" in its place. His "History of the New York Custom-house and Post Office" was prepared at the request of President Hayes. Following Mr. Parton's "Life of Andrew Jackson," Mr. Eaton fixes on Aaron Burr as the original author of the system, the political ancestor of Tweed and Kelly. That arch-intriguer had formed a very definite and clear conception of politics as a business; and the administrative history of New York proves that there went considerable knowledge of human nature to the composition of the "Burrian Code." It is encouraging to perceive that the prospects of the "Spoils System" were never worse than they are at this moment. Mr. Garfield's nomination was a blow to its supporters; the defeats sustained by Mr. Conkling in the Senate and in the New York Legislature have done something to break the power of partisan despots, who had come to regard the public service as their own private domain. It is to be expected that the evil system will die hard. The Civil Service Reform Association, under whose auspices Mr. Eaton's pamphlet is published, has set itself to a heavy piece of work. We are glad to observe that the Association shows already an excellent list of names; and we sincerely wish it all success.

Another New York Association which may give valuable indirect aid to the cause of Civil Service Reform is the Society for Political Education. We have received from the Society a classified list of books[10] intended for the use of those who wish to make a systematic study of political science. Some hundreds of standard works are here arranged under headings; the price of each book is mentioned; and short notes are added, indicating its scope and its general reputation. This list is likely to prove very useful.

We have been accustomed to see the Australian "black fellow" described in books as the most degraded of savages. Mr. Dawson's valuable essay,[11] compiled from facts communicated to himself and his daughter by natives of Victoria, will raise the character of our dusky fellow-subjects. According to the description here given of them, the Australians are by no means destitute of intelligence. The results obtained in the Victorian schools for aboriginal children are excellent; and the laws which Mr. Dawson has investigated are not those of a wholly unenlightened race. They have a strong sense of property; the estate of each family in the tribal land is carefully protected; poaching and trespass are severely punished. The rights of chiefs and their families are well defined, and etiquette has, as in all primitive communities, the force of law. No one may address a chief or chiefess

[9] "The Spoils System," &c. By Dorman B. Eaton. New York: Putnams. London: Trübner & Co. 1881.

[10] "Political Economy," etc. A List of Books compiled by W. G. Sumner, D. A. Wells, &c. New York. 1881.

[11] "Australian Aborigines." By James Dawson. Melbourne: G. Robertson. 1881.

without being spoken to. A chief may have many wives; a chief's son two; other men only one. The marriage laws, intended to prevent the marriage of near relations, are elaborate and strict. One curious rule of etiquette forbids the mother and aunts of a married woman to speak to or even look at her husband. If there is any foundation for the common prejudice against mothers-in-law this rule seems a very reasonable one. The wife coming from a different tribe retains the use of her own language; but she is expected to speak her husband's language to their children. Babies are named after some object on the family estate: they are not black at birth; their colour appears first on the forehead, and spreads downward. Family life seems tolerably happy, so long as food is not scarce. The tools, made of greenstone and kangaroo bone, are few but effective; the dome-shaped hut is warm and healthy, and the sanitary arrangements are good. Wars are, or were, very frequent; and the blood-feud is an established institution. Cannibalism is not practised; but the bodies of relatives who have died by violence are eaten, as a sign of respect. The more ordinary bill of fare includes the bear, the wild dog, and other quadrupeds; fat grubs, caterpillar larvæ, manna deposited by the cicala, and a great variety of roots and leaves. Fire is obtained by friction, in about two minutes. The "black fellow" is not, as some have stated, destitute of religion. He does not fear thunder, believing it to be the voice of the Good Spirit. He believes also in a Bad Spirit, who sends the owls to act as his spies. Mr. Dawson has given us much information concerning the superstitious and primitive notions of these people; and his book is further enriched by the addition of a vocabulary of words in three languages.

Under the title "'Twixt Greek and Turk,"[12] M. Valentine Chirol has given us a lively account of a journey through Thessaly, Macedonia, and Epirus, in the autumn of last year. His narrative affords us a glimpse into a region which few of us would care to explore for ourselves under present circumstances. At every point he had occasion to remark how misrule and political uncertainty are keeping one of the most desirable regions of the earth in a state of disorder, distress, and unrest. Those who think that these evils may be at once and for ever removed by a simple application of the "policy of nationalities," will be a good deal puzzled by M. Chirol's description of the country. In every town and village nationalities and religions are inextricably mixed. The population of Monastir, for example, contains a small number of Jews, and three communities, almost equal in strength, consisting of Mussulmans, Hellenized Wallachs, and Bulgarians. Among the Christian communities there is bitter hostility; for they all regard the Turkish power as dead or dying, and they are making ready to fight for the Sick Man's inheritance. The Orthodox Church is grasping at power with both hands; even brigandage is pressed into its service; and its Bishops are not ashamed to conspire with the Turks against their Bulgarian rivals. But the Bulgarian schism

[12] "'Twixt Greek and Turk." By M. Valentine Chirol. London: W. Blackwood & Sons. 1881.

continues to prosper; and there is some reason to hope that the rivalry between the two clerical parties may have some good effect in the way of emancipating the people altogether from sacerdotal influence. Returning from Macedonia to Thessaly, and passing thence over the Pindus mountains into Epirus, M. Chirol had an opportunity of visiting one of the monasteries of Meteora, which are built on isolated rocks, so steep that the communications with the world below are only maintained by means of ropes and nets. Each of these houses has its library; and it seems not unlikely that if some wandering scholar were to go manuscript-hunting among them he might be rewarded by discovering some priceless treasure on the dusty shelves which are seldom disturbed by the present race of monks. We have not space to do more than mention M. Chirol's description of "Metzovo the Sunless," and its Wallach inhabitants, whose history has been the theme of so much speculation. More interesting perhaps to the politician of to-day is the enthusiastic account of the Albanians. Even if we suspect the "National movement" embodied in the League of owing something to outside diplomacy, we cannot but respect the courageous patriotism, equally jealous of Turkish despotism and Greek annexation, which has united Christian and Mussulman, and consigned a hundred ancient feuds to oblivion. The Porte would like to make Albania a mere feeder of the Turkish army; the Athenian Government would like to parcel it out among officials, who would govern it as M. Albert Grévy governs Algeria. The Albanians are not unwilling to treat, on a perfectly equal footing, with either power, but they are determined to accept no settlement which would undermine their independence and efface the ancient character of their race, and they have as good a right to be heard as other "rising nationalities," patronized, for sentimental and other reasons, by Great Powers.

From the title-page of Madame Séréna's Travels [13] we gather that she has already published a volume containing part of the record of her journey. Her narrative begins at Baku, on the Caspian, from which point she was ill-advised enough to cross into Persia, without having made adequate preparation or learned a word of the Persian language. It was not to be expected that her journey, which did not extend beyond Teheran, should add much to what is known of the country and people. In fact, the greater part of this book is taken up with a quarrel between Madame Séréna and a French couple who were proceeding to join the French legation at the Shah's capital. If our readers wish to know how shamefully Madame G. L. R. behaved, how terribly Madame Séréna suffered, and how her sufferings were rewarded by participation in the festivities of the British Embassy, we must refer them to the book itself.

Mr. Tristram Ellis's eastern journey [14] was undertaken with an

---

[13] "Mon Voyage: Une Européene en Perse." 2e Série. Par Mme. Carla Séréna. Paris: M. Dreyfous. London: Trübner & Co.

[14] "On a Raft and Through the Desert." By Tristram Ellis. London: Field & Tuer. 1881.

artistic purpose, and the two handsomely printed and sumptuously bound volumes before us purport to be published chiefly for the sake of the etchings with which they are illustrated. The narrative has, however, considerable value of its own. Landing at Iscanderoon in February, 1880, Mr. Ellis passed by way of Aleppo, crossed the Euphrates at Bir Edjek, struck the Tigris at Diarbekir, dropped down to Mosul on the raft from which his book takes its title, and returned from Baghdad by the desert route to Beyrout. Almost all the country through which he travelled was stricken with famine; at Mosul people were dying of hunger, many of the inhabitants being kept alive by the soup supplied to them at the British Consulate. This wide-spread distress is due to want of roads and want of security—the Turkish Government being represented, as usual, only by the inevitable tax-gatherer. To travel in those regions a man should be endowed, not only with resource and physical energy, but also with endless patience. The construction of a Tigris raft and the inflation of the skins on which it is buoyed is a work of time; the river may be pronounced too dangerous for traffic, owing to reports of Kurdish raids; and even when the traveller is fairly committed to the stream, contrary winds may force his unwieldy craft against the bank and delay him for a long time in the midst of uninteresting scenery. To journey on camels over the 750 miles that lie between Baghdad and Damascus is an arduous feat; and Mr. Ellis has reason to congratulate himself on having performed the distance in twenty-two days. The half-way house is "Tadmor in the wilderness," which Mr. Ellis found to be built of limestone, not of marble, as early writers assert. He accounts for the former riches of Palmyra by the theory that it was used as an *entrepôt* by merchants from Syria on one side and Persia on the other. Such a trading centre would require extensive bazaars, and it may be that the brackets which face each other all the way down the Street of Columns were used to support the wooden fittings of the shops. But we must not linger over Mr. Ellis's literary description of classic scenes while the artistic work placed before us in these volumes is waiting for recognition. Thirty-eight studies and sketches, made on the spot, are here reproduced by means of etching on copper—"the most artistic form of illustration, because it is the work of the artist himself." Certainly no copying process could give so fine a rendering of light and distance as the etching entitled "America's Portion" (the obelisk at Alexandria made over to the Americans), or "Baalbek in the Afternoon." Nor could any hand but the artist's draw successfully the two admirable studies of form and shadow, entitled respectively "Mule-caravan—Daybreak" and "Night March in the Desert." The simpler figure drawings are equally well executed—witness the very characteristic portrait of "Old Monsour," and the delicate truth of the "Damascus Handmaiden," in vol. ii. There are just one or two of these illustrations which remind us that etching on copper is not altogether in the hands of the artist himself, but contains a certain element of the unintentional. The effect of "Summer Residences, Iskanderoon," is surely too dark, and we should be disposed to make

the same remark in reference to the etching, "Sponge-boats on the Mediterranean." We offer this criticism with some diffidence; for scaling and arrangement are all-important in such matters, and general effect may be misleading; but the opinion which we formed on first looking at the illustrations referred to has been confirmed by comparison with other specimens of Mr. Ellis's work.

"Levkosia, the Capital of Cyprus," a thin crown octavo volume, anonymously published,[15] is understood to be the work of an Australian Archduke, who visited the ancient seat of the Lusignan dynasty some years ago, while as yet the Anglo-Turkish Convention was not even dreamed of. It would be interesting to have a supplement to his book, setting forth with precision the changes which our advent has produced. How many of the 20,000 inhabitants of Levkosia are better off because of us? Has the trade of the twenty-three bazaars taken a new start? Has the British Lion turned out the lion of St. Mark's, which recalled the old days of Venetian ascendency? (In any case, we hope that the Russian eagle, which our author found figuring in the *Ikonostasis* of a Greek Church, has been carefully removed.) Meantime we are glad to have the main features of Levkosia as it was in 1877 so clearly set down for us as they are in this description. The author has not attempted historical research or scientific accuracy; he contents himself with recording what an observant tourist can see for himself in the course of a few weeks' residence. Levkosia, like Damascus, stands in an oasis—"a bouquet of orange gardens and palm trees in a country without verdure." It is surrounded by a wall, three miles in length, which was built by the Venetians. The streets are narrow and winding; there are few good houses; and all the more modern buildings are in inferior taste. Here and there are Gothic windows, with flowing tracery and old-fashioned woodwork. One or two fine Gothic buildings are in use as mosques. Of the two hundred and fifty churches which the town is said to have possessed in former times, few now remain. There is, or was before 1878, a large gaol, to which prisoners were sent from all parts of Asiatic Turkey. The bazaars—twenty-three in number—form a cross-work of small streets, extending from the eastern to the western gate. The buyers form a motley crowd, and the vendors of oil, salep-tea, and small articles wander up and down; "the shopkeepers alone are like statues, motionless, smoking in deep silence." Great riches are seldom acquired by these stolid traders; a Turk who has 40,000 piastres (about £400) is considered a very wealthy man. Turks and Greeks seem to live on good terms with one another, using each their own rites and customs. One curious custom in mentioned by our author in speaking of Greek funerals. When the body is taken to the church, all proprietors of houses pour a glass of water into the street before it passes. This volume is illustrated by twelve careful sketches by the author, photographed on wood.

Not long ago we had occasion to notice in this section Mr. Finlay

---

[15] "Levkosia, the Capital of Cyprus." London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1881.

Dun's report on the agricultural condition of Ireland. We are indebted to the same gentleman for a careful account of American farming,[16] from which our agriculturists may obtain a detailed notion of the advantages enjoyed by those terrible competitors who have been so much in the thoughts of the British farmer during the last four years. Mr. Dun's pages bristle with figures derived from public documents or from competent witnesses on the spot. His inquiries extended to the Northern and North-Western States, and to the new fields which are being opened to agricultural enterprise in Canada. The practical conclusion at which he arrives is that our farmers may as well give up the attempt to compete with America in the article of wheat. In order to hold his own, he must produce wheat at 42*s.* a quarter. This he may, perhaps, succeed in doing on the best soils, where four quarters may be raised per acre; but elsewhere he must turn to the growing of produce which cannot be so cheaply forwarded. And, if we are not to be driven from our own meat-market, we must learn to produce good meat at 7*d.* or 7½*d.* per lb. This will be a hard saying in the ears of English farmers, who believe in high prices and know little of the profit that is realized by economy in production. But the bad seasons from which we have suffered have been breaking up many ancient prejudices, and we may hope that Mr. Dunn's book will be studied by many who would have scorned it in the day of their prosperity. Of course, there is not much in American methods which we can directly imitate: indeed, those methods are, in many respects, much inferior to our own. The very richness of the virgin soils of the States leads to great waste of manure. One farmer told Mr. Dunn that he would give $100 to have 1,000 tons of manure cleared out of his yards. The average yield of wheat-farming in the States—thirteen bushels to the acre—is much below that of good farming in this country. But the significant notes given at various points of Mr. Dunn's report, in regard to the "sobriety, assiduity, adaptability, and energy of the people," may well suggest the inquiry whether the mental energies of our own country people might not be stimulated and trained by the adoption of more scientific methods of husbandry than those which we now employ.

Mr. Dunn's chapters on America are reprinted from the *Times* newspaper, in which they appeared in the form of letters. Another correspondent of the same journal is Mr Fraser Rae, whose letters are now republished under the title, "Newfoundland to Manitoba."[17] In reading the earlier chapters of this book we feel that we are in a region of old-world conservatism very different from the restless enterprize of the Far West. Newfoundland is blessed with squires and farmers of the old school, who object to the construction of a railway; and the dislike of compulsory education in the island is apparently wide-spread. The Nova Scotians are, according to Mr. Rae, "too

[16] "American Farming and Food." By Finlay Dun. London: Longmans. 1881.

[17] "Newfoundland to Manitoba." By W. Fraser Rae. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1881.

ready to grumble, and deficient in a patriotic faith in the resources of Canada and in the capacity of her sons to develop them." In Prince Edward's Island civilization is already old enough to have produced a Land Question of formidable dimensions. Very different is the face of things presented in Winnipeg, the capital of Manitoba—ten years ago a "miserable village" of 300 souls, now a city of 15,000 inhabitants, with a University of three affiliated Colleges, a Town Hall, "built of cream-coloured brick," and everything handsome about it. Nor does it seem at all likely that the prosperity of Winnipeg should vanish away as rapidly as it has been created. On the unimpeachable evidence of the United States Consul, we are assured that three-fourths of the wheat-producing belt of the North American Continent lie north of the international boundary, and that the nearer the northern limit of the belt is approached, the finer is the quality of the grain. It is estimated that North-Western Canada could supply the whole of Europe with bread. No doubt some of the early settlers have had to endure hardships; and some, who bought land which they had never seen, were disappointed in their investment. But, after making all allowance for drawbacks and difficulties, it seems certain that a future of great prosperity is opening before the Canadian Far West. There are not wanting those who maintain that the development of her resources would hasten what they are pleased to call the "manifest destiny" of Canada—incorporation with the United States. Admitting fully that "the future of Canada is in the hands of the Canadians," Mr. Rae deprecates all attempts at prediction in such a matter. Advocates of incorporation have not always found it easy to point out the definite advantages of their scheme; and it is stated by competent observers that both the European settlers and the native Indians would prefer to live under our flag. Mr. Rae's letters are written in a pleasant style, and contain information on a great variety of subjects.

Mr. Milner's travels, so far at least as they are described in this prettily bound volume,[18] do not extend beyond our own island. Indeed, the greater part of his book is occupied with the description of aspects of natural beauty noted within the compass of a single year, from an old garden in South-east Lancashire. But, even on the most familiar ground, new facts and fancies may be gathered by loving study. Mr. Milner's calendar of country pleasures will be read with enjoyment by all who have spent quiet morning and evening hours in making acquaintance with the trees and the birds of some favourite spot of ground. It is not a book to be read through at a sitting; it should be taken up from time to time, and compared journalwise with the reader's own observations and reflections. In his journey round his garden, Mr. Milner is usually accompanied by a "garden book," so that he is able to verify minute touches of description, and trace poetic impressions to their origin in nature. His record of the seasons is illustrated by some hundreds of appropriate phrases and passages from our best poets.

---

[18] "Country Pleasures." By George Milner. London: Longman & Co. 1881.

A memorial was lately presented to the Committee of Council on Education, praying their Lordships to adopt a more simple and scientific order of studies than that which is embodied in the present Code, and submitting certain proposed standards approved by the memorialists. Mr. Sonnenschein has done a service to the cause of Code Reform by reprinting in this little book[19] the memorial and proposed standards, together with a number of extracts from foreign codes. It would not be easy, nor perhaps very useful, to collect in one volume all the standards of Europe, and to compare them exhaustively, one with another. But there is much instruction to be derived from such partial comparison as Mr. Sonnenschein has been able to make. He has given us the standards for arithmetic, language, and geography, from fifteen codes. The general conclusions at which he arrives, from an examination of the English system in the light of foreign experience are given in an introduction. Even bad standards are better than none; but standards may be so arranged as to make scientific teaching simply impossible. Our standards are too much adapted to encourage learning by rote; and their sequence is unnatural. We make too little use of intuitional methods; we insist on teaching arithmetic by rule of thumb; and instead of teaching literature so as to form the whole mind and character of the child, we are content with setting so many lines of poetry to be learned off by heart. Payment by results converts the teacher into a crammer; exclusion of elementary teachers from the inspectorate is an injustice committed only in this country; and our system of pupil-teaching is very defective. To discuss these views fully would lead us too much into detail; but we have no hesitation in admitting that the charges made by the Code Reformers against our methods of education are perfectly well founded. The difficulty of the subject lies, as usual, not in the discovery of defects and the suggestion of better ideals, but in making the detailed arrangements rendered necessary by a change of principle. Enthusiastic reformers sometimes speak as if each new generation of children were a sort of *tabula rasa* on which an enlightened Education Department may write what it pleases. But, when an improvement, however small, has to be actually introduced, we discover that teachers and inspectors have to be educated as well as the children; even an enlightened Department is sometimes found to stand in need of a lesson. Mr. Sonnenschein, to do him justice, is fully conscious of the difficulties of the work in which he and his friends are engaged. His plea for more scientific methods of elementary education is thoroughly practical in tone, and ought to do good.

Conferences have been held in recent years at Milan and London to consider the best method of teaching the deaf and dumb. A considerable majority of teachers at both meetings pronounced in favour of the system known as "lip-reading." There has been hitherto no complete text-book of lip-reading accessible to English teachers. Mr. Thomas Arnold has now supplied this want by giving us the results of long

[19] "Foreign Educational Codes." By A. Sonnenschein. London: W. S. Sonnenschein & Allen. 1881.

experience and study in the volume before us.[20] The method which he adopts (popularly known as the German method) appears to be based on three principles. The first is that every spoken utterance is accompanied by muscular movements which the eye may be trained to read. The truth of this principle is proved by the success with which deaf children have been taught to follow the words of any speaker who keeps his face turned towards them. We understand that the deaf children in a Belgian school have actually taken the best place in an examination orally conducted and open to all the schools of the country. The second principle is that any person possessing the organs of speech (as almost all so-called deaf-mutes do) may be taught to adjust the organs so as to produce articulate and duly modulated speech. In order to communicate instruction on this principle, the teacher must make the pupil accurately acquainted with the relative positions and uses of the vocal organs. It might seem that this preliminary study would prevent a child from advancing to the actual use of speech; but again science is justified of her children, and it is proved that teachers who have the patient enthusiasm to follow this plan can teach the deaf to speak almost as well as those who have their hearing. The third principle of the system, as expounded by Mr. Arnold, is that a child cannot be taught to use language except in so far as it is taught to reason. Mechanical systems of signs and gestures can only enable the pupil's mind to move in a narrow world of thought. By developing the ideas which belong to abstract words, language becomes to the deaf child an instrument of thought, and not a mere code of signals. We cannot criticize Mr. Arnold's book from the point of view of the experienced teacher, but we can cordially recommend it to all who care to see scientific principles applied with convincing clearness to the practical work of education.

From Canterbury College, New Zealand, we have received a copy of an inaugural address, delivered by Professor Bickerton, on the subject of "University Reform"[21]—a subject less complicated and thorny, let us hope, in colonial regions than it is in this country. Mr. Bickerton defends the claim of natural science to a place in general education, protests against the exclusive cultivation of memory which is sometimes mistaken for mental culture, and forcibly reminds his students that they are not to estimate their acquirements by a worldly standard. To a Dialectical Society in connection with the same college, Professor J. M. Brown delivers a fresh and sensible address on "Student Life."[22]

The "Proceedings of the Royal Colonial Institute"[23] contain, as usual, a considerable amount of useful information and discussion. We would suggest, however, that it is hardly necessary to publish a full

---

[20] "A Method of Teaching the Deaf and Dumb Speech," &c. By Thomas Arnold. London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1881.

[21] "University Reform." Inaugural Address by Professor A. W. Bickerton, &c. Christchurch, N.Z. 1881.

[22] "Student Life." Address to the Canterbury College Dialectical Society. By Professor J. M. Brown. Christchurch, N.Z. 1881.

[23] "Proceedings of the Royal Colonial Institute." Vol. XII. 1880–1. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1881.

report of all the speeches made at the meetings of the Institute. The reproduction in full of the complimentary parts of the speeches makes the report somewhat tiresome to read, and savours too much of the Mutual Admiration Society.

We have to acknowledge the new volumes of the *Annali di Statistica,*[24] which contain an interesting series of nosological maps of Italy; a full report of the meeting of the Central Statistical Association; and essays, original and translated, on various points of statistical theory; and three parliamentary papers[25] issued by the Italian Ministry of Commerce, the contents of which are sufficiently indicated in their titles. "The Annual Report of the Mines Department of New South Wales"[26] shows a decrease in the aggregate value of minerals won, which is accounted for by the diminished output of coal and shale. Gold and metals generally show an increase. On behalf of the province of Manitoba, the opinion of Mr. J. W. Taylor (to which we have already referred in our notice of Mr. Fraser Rae's letters) has been put out in the shape of a tract.[27] Mr. Henri Cernuschi has thrown his well-known opinions on the Silver Question into the form of a catechism of questions[28] addressed to the delegates appointed to attend the Monetary Conference. Professor Tanner's "Alphabet"[29] contains the simplest elements of agriculture, in a form suitable for school children.

The three volumes which complete the "Imperial Gazetteer of India"[30] exhibit all the excellences to which we endeavoured to do justice in our notice of the six which preceded them.

---

## SCIENCE.

MR. JUDD'S book on volcanoes[1] is eminently readable, clear, stored with the best modern knowledge, and is altogether an excellent popular exposition of the subject. It might, perhaps, with advantage have been condensed into somewhat less space, and there may be differences of opinion as to the way in which such a subject could best be treated; but, since the author has moulded his book

---

[24] "Annali di Statistica." S. 2. Vols. vi. xx. and xxiii. Roma: 1881.

[25] 1. "Movimento della Navigazione." Roma: 1880; 2. "Movimento della Stato Civili." Roma: 1880; 3. "Statistique Internationale des Banques d'Emission.—Russie. Roma: 1881.

[26] "The Annual Report of the Department of Mines, New South Wales, for the year 1880." Sydney: 1881.

[27] "Central British America." By J. W. Taylor.

[28] "The Monetary Conference: Questions," &c. By Henry Cecnaschi. London: P. S. King & Co. 1881.

[29] "The Alphabet of the Principles of Agriculture." By Professor H. Tanner, F.C.S. London: Macmillan & Co. 1881.

[30] "The Imperial Gazetteer of India." By W. W. Hunter, C.I.E., &c. London: Trübner & Co. 1881.

[1] "Volcanoes: What they are and what they Teach." By John W. Judd, F.R.S., Professor of Geology in the School of Mines. With 96 illustrations. London: Kegan Paul & Co. 1881.

essentially on the plan of Huxley's "Physiography," and elected to follow the inductive method of exposition rather than the deductive method, there is probably little that anyone would be disposed to quarrel with in the way in which the work is elaborated. We cannot but think, however, that the old-fashioned deductive mode of treatment is admirably suited to such physical subjects as this, especially when so much has to be assumed on account of the briefness of discussions in a work designed for general reading; for there is a tendency on the part of the reader to become impatient even with the best digested and most consecutively arranged statement of facts, when the principles which hold them together and give them vitality are kept from his knowledge unnecessarily long. The volume is divided into twelve chapters. The second, entitled "The Nature of Volcanic Action," is chiefly devoted to an account of the island of Stromboli, and then passes on to describe the more recent eruptions of Vesuvius, and incidentally notices the popular views that certain volcanic eruptions are connected with conditions of atmospheric pressure and lunar attraction. The third chapter deals with the products of volcanic action. These are not enumerated so much in the order in which they appear during the eruption as in relation to chemical, mineral, or physical properties. After mentioning the acid gases and other volatile substances, and their reaction on each other, attention is drawn to the way in which these substances, dissolved in the rain, gradually remove the soluble constituents of the surface rock, so as to leave nothing but a chalk-like substance, which consists of almost pure silica. Then the ejected rock fragments are noticed. Vesuvius, for instance, throwing out abundant fragments of limestone, from which several hundred species of shells have been collected; and it is from these fragments of altered limestone that the so-called lava ornaments made in Naples are carved. Then the different kinds of lavas are discussed, and their microscopic structure illustrated by some interesting drawings. The classification of igneous rocks might perhaps have admitted of a little amplification, for we can regard it as by no means certain that phonolite is the lava form of miascite, that andesite is the lava form of diorite, that trachyte is the lava form of syenite, while the rhyolites are so variable that it may be well doubted whether they would all take on crystallizing the form of granite. The fourth chapter discusses the distribution of the materials ejected from volcanoes. Exception might perhaps be taken to the explanation given of the formation of scoriæ which is compared to the foam on the advancing crest of a wave. Allowing for the difference of material, it would rather seem to us as comparable to the froth on bottled stout or soda-water. We then pass to the history of the formation of volcanic mountains, so many of which have been thrown up in historic times, or have had the upper part of the cone more or less blown away by the energy of successive outbursts. Interesting facts are given concerning the modern Vesuvian lava flows, and the author passes on to the columnal structure of basalt, and the perlite

and spherulitic structure of other volcanic rocks. The fifth chapter concerns itself with the internal structure of volcanic mountains, with a view of demonstrating the ways in which they were formed. Too absolutely imbued with the sound teaching of Mr. Scrope, the author has perhaps scarcely given sufficient notice to the share which upheaval has certainly had in the formation of some volcanoes; and, although numerous sections are given of various volcanic phenomena, we miss that geological evidence which might have been furnished by sections across mountain chains. The sixth chapter treats of the various structures built up around volcanic vents, such as cones of scoriæ and tuff, and the parasitic cones which occur over Etna, Ischia, and many other volcanoes. The formation of craters and crater lakes are noticed, as are submarine volcanoes, mud volcanoes, and the sinter terraces and siliceous cones of geysers. The succession of events taking place at volcanic centres occupies another chapter, and gives excellent examples of the occurrence of volcanic vents along fissures, and of the shifting of vents along these lines, of the characters of fumeroles, solfataras, &c. The eighth chapter treats of the distribution of volcanoes upon the surface of the globe, chiefly in relation to coast lines, mountain chains, &c.; and the next chapter deals with volcanic activity during past geological time. The tenth chapter, "on the part played by volcanoes in the economy of nature," is chiefly occupied with the relation of the formation of mountain chains to volcanoes. The last chapter but one is entitled "What Volcanoes Teach us concerning the Nature of the Earth's Interior." The author adopts the view that the earth's interior is essentially the same as that of meteorites, and that the density cannot be explained by compression, in the interior, of ordinary surface rocks; but this conclusion, however well founded it may be, seems to rest almost entirely on the view that the Ovifak masses of iron entangled in basalt have really been derived from the central regions of the earth, against which there is something to be said. The last chapter gives an excellent summary of the hypotheses which have been advanced to explain volcanic action, without, however, accepting any one of them. Whatever shortcoming the student may fancy he detects in this work, may well be attributed to the fact that it was obviously impossible either to state facts fully or discuss difficult problems of a technical nature in a volume of this kind. The work is essentially elementary and educational, and as such, may be pronounced not only the best introduction to the study of volcanoes extant, but a faithful reflection of the present condition of vulcanology, which is certain to recruit sicence with future labourers, owing to the admirably clear manner in which fact and theory are alike unfolded.

It is eminently characteristic of British science, and of our countrymen, that systematic observations on rainfall, though of great importance to the nation in many ways, have been initiated and carried on by private enterprise.[2] We owe this work to Mr. G. J. Symonds,

[2] "British Rainfall, 1880. On the Distribution of Rain over the British Isles during the year 1880, as observed at more than 2,000 stations in Great Britain

who for the last twenty years has succeeded in enlisting a body of fellow-workers, who now furnish reports from 2,114 stations in the British Islands. While the Indian Government has organized an elaborate system of observations, and appointed meteorological reporters, who publish valuable discussions of the records made, the British Government is apparently unable to appreciate the necessity that exists for similar work at home. It would be difficult to estimate the value to manufacturers, agriculturists, and all concerned in questions of water supply, of systematic observations in meteorology; and, without desiring that Government should undertake any duties which can be as well discharged by individual effort, it may be doubted whether the welfare of large sections of the community is not seriously neglected so long as the Government omits to have records prepared which could be turned to practical account. Most of the work done under Mr. Symonds's direction is voluntary; and, as an example of admirably organized observation, deserves great praise and every encouragement. The little volume giving the records of rainfall during the last year, though at first sight somewhat technical, will be found charged with facts which well repay the reader's attention. The book consists of a number of separate essays and tables. The first, by Mr. Dines, deals with the difference of rainfall with elevation, giving observations through all the months on rain-gauges near the ground, and fifty feet above it, from which we learn that with a rainfall of 28 inches at four feet above the ground, only 24 inches fall at a height of fifty feet. It also appears that in these observations, made at Hersham, in Surrey, a rain-guage in a N.W. position collects on the tower 2½ inches more rain than one in a S.W. position. The second article discusses the amount of rain collected at considerable heights above the ground. Thus, in the year 1766, the rain falling in a garden near Westminster Abbey amounted to 22½ inches, while on the Abbey tower, at a height of 151 feet, the rainfall was only 12 inches. Similar observations made on York Minster, which is 213 feet high, gave almost identical results; but at Chester, while the rainfall at one foot above the ground last year was under 31 inches, at a height of 160 feet it was 21 inches. It appears that when the wind comes from the west, the rain-guage in the east always collects more water than one in the W.S.W., though, if the wind comes from the E., the difference between the guages disappears. The greatest height at which observations have been made is 260 feet, where the rainfall is little more than half what falls on the ground. Indeed, there is, at present, no evidence of any difference in the rainfall between heights of 60 feet and 260 feet above the ground. Then succeeds an article by Mr. Baldwin Latham on the rate at which rain falls. From a glance down his tables, it may be observed that in 1879 rain fell fastest during half an hour on the 20th of July, when the fall was at the rate of upwards of 20 inches a day; while in 1880, rain

---

and Ireland, with Articles upon various branches of Rainfall Work." Compiled by G. J. Symonds, F.R.S. London: Edward Stanford. Simpkin, Marshall & Co. 1881.

fell for five minutes on the 10th of July at the rate of upwards of 37 inches in the day. No approach to this heavy fall occurred till the 29th of December, when, for ten minutes in the evening, the fall was at the rate of 33 inches in the day. In ordinary rainfall, the rain comes down at the rate of from two to four inches a day. An article by Mr. Mawley gives directions for measuring the fall of snow. A detailed account follows of the county organizations for rainfall observations, with a list of changes during the year in the staff of observers, followed by a short obituary. All this matter may be regarded as introductory, for a separate pagination then commences, giving the meteorology of 1880, with notes on some of the principal atmospheric phenomena. They are arranged successively, according to the days of the month, and months of the year. Another section gives the observer's notes on the months in the various districts of the country; and the third section gives the observer's notes on the year in the various districts, recording the more interesting phenomena, often with reference to corn, root crops, fruit, insects, floods, and other phenomena. Other sections succeed, on heavy rains in short periods, which appear to have occurred chiefly in June and July, the heaviest being on the 22nd of July, at Malden, when rain fell for half an hour at the rate of nearly six inches in an hour. There is a similar chronicle of heavy falls in the twenty-four hours. On the last two days of July, 1880, the rainfall, over an area of 2,500 miles in the central part of England, was three inches. A single inch in such an area amounts to one hundred thousand million gallons. A like heavy fall in September extended over the N.E. of England and S.E. of Scotland. A table is given of sixteen stations, at which upwards of three inches of rain fell in twenty-four hours; while at Scathwaite, where the total fall in the year is 120 inches, four and three-quarter inches of rain fell in one day, November 13. Other tables compare the maximum rainfall with those of previous years. The dry periods are similarly treated. These are more numerous than might have been supposed. Thus, in January, there was a period of drought in the East of England, including a rainless time, of fourteen days. At Maidstone there were 33 consecutive days between February and the end of March practically without rain, since, in the whole period, less than a quarter of an inch fell. Again, between the 24th of April and 21st of May, there was a dry period at many places, having an average duration of 33 days. Later on, in August and September, came another dry period, when there was no rain for 20 days at a quarter of the stations; while in the north of Aberdeenshire the dry period extended over 41 days. Other examples are given of dry periods occurring later in the year. Next succeeds the monthly rainfall, with the chief places of observation in the various counties; illustrated with maps, which show during the several months the localities where the rainfall was below and above the average. Other articles compare the rainfall of the year with the average of the previous 30 years; and an interesting table gives the extremes of rainfall at various localities in England, Wales, Scotland, and Ireland. Finally, there are tables, systematically

arranged, giving the observations made at upwards of 2,000 stations in the British Islands. We have probably said enough to show the interesting character of the information which Mr. Symonds's volume makes accessible; and we can only trust it may lead many to make observations for themselves in localities where such work is required.

The ravages of insects have always engaged a large part of the gardener's and farmer's attention, and of late years we have had occasion to notice several little books in which the treatment of these pests to crops has been a prominent feature. We now draw attention to a practical treatise on injurious insects, which is not only the best that has been written, but is likely to remain a standard work.[3] Miss Ormerod, whose valuable annual reports on insect depredations have been such signal service, conceived of the excellent idea of enlisting her numerous correspondents in the attempt to produce a practical manual of injurious insects. It is needless to say that the work has been admirably carried out, it will familiarize all who have occasion to observe insect depredators with a good deal of practical entomology, and at the same time show the ways in which the natural enemies of plants may be best combated in the localities and circumstances where they are met with. After a short general introduction, a brief but useful introduction to entomology follows, chiefly limited to practical illustration of the classification employed. The book consists of three parts, which deal respectively with food crops, forest trees, and fruits. The arrangement is alphabetical, thus the food crops commence with asparagus, and end with turnips; and when a plant is infested with more than one insect these also are arranged alphabetically. Figures are given of the eggs, various stages of development, and depredations of the different insects, so that there can be no mistake as to the author's meaning, owing to any local differences of nomenclature. The food crops treated of are:—Asparagus, which is infested with the asparagus beetle; Bean, attacked by the bean aphis, humble bee, and bean beetle; Beet, infested by the beet carrion beetle, the mangold fly, and silver Y. moth; Cabbage, which has for enemies the cabbage aphis, the large and small white cabbage butterflies, the green-veined white butterfly, cabbage fly, root-eating fly, cabbage moth, the great yellow underwing moth, cabbage powdered wing, and cabbage gall weevil. The Carrot has to be guarded against the carrot fly and the common flat body moth, the carrot blossom moth, and the purple carrot seed moth. Celery is attacked by the celery leaf miner and celery stem fly. Corn has for its chief enemies the grain aphis, daddy long-legs, ribbon-footed corn fly, wheat midge, corn saw fly, corn thrips, and wire-worms, which are the grubs of click beetles. Hops have for enemies, the hop aphis (which is chiefly destroyed by ladybirds), hop bug, hop flea, hop frog fly, hop dog, otter moth, hop fine snout moth, red spider and hop wire-worm. The Lettuce has two enemies,

---

[3] "A Manual of Injurious Insects, with Methods of Prevention and Remedy for their Attacks to Food Crops, Forest Trees, and Fruit, and with short Introduction to Entomology." By Eleanor A. Ormerod, F.M.S., &c. London: Swan, Sonnenschein and Allen. Edinburgh: J. Menzies & Co.

the lettuce root aphis and lettuce fly; Onion has the onion fly; Parsnip is chiefly attacked by the insects infesting carrots; Peas by the pea moth and weevils; Potatoes have the potato frog fly and death's head moth; Turnips have numerous enemies, chiefly aphides, turnip fly, leaf miners, various moths, saw fly, and weevil. This enumeration may serve as a specimen of the systematic way in which the other parts of the book, which relate to forest trees and fruit crops, are treated. As an illustration of practical science, we could wish to see this handy volume in use by all the classes who have any interest in the subjects to which it relates.

Under the title, "My Garden Wild,"[4] Mr. Heath tells the story of his love for wild flowers and what he did to get them to grow in his own garden. The volume opens with a record of a dream which the author had, falling asleep in a garden which exhibited some of the perfections of modern cultivation, when his thoughts went back to the home of his boyhood, and created pictures in succession of wild plants growing by a brook, and succeeding each other with the seasons. This dream he endeavoured to realize in the garden which happened to be attached to his own house; and, after explaining how it became modified and adapted for its new function, records his experiences in some chapters which are sure to interest and instruct readers who would like to have the delight of turning from the house into the associations of country lanes. First comes an account of the ferns he grew, interspersing the story with information concerning the conditions under which the hardier ferns thrive. There is certainly no difficulty in getting the twenty-four kinds enumerated to grow in an ordinary garden, as we have proved by long experience. Another chapter treats of Flowery Grass Banks. Hawthorn, bramble, briar, gorse, and honeysuckle were planted on raised banks; and in the dells between, margined by a stream, were grown many of the land and water grasses, side by side with the sweet-scented vernal grass, which gives its characteristic odour to new-mown hay. Among these were placed the buttercups, anemones, daisy, primroses and cowslips, violets, with clumps of heather and gorse, and many another well-known wild flower. Other chapters, full of pleasant chat, are entitled, "A Garden Green Lane," "My Hedge Banks," "Weeds," and "Other Flowers I Grew." The concluding chapter, quaintly called "My Garden Key," is a sort of index, in which reference is given to the geographical distribution in the 112 provinces of Britain of the plants mentioned in the body of the work. This is a thoroughly healthy little book; and, in these days of artificial living in towns, may exercise a grateful influence in many a home, by leading us to cherish, with the plants collected in holidays, associations clustering round them which would otherwise grow dim.

The late Miss Hope, of Wardie Lodge, near Edinburgh, was a lover of plants and trees for their beauty; and during her too short life communicated to the *Gardener's Chronicle* and the *Garden* a

[4] "My Garden Wild, and What I Grew There." By Francis George Heath. London. Chatto & Windus. 1881.

number of articles of more than ordinary interest, which have now been gathered into a volume by the piety of a friend.[5] Many of the articles are of enduring value, especially those on "Flowers for the Blind," "Flowers for the Sick," "Flowers for Decoration," and "Cut Flowers," whilst almost every note is rich in valuable experience or suggestion. Still, the collection might have been shorn with advantage of many papers of little value, and the residue would have seemed better worth preserving.

From time to time the possibility of spontaneous generation has engaged a good deal of serious attention; far more than the subject deserved. The pursuit, in the present state of science, is comparable only to the search after the philosopher's stone, though anyone who possessed the historic faculty, and would write a history of the wanderings of the scientific mind in this unproductive wilderness, would make a contribution to knowledge of no small value. Professor Tyndall has brought together his own researches in this field in a volume, whose title, "Floating Matter of the Air," strikes an antithesis to the conception of spontaneous coming into being.[6] This floating-matter in the air is to spontaneous generation what Saul's kingdom was to his father's asses. For it has proved the explanation not only of fermentation and putrefactive change, but also, in many cases, has demonstrated the certain cause of disease. The present volume bases its *raison d'être* entirely on the practical utility to mankind of studies, the general value of which is demonstrated by multitudinous experiments. The first article, on "Dust and Disease," has done duty before in another work, but is here reprinted, with great fitness, as giving a lucid introduction to the practical side of the investigation. The second and third chapters are entitled "Optical Deportment of the Atmosphere in Relation to Putrefaction and Infection." They are reprints from the *Transactions of the Royal Society*. The first of the two articles details numerous experiments, in which infusions of all manner of animal and vegetable substances were exposed, some to the air and some in a box, constructed to insure the freedom of the air from motes. In every case putrefaction was rapidly set up in the unprotected tubes, while those contained in the boxes underwent no change. But the second memoir details investigations which were not always so successful. Three days were ample to ensure the deposit in the box of all floating matter, and five minutes' boiling always rendered the protected infusions sterile; but now, in common with many eminent Italian and other observers, Professor Tyndall found that germs were not always easily got rid of, and when present they were often killed with extreme difficulty. The infusion of hay, after being boiled for ten

---

[5] "Notes and Thoughts on Gardens and Woodlands. Written chiefly for Amateurs." By the late Frances Jane Hope. Edited by Anne J. Hope Johnstone. London: Macmillan & Co. 1881.

[6] "Essays on the Floating Matter of the Air in relation to Putrefaction and Infection." By John Tyndall, F.R.S., M.D. Tübingen. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1881.

minutes, though protected with plugs of cotton wool, sooner or later became turbid. The investigation is carried on with all kinds of hay infusion—hay neutralized with caustic potash, desiccated hay, old and new hay, soaked hay—and the experiments extended to a great variety of animal and vegetable substances, but, as a rule, the results were different from those of the previous year. The hay introduced into the laboratory of the Royal Institution had apparently infected the atmosphere. Infusions which had been rendered sterile with five minutes' boiling now resisted three hours' boiling. Occasionally a bulb resisted eight hours' boiling, but this appears to have depended on the kind of hay used. Discontinuous heating, however, generally destroys life in the germs in a short time, and the whole of the experiments go to show that some germs possess far greater vitality than others, but that all can be destroyed under suitable conditions. The fourth article is a lecture on fermentation, and its bearings on surgery and medicine. The last chapter is an article on spontaneous generation, reprinted from the *Nineteenth Century.* There are also two or three short appendices. The volume is one of great importance, rather from the possibilities which it opens up to general interest concerning the future of medicine than for the facts themselves, which have somewhat lost their freshness for those who followed the subject in the days when it engaged general attention.

---

## HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

AMONG the more important books of the quarter, the English rendering of Thucydides, by the Master of Balliol, occupies a prominent position.[1] The sanguine expectations of the intellectual world are amply realized; and the frame-work in which the main idea is set is not the least of the goods provided. In the very introduction, short as it is, there are pregnant words as to previous commentators and expounders. Arnold is relegated to his true position; while Poppo is rightly vindicated for his opinion that, in judging of the constructions in Thucydides, we must bear in mind that grammar is, after all, no transcendental and iron set of rules, but a mere summary of the usages of some one language at a given date. Professor Jowett shows clearly that what small minds call the want of grammar in Thucydides is in reality but a result of the fact that Thucydides wrote in that free time, before the age when "men instead of wrestling with language and logic, fell under the dominion of them." The general remarks on the interpretation of ancient authors are worthy of close study. The concluding apology for this addition to the "perennial stream of interpretations" is able and suggestive; it explains how, in the world of commentaries, the subjective spirit is gradually being driven out: and how these latest commentators work on the new lines.

[1] "Thucydides." Translated. By B. Jowett, Master of Balliol College. Oxford. 1881.

that "words are understood to have a fixed meaning; not that which we bring to them, but which is contained in them."

We may, indeed, pause to ask what is the justifying cause for such translations. In these days, when it is matter of common opinion that nobody reads books, who are those who will study these two volumes? We may be sure that their numbers will be great. Students will undoubtedly read them; for very reputation's sake, any candidate for honours at the universities will keep the volumes conspicuous on his shelves, and their contents well-ordered in his mind. Is there not, however, some prospect that so full a critique, if duly absorbed, must usurp and supersede the devotion and study that of right belong to the original? A clever brain, with these volumes at its finger's ends, and an average command of Greek scholarships, would have but little difficulty in doing good justice to an honour paper in Thucydides. Evils, we know, are mere relics of an antiquated system of education; but the patient, wholesome discipline of working out Thucydides for oneself, which has so stimulated and developed many of our greatest minds, will disappear before this successful result of a new application of division of labour, which somewhat illogically leaves to the professor all the disciplinary investigation, and offers to the student the tempting if unprofitable duty of registering results. In short, such a volume, by its very merits, must exert considerable influence in lessening the number of students of Thucydides himself. More than this—we call to mind, that the shrewd wisdom and powerful reasoning of Thucydides are, indeed, for all time; but his expressed thoughts are rather analogous to than identical with what is proceeding around us; and it may be asked, will a coming generation devote close attention to these bracing thoughts when bereft of their explanatory and attractive Greek clothing? That mental discipline, so successfully obtained in the "classical education," finds as yet no place in the fashionable system of education of to-day. It is, therefore, not without concern that we view this assignment to an English bookshelf of the most fertilizing of Greek authors. To make English classics out of Greek classics is, as it were, to convert a field from arable to pasture. Generations after generations, by their own personal labour, may gain habits of perseverance, health and harvests from the one in endless succession; but the other merely suffices to feed or refresh lower natures, and to afford no opportunities for work. So useful, both because it is disciplinary and because it is profitable.

But to return to the work itself; perhaps the feature that first attracts attention is the conservative treatment of the spelling problem. We have our old friends Pericles and Cleon, undisfigured by the latter-day *K*. Logic is, indeed, on this conservative side in their case, for there is but one way of pronouncing c: but the idea is further retained in the case of the soft *c* before *i*. And there is much to be said for the fact that Cithæra and Coreyra are the English for Greek words; we are by no means sure about the pronunciation of the Greek words; and we look for *English* in a translation, and not for pedantic and oftentimes altogether misleading and erroneous reproductions of the *foreign* forms of words.

Of the translation itself we must speak in the highest terms. There are some leading men among us whose scientific training has rather interfered with the chances of their acquiring a knowledge of the surpassing achievements of the human mind 2,000 years ago. While there is yet time we would call upon them to study this translation, for they will thus gain no inconsiderable knowledge of an author of whom Macaulay wrote: "A young man, whatever his genius may be, is no judge of such a writer as Thucydides. I had no high opinion of him ten years ago. I have now been reading him with a mind accustomed to historical researches and political affairs: and I am astonished at my own former blindness and at his greatness. . . . . He is the greatest historian that ever lived." This translation will have achieved a great and a salutary work if it brings even one of the "scientific" minds to a recognition of the antiquity of a human mind, of power and calibre at the least equal to the highest average of the present age.

The second volume provides that framework without which the world's attention is but inadequately directed to the treasures laid out in the text. There is an able and full account of the Greek inscriptions, and of the right methods of their interpretation. Professor Jowett, with his clear sense, warns us to remember that, though scholars have achieved so much lately in this branch of investigation, a great deal has been negative rather than positive in effect; and that, if we sum up results, we shall see they have thrown "a real, but not a considerable light upon the history of Greece." The difficulties of deciphering are fully gone into; and this essay forms a valuable guide-book for any who may contemplate such interesting and fruitful work. Not the least useful are the warnings uttered. "Far greater than the temptation to amend is the temptation to read into an inscription more than is really to be found in it." Several remarkable instances are given of this tendency towards misleading divination. The note on the geography of Thucydides is altogether good. It breaks from the trammels of the Arnold school, which attributed to our ignorance, and not to the author's, all geographical inconsistencies in Thucydides. In this note it is well pointed out that Thucydides, in his age, could not have possessed an accurate geographical knowledge of all the lands he deals with. In his day there were no ordnance maps, no surveys; all was guess and hearsay, save over the limited area of personal experience. Much of the volume is occupied by capital notes on the current difficulties in the Greek text; and it was inevitable that the celebrated description of the Plague should be fully discussed. The valuable addition has here been made of the two great parallel accounts of the plague—at Constantinople, by Gibbon, and at Florence, by Boccacio.

Another work that has now appeared, and that will prove exceptionally valuable in the present day, is the new emended edition of Dr. Stoughton's "History of Religion in England."[2] This edition gives

[2] "History of Religion in England." By J. Stoughton, D.D. New and Revised Edition. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1881.

us, in uniform binding, the six volumes, dealing respectively with the Church of the Civil Wars, of the Commonwealth, of the Restoration, of the Revolution, and of the Georgian Era—which have appeared from time to time during the last twenty years. This revised edition is a marked improvement, and the author has availed himself of all criticisms and suggestions, public and private, that could assist in perfecting the original idea of the work. Its study by the clergy of all denominations would do much towards bringing the more extreme and self-confident to the desirable point of seeing that, after all, they are each of them working together, under one common dispensation, for one common end.

The author seeks to impose upon himself an excellent canon. "I am by no means indifferent to the principles involved in the great controversies of the last two centuries; but I have never been able to see why private opinions or public events should stand in the way of an impartial statement of facts, or a righteous judgment of characters." The author makes a vigorous, and not altogether unsuccessful, attempt to realize this canon. But this is a book on religion, and once again we discover that it is impossible in human work in such a field, to avoid the fatal bias in dealing with subject matter so closely bound up with the heart as well as the head of mankind. Throughout the six volumes are scattered not infrequent exhibitions of the author's "private opinions." There is ample evidence that the author holds not only convictions, but very substantial and strong convictions, and that so far from being "indifferent to the principles involved," he is quite unable to judge of the facts or characters in these controversies but by the light of these convictions.

Dr. Stoughton is, and intends to be, an advocate of that centripetal tendency towards union among sects, which find such favour with many leading thinkers. But in his exposition of this tendency he gives evidence of its inherent and ultimate impossibility. His very concession that Methodism served to give personal ascendancy over ecclesiastical government is plain proof that the personal element in religion predominates and is paramount; and it is an element which must always create sects and induce "radical" differences of opinion. His idea of an Evangelical piety, by the means of which "men may differ in Church views, and yet be one in spiritual sentiment," is an idea which depends largely on the elasticity of that little word "may." There is genuine pious horror, which forbids all communion between the earnest Low Churchman and the good Roman Catholic. There is a great gulf fixed by the genuine High Churchman between himself and those false prophets who would officiate as the ministers of religion, in distinct contravention of his vital principle of apostolic succession. Men "may" be one in spiritual sentiment, but they are not so always. They have been known to differ no less in their views of spiritual sentiment that in their views of Church government. And of this the great Dissenting movement is conclusive proof. The one great motion was the breaking loose of personal liberty of opinion from the trammels of ecclesiastical government. It was not a mere

revolution in Church views, but a breaking of those bonds which the Church seemed willing to forge for the control of all freedom in spiritual sentiment. As Dr. Stoughton himself points out, it was because Church views had become inconsistent with free spiritual sentiment that Dissent became a reality in its endeavour to set up new Church views. "Wesley saw that organization was essential to the permanence of his work; his attention was occupied by principles of Church government." Personal religion broke away from a decidedly crystallized form of organization, but it immediately clothed itself again in other forms. If there be a Church it must be organized; but Churches are of men, and there have been, are, and must be, differences, many of them radical, in Church organizations. The very fact that the personal nature of religion caused the rupture, was the very reason why the rupture was the segregation of many schools, and not the splitting of the old into two only. If there be spiritual sentiment, it is of men; and there have been, are, and must be, differences, many of them radical, in spiritual sentiment. No greater proof of this abiding fact can be given than the well-arranged, elaborate, and eloquently stated details of this "History of Religion in England." It is true that the work is inspired throughout by the centripetal desires of the author—beating in unison with the desires of many thoughtful leaders;—but throughout the work itself supplies evidence of that centrifugal tendency of men's minds in the field of religion—which is inevitable, because religion is so distinctly and so essentially a personal and subjective attribute of human existence.

Of this centripetal tendency towards union among religious leaders, we have another instance in the publication of the History of the Scottish Church.[3] It was determined, by those of Edinburgh, to give in old St. Giles' Church a series of lectures upon Scottish Ecclesiastical History—each dealing with some, and one period each by some well known authority on the subject. These lectures, twelve in number, are now published, bound together in one volume. Regarded as a history, the volume naturally lacks unity; for though each writer has much in common with the others, there is, of course, apparent all the difference that must exist between twelve minds of such good calibre. The work is prefaced by a capital history of St. Giles' Church: and it is a church well worthy of a history. Figuring in every stirring event and change in its country's history, it has passed through the somewhat unique fate of being divided off into several parish churches; at one time within the old walls there would be providing services according to high church, low church and Calvinistic opinions. Parts were also portioned off to serve such secular purposes as accommodating a police station. The series of lectures that follow this preface are each of them short and to the point, and will amply repay perusal. We see successively come and go the Celtic Church, and the mediæval organization that succeeded to it: we have the full tale of the Reformation and the renewed purifying of all things. Then

[3] "The Scottish Church from the Earliest Times to 1881." W. & R. Chambers, London & Edinburgh. 1881.

follow the long-drawn struggles between Presbyterianism and Prelacy; the romantic and stirring episode of the Covenanters, and the living hatred, popular and ineradicable, of all that savoured of Rome. The close connection of this strong religious spirit with the securing the liberties and privileges of the Revolution and the Union is fitly described. We then have the tale of the more sober and earnest work of the Church in the present century. The last lecture discusses the question how far the Church of the present day is an expression of the religious life and thought of Scotland. This is coming out of the past into the present; we are no longer dealing with history; and at once we have a lecture that is polemical and political. Throughout the book Scotch individualism in religious matters rears its head now and then; but in this last chapter it arises in its might, and dashes into the antagonisms of Disestablishment and other vital questions of Scotch ecclesiastical policy. At once there is an end put to Scotch ecclesiastical history.

The Rede Lecture for 1881 calls attention to a chapter in religious history of which most western nations are profoundly ignorant.[4] Considering that the Empire of Mahomedanism spread itself over territories and over peoples as extended and as diverse as the Empire of Rome, we may well endorse Sir W. Muir's justified surprise that so little has been done in England to follow the early history of this important movement. It is, however, becoming daily evident that a classical education would find ample material, had the records of Greece and Rome one and all perished, in the treasures yet hoarded for us among the records of every great nation of the past. More research, and the inroads of our own western civilization into the dominions of the bygone states, is fast discovering these hoards. A new and most promising field opens out for scholarship in the setting up in type, so to speak, these relics and monuments of an important past. This Rede Lecture supplies a brief summary of what may be looked for among the Arabs of high literary as well as historical value. It is from the Arabian annalists alone that we can obtain material for the history of the victorious spread of the Mussulman over Syria, Persia, Egypt, Arabia and Northern Africa during the ten short years succeeding to the Prophet's death. Rome and Europe were driven back upon this sudden and signal advance; but Europeans recorded nothing, save untrustworthy accounts of a few battles. These Arabian annalists recorded all details. And there were many most remarkable developments to record; for instance, Osman's elaborate "Dewan" or national registry and pay system—which at one time embraced, in one close organization, all the ruling classes of the East. This period is also doubly interesting from the persistent activity of the "Kharzites" —the Covenanters of Islam—as Sir W. Muir well styles them. Again, the whole details of the prosperity of Bagdad, suggests many striking analogies to our own age; with its care for hospitals and for

---

[4] "The Early Caliphate and Rise of Islam." The Rede Lecture for 1881. By Sir W. Muir, K.C.S.I. London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1881.

commerce and for learning; and its rationalism in religion. It was during this period that the Arab did so much for science; absorbing both Greek and Indian learning; gathering up and preserving for Europe "its patrimony of philosophy and science through the darkness of the Middle Ages."

Germany sends forth a work of some interest at the present moment.[5] It is a detailed account of English commercial policy during the reigns of Henry VII. and VIII. When we say that this account of so far distant and so brief a period fills two octavo volumes, of 700 pages each, we shall explain the curiously elaborate and laborious work that Germans devote to their researches. The immediate cause of the appearance of this book was a prize offered, in 1876, by the Beneke Institution, at Göttingen, for an "account of English Commercial Policy in the age of Henry VIII." The prize was awarded to the work of which we here have a full reprint. The author hopes that the results of his labour may assist the historian of the economic development of England. And in his preface he justly remarks that, in order properly to judge of the present commercial and industrial activity of England, we must lay bare its roots in previous ages. These bulky volumes are full of details as to the industry, trade, finance, and commercial negotiations of the period. The quotations are lengthy, from every species of old record and document. There is thus provided for those that have patience and opportunity to study these two volumes, abundant and clear evidence as to the antiquity of the English spirit of industrial and commercial enterprise, so vigorous in the present day, and every whit as restless, and as much given to apprehensions and grumbling in the days of Henry VIII. as in those of Victoria.

From France, as well as from Germany, we have publications inquiring into our own historical antecedents. M. Jusserand, already favourably known by his works on "Piers Plowman" and Chaucer, publishes now a second edition of his history of the "Theatre in England before the time of Shakespeare."[6] Though by no means the solitary book on its subject, those who are interested therein will find much that is suggestive in this account of mysteries, pageant, masks, and moralities. The effect on the National Theatre of the Reformation and the Renaissance is viewed from the refreshing standpoint of a trained French mind. The tendency of the whole argument is towards the idea that the English in their theatre, as in other matters, have been essentially conservative—steering their course with eye fixed on the past rather than peering into the future.

In a handsome quarto, amply enriched with plates and engravings, we have an instalment of the result of James Milne's last three years' work at Carnac.[7] But a melancholy fate clouds over this instalment:—as

---

[5] "Englische Handelspolitik gegen ende des Mittelaltes." By Dr. George Schanz, Leipsig. Duncker und Humbolt. 1881.

[6] "Le Théâtre en Angleterre." Par J. J. Jusserand. Second edition. Paris: Ernest Leroux. 1881.

[7] "Excavations at Carnac." By (the late) James Milne. Edinburgh: D. Douglas & Co. 1881.

it is the first, so is it the last. While this book was actually in the press, its energetic and well-informed author succumbed to a short but severe illness. The book itself is an admirably concise, clear and honest account of explorations carried on by the author; the whole is fitly crowned by the last chapter of summary and conclusions. In this we learn how the Romans utilized and improved defensive works originally erected by the Celts. We learn that the same practical people took a distinctly utilitarian view of the "menitors," or standing monoliths, and incorporated them into their walls and buildings. There was little antiquarian spirit among the legionaries; they noticed the "rudes et informas saxorum compages;" but their admiration and their attentions were for them as materials for building and not for history. Mr. Milne, however, shows clearly that not only did the Romans turn to their own purposes the work of their predecessors—but this combination of results was further complicated, on the departure of the Romans, by the fact that the Romanized nations, in their turn, adapted the Roman works to the purposes of residence and defence. Mr. Milne brings forward conclusive evidence to show that the monuments at Carnac date far anterior to the Roman occupation. And thus, if we would discover their true origin, we must penetrate these superincumbent changes. Mr. Milne is altogether strong in the theory that the separate upright stones were sepulchral monuments—set up in memory of the dead, but not necessarily over their bones. He points out that this is a custom of Northern Europe—surviving in Sweden in the sixteenth century. He recalls to memory the fact that in that century the contemporary writer Olaus Magnus describes in detail the signification of the various forms and arrangements of these stones. It may be remarked incidentally that the setting up of stone crosses, obelisks, or cairns where individuals have met with violent deaths in combat, or by accident, is yet common among us. These are becoming in South Africa the milestones, as it were, on the road of our annexations, and they are by no means unknown in the English countryside. Mr. Milne points out that at Carnac, of these monoliths the majority are of the stone of the locality, but many are not, but have been brought thither from distant places. This is proof, not only of design, but of design for a purpose considered of much importance; and it thus appears that at all events one lesson to be learned from these stone circles is the fact that the idea of national cemeteries, and of respect for the dead, are older than the limited period as yet covered by history.

Professor Gardiner and Mr. Mullinger provide an "Introduction to the Study of English History,"[8] uniform with the series which has already given us introductions to the study of language, genre-painting and comparative mythology. This introduction to English history divides itself into two parts. The first of these deals with English history as a whole. A very comprehensive review is condensed within 200 pages. This is the work of Professor Gardiner, and he seeks by it to

[8] "Introduction to the Study of English History." By Samuel R. Gardiner and J. B. Mullinger. London: C. Kegan Paul. 1881.

supply the advanced student with an adequate idea of relativity and continuity of all characters and events that in their total make up history. As he well says in his preface, the student "cannot successfully study a generation of men as if it could be isolated and examined like a piece of inorganic matter. He has to bear in mind that it is a portion of a living whole which is under observation." Throughout, this succinct description of English history is an account, able and thorough, of the rise of authority generally among men, and particularly in the English nation. This involves a skilful tracing of the continuous changes as to where authority resided in the polity. Strong proof is incidentally afforded of the innate tendency of the English nation not to disregard the past; and, therefore, to set aside or reform old institutions only after they have proved themselves hurtful and no longer useful. The second part of this book—the work of Mr. Mullinger—though of less interest to the general reader, is of the greatest value to the student or investigator of any particular portion of English history. It seeks, not to teach him the place of this portion in regard to the whole, but to provide him with a list of desirable authorities for his period. Mr. Mullinger thus affords assistance of special and novel character. All authorities for each period of our history are not only placed on a list, but a brief and adequate estimate is attached to each one as to his respective credibility and value. The ample details of this long list prove incontestably that the work of the historian is, now-a-days, one of selection, and not one of compilation, as in older and less literary times.

The Education Code of 1880 provides that certain subjects, among them history, "shall be taught throughout the year, through reading lessons, according to a graduated scheme." A want is thus created by statute, and its supply has been undertaken by authors of no less fame than Sir George Coxe, Mr. Yorke Powell, and Prof. Gardiner. Culture and learning have seen fit to guarantee that the children in public elementary schools shall have substantial and genuine intellectual food. In the volume "Outlines of English History,"[9] Professor Gardiner seeks to supply a reading-book for Standards III. and IV.; and as the majority of children pass those standards, there should shortly be few in England whose education has not familiarized them with the outline history of their own country, from the day it first had a history up to the present year. It is only natural that this book, though freshly and newly written, should remind us greatly of previous simple histories adapted for the young. It embodies, however, the most recent "improvements" in history; and succeeds better than most of its kind in preserving due proportion between leading events. It is said that history cannot be written till all the actors are dead; it is certain that the attempt to ignore this canon is never successful. In the last pages of this book, in the history of our own times, the author, falling from the high estate of historian, descends to political innuendo. It is, for instance, of little benefit instilling into Board School children ideas so full of partisan animosity as that Lord Palmerston did not

[9] "Outlines of English History." By S. R. Gardiner. London: Longmans & Co. 1881.

resign when his Reform Bill failed, because "he did not really care about Reform:" or that English merchants "sent out ships to burn and plunder the merchant vessels of the United States." Such histories, if they attempt a record of our own times, must be scrupulously impartial and rigidly fair to all parties and policies.

If it cannot be said that Mr. Barnett Smith's "Life of Sir Robert Peel"[10] takes high rank among biographies; if, in fact, we have to place it in the second class of such books, it is, nevertheless, a clear and full account of the life and work of "our greatest Member of Parliament." The body of the work, apart from the personal interest of its subject, is a detailed and instructive account of the constitutional ways of English ministries. The last chapter is devoted to a summing up of Peel's character. The happy idea is there realized of combining quotations from the estimates of the character recorded by eminent men; and by this eclectric method we obtain a view of Peel's character which is the result of the combined judgment of all his contemporaries best capable of forming true judgments. By the perusal of this detailed life, and the subsequent correction of the judgment so formed by the study of the last chapter, the reader must gain no inadequate or incorrect idea of what Sir Robert Peel was, of what he did, and of how he did it. It has been, perhaps, too little acknowledged that by his very nature, by the sovereign tendency of his mind to dwell on facts and be influenced by the present, Peel was essentially a man of the present. With him the traditions of the past yielded to to the obvious teaching of the present; with him the imaginative ambitions of a future yielded before its more obvious necessities. A chapter in this life, of present interest, is that descriptive of the Abolition of the Corn Laws. It retails facts and arguments now only too often forgotten.

Sir Alexander Arbuthnot, with the avowed object of confirming the principle that India should be regarded as beyond the sphere of English party politics, edits and publishes selections from the official and other writings of Sir Thomas Munro.[11] This is professedly no mere biography for the general reader, but rather a book of reference for the administrator. The two volumes open, indeed, with a life of Munro, which tells the tale, from the arrival of the young cadet in the factory fort of St. George, till the cadet had become governor of the new Presidency of Madras, after a career of nearly half a century. The chief and peculiar value of the work lies, however, in the copious extracts from official papers that fill the remainder of the two volumes. Ranged under the head of revenue, judicial, political, military, and miscellaneous, we have recorded the detailed views of reasons guiding Indian policy in the days of the rise of our empire. And although time has robbed much of this of its point, much still remains of great value, not only to the historian but to the administrator. The land system and

10 "Sir Robert Peel." English Political Leaders. By George Barnett Smith. London: W. Isbister. 1881.

11 "Major-General Sir Thomas Munro, Bart., K.C.B." By Sir A. J. Arbuthnot, K.C.S.I. London: Kegan Paul & Co. 1881.

the revenue question are still unsettled. Famines, forest conversation, grain duties, and the whole list of Indian questions, find ventilation within these pages. Much is to be learned from their perusal, especially as we can judge of the successes and failures of reasons and measures advocated and carried out in the early years of this century. The book is, as it were, an encyclopædia on Indian political problems; some of them pressing for solution even in the present day. The various subjects are grouped in their special categories, and are thus made easy of reference, even without the aid of the very full index that closes vol. ii.

Professor Colvin has, perforce, to justify his "Landor,"[12] in the English Men of Letters Series, by pointing to the improvements possible on Mr. Forster's Life. The contention that this latter life is "cumbrous in comment, inconclusive in criticism, and vague on vital points," is, no doubt, just on the whole. Yet, even in this honest attempt to remedy these defects, it becomes evident that there must be prolix, if not cumbrous, comments on a character and a man so wayward and so productive. At all events, the world possesses one more close and full account of Walter Savage Landor; and there is something peculiarly attractive in the account of such a character, seeing that in it were blended in extreme the two opposite but powerful human motors, pride and energy. Professor Colvin happily sums up the result in the sentence: "Landor's career seems to present a spectacle of almost as much fertility as force." And this was because all his energy, all his genius, all his scholarship, was in a perpetual state of warfare with an uncontrollable pride; and, in the friction, all further or lasting results were frittered away and destroyed. The most marked feature of Landor's career is the vast number of his works that were destroyed before the public saw them, or withdrawn from circulation so soon after issue that the public had too little time to become acquainted with them. This was due to the paradoxical reason that the author himself held an extravagantly high opinion of their value. In anticipation, he devoted the proceeds of his "Idyllic" to be divided among the poor of Leipsic. His "Charitable Dowager," he said, should provide an annuity for an old Spanish friend of his youth. But the poor of Leipsic reaped no benefit, and the "Charitable Dowager" was not even printed. There is much in this career of great interest. Landor's reflection on himself: "I never did a single wise thing in the whole course of my existence, although I have written many which have been thought such," would have been truer had he written, "which were such." His whole life, even if essentially unwise, is full of meaning and instruction; and Professor Colvin has succeeded admirably in this portrait; he has produced a work, the perusal of which must be not only interesting, but wholesome and improving..

The publishers of the "Allgemeinen Deutschen Biographie" have

[12] "Landor." By Sidney Colvin. English Men of Letters Series. London: Macmillan. 1881.

brought out in pamphlet and separate form a group of biographies from their larger work.[13] The group is composed of the two Forsters (Johann Reichole and his son George), and the two Humboldts (Wilhelm and his brother Alexander). These distinguished Germans are especially well-known to Englishmen, though to Englishmen of a generation that is fast passing away. The elder Forster, who, with his son, accompanied Captain Cook, as naturalist, on his great voyage of circumnavigation, settling among us, did much to awaken attention to natural history in England. His son finally settled in France, and became known as a prominent worker in the same field of science as his father. The link that connects the Forsters with the Humboldts is the meeting, at Göttingen, of Alexander von Humboldt with the aged naturalist and shipmate of Cook. Humboldt was charmed, and himself tells us how then and there he imbibed the seeds of his eagerness to visit and explore the tropics. This brochure is thus of special interest to English readers;—tracing the inspiration of the "Cosmos" to the explorations of Captain Cook. The lives of the Humboldts are here told with only too great brevity. They tell the tale of a first awakening to a scientific exploration of Nature, which followed directly upon the wider comparative knowledge consequent upon the new-born commercial exploration of the world.

In republishing in pamphlet form his "Opening Paper read before the members of the Glasgow Carlyle Club,"[14] Mr. Martin adds one more to the many biographical sketches the world now possesses of Thomas Carlyle. As to the necessity for this latest of these multitudinous biographies the author is presumably the best judge; but in all these condensed sketches the public will only discover much sameness. They are, and they must be composed, in the main, of the same incidents more or less ably joined the one to the other. It is only in these links that there can be difference. In the present case these links are from the oratorical forge, as befits an opening paper before a club. This may account for sundry literary blemishes. "To refrain from entering a profession to which his inner nature did not direct him in no uncertain tones." "The epic poem of his life was fully finished, and not, as it so often is, a poor and broken fragment,"—are sentences which may have had a meaning when spoken, though they have lost all by transmission into print. It is true that this sketch is an address, but that does not justify the author in boasting that he has altogether grown out of the "hero-worshipping epoch of life," when at every turn his words are those of blind hero-worship. The sketch professes to be philosophical, but it sadly lacks depth; and the author allows a very narrow Christianity to direct and invalidate his philosophical ambition. "Laws without a law-giver, matter without spirit," are taken as synonyms. The rigid creed of

[13] "Die Forsters und die Humboldts." By A. Dove. Leipsig: Duncker und Humblot. 1881.

[14] "Thomas Carlyle, his Life and Work." By W. Martin. Glasgow: Wilson & McCormick. 1881.

the author blinds him to all difference; he does not see that the one posits mind, and the other denies its existence; the one may deny anthropomorphic explanations of mind outside of the world, but it cannot rightly be classed with pure materialism. The "high priests of dirt" may reject mind altogether, but the freethinker may be the opposite of materialist, and see the secret of all things in psychic force, or explain all to himself by the inspiration of Hegelian doctrines. As a philosophical account of Carlyle this sketch is altogether a failure; as a short biography it has many superiors. It becomes a question whether this printing of superfluous books is not real waste of energy and capital—what the economical would call a dead loss to the community at large.

"Studies of Modern Mind and Character" are published in book form, and with the author's name,[15] by way of realizing John Stuart Mill's advice in the Preface to his "Dissertations and Discussions." Mill writes that the practice of republication of papers originally contributed to periodicals is a decidedly beneficial one; if only because of the greater original care it calls forth in the manner and the matter of such anonymous writing. This is a practice which may be followed, no doubt, with much advantage to the author's style; but when the public has reaped the benefit of this in the article itself, the public will hardly care to re-peruse, or to treasure up on its book-shelves the incidental reduplication of matter that in uncontrollable flood bids fair already to overwhelm the attention of the world. Few people find time now to study the leading Reviews as they come out; it seems probable that the study of books, save for the immediate purpose of one's particular career, is rapidly becoming a thing of the past. And yet in books are preserved much that is of the greatest value, had we only time to open them. And this book is a signal example of the fact. We have bound together a series of most thoughtful and able essays contributed originally to the *Quarterly* the *Westminster* and the *Fortnightly* Reviews. There is a great variety in the bill of fare offered; and there is much to be digested with profit. From a final laying of the ghost of Junius to the presently valuable account of the land question in France, we have a varied feast of literary, historical and economical essays. In relation to the land question we have it clearly set forth how agriculture was at one time altogether ruined in France by the absenteeism of the landlords at Court, and by the realization of the Quesnay theory that agriculture was the sole source of real wealth to a nation, and that it therefore ought to bear the burden of taxation. It is pointed out that if the first evil is absent in England at the present, it is none the less certain that the second has still to be exorcised. Agriculture is still burdened with taxes imposed when it was the chief wealth-producing industry; and when commerce and manufactures and mining were of comparative insignificance.

Compressed into 130 pages, Mr. Bourinot publishes a capital

---

[15] "Studies of Modern Mind and Character." By John Wilson. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1881.

account of the intellectual development of the Canadian people.[16] The book in its external characteristics is a model of what a book should be; and in so far bears upon its face evidence of intellectual success. But the author, in his opening sentence, repeats the well-worn complaint of ignorance at home on Colonial topics: yet this sentence is evidently a mere thoughtless repetition of a commonplace assertion that has now lost its meaning. In England a very great deal is known of the intellectual development of the Colonies; and Canada, in particular, in all probability has obtained an undue share of credit, which leads people "at home" to expect greater results than are at the present possible. But Mr. Bourinot, with all his knowledge of things Canadian, is himself led astray in this desire to see Canada properly appreciated. Indeed, throughout the book he tries to correct the idea that intellectual or literary acting has formerly prevailed in Canada. "It is quite obvious," he writes "that in the first centuries of Colonial history but few intellectual fruits can be brought to maturity." This is a proper corrective of his opening complaint that "Englishmen in general know very little of the progress that has been made in culture in Canada." Englishmen know very well that Canada is no new nation, but an offshoot of older nations settling down in unpopulated wilds; and an offshoot cultured and civilized, even though its daily work be pioneer and rough. The second chapter gives a good account of the capital educational system that has developed itself in Canada. There is much of interest in the tendency in Canada, as in Australia—for colleges or universities to become denominational. One great cause of this is that these colleges are new, and have no traditions and individual tone; parents can trust for the moral training of their sons only to the denominational character of the college. With age this will disappear, and universities will gradually arise from among these scattered institutions—as they have done in Europe. The third chapter is a detailed history of the Canadian newspapers—of greater interest in Canada than in England, where it merely suffices to prove that the press in Canada has shown a full share of ability and enterprise. The last chapter gives a capital review of Canadian intellectual activity, pointing out its present condition; but most properly trusting to the future rather than to the past.

---

## BELLES LETTRES.

THE survey of Italian literature naturally demands a far wider field than the limits assigned to the Renaissance in the first volume of this series,[1] the "age of the despots." Mr. Symonds takes for boundaries

---

[16] "The Intellectual Development of the Canadian People." By J. G. Bourinot Toronto: Hunter, Rose & Co. 1881.

[1] "The Renaissance in Italy." By John Addington Symonds. Vols. IV. and V. Italian Literature. In Two Parts. London: Smith & Elder. 1881.

1300, the date of Dante's Vision, and 1530 when Florence fell, and divides the space into three epochs, the first ending with Boccaccio's death in 1375, and the second with Lorenzo de' Medici's birth in 1448, and the third, the "golden age" of the Renaissance.

Passing rapidly over the account in the first chapter of the slow growth of the Italian language, and that first show of Renaissance spirit, which came with the rule of Frederick the Second in Sicily, like the earliest colours of the dawn before the appearance of the sun, we pause at the study of the great triumvirate, Dante, Petrarcha, and Boccaccio. Here at once we turn to the passages which treat of that loveliest among love-books, the *Vita Nuova.* Here we are heartily at one with our author. He happily is not of the chilly pedants who see in the glorious Beatrice a philosophical abstraction, or a tedious allegory, written chiefly to serve as a sampler for sonnet-makers. Let Mr. Symonds speak for himself. "Within the compass of one little book is bound up all that Florence in the thirteenth century contributed to the refinement of mediæval manners, together with all that the new school of poets had imagined was highest in their philosophical conception." Let no one who reads these last words think, however, that Mr. Symonds is at all at one with the allegorists, for he goes on:—

"It is enough for the young Dante to meet Beatrice, to pass her among her maidens in the city-ways, to receive her salute, to admire her moving through the many-coloured crowd, to meditate upon her apparition as of one of God's angels in the solitude of his chamber. She is a dream, a vision, but it is the dream of his existence. . . . . more actual, more steeped in emotion . . . . than many loves which find fruition in long years of intercourse. . . . . No one reading these poems will doubt that, though Beatrice did but cross the path of Dante's life, and shed her brightness on it for a season from afar, the thought of her had penetrated heart and fibre, making him a man new-born through love, and striking in his soul a note that should resound through all his years, through all the centuries which grow to understand him."

Mr. Symonds is no less happy in his appreciation of Petrarch, that master of the masters of love.

"Without exaggeration, he might have chosen for his motto the phrase of Marcus Aurelius: 'I will not say, dear City of Cecrops, but dear City of God.' . . . . Petrarch's verses, to use Shelley's words, 'are as spells, which unseal the inmost enchanted fountains of the delight which is the grief of love.' . . . . The interval of twenty-one years, when Laura trod the earth, and her lover, in all his wanderings, paid his orisons to her at morning, evening, and noonday, and passed his nights in dreams of that fair form which never might be his, was the storm and stress period of his chequered career. There is an old Greek proverb that says: 'To desire the impossible is a malady of the soul.' With this malady, in its most incurable form, the poet was stricken; and, instead of seeking cure, he nursed his sickness, and delighted in the discord of his spirit. From that discord he wrought the harmonies of his sonnets and 'Canzoni.' That malady made him the poet of all men who have found in their emotions a dreamland more wonderful and pregnant with delight than in the world which we call real."

Boccaccio's *bourgeois* spirit he contrasts with Dante. "Dante's Comedy represents our life in relation to the life beyond the grave, Boccaccio

depicts the life of this earth only, subtracting whatsoever may suggest a life to come. . . . . It would be difficult to determine which of the two dramas is the more truthful, or which of the poets had a firmer grasp upon reality. But the realities of the 'Divine Comedy' are spiritual; those of the human comedy are material." Mr. Symonds well describes the dramatic opening of the "Decameron:"—"Florence crowded with corpses, echoing to the shrieks of delirium and the hoarse cries of body-buriers, is the background he has chosen for that blooming garden where the birds sing and the lovers sit by fountains in the shade, laughing or weeping, as the spirit of each tale compels them." Mr. Symonds's curious statement, that, "like Balzac, Boccaccio was unsuccessful in depicting virtuous womanhood," will scarcely be accepted, as far as the great French novelist is concerned, by all real students of Balzac, to whom, for example, the name of Laurence de St. Cygne, in the "Ténébreuse Affaire," will at once occur as a true and beautiful picture of virtuous womanhood.

We wish much that space would allow us to follow Mr. Symonds in his study of the transition from the Middle Ages, effected by writers who, though they use the mother-tongue, take rank among cultivated authors, and in his chapters on the more obscure branches of vernacular literature which flourished among the people. All we can do is to dwell, with all briefness, upon those parts which most appealed to us in our study of the volumes.

The chapters devoted to Lorenzo de' Medici and to the three great singers of the "Orlando" story are admirable examples of Mr. Symonds's vivid and beautiful style. The analysis of the "Orlando Innamorata" of Boiardo is an excellent piece of literary skill; anyone who wished in brief space to make acquaintance with this great and too little known poem could not do better than study deeply Mr. Symonds's abstract, reading its poetic translations with the accompaniment of the Italian text. We must, however, avoid all temptation to follow Mr. Symonds further, either into his somewhat too lengthy study of the "Novellieri," or his fascinating account of the pastoralities of Sannazzaro and Fontano; nor may we pause to discuss his vigorous description of the base and brutal Pietro Aretino. All we can do is to quote his translation of a sonnet of that tuneful Cardinal Pietro Bembo, who is too little known and read to-day:—

"Ah, me! at one same moment forced to cry
 And hush, to hope and fear, rejoice and grieve,
 The service of one master seek and leave,
Over my loss equally laugh and sigh.
My guide I govern; without wings I fly;
 With favouring winds, to rocks and sandbanks cleave;
 Hate haughtiness, yet meekness disbelieve;
Mistrust all men, nor on myself rely.
I strive to stay the sun, set snows on fire;
 Yearn after freedom, run to take the yoke;
 Defend myself without, but bleed within;
Fall when there's none to lift me from the mire;
 Complain, when plaints are vain, of fortune's stroke;
 And power, being powerless, from impuissance win."

It is a pity, however, that Mr. Symonds did not see fit to quote some other example of the sonnets of Bembo than one which is purely typical of the taste of the time for affectation and conceits.

The preface to the prose writings and poems of Count Carlo Pepoli, by Count Cesare Albicini,[2] Professor of Constitutional Rights in the University of Bologna, is a good specimen of historical and biographical Italian literature. Carlo Pepoli was well known in English society, during his long exile amongst us, as an accomplished gentleman and a distinguished melodramatic writer. He composed the *Puritani* for his friend Bellini, the *Malek Adel* for Vaccai, the *Giovanna Gray* for Costa. These, however, were but occasional productions in his "hours of idleness." The collection of his works, of which the two volumes before us are but a fraction, proves the fulness and variety of his literary activity. Lectures, poems, inscriptions, historical and political dissertations, and a vast correspondence with the men who in his time were best known in science, literature, and politics, give a peculiar interest to Count Pepoli's memoirs. But the most remarkable feature of his life is its connection with the fate of his country, and the preface of Professor Albicini constitutes, from this point of view, a very interesting chapter of Italian history.

The author describes the intellectual and moral state of the Roman provinces after the Restoration of 1815; the traces left in the new generation by the Revolution and the Empire; the emancipation of the educated classes from old customs and prejudices; the national feeling awakened in their mind by political union and military enterprise; the deep change introduced into social relations through the working of the civil law and of Imperial administration; the growth of science, literature and art in the country at large, and more particularly in Bologna—a centre of elevated culture and genial sociability, through both the University and the pleasantness of the place. He points forcibly to the fatal contrast between the new tendencies of the people and the system of blind reaction adopted by the restored princes and, above all, by the Papal Court, under the sanction of the Treaty of Vienna, which he styles a "negation of history, ethnography, and morals," at the same time.

The deadly struggle between the Liberal party and the Papal Government, during the latter years of the Pontificate of Pius VII. and the reigns of Leo XII. and Pius VIII. (1815–1831), is admirably sketched out. On the one side, all the abuses and vexations of an arbitrary *régime*, committed to a privileged caste, ruling the country by means of an inquisitive secret police in Church and State; civil and political liberty totally suppressed; the schools, the press, the academies, all social intercourse, subject to priestly vigilance and censure. The most innocent manifestations of love for the fatherland, the very mention of the name of Italy, with a view to her rescue from foreign yoke, were converted into a crime of high treason. On the other hand, a latent discontent, nourished in silence, and gradually

[2] "Prose e Poesie di Carlo Pepoli," con Prefazione di Cesare Albicini. Bologna: Nicol Zonichelli, etc.

spreading from the higher and middle classes to the people at large; an underground conspiracy, fostering, under the leadership of the Carbonari, hatred and revolt: and then, through suspicion and party spirit, the iniquitous proceedings of the exceptional Courts, under the dictatorship of Cardinal Rivarola, at Ravenna and elsewhere (1827): imprisonments, exiles, capital executions on the slightest evidence; and, as counterpart, the progress of secret rebellion throughout the country and the vengeance of the victims by the knife of their associates and friends.

Still, from the background of this ominous picture there come out, here and there, luminous spots, showing, amidst the encroachments of reaction, the surviving elements of a highly refined culture and ancient civilization. The true basis of Italian society is municipal self-government. The *municipia* of antiquity, and their offspring the *comuni* of the Middle Ages, sheltered, under Roman sway and through barbarian conquest, the native peculiarities and customs of the country. And, from the Middle Ages down to our days, the municipalities of Italy have been the very source of national life. They have resisted — unaltered in their main features — all the vicissitudes of war and politics, preserving, equally amidst Imperial or Papal domination, within the precincts of their jurisdiction the seeds of liberty and the essential elements of the genius of the race. Amidst the territorial divisions of independent States, the spontaneous unfolding of those elements gradually tended, through communion of language, thought, artistic inspiration and literary taste, to moral and national unity. And this tendency received confirmation from the equal doom that weighed for centuries over the country and the necessity of common action against common aggression.

Thus the first germs of national revolution in Italy in the present century are to be sought for among the *bourgeoisies* and the learned circles of her cities. Thence the movement rapidly spread, and descended to the working classes, embracing at last in one common feeling the bulk of the nation. "The revolution of '31," Professor Albicini justly says, "was a rising of *municipalities;* the revolution of '48, a rising of *States;* that of '59, a general awakening of the *whole people* of Italy, brought by a common impulse to join in one common thought and action." The long-premeditated, long-cherished Utopia of Mazzini's mind reached then its practical issue through his countrymen's consentaneous persuasion. Unity was *the* question—the "To be or not to be" of national life in that supreme moment of Italian history; and to that great end all party predilections were sacrificed. Thus the banner of the Sardinian Monarchy became the banner of United Italy.

But to return. Amidst the Italian cities of historical renown, Bologna stands foremost, chiefly through the noble traditions of its University; and when, in 1830–31, the insurrection of Paris and the proclamation of the principle of non-intervention by the Ministers of the new dynasty excited Italian hopes, she took the lead in the local protest against Papal misgovernment. The movement spread with

electric rapidity throughout the Roman States. Not a single hamlet rose in behalf of Pontifical authority. The Assembly of Representatives convoked at Bologna voted unanimously for the abolition of the temporal power of the Pope. The will of the country was even then clear and undoubted, but unavailing against arbitrary force. An Austrian army was sent to suppress the infant freedom of the revolted provinces, and the Government of Louis Philippe remained a passive spectator of the deed.

In such a city and in such circumstances Count Carlo Pepoli passed the best part of his youth. Born in the latter years of the last century, and belonging to one of the most ancient and celebrated families of Italian nobility, his talents, favoured by his social condition, procured him, from the outset, a distinguished position among his fellow citizens. As a youth of literary promise, handsome, chivalrous, enamoured of art and devoted to the cause of his country, he soon attracted the notice of the learned world; whilst his hospitable disposition and gentle manners made him dear to all. He got honorary degrees in the University, was elected Vice-President of the Academy of the Felsinei, obtained the esteem of the highest literary and artistic authorities of the time—Monti, Perticari, Mamiani, Canova, &c., the admiration of Michelet, whilst a visitor at Bologna in 1829, and the friendship of Giacomo Leopardi, who addressed to him, during his sojourn there in those days, his well-known "Epistle to Carlo Pepoli."

The bright prospects of his early life were, however, thoroughly overclouded by the political storm of 1831, when he was called by the vote of his fellow-citizens to form part of the Provisional Government. Having been appointed Commissary to the expeditionary corps marching towards the capital under the command of General Sercognani, the rulers entrusted to him the mission of inducing the brothers Bonaparte to retire from the enterprise, in order not to excite suspicion in the French Court by their alliance with the Italian revolution. He succeeded in his task and soon returned to his duties in Bologna. But he was compelled, before long, by Austrian invasion, to retire with his colleagues to Ancona; where, not to separate his fate from theirs, he refused the offer of Queen Hortensia to avail himself of a safe-conduct by means of the passport of her eldest son, Napoleon, who had just died of low fever at Forli. He embarked with his friends, among whom were Mamiani, and Orioli, the celebrated naturalist; but the vessel *Isotta*, which contained the exiles, was seized by an Austrian man-of-war, and they were conveyed to Venice, and there kept for several months in a lurid dungeon until, through French interposition, the Austrian Government allowed them to seek refuge in France. From that time down to 1859, the life of Count Carlo Pepoli—with the exception of a short interval in '48—was spent in exile, first in France and Switzerland, and then in Great Britain, where he continued his literary pursuits and obtained the chair of Italian language and literature in University College in London.

During his stay on the Continent, he kept up friendly relations with Deodati, Sismondi, Rossi, Lerminier, Alexander Humboldt, at Geneva; with Mignet, Lafayette, Guizot, Valèry, Leclerc, in Paris. In England he was a welcome guest in our literary circles, and was held in esteem by his numerous friends for his upright and dignified character in the midst of adversity.

In 1839 he married Elizabeth Fergus, an accomplished Scotch lady, who has endowed Italy with a valuable translation of the works of Mary Somerville. After twenty-eight years of exile, the events of 1859 opened to him the way—this time with permanent security—to greet once more the land of his fathers. On his return to Italy Carlo Pepoli was elected by his fellow-citizens as a member of Parliament, and subsequently by the Crown as Senator of the Kingdom. At the present day, this venerable old man, preserving, notwithstanding infirmity and age, the youthful freshness of his mind, lives in the ancient palace of his family at Bologna, surrounded by the affectionate care of a small circle of truly devoted friends and by the respect of all who are acquainted with him.

As one of the few survivors of the generation which prepared the ground for the rebuilding of a great nation, he devotes his remaining energies to the compilation of his memoirs, himself a living testimony of bygone times and virtues, "as we see occasionally," says Albicini, "a noble column, which has remained erect to testify to the beauty of a destroyed edifice." And noble indeed was the band of patriots to which Carlo Pepoli belonged. The greater part of them have died in suffering and exile, some on the scaffold, others more fortunate, on the field of battle, fighting for their country. But the *idea*, which upheld and inspired them in their noble self-sacrifice has become a *reality*. Italy is no longer "a geographical expression:" she is a living member of the brotherhood of nations, risen on the ruins of the two most powerful institutions of the past—the Papacy and the Empire. Her very rise marked the downfall of Absolutism both religious and political, and gave her the clue to her future mission in the civilized world. Once the seat and centre of the two great powers that enslaved Europe through inquisition and conquest, she is now, as an independent State, called to be one of the foremost in the march of humanity towards mutual goodwill and peace, through freedom of conscience and international justice. And we trust that the traditional wisdom and habitual moderation of her people will not fail her in "the hour of need."

All the lovers of a great poet will welcome the new edition of Mr. Matthew Arnold's poems,[3] for it may really be in some measure called a complete edition. It omits, unfortunately, the beautiful Greek play, "Merope," which perhaps not a few of those who claim to be admirers of Mr. Matthew Arnold's writings have never read. It omits, also, and with greater wisdom, the sonnet, "Steam-ship Lusitania," which appeared some little time back in the *Nineteenth Century*, and which showed conclusively that even a great poet was

---

[3] "Poems." By Matthew Arnold. Two Vols. London: Macmillan. 1881.

quite capable on occasion of writing very poor verse indeed. But the present volume contains the exquisite poem of "The New Sirens," which for so long was banished from his collected works. It has, too, the beautiful, melancholy poem, "Mycerinus," which deserves to rank with Mr. Matthew Arnold's choicest work. The story of the good Egyptian king, condemned by the strange gods to death in six years' date, going forth, in sorrow and scorn, to spend the remnant of his life in pleasure, is told with that rich variety of thought and nobility of verse which characterises Mr. Matthew Arnold's greatest creations. If Mr. Matthew Arnold could but be induced to publish a fresh selection from his works to take the place of the very imperfect selection he has chosen to give to the public, we should be very grateful to him. The little volume of selections which has been published in the Golden Treasury Library contains some of the poet's rarest and loveliest productions, but it also contains some things quite unworthy of the singer of "Switzerland" and "Balder,". and these things take the place which might be better filled by "The Buried Life," by "Philomela," and by the "Stanzas written at the Grande Chartreuse," none of which it contains.

But, if Mr. Matthew Arnold made a bad selection from his own poems, he has just shown for the second time that it is possible for a man who is at once a great poet and a great prose writer to make but a poor editor of the works of other poets.[4] He has just done for Byron what he formerly did for Wordsworth. But the new attempt is even more disappointing than its predecessor. A volume of selections from Byron was much wanted, and it was to be hoped that when Mr. Matthew Arnold undertook the task it would be accomplished most successfully. But, unfortunately, the want still remains. Mr. Matthew Arnold has not supplied it. The preface promises well enough in the beginning. The criticism of Byron is keen, accurate, exact. Most persons, except the mere Shelleyites, who are tiresome folk enough, will agree with him in denying that "Shelley's poetry, except by snatches and fragments, has the value of the good work of Wordsworth and Byron." Whether Mr. Matthew Arnold is not almost too determined to be critical to give Byron his due is a matter that is difficult to decide. For our own part we think Byron deserves all the praise, and more, that Mr. Matthew Arnold awards him, and that such censure as the great critic deals out is often overrated or unfair. But, the preface once passed, disappointment begins. The selection, to begin with, is made upon the dreadful principle of classification. It is arranged under the heads of Personal, Lyric and Elegiac, Descriptive and Narrative, Dramatic and Satiric. A far better plan would have been that adopted, for example, by M. Sainte-Beuve in his selections from Ronsard and acted upon by M. Becq de Fouquières in his selections from the Singers of the Pléiade. It would be fitter to take each of the author's works in turn, making such selection from them as seemed necessary to the

---

[4] "Poetry of Byron." Chosen and arranged by Matthew Arnold. London: Macmillan. 1881.

editor, and not gather those selections under various headings in different parts of one little volume. But the selections themselves are not happy. Things are left in which it is hard to find any reason for retaining; things are omitted which it is marvellous to conceive how anybody could leave out. It is difficult to imagine what could have impelled Mr. Matthew Arnold to keep in the poem "Loch na Garr," and to leave out that most lovely perhaps of all Byron's lyric poems, beginning—

> "River that rollest by the ancient wall,
> Where dwells the lady of my love"

while the common-place "Epistle to a Friend" might well enough have been spared for that master-piece of emotional writing which ends—

> "And thou who tell'st me to forget,
> Thy looks are wan, thine eyes are wet;"

The selections from "Childe Harold," too, are very trying. Many unimportant portions, which only belong to what we may call the narrative of the poem, are retained, while passages which seem positively made for selection are unaccountably passed by. We miss, too, the sad and splendid poem, "Were my bosom as false as thou deem'st it to be," and we have instead, in poorest lieutenantry, the comparatively commonplace "Vision of Belshazzar." The selections, too, from that famous series of romantic stories which begins with "The Giaour" are exceedingly aggravating. The quotations from "The Giaour" itself are far too many, and the many beautiful things that might have been obtained from "The Corsair" and "Lara" are omitted. Most remarkable of all, perhaps, is the omission of the death of Lara himself, one of the finest and most moving passages that Byron has written. The dramatic selections consist chiefly of a condensation of "Manfred," which gives the greater portion of the play, and a few excerpts from some of the others. From "The Doge of Venice" the final speech of Marino Faliero has to be given, but even here the unaccountable eccentricity of Mr. Matthew Arnold's method of selection, deliberately and for no purpose that we can understand, omits the last magnificent address to the executioner—

> "Slave, do thine office!
> Strike as I struck the foe! strike as I would
> Have struck those tyrants! Strike deep as my curse!
> Strike—and but once!"

The cuttings from "Sardanapalus" and "The Two Foscari" are too brief to be of value. That from "Cain," where he enters with Lucifer into the abyss of space, is better; but from "The Deformed Transformed" nothing whatever is taken, not even the splendid incantation with its

> "Beautiful shadow
> Of Thetis's boy!
> Who sleeps in the meadow,
> Whose grass grows o'er Troy."

The satiric selections which conclude the volume have the same defects that have marked all the other portions. There are passages here which have not the slightest right to this form of representation, and exceptionally characteristic passages are left out instead. Altogether, the volume is decidedly disappointing. We had hoped that from Mr. Matthew Arnold's hands would come a little volume of Byronic poetry which might be a dear and treasured companion, holding, as in a precious casket, all the most perfect gems of the captain jewels from the carcanet of England's greatest modern poet. As it is, the work of selecting from Byron is as much open to anybody who likes to attempt it as if Mr. Matthew Arnold had never thought of undertaking the task.

The extraordinary influence which Byron had upon the world is exemplified in its most interesting form in the strange poem of the great Russian poet, Alexander Pushkin.[5] English students therefore who are not acquainted with the Russian tongue owe a debt of gratitude to Lieut.-Col. Spalding, for translating Pushkin's chief work, "Eugene Onéguine," and enabling them to estimate the strength of Byron's influence at a time when "The Corsair" and "Lara," "Childe Harold" and "Don Juan" were but the works of yesterday, and had not definitely taken their place among the classics of English poetry. Pushkin's own brief bright and wild career, with its stormy youth, its short season of happy married life, and its tragic ending in the fatal duel on a Nova island in February, 1837, reads like a Byronic tale in itself. Those who lived while the Byronic star was in its ascendant—those, that is, who read poetry and allowed it to influence their lives—could no more fail to become amateur Childe Harolds or Don Juans than the readers of Goethe's first romance could fail to fancy themselves new Werthers, or than the joyous Venetian society which went wild over Balzac could fail to think it had in its midst any number of Rastignacs and Lucien de Rubemprès. The influence which took so strong a hold upon Pushkin's life is made very evident in "Eugene Onéguine," whose unfamiliar story we need make no apology for telling. Eugene Onéguine is a brilliant young Russian "swell," a Moscow Don Juan, with many points of resemblance between him and the Disraelian heroes, who were based, so many of them, upon the Byronic model. Sated of pleasure, he becomes, of course, devoured by *ennui*, and assumes the true Childe Harold-like weariness of everything. While in this mood he comes into an inheritance and takes up his abode in his country house. In a neighbouring family are two beautiful girls, Olga and Tattiana. Olga is engaged to a young poet, Vladìmir Lenski; Tattiana sees Eugene but to fall in love with him. Like the girl in Octave Feuillet's "M. de Camors" she writes and tells of her love, and, like Camors, Eugene thanks her for the honour he declines. Oppressed however by Tattiana's despair, Eugene finds relief in a flirtation with Olga, which rouses the wild jealousy of Lenski; there is a challenge, a duel, and Eugene shoots

[5] "Eugene Onéguine." Translated from the Russian of Alexander Pushkin. By Lieut.-Col. Spalding. London: Macmillan. 1881.

Lenski. The poet's reflections over Vladimir's death seem strangely prophetic of his own career, untimely concluded by a pistol bullet. Eugene wanders over the world oppressed by the deed, and Tattiana goes to Moscow where she becomes at once an acknowledged beauty and marries a prince. Eugene, returning from his wanderings, sees her again, and now falls madly in love with her; but, when he declares his passion, she reminds him of that other time when she flung her love at his feet, and repulses him, declaring her determination to keep faithful to her husband. Here the poem abruptly concludes; a remarkable and brilliant poem which should be read by every one who wishes to understand the mighty power of England's great modern poet and the Russian genius which could remain original while acknowledging the spell. Pushkin puts Eugene, indeed, forward as an example of a clever young man whom the Byronic power has fashioned into a reproduction of the Byronic heroes, till it is hard to say how far the events of his life are due to his own nature and how far they are formed by the play-acting imitation of the melancholy and morbid heroes of the English singer. As an example of Pushkin's Byronism and of the translator's ability, we may quote a stanza:—

> "But sad is the reflection made,
> In vain was youth by us received,
> That we her constantly betrayed,
> And she at last hath us deceived;
> That our desires which noblest seemed,
> The purest of the dreams we dreamed,
> Have one by one all withered grown,.
> Like rotten leaves by Autumn strown—
> 'Tis fearful to anticipate
> Nought but of dinners a long row,
> To look on life as on a show;
> Eternally to imitate
> The seemly crowd, partaking nought
> Its passions and its modes of thought."

We cannot speak as to the fidelity of Lieut.-Col. Spalding's translation, but we may commend it as a specimen of smooth versification.

There is some very good work in Miss Rossetti's new volume of Poems.[6] She has a skill in framing sonnets which must win the praise of all who admire the sweetest form that Tuscan poetry has given, and who can appreciate the delicate grace and cunning workmanship which it demands. The series of sonnets entitled "Monna Innominata" are especially good examples of Miss Rossetti's ability to deal with a form in which the genius of her brother has made itself evident. There are a great many poems in the volume, and not all are of equal merit; but all are marked with the stamp of Miss Rossetti's style. The same sorrow, the same sense of incompleteness, are enlivened by the same joyous songs for children and of children, and by the same religious expressions of faith and hopeful aspirations.

---

[6] "A Pageant, and other Poems." By Christina G. Rossetti. London: Macmillan. 1881.

Had we space we should certainly quote "Brandons Both," a tenderly melancholy idyll, which, while it vaguely recalls some of Tennyson's shorter poems, has a greater charm than many of the Laureate's love-pictures can offer. As it is, we must content ourselves with extracting the poem, "Italia, io ti saluto:"—

> "To come back from the sweet South, to the North,
>   Where I was born, bred, look to die;
> Come back to do my day's work in its day,
> Play out my play—
>   Amen, Amen, say I.
>
> "To see no more the country half my own,
>   Nor hear the half familiar speech,
> Amen, I say: I turn to that bleak North
> Whence I came forth—
>   The South lies out of reach.
>
> "But when our swallows fly back to the South,
>   To the sweet South, to the sweet South,
> The tears may come again into my eyes
> On the old wise,
>   And the sweet name to my mouth."

The poem, "Sœur Louise de la Miséricorde, 1674," is a fine study, from which we must quote the first verse:—

> "I have desired, and I have been desired;
>   But now the days are over of desire,
>   Now dust and dying embers mock my fire;
> Where is the hire for which my life was hired?
>   Oh vanity of vanities—Desire!"

To those who like Miss Rossetti best in her lighter moods, we heartily commend "Freaks of Fashion," in which a very Parliament of birds meet together to commend each their own plumage in lively verses, which recall the delightful swing of "Goblin Market."

Who May Probyn may be we know not, but she has written the prettiest and daintiest volume of verse we have met with for a long time.[7] At first it seems a little out of date, for we find in it the fantastic verse-forms of old France, the *ballades*, *rondeaux*, *rondels*, *virelais* and *triolets* which it was so very much the fashion for every one to write within the last six or seven years ago. Had May Probyn written when the affectation was new, she might very well have taken a high place among the makers of quaint verse and the fashioners of poetic *concetti* who piped in pleasant chorus then and who are now forgotten. As it is, people may perhaps feel impatient of any more *ballades* and *triolets* and *virelais*, and treat May Probyn unfairly in putting her by as a mere imitator of a discarded fashion. If they do, they will be wrong. Our poetess is no imitator. She has a fresh sweet voice, very delightful to listen to. It is positively fascinating to read these bright, pure verses after the silly schoolboy imitations of Swinburne, with which young writers have wearied the world over-

---

[7] "Poems." By May Probyn. London: W. Satchell & Co. 1881.

much of late. May Probyn can write love-poems, which are neither tediously sentimental nor cheaply sensual. Hers are exquisite fancies, tender thoughts, and a joyous delight in the beauties of colour and sound and summer; hers too is a sweet melancholy, the fair sorrow of love which lingers in the lines of our old English ballads. There are many of May Probyn's poems we should like to quote had we space, especially "Soapsuds," which is a delicious piece of work; "In February," and "Portrait of a Lady, 17—," which, if it faintly recalls Austin Dobson, would do credit even to his master-hand. We must, however, find room for "The Almond Tree."

> "My love was out in the garden,
> Under the almond tree,
> All in the blush of blossom
> That blows for the honey-bee.
> I came up over the daisies,
> Before she could turn to see—
> I caught her hand and I kissed it
> Under the almond tree.
>
> "She flushed like a rose in summer—
> She stepped aside from me—
> 'I am young,' she said, 'and happy,
> And I pray you let me be.'
> 'To be happy,' I said, 'it needeth
> That a man and a maid agree'—
> And I turned and left her weeping
> Under the almond tree.
>
> "She made a step through the daisies—
> She called with a sob to me—
> She said, 'How can I be happy
> If you are not there to see?'
> I looked in her eyes and lingered—
> Like blossom in May blushed she!
> I clasped her close, and I kissed her
> Under the almond tree."

We must give our poetess a word of advice. She has done very well with this volume; let her wait awhile, a good while before publishing any more. Until she is perfectly sure that she can do a great deal better than she has done she should stay her hand. She has written a volume of verse that is worth reading, some bits of which linger like perfume in the memory; but her next should either be far beyond it, or she should let well alone. So many would-be poets and poetesses who have made quite a little success with their first volume have failed dismally in their next, in showing that they could only repeat the old notes, could utter no new one.

Mrs. Webster is a sweet and graceful singer. All her work, whether it be poetry or prose, drama or translation, bears on it the stamp and impression of a strong and thoughtful intellect. Allied to a vivid power of artistic presentation, it was to be expected therefore that "A Book of Rhyme" would contain poems of a higher order than the modest title suggests, and the expectation was not formed in

vain.[8] Into this volume are collected lyrics from Mrs. Webster's plays, and some from an unpublished play called "In a Day," which, if we may judge from the songs taken from it, should be a very fine work. Yu-Pe-Ya's Lute sends some of its echoes through this volume, in the form of dainty, many-coloured songs that are full of music; and there are songs here which call for high commendation. We must quote one of the poems from "In a Day:"—

"Joy that's half too keen and true
Makes us tears.
Oh! the sweetness of the tears!
If such joy at hand appears,
Snatch it, give thine all for it,
Joy that is so exquisite,
Lost, comes not new.
One blossom for a hundred years.

"Grief that's fond and dies not soon
Makes delight.
Oh! the pain of the delight!
If thy grief be love's aright,
Tend it close and let it grow;
Grief so tender not to know
Loses love's boon.
Sweet Philomel sings all the night."

The "Stornelli" are a series of wonderful picture verses, *huitains*, containing each its little study, carved like a gem by a skilful master-hand.

Miss Mathilde Blind has got hold of a strange, grim legend for the subject of her poem, "The Prophecy of St. Oran."[9] St. Oran is a monk, who has thrown his lot in with St. Columba in his great labour of spreading the Gospel, but who falls a victim to the beauty of a heathen girl, and learns love's lesson from her instead of teaching her the new faith. Oran's crime seems to bring a curse upon Columba's labours, and the master feels convinced that some amongst his following is stained with sin. As he is questioning his monks, bidding whoever is guilty confess and cleanse his soul, and all the monks, including Oran, swear themselves to be holy, the girl makes her appearance, seeking for her lover, and calling on him by name to come to her. At first Oran denies all knowledge of her, but when Columba thereupon orders the girl to be killed as a sorceress, Oran confesses his guilt. He is thereupon doomed by Columba to be buried alive. The sentence is carried out; but three days later Oran rises from the grave to tell Columba and his monks that there is no God, no devil, no heaven, and no hell, whereupon Columba bids his monks re-inter him, and lay earth upon his mouth, "that his blaspheming tongue may blab no more." The ghastly legend is vigorously told by the authoress, and the other poems in the volume call also for com-

[8] "A Book of Rhyme." By Augusta Webster. London: Macmillan. 1881.
[9] "The Prophecy of St. Oran, and other Poems." By Mathilde Blind. London: Newman & Co. 1881.

mendation. One of them appears to be devoted to the memory of Professor Clifford.

We are glad to see that Miss Maria Rossetti's work, "A Shadow of Dante," has gone into a third edition.[10] It is an admirable exposition of the "Divine Comedy," done on the right principle. What may be called the story is told and illustrated by appropriate commentary and expositions, interspersed with frequent and admirable verse translations of the poem. There could hardly be a better book for anyone who wished to gain a clear understanding of Italy's greatest poem, an understanding that would be of great importance to a later study of the Italian text, and that would be sufficient in itself for a general appreciation of the *Divina Commedia.*

Mr. Mallock has met with the fate of many other rash young men. He has tried to be indecent—he has succeeded in being dull.[11] Seldom, perhaps, has a novel within late years been greeted with so unanimous a chorus of disapproval and contempt as has been awarded to "A Romance of the Nineteenth Century," and it undoubtedly deserves both disapproval and contempt. For deliberate determination to be obscene, for poverty of idea and plethora of phrase, for crudity and vulgarity, it undoubtedly calls for censure. But, to our mind, by far its greatest vice is its unutterable and intolerable tediousness. Mr. Mallock should remember that a young woman may be afflicted with erotic mania and yet remain an exceedingly uninteresting person, and that his heroes may be blasphemous gluttons without being particularly remarkable for their ingenuity in blasphemy or their eccentricity in gluttony. In "Is Life worth Living?" Mr. Mallock devoted a few pert, unpleasant pages to the consideration of the "literature of concupiscence." Not content, however, with criticising, he wished to add to this literature. But, with every intention to be disgusting, he wants the strength to be harmful. We learn, with languid indifference, that his virginal-looking heroine has been the property of several gentlemen of more or less degraded types, one of whom justifies his admiration and appreciation of her by presenting her with an album of indecent photographs, such as "in England the police would seize upon." We smile at first, and then yawn over the prolix profanity of the hero and his bumptious circle of acquaintances, with their occasional clumsy gropings after something a little higher than the basest sensual appetites, which are the chief motive powers of their existences, but which they lack the wit and culture to make entertaining. All Mr. Mallock's characters are dull; most of them are heavily immoral. All are ill-educated and ill-bred. What would Epicurus have thought of a man who quotes Horace as a characteristic disciple of his teaching; that Horace whom, as Mr. George Meredith so truly says, Epicurus would have scourged out of his garden? It is no harm for Mr. Mallock to be unacquainted with the teachings of Epicurus. He cannot even be blamed if he has

---

[10] "A Shadow of Dante." By Maria Francesca Rossetti. London: Rivingtons. 1881.

[11] "A Romance of the Nineteenth Century." By W. H. Mallock. London: Chatto & Windus. 1881.

omitted from his course of reading the study of Diogenes Laertius; but in that case he would do well to leave the master of Metrodorus and the founder of the Garden alone. We are sorry to have had to speak with something like severity of Mr. Mallock's book, for Mr. Mallock is, or seemed to be, a clever young man. His "New Republic" was very bright and amusing—was even instructive for the ready way in which he brought together the thoughts and teachings of some dozen of our wise men and philosophers. But there is no evidence in "A Romance of the Nineteenth Century" of the ability of "The New Republic," or even of "Is Life Worth Living?" Certainly nothing whatever of the humour that did something to condone the vulgarity of "The New Paul and Virginia." If English society were really so lewd, so gross, and so stupid as Mr. Mallock has chosen to represent them, we ought to welcome a new '93 that would purge the world of them. Happily, we are not bound to believe Mr. Mallock's picture.

Mr. Hardinge, whose name we do not recollect having met with in the world of romance before, though we have a dim recollection of some association between his name and some translations of the "Sweet Flowers of the Greek Anthology," has written a rather remarkable story.[12] Remarkable for its slight cleverness, remarkable for its silliness, remarkable for being so like a great many other books, remarkable for its lack of art, and for its occasionally odd ideas. It has a heroine, with whom we have now been familiar long enough; the woman who destroys men's lives with a light heart, and accepts their homage with a cruel forgetfulness that is at once childish and demoniacal. Of course, there is a young artist in love with her. Of course, he dies; he always does in this sort of story. He is disappointed, apparently, to discover that the lady who has fascinated him has been the mistress of two or three other gentlemen before he honoured her with his affections; and, as he is unable to reconcile himself to the situation either of taking or leaving the lady, he conveniently expires. As an example of the young lady's indifference to the pain she inflicts, we are told on one occasion she poured boiling sugar over a chameleon to see what would happen to it She is not very interesting this chameleon-roasting young lady; but as a specimen of a young man's imitation of some types of French romance, she is not so badly done. The book is boyish, lengthy, nonsensical, hopping from the sublime to the ridiculous with the alacrity of some eccentric and excited bird; but it is readable, and it is only in one volume. It would probably not have been written if Mr. Mallock were not a popular author.

Mr. Trollope's new novel[13] is, like a great many of his old novels, an interesting study of common-place people. It is as good as a great many of the books he has written, but it does not rank with that half-

---

[12] "Clifford Gray." By William M. Hardinge. London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1881.

[13] "Ayala's Angel." By Anthony Trollope. London: Chapman & Hall. 1881.

dozen of his best which deserve to be remembered, and which constitute his claim to be considered a really good novelist. "Ayala's Angel" is, like a large number of the stories that Mr. Trollope has been turning off at the rate of about two a year, for the last ever so long, a respectable specimen of his handicraft, which bears the same relationship to his highest work, and to high work in general, as a strong, steady, respectable chair does to an altar piece. The plot is, as usual, somewhat complicated, without being rendered exciting by the complication. It tells of the fortunes of two girls who are left orphans, and who are taken charge of by different people, the one rich the other poor. They do not get on under the first arrangement, and are shifted again, and people fall in love with them, and in the end they marry respectably and happily. Ayala is the name of one of the girls, and her angel is a certain Colonel Jonathan Stubbs, a red-haired, ugly, well-meaning colonel, whom we have all met so many times before, and no doubt shall meet many times again, who falls in love with her, and twice proposes, and is twice refused. Of course, however, she falls in love with him in the end, and he proposes again, and she accepts him. There is nothing in this story to greatly exhilarate the seeker after novelty in modern romance. But it is very good in its way—honest, sensible, well put together, a very agreeable specimen of the manufacture of three volumes. People who have the Trollope taste strongly developed will read it and enjoy it thoroughly. Even those who have not will find it pleasant occupation enough, which is more than can be said of many of its companions.

M. Henri Rochefort is an ambitious man. He was not content with the varied tributes that fate had offered to him, his editorship of *La Lanterne*, his persecutions under the old Imperialist *régime*, his wild period of communistic splendour, his convict sufferings in New Caledonia, and his strange escape; his duels, and the affection of M. Victor Hugo. He wanted something more, and he accordingly wrote a novel.[14] "Mademoiselle Bismarck" is as odd and as interesting as one would expect a work of M. Rochefort's to be. The plain treacherous little adventuress who is its heroine, is perhaps improbable, but she is so skilfully handled that she seems possible, which is the great point. Her many intrigues, her petty duplicities, with their grim ending, which was meant to be part of the shamming, and turned out an unintentional truth, must at least compel the attention of the reader. The character of Talazac, the Republican man of the people, is cleverly conceived and executed, by an author who has as good a right to describe men of the people as experience could give him.

Mrs. Lynn Linton's new novel[15] does not deserve to rank among her best works. There are too many people in it, most of whom are

---

[14] "Mademoiselle Bismarck." From the French of Henri Rochefort. By Virginia Champlin. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. London: Trübner & Co. 1881.

[15] "My Love." By Mrs. Lynn Linton. Three Vols. London: Chatto & Windus. 1881.

uninteresting, and there are various rather tiresome careers hardly worth following out to the end of the third volume, where they are all safely married off. Of course, there is good writing in everything Mrs. Lynn Linton does, but it is decidedly disappointing. The two best characters in it are the wild fast girls, who are known to their friends as "Gip" and "Pip."

"Doctor Victoria"[16] is a clever brightly written story of a girl born unhappily of parents who were not man and wife, and who only learns the secret when she is a young woman, and in love. She resolves to remain unwedded, and to keep the stain of her birth to herself. She nobly resigns love and her lover, becomes a doctor, and finds the consolation of her broken life in making the lives of others happy, most notably the life of one little girl whose blindness she is able to cure. It is a melancholy story, but it is well told, and better worth reading than eleven out of every dozen of the novels published this season.

The author of "Four Crotchets to a Bar"[17] has made an attempt, by no means wholly unsuccessful, to revive something of the manner of Mrs. Gaskell and of Miss Austen. The name is annoying, but all except the name is good work enough, reasonably well written and interesting. The four crotchets are four maiden ladies, and the bar is one of those erections which some persons are privileged to set up on roads over which they have a right of way.

Those who are prepared to read an historical novel in two large volumes, rather closely printed, will find themselves well repaid for their trouble in reading "John Inglesant"[18]—repaid, that is, if they are satisfied with a careful and lifelike story of that interesting period in English history which saw the fall of Charles I., and in the investigation of the Italian Molinists, or Quietists. Those who expect an historical novel of the brilliantly dramatic kind, which Sir Walter Scott made classic, and which Alexandre Dumas made so delightful, will be disappointed.

## MISCELLANEA.

MISS Thackeray (Mrs. Richmond-Ritchie) has written for the series of "Foreign Classics for English Readers,"[1] a study of Madame de Sévigné, which may very well serve as a model for what all the volumes of the series ought to be, and what very few of them are. The defect of such a series as this is, that while one or two of the essays are really well executed by competent writers, the majority

---

[16] "Doctor Victoria." In Three Vols. By Major-General G. G. Alexander. London: Samuel Tinsley. 1881.

[17] "Four Crotchets to a Bar." In Three Vols. By the Author of "The Gwillians." London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1881.

[18] "John Inglesant." A Romance. In Two Vols. London: Macmillan. 1881.

[1] "Madame de Sévigné." By Miss Thackeray. London: Blackwood. 1881.

are undertaken by persons who have not either the capacity for masterly condensation or that previous knowledge of the subject which enables them to keep the work in due proportion, and to avoid the appearance of having read-up for the subject.

It is therefore fortunate indeed that so good a volume should be devoted to Madame de Sévigné. It would be really painful to think of this most delightful, most accomplished, most fascinating of women being handled in the rough-and-ready, or somewhat clumsy, style with which other great authors have been treated in this series as well as in its predecessors, the "Ancient Classics for English Readers." In all the world of letters there shines out no fairer and lovelier personality than that of Madame de Sévigné. Among the half dozen really good letter writers of the world, with Pliny and Horace Walpole and Lord Chesterfield, Madame de Sévigné stands easily at the head. If, as in old days, we worshipped a deity for every occupation of our lives, those who have correspondence to carry on should set up a shrine to the sweet Frenchwoman who has made the seventeenth century a living reality for us. In the strange and somewhat evil time, when ladies of title went to their deaths for poisoning whole families, with a comprehensiveness that would have made Locusta shudder and raised envy in Agrippina; when field-marshals were immured in the Bastile on a casual charge of witchcraft; when beautiful women jostled each other in the race for the proud privilege of being mistress of the great king, to pass perhaps from the chamber of the monarch to the cloister of the convent; in an age which was almost utterly corrupt, the letters of Madame de Sévigné are always pure, noble, and kindly. No one could learn evil from her; most of us, even the best of us, much that is good, and true, and honest; all the more to be learned because the writer had no idea that she was teaching or preaching anything. From the sincerity of her good, and honourable, and happy spirit, she wrote to her idolized daughter the letters which are the priceless inheritance of succeeding centuries. The age which mastered one side of human life and explored some of the deeps of human nature, when it gave the world the maxims of La Rochefoucauld, understood and expressed the higher and happier view in the letters of Madame de Sévigné. Miss Thackeray appreciates, understands, and expounds admirably her most delightful text. She has written a delightful little book, which must give intense pleasure to those with whom Madame de Sévigné is an old friend, as well as the freshest delight to those who are first introduced to her in these pages. Some few trifling faults we must find. Why, in the letter of November 20, 1664, in which the name of D'Artagnan occurs, does Miss Thackeray think it is sufficient to say of him that he was "the Hedzoff of those days"? This is scarcely the way in which Miss Thackeray's father would have passed by an allusion to the gallant soldier of fortune he loved so well, and whose name will be endeared to readers of romance for all time in the immortal pages of "Les Trois Mousquetaires." Also, how can she give a translation of the epigram of the Abbé Montreuil on Madame de Sévigné by

Mr. Hallam Tennyson, and appear to consider that the translation is a good one?

Under the title of "Wit and Wisdom,"[1] an anonymous compiler has offered the public a most delightful volume. Whatever may be the opinions of men as to the public life of Lord Beaconsfield, few indeed will be so rash as to deny his literary genius, and even those who most deplore his influence upon the politics of his day may admit that he has shone with honour and credit in the world of letters. His novels are the most fascinating reading. We know, of course, that they have great faults, grave defects; so had Smollett; so, for the matter of that, had Cervantes; so had Balzac, and Dickens, and Thackeray. No novelist that ever yet wrote is wholly free from blemishes, but a man's worth as an author is measured by his merits, not by his demerits. As pictures of the political life of the time they represent Lord Beaconsfield's novels are invaluable; the movements of parties, the sudden currents of thought and feeling, the influences of particular individuals, are described by one who was himself a prominent actor in the great play, and described in that strange style half-homage, half-mockery, which makes it never certain whether the writer was a true adorer of wealth and power and pomp, or was but a jesting satirist, a laughing philosopher—a new Democritus come to make merry over his age. But valuable for these reasons as his books are, they have little value as romances. The stories they tell are as nothing. Nobody would ever think of reading "The Young Duke" or "Coningsby" for the sake of its plot. Therefore, our anonymous compiler, who has joined himself to the long list of excellent anonymous authors whom Lord Beaconsfield commemorated in his speech on the Newspaper Stamp Duties Bill in 1854, has done sterling service to a large number of readers. In an age like ours, where there is so much to read and so much to learn, good anthologies must be every day more useful, and this collection is a really good anthology. Anyone wholly unacquainted with the writings of Lord Beaconsfield would rise from a study of its pages with as thorough a knowledge of his style and thoughts as he could wish to have, while even those who are familiar with the works of Benjamin Disraeli will find keen enjoyment in reading this book from cover to cover, reviving old memories of pleasant hours passed with the books from which these extracts are made, coming with delight upon familiar and cherished passages, and reading with admiration epigrams and philosophies which they had not noticed before or had not remembered. The collection is very complete. One finds at once most of the best things connected with the name of Disraeli. That famous saying of Sidonia, in "Coningsby," "for life in general there is but one decree. Youth is a blunder; manhood a struggle; old age a regret," is of course here: so is its fellow, uttered by the Princess of Tivoli, in "Lothair," "The blunders of youth are preferable to the triumphs of manhood or the successes of old age": and the somewhat similar reflection in "Vivian Grey," "The

[1] "Wit and Wisdom of Lord Beaconsfield." London: Longmans. 1881.

disappointment of manhood succeeds to the delusion of youth; let us hope that the heritage of age is not despair." We are glad, too, to find here the advice which Contarini Fleming receives from his father, and which practically compresses all the counsels of Chesterfield into a couple of pages; also the brilliant description from "Coningsby," of the character of Sidonia given in its entirety. One curious omission we have discovered, or think we have discovered. In our study of this most attractive book we have not come across that brilliant paradox of Lord Beaconsfield, which, like many a paradox, is almost a truth—the aphorism, "There are only two events in history—the Siege of Troy and the French Revolution." If one considers the influence which these two events have had—the one upon the world of art, the other upon the fortunes of people everywhere—one is half-inclined to give an implicit adhesion to this summary condensation of the history of humanity. Lord Strangford, if we remember rightly, adopted it as the motto of his brilliant novel, which he moulded so closely upon the lines of his friend and leader, Disraeli, but to which he could not give the spirit of enduring existence. We can but congratulate the editor of "Wit and Wisdom" on the way in which he has done his work and the public upon having it done for them.

We have so often praised Mr. Jefferies loyally and lustily before that he can very well take a few words of blame from us now. His last book, "Wood Magic,"[3] is in many respects delightful, written with that same delicate appreciation of country life, and the same kindly sympathy for all the birds, beasts, trees, and flowers that haunt the forest or the meadow. But the defect of "Wood Magic" is its length. It is practically a children's story, almost a fairy story. And a fairy story in two volumes!—the idea is absurd. The very business of such a story as this, in which all the animals converse with the little boy, Sir Bevis, who is its hero, is that it should be brief. As it is, it vaguely reminds us of one of Lord Brabourne's fairy tales expanded preternaturally to gigantic proportions. The long account of the war between the armies of the magpie and the wood pigeon are done with as much detail and diffuseness as if the writer was setting forth the veritable history of international conflict, or describing minutely the plans of actual battle and the processes of true diplomacy. All this is a mistake. Children will not want a story to be so long and so elaborate, while those who are not children prefer Mr. Jefferies in his ordinary mood to Mr. Jefferies disporting himself for the amusement of the young folks. "Folly walking a funeral pace, and clinking her bells to the time of a passing knell, makes sad music indeed," observes Touchwood, the traveller in Scott's "Old Mortality." Mr. Jefferies would have done well to remember that his fooling, to prove acceptable and delightful, should not have extended to so great a length. So, while we find "Wild Life in a Southern Country" and "The Gamekeeper at Home" only too short, we must admit that we have found

[3] "Wood Magic: A Fable." By Richard Jefferies. Two vols. London: Cassell, Petter, and Galpin. 1881.

"Wood M: gic" distinctly too long. Happily there is no sign in the book that Mr. Jefferies is writing himself out, but he certainly has, since his first success, produced volume after volume with a rapidity which he can hardly hope to keep up for long, and yet retain his freshness and his power of new creation. He would, perhaps, do well to rest awhile before producing any more books, and to be sure in the next he essays to write to make up his mind whether he addresses an audience of children or of maturer readers. One of the prettiest things in the book is the little story, which only occupies a few pages, of the melancholy quarrel between two lovers caused by the secretive habits of a magpie who hid a certain locket, the loss of which parted the pair for ever.

Mr. J. P. Postgate has made a very delightful little volume of selected elegies from Propertius.[4] The sweet Umbrian singer whose poems were, if we remember aright, discovered, after the disappearance of many centuries, hidden somewhere beneath a wine vat, may well be read once and again by all lovers of exquisitely amorous poetry. In the trinity of famous Latin lovers, where Catullus holds the highest place, it is not easy to settle whether Tibullus or Propertius be the greater poet. The point is happily most unimportant. Those who like Propertius best may be content with the lover of Cynthia, and the admirers of Tibullus may be happy with the singer of Delia's charms, without either finding fault with the choice of the other. We, for our part, prefer Tibullus to Propertius, but we are not on that account disposed to quarrel with any one whose choice lights upon Propertius. We are, however, somewhat inclined to quarrel with Mr. Postgate for his too vehement championship of his poet against the world. He is a scholastic imitator of those chivalrous knights of the Middle Ages who were ready to run a tilt at everyone who did not admit the peerless beauty of their lady. Mr. Postgate is not sufficiently happy in admiring Propertius; he must needs fall foul of Tibullus, and not only of Tibullus, but of Ovid too. But his criticisms of Ovid are too diverting to cause any real anger at their curious perversity. They are obviously the result of fierce indignation with those who have underrated his poet; and, in consequence, he assails a few established reputations in order to make amends. To describe Ovid as "an inferior Cicero in verse" is a clumsy effort after epigram, which is only equalled by the implied attack, a little later on, where he says, "And hence it has happened, not only in ancient but also in modern times, that some have assigned him (Propertius) a poetical position below that of Tibullus and of Ovid; just as some minds, and probably more than is suspected, find the rugged mountain torrent less attractive than the rippling village brook, and even than the dead level of a canal." But the triumph of naïve absurdity is reached when, after placing Propertius "high above" both Tibullus and Ovid, he makes this attempt to "obtain a juster estimation" for the works of Ovid:

---

[4] "Select Elegies of Propertius." Edited by J. P. Postgate, M.A. Macmillan. 1881.

"Whether he had any of the qualities of a poet himself, I shall leave undetermined"—this is really very kind, thoughtful, and considerate on the part of the critic—"Though it may be doubted with reason whether, in the whole mass of his writings, there is a single poetical image or idea for which he had not warrant among his predecessors." Canning declared that the man who could say he liked dry champagne might say anything. Certainly the critic who could write this of Ovid might write anything he liked, but it would indeed be waste of time to pay any attention to such meaningless nonsense. If there is anyone so lacking in poetic capacity and the appreciation of the beautiful as really to think this of Ovid, we cannot even praise his courage in saying so. There are cases in which shame is better than self-conceit. Mr. Postgate might remember that Ariosto did not care much for Propertius, yet he could scarcely accuse Ariosto of want of poetic feeling.

"Bush Life in Queensland"[5] is evidently a record of personal experience disguised under the thin veil of narrative. Those who like accounts of rough-and-ready Australian life, of its adventures and its mishaps, will thoroughly enjoy this volume, which bears everywhere the mark of sincerity, of being a genuine description of facts, and not a recital cooked up and highly coloured for the English market. Wild tales of bush-whacking, of sticking up, and shooting down, will not be found here, but there is plenty of fun and adventure in the volumes, as well as information of a varied kind about the life and surroundings of a Queensland settler.

There are a few more books for us to deal with. Mr. Giles has written a little volume of poems,[6] in which his loyalty is more conspicuous than his capacity for writing verse. Mr. James Mason has taken upon himself to tell over again the old fairy tales which have delighted children for so long, from "Puss in Boots" to "The Fair One with the Golden Locks," and he has got Mr. Moyr Smith to illustrate them.[7] Neither the re-telling nor the illustrations are very successful. Mr. Andrew James Symington takes two volumes to tell the life of William Wordsworth, which might have been done better in one.[8] Miss Elaine Goodale has written a delightful little volume,[9] with the title of "Journal of a Farmer's Daughter," which is one of the pleasantest and most poetic contributions that America has sent to us for some time. It is a pleasant combination of charming prose and charming verse, full of the praise of Nature, and of all kind thoughts and feelings. Mr. S. C. Hall has written a volume of versified aphor-

[5] "Bush Life in Queensland." By A. C. Grant. Two vols. Blackwood. 1881.

[6] "Poems: Domestic and Miscellaneous." By James Giles. London: Whittingham & Co. 1881.

[7] "The Old Fairy Tales." Collected and Edited by James Mason. London: Cassell, Petter, and Galpin. 1881.

[8] "William Wordsworth." By Andrew James Symington. Two vols. Glasgow: Blackie & Son. 1881.

[9] "Journal of a Farmer's Daughter." By Elaine Goodale. New York: G. P. Putnam's & Sons. London: Trübner & Co. 1881.

isms,[10] which he calls "Rhymes in Council," and which certainly contain a very large amount of good advice. Lovers of old German stories will thank "Toofie Lauder" heartily for having collected together so charming a volume of "Legends and Tales of the Hartz Mountains."[11] Whether the name "Toofie Lauder" signifies a lady or a gentleman we have no means of guessing, but we should fancy that the graceful style of the book comes from a woman's pen. The Folk Lore Society has added to its publications a very interesting and valuable volume on the "Folk Lore of the North-East of Scotland," by the Rev. Walter Gregor.[12]

The young lady who, to judge by the portrait prefixed to her book, is exceedingly attractive, has compiled a very delightful little volume of "Roumanian Fairy Tales," for which children who get them should be very grateful to her.[13] We regret that, as she has published her volume anonymously, we cannot thank her by name for her pleasant book and for the pleasant picture of herself. We are only allowed to know that her initials are E.B.M., and her Christian name Elizabeth, signed at the bottom of her portrait.

Mr. Henry Jennings has compiled a volume of "Curiosities of Criticism," which may amuse persons whose taste in literature is of a simple type.[14] An unknown writer has expressed his thoughts upon things in general, in agreeable verse,[15] which conveys his ideas very pleasantly to his readers. "The Villa by the Sea"[16] is a tiresome volume of verse, from which we may quote one appropriate couplet.

> "When will drones restrict their drivel
> To the limits of their thought."

"Waifs"[17] is a tiresome volume of prose.

Mr. Rutherford has done good service for severe students of the Greek language by his new and elaborate annotated edition of "Phrynicus the Grammarian."[18] To the light-minded, Phrynicus may appear a somewhat dreary individual of the type immortalized by Mr. Browning in his "Grammarian's Funeral," but he is of immense service to the scholars whose study of the classics is philological rather than literary.

Baedeker ha sadded to his list of famous guides a London handbook,[19]

[10] "Rhymes in Council." By S. C. Hall. London: Griffith & Farran. 1881.

[11] "Legends and Tales of the Hartz Mountains." By Toofie Lauder. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1881.

[12] "Notes on the Folk Lore of the North-East of Scotland." By the Rev. Walter Gregor. London: Elliot Stock. 1881.

[13] "Roumanian Fairy Tales and Legends." London: H. K. Lewis, Gower Street. 1831.

[14] "Curiosities of Criticism." By Henry J. Jennings. London: Chatto & Windus. 1881.

[15] "Moods." Glasgow: James Maclehose. 1881.

[16] "The Villa by the Sea and other Poems." By James Hedderwick. Glasgow: James Maclehose. 1881.

[17] "Waifs." By W. T. Ross. Glasgow: James Maclehose. 1881.

[18] "The New Phrynicus." By W. Gunion Rutherford. London: Macmillan. 1881.

[19] "Baedeker's London." London: Dulau & Co. 1881.

which is likely to be as popular as any of its predecessors. The average Londoner into whose hands this portly little red-bound volume may fall will probably be surprised to find out how little he really knows about the capital in which he lives, and how many places of interest there are which he has not seen, and even perhaps has not heard of.

Mr. Anderson has compiled an exceedingly valuable work of reference to all the authors who treat of the topography of the British Islands.[20] So far as we have seen, it seems to be singularly complete and accurate.

Mr. Sidgwick has edited an edition of the masterpiece of Æschylus,[21] which deserves to take a high place amongst school editions of Greek plays. The type is very good, and the notes are full, exhaustive, and scholarly, without being at all too deep for those for whom the book is intended. Mr. Verrall has made an interesting contribution to classical scholarship by his edition of the great Euripidean drama.[22]

The new part of Spons' "Encyclopædia"[23] contains several interesting articles, especially those on lace, leather, and matches. The fourteenth part of the "Dictionary of Music"[24] contains a very valuable essay upon Russia, and an account of the career of Rouget de Lisle, by the editor, Dr. George Grove. Mr. Douglass's volume, on "Ostrich Farming,"[25] may be found instructive reading, even by those who have no intention of becoming ostrich farmers.

Mr. Baddeley has written a useful "Guide to the Scotch Highlands,"[26] upon the model of Baedeker's Handbooks.

[20] "The Book of British Topography." By John P. Anderson. London: W. Satchell. 1881.

[21] "Æschylus' Agamemnon." By A. Sidgwick. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1881.

[22] "The Medea of Euripides." By A. W. Verrall. London: Macmillan. 1881.

[23] Spons' "Encyclopædia." Division IV. Edited by Charles G. Warnford Lock. London: E. & F. N. Spon. 1881.

[24] "A Dictionary of Music and Musicians." Edited by George Grove. Vol. III. Part XIV. London: Macmillan. 1881.

[25] "Ostrich Farming in South Africa." By Arthur Douglass. London: Cassell, Petter, and Galpin. 1881.

[26] "The Highlands of Scotland." By M. J. B. Baddeley. London: Dulau & Co. 1881.

# INDEX.

*** *All Books must be looked for under the Author's name.*


Adams, Mrs. Leith, "Aunt Hepsey's Foundling," 285
Adamson, R., M.A., "Fichte," 512
Alexander, Major Gen. G.G., "Doctor Victoria," 568
Anderson, Joseph, "Scotland in Early Christian Times," 267
———, J. P., "The Book of British Topography," 575
"Annali di Statistica," 250, 530
Arbuthnot, Sir A. G., K.C.S.I., "Major Gen. Sir T. Munro, Bart., K.C.B.," 547
ARISTOTLE, CHARACTERISTICS OF, 1-41
ARISTOTLE, SYSTEMATIC PHILOSOPHY OF, 320-372
Armstrong, R. A., Six Lectures by—"Latter-Day Teachers," 500
Arnold, M., "Poems," 557
———, —, "Poetry of Byron," chosen and arranged by, 558
———, T., "A Method of Teaching the Deaf and Dumb Speech," 529
Aubrey, J., "Remains of Gentilisme and Judaisme," 291
Aveling, E. B., "Natural Philosophy for London University-Matriculation," 259

Barnard, C., Co-operation as a Business," 515
"Beaconsfield, Lord, Wit and Wisdom of," 570
"Beaconsfield, Lord, A Memoir of." From the *Times*, 277
"Beaconsfield, Lord, Memorials of." From the *Standard*, 277
Bickerton, Prof. A. W., "University Reform," 529
Biddle, H. P., "Elements of Knowledge," 237
Black, W., "Sunrise," 283
Blandford, H. F., F.R.S., "Report on the Meteorology of India, in 1878," 263
Blind, Mathilde, "The Prophecy of St. Oran, and other Poems," 564
Blunt, Lady Anne, "A Pilgrimage to Nejd," 248
BOHEMIAN LITERATURE, THE LATEST, 372-391; lyrical poetry the favourite form of, particularly the ballad, 373; influence of Percy's 'Reliques,' 374; Erben's poems, 375; his collection of national tales. Halek, a writer of narrative pieces and a lyric poet—Neruda, a meditative and subjective poet, 376; Heyduk, the greatest of their lyric poets, inspired by the poetry of Southern Europe, 377; his "Cymbal and Guitar" and other works. Mdlle. Pech, 378; her poems, 379; M. Joseph Sladek, editor of the literary journal "Lumir," reflects the influence of America, and of English writers, 380: M. Frida, a very voluminous writer, 381; his principal productions, 382; chiefly affected by the French poets, 383; M. Cech, a versatile writer and admired poet—M. Zeyer's recent publication, 384; the social romance a good deal developed since 1860, 385; modern school of history founded by Francis Palacky; his pupil, Vaclav Tomek, now professor of Austrian history in Prague University, 386; Prof. Semhera and Dr. Gindely, historical writers, 387; the Brothers Jirecek, 388; Vincent Brandl and Beda Dudik, historiographers of Moravia, 389; Martin Hattala and Drs. Gebauer and Geitler, eminent philologists; Dr. Holub, the well-known traveller, 390; the journal "Casopis," printed four times a year, a mine of erudition. "No nation in Europe so well deserves the sympathy of all liberal-minded Englishmen" as Bohemia, 391.
Bourinot, J. G., "The Intellectual Development of the Canadian People," 551
Boyd Kinnear, J., "Ireland in 1881," 518

Brenon, E. St. John, "The Tribune Reflects," 286
Brewer, Rev. Dr. C., "The History of Germany," 268
Broadhurst, J., "The Student's Helmholtz: Musical Acoustics," 259
Brown, Prof. J. M., "Student Life," an Address, 529
Browne, H., M.A., "John's Apocalypse, &c.," 227
Buchanan, D., "Specimens of Australian Oratory," 244
Bullock, T. A., "Wild Africa, the Benighted Continent of To-day," 248
Burke, Edmund, "Letters, Speeches and Tracts on Irish affairs," edited by M. Arnold, 518
Butler, A. J., "Amaranth and Asphodel," 287
Byron, *see* Arnold

Cairnes, J., D.D., "Unbelief in the Eighteenth Century," 221
Calderwood, H., LL.D., "The Relations of Science and Religion," 239
Campbell, L., edited by, "Sophocles. Plays and Fragments," vol. ii., 300
*Canada*, 209, 485
*Cape Colony*, 218, 494.
Chirol, M. Valentine, "'Twixt Greek and Turk," 522
Clairaut, A. C., "Elements of Geometry," 260
Clay, A., "The Agony Column of the *Times*," 299
"Colonial Institute, Proceedings of the Royal," vol xii, 1880 1881, 229
*Colonies, The*, 208, 484
Colvin, S., "Landor," 548
Cook, Rev. J., "The Boston Monday Lectures," 235
COPYRIGHT QUESTION, THE, 392–403
Core, T. H., "Questions on Stewart's Lesson in Elementary Physic," 258
Cox, Rev. Sir Geo. W., "Introduction to Mythology and Folklore," 290
Crooks, G. R., edited by, "Library of Theological and Biblical Literature," vol. i., 222
Cumming, C. F., Gordon, "At Home in Fiji,' 246

Dawson, J., "Australian Aborigines," 521
DEAN STANLEY, 439–469, his latest productions, 439; instance of the Dean's chivalry, 440; the Dean the greatest living master of the English language, his greater works are treasures of British literature; unrivalled amongst the biographers of his age, 441; his excellence as a word-painter of historical scenes, 442; "Lecture on the Study of Modern History," 443; early home influences, 444; Bishop Stanley and Canon Wodehouse, 445, 446, Stanley's doubts as to subscription quelled, and his course decided, by Arnold, 447, 448; Stanley's views as to the literal inspiration of and human element in the Bible, 449; influence of J. H. Newman at its height during Stanley's stay at Oxford, 449–452; the Dean's reticence in dealing with the question of miracles, 453; "Christian Institutions," 455; the Dean's latest utterances contrasted with the doctrines and formularies of the Church, 456–464; "Baptism of Infants," 457–459; "the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper,' 460–462; the three orders of Ministers, 463; "the power of the Keys," 464; "The Creed of the Early Christians," 465, 466; Dr. Martineau quoted, 467; the Dean a "poetic iconoclast;" "would have been a greater man had he renounced his offices in the Establishment and their emoluments" 468; "he might have risen to martyrdom; he only sank into his deanery."
Denton, W., "Is Darwin Right? or, the Origin of Man," 256
Douglass, A., "Ostrich Farming in South Africa," 575
Douglas, Mrs. Stair, "The Life of William Whewell, D D.," 274
Dove, A., "Die Forsters und die Humboldts," 519
Doyle, J. P., "Old Ireland Improved and made New Ireland," 243
Dun, Finlay, "Landlords and Tenant in Ireland," 242
——, ——, "American Farming and Food," 526

EATON, D. B., "The Spoils System," 521
Ellis, T., "On a Raft and Through the Desert," 523

Felkin, H M, "Technical Education in a Saxon Town," 252
Feuerbach, L., "The Essence of Christianity," translated by Marian Evans, second edition, 512
*Fiji*, 217
"Fifty Years of the House of Lords," 517
FITZGERALD'S LIFE OF GEORGE THE FOURTH, 70, 108

Forschammer, J., "Ueber die Principien der Aristotelischen Philosophie, &c., 510
"Four Crotchets to a Bar, 568
Fraser, A. C., LL.D., "Berkeley," 236
Freeman, E.A., D.C.L., "The Historical Geography of Europe," 264

Gale, J. B., "Affinity no Bar to Marriage," 518
Gardiner, S. R., and J. B. Mullinger, "Introduction to the Study of English History," 545
——, "Outlines of English History," 546
Gascoigne, Thomas, "Loci e libro Veritatum," passages from the "Theological Dictionary," 230
Geldart, E.M., "Faith and Freedom," 500
George, H., "The Irish Land Question," 240
GEORGE ELIOT, HER LIFE AND WRITINGS. 154-195, early life, 155; letter to Miss Hennell, 156; life and education at Foleshill, 157; friendship with the Brays, 158; and Dr. Brabant, 159; translation of Strauss's "Leben Jesu," and of Feuerbach's "Essence of Christianity," 160; life at Rosehill, 161; Miss Evans removes to London, 1851, and assists in conducting the WESTMINSTER REVIEW. Union with Mr. Lewes, 162, 163; Publication of "Amos Barton" in Jan. 1857, followed by "Scenes of Clerical Life," 1864, critical estimate of "The Scenes," 165, 166; "Adam Bede," 1859, 167; criticism of, 168, 169; "the veritable Dinah Morris," 170, 171; "Mill on the Floss," 172, 174; "Silas Marner," 175; "Romola," 176, 177; "Felix Holt," 178, 179; "Middlemarch," 180; "Daniel Deronda," 181, 183; "Theophrastus Such," 184; the "Spanish Gypsy," 185; Minor poems, 186; the "George Henry Lewes Studentship," 187; characteristics of George Eliot's art; her culture, 188; tragical aspect of her representations of life, 189, 190; intense sympathy with all sentient emotion, 191; her religion, unquestionably the religion of humanity, 192, 193; Was George Eliot a Positivist? 194; her politics, 195; her portrait, and figure, 196; marriage with Mr Cross; her death and burial, 197
Giles, J., "Poems; Domestic and Miscellaneous," 573
——, J. A., D.C.L., "The Evil One, or the Revisionists Revised," 501
Goodale, E., "Journal of a Farmer's Daughter," 573
Govett, R., "Exposition of the Gospel of St. John," vol. i., 502
Graham, W., "The Creed of Science: Religious, Moral and Social," 507
Grant, A. C., Bush Life in Queensland," 573
Greener, W. W., "The Gun and its Development," 255
Gregor, Rev. W., "Notes on the Folk Lore of the North East of Scotland," 574
Grey, H., "The Classics for the Million," 293
*Griqualand West*, 219

Haines, W. T., and W.V.K. Young, Essays by, "Liberalism in England," 516
Hall, S. C., "Rhymes in Council," 574
Hamley, Gen. Sir E. B., "Thomas Carlyle," 278
Hardinge, W. M., "Clifford Grey," 566
Harper, F., "The Metaphysics of the School," vol. ii., 233
Hart, J. M., "A Syllabus of Anglo-Saxon Literature," 298
Heath, F. G., "My Garden Wild," 536
——, R., "Edgar Quinet," 280
Heine, H., "Ludwig Borne," 280
H. H., "A Century of Dishonour," 272
Hickman, W. T., "From Poverty to Wealth," 284
Hill, G. B., edited by, "Colonel Gordon in Central Africa, 1874-1879," 247
Hodgson, S. H., "Outcast Essays and Verse Translations," 294
*Hong Kong*, 489
Hope-Johnstone, A.J., edited by, "Notes and Thoughts on Gardens and Woodlands," by the late Miss F. J. Hope, 537
Hunter, W.W., LL.D., C.I.E., "The Imperial Gazetteer of India," 250, 530

*India*, 199, 479
Ingleby, C. M., "Shakespeare: the Man and the Book," part. ii., 294
INTERNATIONAL MEDICAL CONGRESS, THE, AND THE PROGRESS OF MEDICINE, 403-439
IRISH LAND ACT, THE, AND THE ENGLISH LAND QUESTION, 273-293; Landlordism upon its trial in almost every country in Europe, neither a time-honoured nor a popular institution, 273; up to the accession of Elizabeth the land of Ireland was cultivated by the people in common. A glance at the Land Act, 1881, which will pro-

bably encourage a more productive cultivation, 274; 'Fixity of Rent' *too late* in coming to be of much benefit to cultivators, *too soon* to benefit the non-landed public, 275; land-rents now at their highest, and must gradually decline, 276; in ten years' time the new Land Act will probably be as obsolete as the Act of 1870: the English Land Question "the question of the immediate future," 277; claim of the manufacturing or non-agricultural British public on the land, 278; enormous increase in land-rents caused by the growth of manufactures, 279; land-monopoly handicaps industry through higher land-rents; English land system as iniquitous as the Irish one; State-proprietorship the best solution of the Land Question, 280; confirmatory statements, 281; benefits likely to follow on State-proprietorship, 282; grouping of small farms into large ones, a crying evil of personal proprietorship, 283; result of the process, 284, 285; evil effects reduced to a minimum by State-proprietorship, 286; Lord Sherbrooke's superficial remedy, 287; and Mr. Bright's delusive one, 287; Mr. Gladstone's preference for repeal of the laws of entail and settlement to "compulsory expropriation," 289, 290; "free-trade" and the raw-cotton monopoly, and American bacon monopoly, 291; warn us against "free-trade in land," 292
ISLAND LIFE, 41-69
Italian Blue Books, 249, 530

*Jamaica*, 488
Jefferies, R., "Wood Magic: a Fable," 571
Jennings, H. J., "Curiosities of Criticism," 574
Jowett, B., translated by, "Thucydides," 538
Judd, J. W., F.R.S., "Volcanoes," 530
Jusserand, J. J., "Le Théâtre en Angleterre," second edition, 544

KAINES, J., "Seven Lectures on the Doctrines of Positivism," 236
Kiepert, H., "Manual of Ancient Geography," 300
Kortwright, Fanny A., "On Latmos," 285

LANDOR, *see* Colvin
Lang, Andrew, "The Library," 295
Lauder, Sir T. Dick, "Tales of the Highlands," 286
Lauder, Toofie, "Legends and Tales of the Hartz Mountains," 574
Le Conte, J., LL.D., "Sight," 261
Lee, J. E., "Note-book of an Amateur Geologist," 257
Letourneau, Dr. C., "Sociology based upon Ethnography," 253
"Levkosia, the Capital of Cyprus," 525
Linton, Mrs. Lynn, "My Love," 567
Lumsden, Lieut. Col., H.W., "Beowulf," 298

"M. A.," "Co-operation in Land Tillage," 514
Macleod, H. D., M.A., "The Elements of Economics," 238
Magnus, Mrs., "About the Jews since Bible Times," 270
Mallock, W. H., "A Romance of the Nineteenth Century," 565
McAlpine, D., "Zoological Atlas (including Comparative Anatomy) with Practical Directions," 262
Martin, W., "Thomas Carlyle, his Life and Work," 549
Mason, Capt. F. H., "The Life of J. A. Garfield," 276
——, James, edited by, "The Old Fairy Tales," 573
"Materialism, Ancient and Modern," 237
Max Müller, F., edited by, "The Sacred Books of the East," vol. x. Part. I, 227
——, "The Sacred Books of the East," vol. xi., 506
May Probyn, "Poems," 562
Meiklejohn, J. M. D., "Dr. Andrew Bell," 275
Mignaty, M. A., "Le Corrège," 297.
Miller, Rev. Dr. J., "The Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England," vol. iii., 224
Milligan, Dr. W., "The Resurrection of Our Lord," 503
Milne (the late), J., "Excavations at Carnac," 544
Milner, G., "Country Pleasures," 527
Morshead, E. D. A., translated by, "The House of Atreus," 287
Muir, Sir W, K.C.S.I., "The Early Caliphate and Rise of Islam," The Rede Lecture, 1881, 543
Mulhall, M. G., "Balance Sheet of the World for Ten Years," 254
Mullinger, *see* Gardiner

NADEN, C. C. W., "Songs and Sonnets of Spring-Time," 286
"New Testament, The," Revised Version, 228

"New Testament, The, in the original Greek," edited by the Rev. Dr. Scrivener, 229
"New Testament, The, in the original Greek," edited by Dr. B. F. Westcott and Dr. F. J. A. Hort, 229
*New South Wales*, 215, 492
*New Zealand*, 216, 492
Nicholson, E. B., M.A., "A New Commentary on the Historical Books of the New Testament," 505
———, H. A., M.D., "On the Structure and Affinities of the Genus Monteculipora and its Sub-genera," 257

Oliphant, Mrs., "The Makers of Florence," 269
Ormerod, Eleanor A., "A Manual of Injurious Insects," 535
Owen, Rev. J., "Evenings with the Skeptics," 232
Oxenham, Rev. F. N., "What is the Truth as to Everlasting Punishment?" 500
———, H. N., "The Catholic Doctrine of the Atonement," 223

Patton, J. M., "The Death of Death," 500
Payn, James, "From Exile," 284
"Political Economy," &c. A List of books compiled by W. G. Sumner, D. A. Wells, &c., 521
Political Memoirs, "The Goderich and Wellington Administrations," 293–320
Poor, L. E., "Sanskrit and its Kindred Literatures," 291
Postgate, J. P., M.A., edited by, "Select Elegies of Propertius," 572

*Queensland*, 216

Radcliffe, F. R. Y., "The New Politicus," 519
Rae, W. Fraser, "Newfoundland to Manitoba," 526
Rawlinson, Prof. G., "History of Ancient Egypt," 269
Redford, R. A., M.A., "The Christian's Plea against Modern Unbelief," 225
"Religion, The Development of," 138–154
Rimmer, A., "Our Old Country Towns," 254
Ritchie, *see* Thackeray
Rochefort, H., "Mademoiselle Bismark," 567
Rodwell, J. M., "Prophecies of Isaiah," 505
Rogers, J. Guinness, "The Church Systems of England in the Nineteenth Century," 497
Ross, W. S., "Lays of Romance and Chivalry," 287
Rossetti, Christina G., "A Pageant, and Other Poems," 561
———, Maria F., "A Shadow of Dante," 565
Rüetschi, Rudolf, "Geschichte und Kritik der kirchlichen Lehre von der ursprünglichen Vollkommenheit und vom Sündenfall," 504
Russell, W. H., "The Crimea, 1856," 271
Rutherford, W. G., "The New Phrynichus," 574

Saintsbury, A., "English Men of Letters, Dryden," 278
Savage, M. J., "Belief in God," 226
Schanz, Dr. G., "Englische Handelspolitik gegen Ende des Mittelalters," 514
"Scottish Church from the Earliest Christian Times, The," 542
Sellars, W. Y., "The Roman Poets of the Republic," 291
Séréna, Mme. Carla, "Mon Voyage: Une Européenne en Perse," 523
Shadwell, Lieut.-Gen., C. B., "The Life of Colin Campbell, Lord Clyde," 273
Shapcott, R., "The Autobiography of Mark Rutherford," 281
Shorthouse, J. H., "John Inglesant," a Romance, 568
Sidgwick, A., Æschylus' "Agamemnon," 575
Smith, G. B., "Sir Robert Peel," 547
*South Australia*, 214, 489
Sonnenschein, A., "Foreign Educational Codes," 528
Spalding, Lieut.-Col., "Eugène Onéguine," translated from the Russian of A. Pushkin, 560
Statham, F. R., "Blacks, Boers, and British," 245
Steenstrup, J., "Études Préliminaires pour servir à l'Histoire des Normands," 267
Stewart, Balfour, LL.D., F.R.S., "The Visible Universe, Is it a Physical or a Spiritual Production?" 238
Stirling, E., "Old Drury Lane," 282
Stoughton, Dr. J., "History of Religion in England," 540
Sugar Bounties Question, The, 109–138. Instances of the prevailing ignorance of Colonial affairs, both in England and in the Colonies, 109, 110; capital invested in the West Indies, and in the West Indian Trade, mostly

belongs to "residents in England," 111; West Indian export duties are "specially appropriated revenues," 112; West Indies yield us normally three quarters of our own colonial supply—"Perpetual plaint of the planters," 113; increased consumption of sugar followed on abolition of slavery, and of sugar duties, 114; since 1838, sugar has fallen from £50 to £20 a ton, but the Englishman's consumption has increased threefold, 115. West Indian colonies capable of producing sugar *cheaper* than it can be produced elsewhere, or from other plants, 116; from 1800 to 1840, there was rapid decline in the prosperity of Jamaica, climax reached in the abolition of slavery, and steady recovery since Morant Bay troubles, 117, 118; prosperity spreading fast in Jamaica, seen in the trade having increased 50 per cent. in the last 15 years, 119; exports from Jamaica 1879, and exports of sugar from the West Indies from 1844 to 1879, 120; sugar land in Barbadoes fetches nearly £100 an acre, 121; rise of a new class of planters, 122; adverse conditions still surrounding West Indian sugar industry, 123; prices of sugar for each year from 1858 to 1878, 124; examined, 120; prices affected by increasing populations, war, and commercial depression, 126; question of "bounties" set out, 127; and examined, 128; condition of the industries in the bounty-giving countries, 129; evidence of M. F. Georges and of M. F. Fouquet, 130; evidence from Austria and Belgium, 131; in all countries where bounties are given, sugar industries are in a precarious condition, 132; manufacturing and refining in bond the best method of abolishing bounties, 134; difficulty of all international action, 135; various conferences, 136; English sugar refiners are doing far better than the refiners in bounty-protected States, 137

Sully, J., "Illusions, A Psychological Study," 239

Swinton, W., "Outlines of the World's History," 266

Symonds, G. J., F.R.S., "British Rainfall, 1880," 532

———, J. A., "The Renaissance in Italy," vol. iv. v., 551.

*Tasmania*, 490

Taylor, J. W., "Central British America," 530

Thackeray, Miss, "Miss Williamson's Divagations," 285.

———, ——, "Madame de Sévigné," 568

Thomson, J., "Essays and Phantasies," 289

*Transvaal*, 220, 496

Trollope, A., "Doctor Wortle's School," 283

———, —, "Ayala's Angel," 566

———, H. M., "Corneille and Racine," 292

Tulloch, Col. Sir A., "The Crimean Commission," 271

Tyndall, J., F.R.S., M.D., "Essays on the Floating Matter of the Air," 537

UNDERHILL, E. B., "The Life of the Rev. J. M. Philippo," 281

Upton (the late), Major R. D., "The Desert of Arabia," 272

VAUGHAN, H. H., "New Renderings and Readings of Shakespeare's Tragedies," 294

Venn, J., M.A., "Symbolic Logic," 234

Verne, Jules, "Tigers and Traitors," 286

*Victoria*, 214, 490

Voysey, Rev. C., "The Sling and the Stone," vol. viii., 501

WATSON, J., M.A., LL.D., "Kant and his English Critics," 234.

Webster, A., "A Book of Rhyme," 564

Weir, A., B.A., "The Critical Philosophy of Kant," 510

*West Australia*, 213, 489

*West Indies*, 211, 487

Wilkins, A. S., edited by, "Ciceronis de Oratore," 300

Wilson, J., "Studies of Modern Mind and Character," 550

Winchell, A., LL.D., "Science and Religion," 509

WOMEN'S RIGHTS AS PREACHED BY WOMEN," 469, 478

Wood, S., "The Ladies Multum-in-Parvo Flower Garden and Amateur's Complete Guide," 260

Wright, G. F., "The Logic of Christian Evidences," 226

YOUNG, *see* Haines

END OF VOL. LX.