











THE  
WESTMINSTER  
REVIEW.

JANUARY AND APRIL,  
1884.

“ Truth can never be confirm'd enough,  
Though doubt did ever sleep ”

SHAKESPEARE.

Wahrheitsliebe zeigt sich dann daß man überall das Gute zu finden und zu suchen hat.  
GOTHE.

*NEW SERIES.*

VOL. LXV.

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

OC 111 W.F. 0  
191 (N.S. 65)

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

**Overseas Maritime Public Library,**  
Acc. No 7835 Date 31.7.75



683  
18

THE

# WESTMINSTER

AND

## FOREIGN QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1884.

### ART. I.—MARTIN LUTHER: HIS INFLUENCE ON THE MATERIAL AND INTELLECTUAL WELFARE OF GERMANY.

**D**URING the past year there has been so much talking and so much writing concerning Luther that we might suppose the majority of people, for whom direct historical research is impossible, to have been provided with sufficient material for arriving at a true judgment of the man and of the movement wherein he was the principal actor. Probably more books have been written concerning the Reformation than about any other period of history. Yet since the very time when history emerges from legend, such a mass of myth has never grown up to obscure all true examination of fact. Not only is this myth the predominant element in popular lives of Luther, but its influence may be continually traced in works having far greater claims on the consideration of scholars. The origin and growth of this myth are perhaps not hard to explain; the upholders of a particular phase of religion invariably invest its originator with a legendary perfection—all the great achievements of mankind during his century and often those of an even more distant date are attributed to him; all human errors, all sins of the age are thrust upon his opponents. To the sect its founder becomes the saviour of mankind, and his adversaries a generation of vipers. So it has arisen that numerous well-meaning folk look upon Luther almost as a second St. Paul, and upon the Pope as un-



doubted Antichrist. It is impossible to escape the dilemma: the orthodox Christian must either regard Luther as nigh inspired of God, or else as a child of the Devil. There can be no reconciliation of Lutheranism and Catholicism; if the teaching of the one is true, the doctrine of the other is false. An "Interim" would be no more successful to-day than it was in 1548. It may perhaps be suggested that the contradiction is to be found in the Apostolic writings themselves, yet the orthodox Christian is hardly likely to make an admission which would certainly deprive those writings of all claim to inspiration. To be consistent, he must adopt one view or the other; and having done so, Luther at once appears to him either as a prophet or a heretic—the discoverer of a long forgotten truth, or the perverter of the teaching of Christ. So long as there is a shred of dogma left about Christianity, there is small chance that Christendom will not divide itself into two hostile parties—the admirers and contemners of Luther. When we consider this fundamental distinction, and the proverbial intensity of theological hatred, it is small wonder that myth should survive and persistently obscure even the most prominent facts of Reformation history. Again and again scholars have shown that Luther's Bible-translation was neither the first, nor immeasurably superior to its predecessors; that vernacular hymns and sermons were frequent long before the Reformation; that Luther's methods were entirely opposed to the spirit of Humanism; that the German Reformation was by no means a great folk-movement—yet these and innumerable other facts have been persistently contradicted in the flood of magazine and newspaper articles which the centenary has brought into existence. Myths, which were first invented to blacken the character of opponents, and found a fitting receptacle in the scurrilous tracts of the sixteenth century, are still dealt out to the public by journalists and pseudo-historians as facts of the Reformation. We are told that toleration was a part of the programme of the German Reformers, a statement absolutely opposed to all critical investigation; we are told that Luther's coarseness and violence were only typical of his age, without the least attempt to inquire whether the nobler thinkers of the age were really coarse and violent; we are told that the Reformation swept away intolerable abuses, yet we search in vain for any scientific comparison of the moral condition of the clergy and of the laity at the beginning and at the middle of the sixteenth century; we are told that literature and learning were fostered by the Reformation, and yet we find absolute ignorance as to the intellectual collapse of Germany in the sixteenth century; lastly, we are told, on the one hand, that the thought of to-day owes its freedom to Luther, while the theologians insist

on the other that Luther was by no means the father of modern rationalism. Here, the theologians, for the most part guided by instinct rather than by history, are undoubtedly right. The whole history of Rationalism is as much opposed to Lutheranism as to Catholicism. Rationalists ought never to forget that thought could express itself far more freely in Basel and Erfurt in 1500 than it could anywhere in Europe by the middle of the century. Not from the doctrines of Lutheranism, but from the want of unity among theologians, has intellect again won for itself unlimited freedom. To the Protestant, who asserts that all our nineteenth-century culture is the outcome of Luther and his followers, the Rationalist must reply: "Yes, but not to their teaching, only to that squabbling which rendered them impotent to suppress." It is sectarian prejudice which has hitherto obscured the history of the Reformation, and has led a distinguished German critic thus to conclude his review of the literature on the subject:—

"The field of history must be thoroughly cleared of all such theological tendencies, whether they come from the right or the left or the middle. A true history of the Reformation must fundamentally and completely reject all theological and ecclesiastical party considerations and party aims of whatever character. A history of Luther is only possible for him who contents himself with writing history, and without the smallest reservation despises making propaganda for any theological conception."\*

The object of the present article is neither to write a history of Luther, nor to endeavour to dispel all the myths which obscure our view of the Reformation. It will entirely avoid theological discussion as to the truth or falsehood of any particular dogma, or as to the unlimited sacrifice of intellectual and moral progress which ought to be made in order to attain a phase of doctrine asserted to be most in accordance with divine revelation. This article will confine itself solely to the effect of Luther's teaching on the social and intellectual condition of the German people. It will endeavour to raise the question, whether any progress can ever be made by a violent reformation, or must not always be the outcome of a slow educational evolution? It will ask whether the folk as a body can ever be elevated by a vehement appeal to their passions, or whether all advance does not depend on a gradual intellectual development?

Let us endeavour to describe, as briefly as clearness will permit, the position of affairs in the Catholic Church towards the close of the fifteenth century. It must never be forgotten that through-

---

\* Maurenbrecher, "Studien und Skizzen zur Geschichte der Reformationszeit," p. 237, 1874.

out the Middle Ages the Church was by no means an institution concerned only with the spiritual element of man's nature, it was besides the basis of the entire mediæval social system, and the keynote to the whole of mediæval intellectual life. All social combinations, whether for labour, for trade, or for good fellowship—trade unions, mercantile guilds, and convivial fraternities—were part of the Church system. A higher spiritual side was thus given to the most every-day transactions of both business and pleasure. It was the Church which formed a link between man and man, between class and class, between nation and nation. The Church produced a unity of feeling between all men, a certain mediæval cosmopolitanism which it is hard for us to conceive in these days of individualism and strongly marked nationalism. So long as the Church was powerful, so long as it could make its law respected, it stood between workman and master, between peasant and lord, dealing out equity and hindering oppression. The battle which arose in Germany in the latter half of the fifteenth century between the Canon and Roman laws, was not a mere contest between Church or State supremacy, between ambitious ecclesiastic and grasping lay ruler. It involved the far more important question whether the peasant should be a free man or a serf. The Roman Law had been created for a slave State; the Canon Law, Roman in form, was yet Christian in spirit, and infinitely more in accord with the Christianized folk-law of the German people. The supporters of the "Reception of the Roman Law" were the German princes, for it increased immensely their power and importance; each became a petty Roman Emperor within the boundaries of his own dominions. The opponents of the Reception were first and foremost the leading Catholic preachers and theologians. Wimpfeling recognized in the contest of the two laws "the most fruitful mother of future revolutions."

"That among the heathen slavery was at home, and the greater part of humanity was reduced to an almost brute service is, alas!" writes the Abbot Trithem, "only too true. The light of Christendom had to shine for a long time before it was able to scatter the heathen darkness, godlessness, and tyranny. But what shall we say of Christians, who, appealing to a heathen system of law, wish to introduce a new slavery, and flatter the powerful of the earth, that they, since they possess the might have also all right, and can measure out to their subjects at will justice and freedom! Surely this is a hideous doctrine! Its application has already given rise to rebellion and rioting in many places, and in the near future great folk-destroying wars will break out, unless an end be put to it, and the old law of the Christian folk, the old freedom and judicial security of the peasants and other labouring men, be again restored."

That freedom was never restored; the Roman law was "received" throughout Germany, notwithstanding the advice of Popes, the protests of the Catholic clergy and the murmurings of the people. All who were interested in oppressing the masses became eager workers for the introduction and spread of Roman Law. As the Catholic Church lost power, the advance was more and more rapid, till it became all-victorious in the Reformation, culminating in Luther's doctrines of the Divine right of princes, and the duty of implicit obedience.\* Thus Trithem's prophecy was fulfilled, and that "great folk-destroying war," the Peasant's Rebellion, broke out. Only one other point can be noted here with regard to the Reception: the Roman Emperor had been head of the heathen religion; the new Jurists said to the German princelets:—"You, too, have a right to be Pope in your own land!" Such teaching was not long in bearing fruit.

These few remarks may suffice to show that apart from religious teaching pure and simple, the Catholic Church was the foundation of mediæval society. Any violent attempt to destroy that Church would in all probability be perilous to the established social life—it would lead to the triumph of might over all forms of right. Such, purely apart from dogmatic considerations, was the effect of the German Reformation; it consummated the degradation of the free peasant to the serf; it destroyed or reduced to a mere shadow of their former selves the innumerable guilds, partly by degrading them as "Papist institutions," partly by removing the old Church influence, the old moral restraints which prevented their becoming selfish trade monopolies; above all, by suddenly weakening the old religious beliefs, it brought about what might almost be described as a break-up of German society—the immorality and dissoluteness of the German people in the middle and second half of the sixteenth century is almost indescribable. It only finds its parallel in the high complete disappearance of all true intellectual and artistic activity. Such is no overdrawn description of what Mr. Pattison has fitly termed "the narrowing influence of Lutheran bigotry." The reader must not suppose that we at all blind ourselves to the abuses which had grown up in the Catholic Church in the fifteenth century; we recognize them to the full; but in return we ask, did the Lutheran Church produce a purer and more enlightened clergy; did it increase the moral and social welfare of the people; was it foremost in the support of literature and art; was it more tolerant, more charitable, nay, even more Christian, than that which it attempted to replace? Shortly, did it reform more evil than it destroyed good? To none of these

---

\* It is a significant fact that Luther burnt, with the papal bull, a copy of the Canon Law.

questions can we give an affirmative answer. The Catholic Church needed reform urgently enough, but the reform which it wanted was that of Erasmus, not that of Luther. Had the labours of Erasmus not been blighted by the passionate appeals of Wittenberg at first to the ignorance of the masses, and then to the greed of the princes, we believe that the Catholic Church would have developed with the intellectual development of mankind, would have become the universal instrument of moral progress and mental culture, and—dogmas gradually slipping into forgetfulness—we should now be enjoying the blessings of a universal church, embracing all that is best of the intellect of our time. If the Church in 1500 could contain an Erasmus, a Reuchlin and a Mutian, who shall say that in our days Professor Huxley and Mr. Arnold might not have been numbered among its members? Luther, by insisting on details of dogma, dragged Europe into a flood of theological controversy, and forced the Church into a process of doctrinal crystallization, from which it can never recover. This is probably what was passing through the mind of the great German poet when he declared that Luther threw back by centuries the civilization of Europe.

Let us, however, examine still more closely the condition of the Roman Church at the beginning of the sixteenth century. What were the particular failings which pressed so peculiarly for reform? We may note first the ignorance of both monks and clergy. It is quite true that the typical monk was by no means that combination of stupidity and bestiality which the "*Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum*" paints for us. There were monasteries which preserved something of the old literary spirit, and whose schools were not to be utterly despised; there were still convents of both sexes where the old earnest religious spirit was very far from dead, and which were only broken up by the most violent methods of "reform." Still the Church had ceased to represent the foremost culture, the deeper knowledge of her time. She was no longer the intellectual giantess she had been in earlier centuries—a certain spiritual sloth had grown upon her, while wealth and power had deadened her mental activity. She was behind the current knowledge of her age and wanting in sympathy for its methods. A second failing—almost more grave, but yet closely linked with the former—was the moral collapse of the spiritual members of the Church. Clergy, monks, and nuns had lost consciousness of the meaning of their vows, and the spiritual calling had become a mere means of obtaining an easy subsistence. Let us grasp fully the very worst that can be said on this point. Many monasteries were little better than taverns; occasionally nunneries approached something still more repulsive. In an order of the Regensburg administrator of 1508, we read

of the clergy seated at night in the public taverns, consuming wine to drunkenness, playing at dice and cards, brawling with their neighbours, and even fighting with knives or other weapons; the dress, too, of these tavern clergy, we are told, was luxurious and improper. Erasmus bears faithful witness to the condition of many of the monks and clergy in his day: "I know," he says through one of his characters, "some monks so superstitious that they think themselves in the jaws of the Devil, if by chance they are without their sacred vestments; but they are not at all afraid of his claws, while they are lying, slandering, drunken and acting maliciously." Yet Erasmus does not indiscriminately abuse clergy and monks; he points out pious and worthy examples of both, and such undoubtedly existed in far greater numbers than Protestant polemic would allow us to believe, even when Luther was pouring out his most violent anathemas against the monastic life. Insults, threats, bribes were often insufficient to break up the convents in Saxony and elsewhere. The reforming Church Visitors frequently found a passive resistance, which could only be the outcome of a deep religious conviction, and which to the modern investigator throws all charges of intolerance and bigotry upon the shoulders of the reforming party. Noteworthy in this respect was the system of insult and petty tyranny, which the high-minded Abbess Charitas Pirkheimer and her convent had to endure at the hands of the coarse and fanatic Osiander. Her diary of these events is one of the most interesting records of the methods of Lutheran reformation extant.\* Yet her experience was by no means unique; we possess other records of a like kind which show how unfounded were Luther's charges: that in no nunnery was there daily reading of the Bible; that among a thousand nuns scarce one went with pleasure to Divine service, or wore, except under compulsion, the dress of her Order. Such assertions as these, however, have, on the authority of Luther, been handed from writer to writer till they are quoted as facts in modern history books. That the cloister-life of the early part of the sixteenth century needed reform is indisputable; but that any real good was effected by absolutely forbidding the members of the Orders to wear their distinctive dress, by bribing the more worldly-minded to leave their convents, by forcing the remainder to listen to Lutheran preachers abusing the Catholic faith and the ascetic life in the coarsest fashion, and finally by the appropriation as soon as possible of the convent revenues, may very reasonably be doubted. Considering how small a portion of those

---

\* Charitas Pirkheimer, "Denkwürdigkeiten aus dem Reformationszeitalter." Bamberger Hist. Verein, Bd. iv. Editor, Höfler, 1852.

revenues was ultimately devoted to educational or charitable purposes, Cobbett's charge against the Reformation that it was a plundering of the heritage of the poor is not without foundation. The doctrine of salvation by faith alone may perhaps be most in accordance with St. Paul's teaching, yet it is perfectly certain that the belief that works were of assistance, not only saved pre-reformation Germany from a State pauper system, but adorned her churches with the noblest works of Christian art. Luther's doctrine, misunderstood if you please to term it so, was immediately destructive of charity, and endless were the lamentations of the Reformers that people had ceased to give as they did in the dark ages of Popery.

The third great evil under which the Church laboured was the worldly aims of the hierarchy. The Church had become not only a spiritual but a great social and even political authority. The princes of the Church had power to equal or greater than the lay rulers, and they needed a princely revenue to support their state. Still more excessive were the wants of the Papal Court, and the means by which those wants were supplied were not at all calculated to make Rome acceptable to the German people. The national unity of France and Spain had enabled those countries to resist successfully the Papal extortions, and to establish a fairly equitable *modus vivendi* with the head of the Church. But national unity was the very thing wanted in Germany. Her princes were eager only for self-aggrandizement, and there was no security for their permanent union to dictate terms to the Pope; one and all of them were always open to the conviction of a bribe. This disunion of the German princes rendered a solution of the question after the French fashion impossible. The same grievances were expressed time after time at successive Reichstages, but no genuine attempt at self-help ever seems to have been made. The pocket has usually far greater influence than the idea, hence it came to pass that the mass of the people at first welcomed Luther as their champion against the Roman imposition; they by no means grasped that his enterprise would ultimately shake the very foundations of their social life. The grievances of the German nation against the Pope are very clearly expressed in a document presented in 1518 by the then Catholic Germany to Kaiser Maximilian.\* The Pope, euphonistically described as "pious father, lover of his children, and faithful and wise pastor," is warned to give heed to Germany's grievances, or else there may be a rising against the priests of Christ, a falling away from the Roman Church even as in Bohemia. The grievances are endless the archbishops and

---

\* "Gravamina Germanicæ Nationis cum remediis et avisamentis ad Cæsaream majestatem." 1518.

bishops exact terrible sums from their flocks to pay the Pope for the "pallium," the sign of his sanction to their appointment; the income from German fields, mines and tolls, which might be used for administering justice, exterminating robbers, and for war against infidels, all goes to Rome. So-called "courtesans"—that is, the Pope's courtiers, his cardinals, notaries and officers—hold the best benefices in Germany, a land many of them have never seen. The money of pious founders, which should be used not only for the repair of churches and monasteries, but for hospitals, schools, paupers, widows and orphans, is grasped by avaricious Italians. These and other ignorant priests add living to living. Learned and earnest clergy, of whom Germany provides a sufficiency, can find no fitting posts. The begging friars, mere agents of the Pope, need to be sternly held within bounds. If Maximilian will only remedy these, and a good many other ecclesiastical grievances, he shall be hailed as the deliverer of Germany, the restorer of her liberty, the true father of his country! It will be noted that these grievances are not in the least matters of dogma, they are precisely the difficulties which national unity enabled France and Spain to conquer.

On the other hand it is well to mark the character of the men into whose hands these ill-gotten revenues passed. They were the patrons, the enthusiastic patrons of literature and art; they were by no means particular as to dogma, and looked upon the Church rather as a means of social than religious government. An anecdote of Benvenuto Cellini is peculiarly characteristic of their conception of the relation between religion and art. Notwithstanding that Cellini had just committed what can only be termed a murder, the new Pope, Paul, sent for him, and prepared at once a letter of pardon. One of the courtiers present remarked that it was hardly advisable in the first days of office to pardon such an offence. Then the Pope turned sharply to him and said:—"You do not understand this as well as I. Know that men like Benvenuto, who are unique in their skill, are not bound by the law." The Pope then signed the letter of pardon, and Cellini was received into the highest favour.\* This autobiography presents us with no edifying picture of sixteenth-century Popes when we look upon them merely as spiritual authorities. It is singular to mark the Pope jesting over the power of the keys at the very time when Luther is forging iron bands of dogma for Northern Germany. These are the Popes who built St. Peter's, and were the patrons of Raphael and Michael Angelo, and the character of their religion is essentially reflected in the works of those artists. They were not insensible to the need of reformation in the Church: the Lateran Council

---

\* "Vita di Benvenuto Cellini; Colonia," p. 99.



shows sufficiently that it was the ignorance of the monks and greed of the clergy rather than the will of the Popes which hindered reform. Yet they looked for improvement rather by education and culture in the spirit of Erasmus, than by a sweeping destruction after the fashion of Luther. They were as a rule tolerant even to excess, and only the progress of Protestantism forced the Roman See again into the path of bigotry, again to lay stress upon phases of dogma.

What the Popes were to Italy, such were the spiritual princes in Germany. Cardinal Albrecht, of Mainz, whom Luther thought fit to class with Cain and Absalom, was one of the most cultivated men of his time. His Court, under the direction of Ulrich's cousin, Frowin von Hutten, may be described as the centre of German art and literature. Here men like Reuchlin, Ulrich von Hutten, Erasmus, Georg Sabinus, Dürer, Grunewald, and Cranach, met with support and sympathy. Albrecht was probably neither an exceedingly moral nor deeply religious ecclesiastic. There are several pictures by Grunewald, of St. Erasmus and the Magdalene, which are portraits of the Cardinal, and, as is supposed, of the fair daughter of one Rüdinger, of Mainz. It is not so many years ago since certain narrow zealots in Halle wished to have Cranach's grand altarpiece removed from the Market Church, because they thought they recognized in the face of the Virgin a portrait of the same lady. The table also, now in the Louvre, which "the godless painter," Hans Sebald Beham, prepared for Albrecht, breathes anything but a religious spirit.\* The leaders of the Church, both in Italy and Germany, were what we should now-a-days term 'emancipated'; they were enthusiastic encouragers of the fine arts and of all forms of humanistic culture. Is it to be wondered at that they could not sympathize with a movement which re-introduced doctrinal subtleties; which completely checked the spread of Humanism; which in Augsburg,† Brunswick, Hamburg, Frankfurt, Basel, Zürich, everywhere north and south, handed over the noblest works of art to the fire and to the hammer; or which, as in Wurzen, by the direct orders of Luther's patron, Johann Friedrich, the "Great-hearted," caused the works of art, "so far as they were not inlaid with gold, or represented serious subjects (*ernstliche Historien*), to be chopped up, and the rest laid by in the crypt"? These are matters which must influence the

---

\* Cf. Förster und Kugler's *Kunstblatt*, "Der Kardinal Albrecht als Kunstförderer," 1846, Nos. 32 and 33. Also Hefner Alteneck, "Trachten des Christlichen Mittelalters." Description to plate 136, Bd. iii.

† "We have never either prayed to the saints or worshipped their images," writes the Bishop of Augsburg. "These monuments and pictures might at least have been preserved from destruction for the sake of their age and artistic merit."

mind of to-day when judging the Reformation, however indifferent or even justifiable they may seem to the iconoclastic zealots either of the past or present.

Granting, then, the existence of serious evils in the state of the Church, we may ask, whether these evils were unrecognized by the more thoughtful Catholics of the time; was there no attempt at reform, which might have avoided that break up of moral, intellectual and artistic life which followed upon the violent destruction of the mediæval church system? We reply that there was such a recognition and such an attempt—a reform constructed on a far broader basis than Luther was capable of conceiving; this attempt at reform has been not inappropriately named after its most zealous supporter, the Erasmian Reformation. A comparison of the standpoints of Luther and Erasmus is of peculiar importance at the present time, when we are so frequently told that, apart from all theological questions, we owe our modern intellectual freedom to Luther. The plans of Erasmus were shipwrecked by the violence of the Lutheran movement. We have to inquire whether our modern thought has not been the outcome of a gradual return to the principles of Erasmus, a continuous rejection one by one of every doctrine and every conception of Luther. Mr. Beard, in his Hibbert Lectures, remarks, with great truth, that while the Reformation of the past has been Luther's, that of the future will be Erasmus's; we venture to remind Mr. Beard that but for Luther the Reformation of Erasmus would have been the Reformation of the past as well as of the future. It is impossible to reverse the course of history, but it is not idle to point out the failures of mankind; they form all-important lessons for our conduct in the future. What were the means then that the Humanistic party adopted to cure those two great evils—the ignorance and immorality of clergy and monks? It may be shortly described as the revival of the religious spirit by inoculating the Church with the humanistic enthusiasm, by identifying Catholicism with the newly won scholarship and progressive culture. Ecclesiastical ignorance could only be conquered by a gradual process of education, not by driving monk and priest into stubborn opposition, but by teaching them to appreciate at their true value the higher intellectual pursuits. It required above all a reform in the teaching of the schools and universities with their theological faculties. When we look back now at the forty years which preceded the so-called Reformation, we are astonished at the amount of improvement which the party of educational progress had in that time achieved. It must be stated at once that the Erasmian Reformation was essentially rational rather than emotional, it appealed to men's reason not to their passions. On this ground it is interesting to mark the great emphasis laid by the Humanistic moralists on the identification

of sin and folly. It is folly, stupidity, ignorance which are the causes of immorality and crime, not the activity of the Devil, or any theological conception of an inherited impulse to evil. Once make men wise and they will cease to commit sin. This is the keynote to Sebastian Brant's "Ship of Fools" (1494), to Wimpheling's pedagogic labours, but above all to Erasmus' "Praise of Folly." Like the great folk-preacher, Geiler von Kaiserberg, these men do not discard religion, but they lay stress upon its ethical side in preference to the dogmatical. They see well enough the abuses in the Church, but they do not therefore cry out for its destruction; they lay ignorance and folly bare with the most biting of satire. If we open the sermons of Geiler on Brant's "Ship of Fools," and mark how he turns its satire into the deepest religious feeling, we are convinced that the highest moral purpose is at the bottom of these satirical productions. They are not written for the reader's amusement, but to teach him the deepest moral truths. There is an intense earnestness about these men, they are imbued with the one idea of reforming the Church, of purifying and elevating both clergy and laity, and the keynote of their method is education. Humanistic culture, combined with a higher moral conception, shall bring back vitality to the old ecclesiastical institutions. The spirit of Geiler, Wimpheling and Brant was in the main the spirit of Erasmus. He, too, satirises ignorance and folly; he, too, preaches a practical Christianity. The "Enchiridion Militis Christiani," he tells us, was written "as a remedy against the error which makes religion depend on ceremonies and an observance almost more than Judaic of bodily acts, while strangely neglecting all that relates to true piety." Yet Erasmus in this very work recognizes throughout man's capacity for good, and expresses his belief in the guidance of the reason. The whole scope of life is to be Christ, but Christ is not an empty name, he is charity, simplicity, patience, purity, shortly whatever Christ taught. Not of food or drink but of mutual love was Christ's talk. While rejecting merely formal works, Erasmus still places man's salvation in the practice of Christian virtue; he is very far from accepting Luther's doctrine of justification by faith alone. The book is full of practical piety, not a trace of theological dogma or any regard to theories of redemption or of original sin. Nevertheless it does not hesitate to attack superstition, the common abuses of the Church, and the ignorance and stupidity of the monks. "To be a Christian is not to be anointed or baptized, is not to attend Mass; but to lay hold of Christ in one's inmost heart, and show forth his spirit in one's life," that is the keynote to the religion of Erasmus, and it is precisely identical with what Christianity means to the best minds of to-day.

The proposal of these Humanistic moralists was to reform the Church by educating her. They believed that the more the

intellectual side of a man was developed, the less likely he was to be selfish and bestial. They put faith in human reason. In what a totally different fashion does Luther regard this safeguard of human action! Without the pre-existence of faith reason is, according to Luther, the most complete vanity; it is blind in spiritual matters, and cannot point out the way of life. "In itself it is the most dangerous thing, especially when it touches matters concerning the soul and God." Luther saw in the reason the "arch-enemy of faith," because it led men to believe in salvation by works; nay, he went further, and declared that whoever trusted to his reason must reject the dogmas of Christianity. In another passage he describes the natural reason as the "arch-whore and devil's bride, who can only scoff and blaspheme all that God says and does." Elsewhere, Luther declares that the reason can only recognize in Christ the teacher and holy man, but not the son of the living God; and on this account he pours out his wrath upon it. "Reason or human wisdom and the devil can dispute wondrous well, so that one might believe it were wisdom, and yet it is not." "Since the beginning of the world reason has been possessed by the devil, and bred unbelief." This particular dislike of Luther for human reason even found expression in his translation of the Bible, and he has in several passages introduced the word reason, where nothing of the kind is referred to in the original text, notably in Colossians ii. 4, where he replaces "enticing words" by "vernünftige Reden".\* It will be seen at once then that the theologians are right in asserting that Luther was not the father of modern rationalism. He considered reason as the very instrument of the devil, unless its application had been preceded by the mystical process of redemption, the attainment of perfect faith. It is obvious that such a condition destroys the only ground upon which reason can be treated as a common basis for truth in all mankind. Nothing more strikingly than this contempt of human intellect, marks the difference between Luther and Erasmus; it expresses exactly the difference of the methods they proposed for the reformation of the Church.

Let us consider how this fundamental difference between the Humanists of Erasmus's school and the Lutherans expresses itself in their teachings. We have already noted what a great step had been taken by the Humanistic moralists in the identification of sin with folly; it at once suggested a rational method—namely, education—by which sin might be diminished. What the Humanists however, attributed to folly, that the Lutherans asserted to be the direct action of the devil; not by education, but only by divine grace was man enabled to resist sin. It was

---

\* Cf. 2 Cor. x. 5; Ephes. ii. 3; Coloss. i. 21., &c.

the perpetuation, if not the re-establishment, of the temporal government of a personal devil and his assistants. Those human errors which in the "Praise of Folly" and the "Ship of Fools" were attributed to stupidity and ignorance, were as a result of Lutheran doctrine distributed to individual devils. The Lutheran preachers wrote books on the Devil of Usury, the Devil of Greed, the Devil of Pride, the Drink-Devil, the Devil of Cursing, the Devil of Gambling, the Devil of Witchcraft, nay, even of the Devils which make wives bad-tempered and induces men to wear inordinately large breeches.\* The Lutherans held that among them Satan was particularly active, because they were the only hindrance to his absolute rule. It was not a mere allegorical representation of evil, but a belief in an active personal set of devils, who walked the face of the earth, and could do bodily as well as spiritual harm to mankind. Not only were the people taught from the pulpit that Catholic clergy and laity were possessed of the devil,—“every German Bishop,” preached Luther, “who went to the Augsburg Reichstag, took more devils with him than a dog carries fleas”—but we know of more than one instance where the stake or the sword was the result of this supposed intercourse between anti-Protestants and the Devil. Children were taught even in Luther’s catechism that the devil not only brought about quarrelling, murder, rebellion, and war, but by his instigation came storm and hail, destruction of crops and cattle, poisoning of the atmosphere. “Shortly, it annoys him that any one should have a bit of bread from God, and if he had it in his power, he would not leave a blade in the field, a farthing in the house, not even an hour of man’s life.” Luther’s writings and his Table-Talk teem with reference to this active personal Devil. The hazel-nut tale and the inkpot tale of the Wartburg are common property; but many other anecdotes of how his friends and he put the devil to flight have been expurgated from modern editions of his works. There can be no doubt of his doctrine of demons. Satan, he tells us, lays changelings and urchins in the place of true children, in order to annoy people. Since magic is a shameful defection, while a man deserts God to whom he is dedicated, and betakes himself to the Devil, God’s foe, so it is only reasonable that it should be punished with body and life. “There are many devils in forests, waters, wastes, and damp marshy places, in order to damage wayfarers. Some are also in black and thick clouds; they raise storms, hail, and thunder, and poison the air. When this happens the philosophers and doctors say it is Nature or the stars! •The doctors consider

---

\* In the second half of the sixteenth century appeared a mass of works under such titles as:—“Geytz und Wucherteuffel,” “Hoffteuffel,” “Sauffteuffel,” “Hurenteuffel,” “Zauberteuffel,” “Fluchteuffel,” “Spilteuffel,” “Hausteuffel,” “Hosenteuffel,” &c.

diseases to arise only from natural causes, and attempt to cure them with medicines and that rightly, but they forget the Devil originates the natural causes in these diseases. I believe that my sicknesses were not all natural, but that Squire Satan practised his roguery upon me by magic. God, however, rescues His elect from such evils." Again, in the year 1538, there was much talk of witches who stole eggs from the hens' nests and milk and butter from the dairy. Luther said, "No one should show mercy to such people: I would myself burn them, even as it is written in the Bible, that the priests commenced stoning offenders." We shall be told that all this was merely the current superstition of Luther's age.\* We allow that such beliefs were very general, but we must, at the same time, point out that the Humanists were, if perhaps not quite free, yet distinctly far more emancipated on this point than Luther. Very strong is Brant against those "fools" who believe in days good for buying, for building, for war, for marrying, and so forth. Great is the folly of all kinds of fortune-telling, belief in the cry of birds, in dreams, in seeking things by moonlight, and in all related to the black arts. The printers, who spread such stuff among the folk, are much to blame. Still more clearly does Erasmus speak out his mind in the colloquy of the "Exorcism" which, in the words of its argument, "detects the artifices of impostors, who impose upon the credulous and simple by framing stories of apparitions, of demons, and of ghosts and divine voices." Perhaps the dullness of Erasmus's orthodox opponents may be best shown by quoting the following satires which they have used to prove his belief in witchcraft! Once in Freiburg he was tormented with fleas, which were so small that it was impossible to catch them; they bit his neck, filled his clothes and even his very shoes as he stood writing. These, he used to tell his friends in jest, were not fleas but evil spirits. "This," he added, "is really no joke, but a divination; for some days ago a woman was burned who had carried on an intercourse with an evil spirit, and confessed, among other crimes, that she had sent some large bags of fleas to Freiburg." On another occasion Erasmus narrates with all gravity how in the town of Schiltach a demon carried off a woman into the air and placed her upon a chimney top, then gave her a flask which by his command she upset, and within a short time the town was reduced to ashes. The following caustic remark is then added: "Whether all the reports about it are true I will not venture to affirm, but it is too true that the town was burned and the woman executed after confess-

---

\* Oslander denied the existence of ghosts, but Luther remarked that the said O. must always have a crotchet. He himself knew that persons were possessed by devils, and that ghosts frightened people in their sleep.—*Tischreden*, Bd. iii. p. 337.

ing.”\* We do not assert that the Humanists were free from superstition, but their rationalistic tendency was distinctly opposed to it. The revival by Luther of an active personal Devil brought back superstition in a flood upon Northern Europe. Nowhere were witches so prevalent, nowhere were faggots and torture so common as in the Protestant countries in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It is not our present purpose to enter into comparative statistics of the growth and prevalence of witch superstition. We recognize the curse of such books as the “Witch Hammer,” but we note that it was the Humanists not the Lutherans who were struggling against such criminal ignorance. It must suffice here to quote the words of a distinguished Protestant literary critic with regard to one Protestant country—Brunswick:—

“Religious fanaticism was revived by the introduction of Protestant doctrine and kept well alive by the representatives of the church. Thus the district has to thank not only for the increased severity of the laws against the Jews, but for the inconceivable number of witch trials conducted without any regard to person. The Devil appeared to be peculiarly active where the Gospel was preached in its greatest purity, and the contest against him more necessary than ever. . . . Duke Heinrich Julius looked at the matter simply as a jurist and confined himself to what torture brought forth. . . . During his rule ten or twelve witches were often burnt in *one* day, so that on the place of execution, before the Lechenholz, near Wolfenbittel, the stakes stood like a small forest.” †

Closely related to witchcraft is heresy; it will be generally found that superstition and intolerance are bred by the same causes. In the sixteenth century witches and heretics were alike viewed as devil-possessed. Thus Erasmus tells us in his “Praise of Folly,” how “an irrefragable and hair-splitting theologian” had deduced from the Mosaic law—“Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live”—the like law with regard to a heretic, since “every *maleficus* or witch is to be killed, but a heretic is *maleficus*, ergo, &c.” For those who would know, even now-a-days, what true toleration means, nothing can be more profitable than the study of Erasmus’ works. ‡ The keynote to his position is contained in that wonderful bit of satire in the Divinity Disputation of the

---

\* It is worth noting that shrewd old Hans Sachs, who is always bringing witches and the Devil on to the stage, yet remarks:—

“Devil’s dames and devil’s knights,  
Are only dream and fancy sprites;  
To ride a goat exceeds belief.”

† Tittmann, “Die Schauspiele des Herzogs Heinrich Julius.” Einleitung, S. xxvii.

‡ Concisely expressed in a letter to Cardinal Campeggio:—“Neminem quidem conieci in vincula, sed plus efficit qui medetur animo, quam qui corpus affligit.”—“Monumenta Reformationis Lutherana,” p. 306.

“Praise of Folly.” “Why should it be thought more proper to silence all heretics by sword and faggot rather than correct them by moderate and sober arguments?” Such was the spirit of toleration which Erasmus would have impressed, and, we may add, *was impressing* upon the Catholic Church when the Lutheran movement destroyed his labours. Noteworthy also is the contempt which the younger Humanists poured upon the “*Fortaliti-um Fidei*.” This remarkable work, due to Alphonsus de Spina, may be looked upon as the fortress of mediæval bigotry and ignorance. Its first book deals with the beauty of the Christian faith, its second with the crime of heresy, its third and fourth are bitter tirades against Jews and Saracens, while the last is concerned with demons and witchcraft. This work is not a bit too strongly described in the “*Letters of the Obscure Men*,” as *merclosus liber, et non valet; et quod nemo allegat istum librum nisi stultus et fatuus*.\* Yet its theory of witchcraft was accepted by the Protestant party, and its language with regard to the Jews can only be paralleled from the works of Luther!

We have now to answer an all-important question:—What were the views of Luther and his disciples with regard to toleration? We have already stated that all Catholics who did not desert their Church were, in the opinion of Luther, children of the devil. Now, as such, they were deserving of no charity, and must be removed from those districts in which only pure gospel was to be preached. Had they been treated as heretics and burnt, the immediate result would have been war with the German Catholic States, in which the latter, during the earlier part of Luther's career the stronger, would have probably prevailed, and Protestantism have been stamped out. Accordingly, in the earlier days of Protestantism, it was customary to banish Catholics, while Anabaptists, who were a weak body, were imprisoned and executed. When Protestantism was firmly established, then there was no hesitation in sending Catholics to the stake or to the block. There is not the least to choose between either great theological party; Protestant and Catholic were alike intolerant, alike opposed to the spirit of Erasmus. It is simple ignorance of historical facts to attribute toleration to the Reformers. As early as the Saxon Church Visitation of 1527, does this spirit break out. In the Instructions we read that not only are the clergy, who do not follow the prescribed code of teaching and ceremonial, to lose their posts, but even the laity, who have given rise to any suspicion as to their conception

---

\* “*Fortaliti-um Fidei*” is probably not the full title, but our early edition has no title-page. The book is thus quoted in the “*Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum*,” I. Epist. xxii: II. Epist. xiii.



of the Sacrament, or as to their faith generally, are to be questioned concerning the same, and instructed ; then if they do not reform their ways within a given time, they must sell their goods and leave the country. "For," remarked the Elector, "although it is not our intention to dictate to any one what he shall believe or hold, yet we will not allow any sect or separation in our land, in order that there may be no riots or other disturbances." Such was the mildest form of toleration to be found in any of the German Protestant countries, and it soon changed to something considerably more severe. But is not this a mere sarcasm on the name ? This form of "toleration" was supported by a noteworthy doctrine of Luther's. Before the Peasants' War, when struggling to assert himself, Luther taught that heresy could not be repressed by force, that no fire could burn it, and no water drown it. Yet so soon as Luther saw other sects springing up around him, and claiming the same privilege as himself, he declared that as *rebels* to the State they deserved punishment, even to banishment and death. This, then, is Luther's doctrine:—The State is the head of religion, and all sectaries are rebels to the State. Invariably Luther associates his opponents with murderers and rebels. Those sectaries who meet in secret for their primitive service "have not only the false doctrine, but meet for murder and riot, because such folk are possessed of the devil. . . . Such knaves are to be forbidden by the greatest punishment, in order that every subject may avoid such conventicles, even as all subjects are in duty bound to do, unless they wish themselves to be guilty of murder and riot."\* Still further did Martin Butzer, afterwards distinguished as an English reformer, carry this Lutheran doctrine. If thieves, robbers, and murderers are severely punished, how much more harshly ought the followers of a false religion to be treated, since the perversion of religion is an infinitely graver offence than all the misdeeds of corporal offenders. Government has the right to destroy with fire and sword the followers of a false religion, aye, to strangle their wives and children, even as God has ordered in the Old Testament. Is it surprising to find after this another Lutheran, namely Melauchthon, approving of the burning of Servetus, and terming that hideous deed of Calvin's "a pious and memorable example for all posterity" ? There are passages in Luther's works which can be cited against the execution of heretics ; but the expulsion of those believing differently from himself was an essential characteristic of that system of State churches which he founded. Those who will take the trouble to investigate the reports of the Church Visitors in the young Protestant States will have some con-

---

\* "Von den Schleichern und Winckelpredigern," 1532. It should be noted that at this time the Anabaptists were innocent of any political schemes.

ception of the extent and the accompanying misery of that system of banishment which it was no small portion of the Visitors' duty to organize. Nor was charity to each other any more a characteristic of the early reformers than toleration of their opponents; the slightest divergence of view was sufficient to raise infinite hatred and abuse. Luther terms Butzer a "chatter-mouth, and his writings potwash," while Zwingli, Oecolampadius, and Schwenkfeld are "in and in, through and through, out and out, devil-possessed, blasphemous hearts, and impudent liars." Flacius terms Melanchthon "a papal brand of hell. . . . He and all his followers are nothing other than servants of Satan; since the time of the Apostles there have been no such dangerous men in the church." Carlstadt, because he differs as to the sacrament, is termed a "murderer, one who wishes only bloodshed and riot," by his previous Wittenberg colleagues. Still more ignorant, still more violent and intolerant is Luther's judgment upon the Jews. We must search the writings of Alphonsus de Spina and of the renegade Pfefferkorn to find a parallel. That most delectable bigot, Herr Hofprediger Stöcker, has recently been republishing Luther's words as an incitement to further anti-Jewish riots. To begin with, Luther tells us that he will give us his true counsel:—

"First, that the Jewish synagogues and schools be set on fire, and what will not burn be covered with earth, that no man ever after may see stick or stone thereof. . . . Secondly, that their houses in like fashion be broken down and destroyed, since they only carry on in them what they carry on in their schools. Let them content themselves with a shed or a stall like the gipsies, that they may know they are not lords in our land. . . . Thirdly, all their prayer-books and Talmuds must be taken from them, since in them idolatry, lies, cursing, and blasphemy are taught. . . . Fourthly, that their rabbis, on penalty of death, be forbidden to teach. . . . Fifthly, that safe conduct on the highways be denied to Jews entirely, since they have no business in the country, being neither lords, officials, nor traders, or the like; they ought to remain at home. . . . Sixthly, usury shall be forbidden them. All that they have is stolen, and therefore it is to be taken from them, and used for pensioning converts."

These are Luther's propositions for treating the Jews as he thinks they deserved, and which he tells us he would carry out in earnest, if he only had the power of the princes; nay, he works himself up to a stronger pitch of passion than this:—

"These 'impudent lying devils' ought not to be allowed to praise or pray to God, since 'their praise, thanksgiving, prayer, and teaching is mere blasphemy and idolatry.' The penalty for any act of worship on the part of a Jew should be loss of life. Not only all their books, but even 'the Bible to its last leaf' shall be taken from them. Not

only are their synagogues to be burnt, but 'let him, who can, throw pitch and sulphur upon them; if any one could throw hell-fire, it were good, so that God might see our earnestness, and the whole world such an example.'"\*

In the face of such teaching we must solemnly protest against that ignorance which terms Luther tolerant, or which attributes to him the culture of to-day. We refuse to recognize in him either the prophet or the great moral teacher. We could fill pages with infinitely harder sayings against the Catholics,† but we have chosen the Jews as a neutral sect, with whom Luther was not waging a life and death battle. The effect of such teaching upon the people can easily be imagined, and, as example, we have already mentioned the increased severity of the laws against the Jews in Brunswick. How strangely, too, it stands in contrast with the conduct of the Humanist Reuchlin—a man whose writings show a sympathetic study of Jewish literature,‡ and whose defence of the Hebrew books against Pfefferkorn's violent pleas for their destruction brought down upon him the wrath of the whole Dominican Order, and was the cause of that notable battle between the party of intellectual progress and the party of ignorance and bigotry—the "obscure men." Mr. Beard, in his Hibbert Lectures, writes:—

"Luther used the weapons of faith to slay reason, lest perchance reason should lure faith to her destruction. But who can tell what might have been the effect upon the Reformation, and the subsequent development of the intellectual life of Europe, had Luther put himself boldly at the head of the larger and freer thought of his time, instead of using all the force of his genius, all the weight of his authority to crush it?"—p. 170.

No truer words have ever been spoken with regard to Luther, and yet this same writer blames us, because we refuse to express any gratitude to the man who crushed all those influences which we believe tend most to the progress of humanity!

We must briefly touch upon one or two other points connected with intellectual development, before we consider the social effects of the Reformation. Under the influence of the Humanists, Germany had at the beginning of the sixteenth century, attained to an unparalleled activity in art and literature.‖

\* "Von den Juden und ihren Lügen," 1543. *Sämmtl. Werke*, Bd. xxxii.

† For example: "If we punish the thief with the rope, the robber with the sword, the heretic with fire, how much rather should we attack with every weapon these masters of perdition, these cardinals, these popes, this whole filth of the Roman Sodom, which corrupts without end God's church; how much rather wash our hands in their blood?"—*Opera Latina*, v. a., Frankfurt, ii. 107.

‡ "De verbo mirifico," 1494, and "De arte cabalistica," 1517.

‖ Cf. a paper on German Humanism in the *WESTMINSTER REVIEW*, April, 1883

Those who have not visited the galleries at München and Augsburg and the Cathedral at Ulm, can form but a slight conception of the artistic perfection of that age. Innumerable art treasures perished in the iconoclastic storms of the sixteenth century, but enough remain to show the wondrous activity, which was brought to such an abrupt conclusion. On the one hand religious art almost ceased, and thus a great source of occupation for the painter and the sculptor disappeared; on the other, wealth found baser demands upon it in the religious wars which so soon devastated Germany. Holbein could not find a living in his fatherland;\* Cranach and others were reduced to employing their genius on the coarsest and most repulsive of theological caricatures; Dürer laments that "in our country and time the art of painting should by some be much despised and be asserted to serve only idolatry." Luther himself, in his sermons against the Iconoclasts, blames only the manner of removal of the works of art from the churches, not the removal itself. "It should have been preached," he said, "that the pictures were nothing, and that it was no service to God to put them up; if this had been done the pictures would have disappeared of themselves." But others were far from being so tolerant even as this: "It were ten thousand times better," they cried, "that the pictures were in hell or in the hottest oven rather than in the houses of God." And we hear of the churches being stormed and the images and pictures trodden under foot. Down in the south under the influence of Zwingli the works of art in the churches of Zürich, Bern, Basel, St. Gallen, and other towns, were committed to the flames or the melting-pot, in some cases by the Protestant mob, in others by order of the authorities. Honest Hans Sachs, too, bemoans the decay of art, though he does not recognize its cause:—"Formerly art flourished, all corners were full of learned men, skilful workers and artists, and books enough and to spare. Now the arts are neglected and despised, few are their disciples, and these looked upon as dreamers; the world runs after pleasure and money; the Muses have deserted the Fatherland!" Still more mournful is another follower of the new Gospel:—"God has by the peculiar divine ordinance of His holy word now in our time in the whole German nation brought about a noteworthy contempt for all the fine and free arts." Only just now in the nineteenth century are certain earnest workers trying to rouse among the masses that love for the beautiful which gave art such a potent influence in mediæval folk-education.

Equally destructive was the effect of the Wittenberg movement

---

\* Cf. the expressive sentence: "God has cursed all who make pictures." —Woltmann's "Holbein," p. 356.

on literature. All thought was directed into theological channels, every pen was busied with doctrinal controversy, the very printers refused to accept anything but controversial and theological works, because those were what found the greatest sale; the more violent, the more mud-bespattering a tract was, the greater the number of editions authorized or plagiarized! Even the stage itself was perverted to sectarian purposes, and a mass of plays concerned with abuse of the Pope and the Catholic Church, checked that advance which had been so marked under Hans Sachs and his contemporaries. The remarkable didactic literature and satire of folly ceased, or rather was transformed into theological pasquinade, while, according to Gervinus, folk-song and folk-book decayed rapidly with the sixteenth century.\* It has been occasionally stated that if the vernacular literature of Germany was at a low ebb in the sixteenth century, at least it produced one all-sufficing writer—Luther. While recognizing Luther's enormous power of language, we think that this oft-repeated statement, that Luther was the founder of modern German literature, arises rather from ignorance of preceding and coeval writings, than from any careful comparison. Luther distinctly was a linguistic giant, but he was only a step in a long development, and we are not prepared to admit that controversial theology can ever take rank as pure literature. That the Germans themselves do not think so, may perhaps be judged from the tardy sale of the last edition of his works. If we turn to the more scholarly side of literature we find no one to replace Erasmus and Reuchlin. Protestantism after a time produced the plodding critic, and ultimately the independent investigator and man of letters arose, but arose not infrequently to throw off Christianity or at least Protestantism altogether. Some will perhaps be inclined to quote Casaubon, but even if we disregard the fact that Casaubon was a Calvinist, and "Calvinism, intolerant as it was, was not so narrow nor had it so cramping an effect on the mind as the contemporary Lutheranism,"† still it must be remembered that Casaubon was no Humanist, he had none of the spirit of Erasmus. He approved of the burning of Legatt, that "feeble imitation by the English Church of the great crime of Calvin"; he wished the body of Stapleton to be dug up and burnt, because he had used extravagant expressions with regard to the power of the Church. Shortly, he was narrow in the extreme;—a man who could believe that the Greek equivalents of Christ's Hebrew speeches were put directly into the mouths of the Gospel writers by the Holy Ghost! But even Casaubon was French, and Scaliger thoroughly

---

\* The decay, such as it is, may be marked by a comparison of Eulenspiegel and Dr. Faustus. We are not inclined to lay stress upon it.

† Cf. Mr. Pattison's "Isaac Casaubon," pp. 73, 244, 502, &c.

expresses the state of Germany in the words: "It is Germany, look you, Germany, once the mother of learning and learned men, that is now turning the service of letters into brigandage."

Closely connected with literature comes the subject of education. The work of the Humanists in this direction cannot be overrated. How far was it adopted by the Reformers? The almost general reconstruction of the German universities by the Humanists is too well known to need repetition here. One after another became centres for the new culture, and their general intellectual activity is one of the most pleasing characteristics of the age. Education was, as we have before noted, the fundamental instrument by which the Humanists hoped to reform the Church, and the success of their educational schemes can hardly be questioned. But they did not confine their endeavours to the universities. Jacob Wimpheling (of whose pedagogic works 30,000 copies were sold in twenty years) was essentially a school-reformer. He it was who broke down the old scholastic system, and declared that grammar and dialectic were not the best means of expanding the youthful mind. He insisted on the need of inculcating reverence and morality, while special subjects of education were to be chosen suited to each individual child. Noteworthy for our purpose are his words in the "Adolescentia":—"The instruction of boys and the young in good morals is of the utmost importance to the Christian religion and the reformation of the Church. The reformation of the Catholic Church to its primitive purity ought to begin with the young, because its deformation began with their evil and worthless instruction." Could the Humanistic conception be more clearly expressed? The *true* reformation can only be brought about by a *process of genuine education*. It would have been well if Luther had understood this law of development! It is one of the most striking examples of theological bias, that the term "Preceptor of Germany" has been transferred from Wimpheling to Melanchthon. It is true Melanchthon was one of the few cultured Lutheran teachers, and that he wrote certain schoolbooks, but it is very doubtful whether even the titles of these works would have survived had not their author won a name for himself in other matters. How many have ever investigated Melanchthon's theory of education at first hand, and of those who have done so, what proportion have taken the trouble to compare his theory with Wimpheling's?\* Melanchthon's views as to the constitution of a "reformed" school are given in the "Instructions of the Saxon Church Visitors" (1528).

---

\* How theological bias reacts even on independent writers may be noted in Mr. Browning's recent "History of Educational Theories," wherein we seek in vain for even the name of Wimpheling!

One cannot help being startled by the barren formalism of his system ; he has nothing to propose beyond the old Latin Trivial School, and he is years behind the Brethren of Deventer, and immeasurably behind Wimpfeling. In this respect Luther is far greater than Melanchthon ; his book to "the Town-Councillors of Germany upon the organizing of Christian Schools" (1524), contains many noble thoughts, and it was written before he had learnt to despise and fear human reason. But the main object even in this work was sectarian. Luther had recognized the enormous power which the education of the young confers on a church, and he was not slow in endeavouring to avail himself of it. His gospel and church were to be the first to profit by the proposed educational organization. One of the greatest difficulties of the reformers was to obtain men of any culture or learning as evangelical preachers ; it is the constantly recurring dilemma of the Church Visitors that they cannot dismiss the unfit or even Catholic clergy, because they have no theologians to replace them. From Luther downwards we have constant complaints that no one will study divinity, that the Protestant universities and schools do not furnish the necessary evangelical ministers. Praiseworthy as Luther's attempts in 1524 were, they by no means point to a great school reform. The reformers might have made the humanistic education their own ; they did not seize their opportunity. Mr. Browning has very truly observed in his "History of Educational Theories," that had the Protestants adopted the new method of instruction, they might have advanced by a hundred years the intelligence of modern Europe. They not only failed to adopt it, but by the turmoil of their movement checked indefinitely the revival of learning in Germany. Their universities and schools fell into decay, and it is mournful to read their self-confessions, their consciousness of the difference between past and present.

The result of the Reformation, if not the later teaching of Luther, was the handing over of reason bound and chained to an emotional faith ; all learning was to be the outcome of a "natural light." Christians were taught immediately by God ; the whole of the Aristotelian philosophy was a "creation of the devil," and all speculative science sin and error. In Strassburg, the Protestants proclaimed that no other languages or studies beyond Hebrew were necessary ; others held that there must be no study whatever but the Bible ; above all, Latin and Greek were superfluous and harmful. Preachers declared from the pulpit that the inexperienced youth must be warned from studying, and that all learning was a deceit of the devil. It is true that Melanchthon wrote that such preachers ought to have their tongues cut out ; but were they not the natural result of Luther's doctrine of the blindness of the human reason ? Nay, had not Luther

himself written : "The universities deserve to be ground to powder ; nothing savouring more of hell or devil has come upon earth from the beginning of the world. . . . All the world thinks that they are the springs whence flow those who should teach the folk ; that is a hopeless error, for no more abominable thing has come upon the earth than the universities." What wonder that such words—often the outcome of transient passion—should have been seized by the ignorant, and led the folk to despise education ? What wonder that cobbler and tinker mounted the pulpit—too often quarrelling on the steps—and proclaimed a new age, when learning should not be the study of years, but somehow directly revealed by God to those of the true—their own—faith ? Erasmus, the apostle of culture, was bitter in his lamentations over the decay of all earnest study where the new *piety* appeared. Still later in the century, Dresser, the Protestant Professor of Greek in Erfurt, wrote : "There is no hope, no prospect of saving learning any longer ; in this decrepit time its total decay and collapse approaches. Note how all learned occupations are laid aside, the schools stand empty, knowledge is despised !" The Protestant Major loses all hope when he thinks of the glowing eagerness, the unrestrainable desire for knowledge in the old dark Catholic days of his youth, and compares it with the idleness and the neglect of study under the rays of the recently kindled light of Protestantism. From 1550 to 1600 we have endless complaints from the Protestants of the utter decay and collapse of their schools. They could find (even as Luther had found in Wittenberg) no other cause to which they might attribute it, than the direct interference of the devil, who must bear an intense hatred to men in possession of the true gospel !\*

So much then follows from a comparison of the methods of the Erasmian and Lutheran Reformations : that totally different in their aims, the one proposed a gradual educational change, the other proceeded to a violent destruction. Before we can judge between the two, we must endeavour to answer the following questions : Had Erasmus any chance of success ? And, secondly, admitting that the sacrifice of intellectual progress may be justifiable, if it is accompanied by the increased moral and social welfare of the lower classes, we may ask :—Did the Reformation improve the moral and social condition of the German people ?

What chance of success had Erasmus ? It must be remembered that the Humanistic proposals were not of a revolutionary character, not those, at least, of the older party, who fell more

---

\* The evidence for the decay of schools and universities in Protestant Germany has been collected by Dollinger, "Die Reformation" I. 420-545. Although this book, from its sectarian bias, must be read with great caution, our own investigations are in material agreement with it on this point.



directly under the influence of Erasmus. They embraced an educational reform, which must from its very nature be a gradual change. To say, then, that Erasmus was not successful in his attempts, because monkish abuses still remained, is quite beside the point. The investigation must turn on the progress which had been made, and the probability of its advancing with increasing yet stable rapidity. Neither a church nor a nation can be educated in one man's lifetime; it is the labour of long years. Erasmus would have gradually revived existing institutions, that they might have aided the intellectual development of mankind. Luther pulled them down; but his attempt to reconstruct upon his own unaided theory was by no means a success. How far did the older Humanists succeed in revivifying ecclesiastical institutions? We hold, to a far greater degree than is generally supposed. The German schools and universities, with few exceptions, had suffered a transformation, which, considering its magnitude and rapidity, can only be described as magical. There was a quite unparalleled spiritual activity, and this of no narrow dogmatical kind, from Vienna to Strassburg, and from Erfurt to Basel.\* We have already pointed out how emancipated the Pope and the princes of the church had become, how they were the patrons of art and letters, and how thoroughly they were in sympathy with the Erasmian spirit. We have evidence enough that the Humanistic influence had begun to be felt not only in the cloisters, but among the clergy. Great moral preachers arose among the people; theology itself could hardly be accused of sluggishness in an age which could lay claim to such men as Cusanus, Heynlin von Stein, Trithemius, Geiler von Kaiserberg, and Gabriel Biel. The consciousness of the spiritual leaders of the people was again aroused; special preachers were appointed for the folk throughout the various German towns. In vernacular sermons and didactic works special stress was laid on the moral and practical side of Christianity. The press served for the popularizing of religious ideas; edition after edition of the Biblical books was offered to the public and eagerly bought up. Collections of sermons, religious contemplations, prayer and confessional books in the vernacular, followed each other in rapid succession, and marked a revival of the religious spirit both in the clergy and laity. A succession of cultured and high-minded bishops like John von Dalberg appeared in the German Church at the close of the fifteenth century.

"We note how the bishops compete with one another in visiting the

---

\* A most characteristic picture of the rise of a German university under the Humanists and its collapse with the Reformation, is given in Kampfschulte's "Die Universität Erfurt," 1858-60.

convents in their dioceses, in order to effect in them the re-establishment of the old discipline; we see them founding and extending educational establishments to forward theological and theologico-humanistic studies; we find that, according to the canons of the church, they hold periodical synods to collect their clergy about them, and to issue detailed instructions for their guidance. We note how the leading spirits of the learned world are on terms of the most friendly and confidential intimacy with the princes of the church; how, in harmony as to the goal of their mission in life, they labour and strive together with united powers."\*

Assuredly the reformation of Erasmus was a possible one, and had in 1517 made wondrous progress. This union between the leaders of the Church and the leaders of thought is one of its most noteworthy features. But in the work for the education of the clergy and the elevation of the folk, the general progress of knowledge is not forgotten. Noteworthy is the battle between the Dominicans and the Humanists for the freedom of study, which occupied the early years of the sixteenth century. We cannot enter into the Pfefferkorn-Reuchlin controversy here, but we may note two facts concerning it. The first is, that among the supporters of Reuchlin were men whom the Reformation was soon to convert into the bitterest foes; Erasmus and Hutten, Luther and Eck, Melanchthon and Cochlaeus, Spalatin and Carlstadt, all declare themselves Reuchlinists! The second fact, which is of extreme interest for our present purpose, is, that the first two judgments of the leaders of the Church are *in favour of the Humanists*; only after Luther has commenced his battle against the Church, does Rome pronounce a third judgment *against* Reuchlin. The outbreak of Luther causes the Church to reject Humanism, and is the death-blow of the Erasmian Reformation! What else could the Church do? Had not Luther expressed his admiration of Reuchlin, and in Luther's rebellion did it not seem as if the whole body of Humanists, were moving against the Church? In an instant Luther was hailed as a deliverer by all classes of the people. The Humanists believed he had come as a new champion of learning, who would sweep away the ignorance and obstinacy of the "obscure men." Pirkheimer, Ulrich von Hutten, Crotus Rubianus, Mutian, even Erasmus, welcomed Luther as a new ally in their battle against monkish stupidity. Humanistic moralists like Brant and Wimpheling, waited anxiously for the result of what they thought only an attack on the immorality of the clergy. The denizens of the towns and the German people generally looked upon Luther as the giant who had come to free them from ecclesias-

---

\* Cf. Maurenbrecher, "Geschichte der katholischen Reformation," B. i. S. 80; also S. 60-80 generally.

tical extortions, to put an end to the "grievances of the German nation." The peasantry hoped in some mysterious fashion that Luther would free them from tithes and the growing oppression of Roman Law. The princes and nobles were not slow in seeing in Luther an instrument, whereby they might satisfy their own peculiar greeds. Lastly, there were some simple, homely folk, who imagined that Luther was about to teach a form of primitive Christianity, a general reign of brotherly love, some hitherto unrealized union of communism and pietism. This class was not infrequent among the peasantry ; it was the source of the various sects generally classed as Anabaptists, and driven alike by Catholic and Protestant persecution into fanaticism. Those who would understand the earlier writings of Luther must grasp clearly his relation to these various groups, and his endeavours to satisfy each of them. The Diet at Worms marks the extreme height of Luther's popularity. Eobanus Hesse, Pirkheimer, Hutten, and other Humanists hailed his journey southwards. Franz von Sickingen promised him more material aid in case of need ; the Elector of Saxony was his protector ; the citizens made his entries into Erfurt and Worms triumphal processions ; and on the very day after Luther's audience, a threat to march with 8,000 men against his Papal foes was found nailed to the door of the council house. It concluded with the cry of peasant insurrection :—"Bundschuh, Bundschuh, Bundschuh !"

It is of peculiar moment in judging the value of the Reformation, to mark how one by one the various parties we have noted ceased to be supporters of Luther. Gradually the Humanists learned that the Reformation was not making for learning and culture ; that it was destroying the schools, and introducing a race of theologians, who were as narrow and as bitter as their old enemies the monks ; they saw the "obscure men" perpetuated in a new class of dogmatists, and ignorance and passion trampling knowledge under foot. Erasmus withdrew the approval he had once given to Luther, regretting that he had not exhibited the same zeal in avoiding violence and preaching morality as he had in defending dogma. Erasmus saw new tyrants, but not a spark of the gospel spirit. Above all, he noted the increasing immorality of the people and the collapse of true learning. Reuchlin, once the great opponent of monkish bigotry, tried to recall his nephew Melancthon from Wittenberg, and, failing, withdrew from him the promised legacy of his library. He died in the Catholic Church. To that Church Pirkheimer also was reconciled—Pirkheimer, whose satire on Dr. Eck had caused him to be included in the Papal Bull against Luther. "I confess," he writes, "that at first I was good Lutheran, even as our late Albrecht (Dürer), since we hoped that the Roman trickery, as well as the knavery of monk and priest would be bettered.

But, as one sees, matters have grown worse, so that these evangelical rogues make the former appear pious. . . . I hoped, to begin with, for a certain spiritual freedom, but all now is obviously turned to pleasure of the flesh, so that these latter things are far worse than the first." In like spirit, Crocius Rubianus, the Humanist, who had conceived the bitterest satire ever written against monkdom, who had hailed, with his chosen comrade Hutten, the outbreak of the Reformation, returned full of bitterness at the growing immorality and the destruction of culture to the Catholic faith.

"In most places," he writes, "where the anti-papists rule, severe laws have already been published against the confessors of the old religion. He who does not renounce all intercourse with the papists must go to prison or purchase his freedom by a heavy fine. Woe to him who dares to enter a papist Church, to hear a sermon there or attend mass, to confess to a priest or perform any ecclesiastical rite! The new dispensation which came from Heaven yesterday has its watchful spies, with Argus eyes, ready to denounce the offender to the judge. . . . O just law, so wholly eye and ear with regard to observation of ecclesiastical routine, but with regard to the adulterer, the blasphemer, struck with blindness and sunk in the deepest sleep!"

Do not these words of Rubianus lay out clearly before us the cause why the Humanists deserted Luther? They had wished for a "spiritual freedom," for a cessation of dogma, for a new and broader view of life and thought; and they found themselves treated to Augsburg confessions and the pitiable tyranny of evangelical church regulations!

Still worse fared the simple folk who had hoped to find in the new gospel the foundation of a millennium of Christian love and charity. Their pious enthusiasm was the stumbling-block of the Lutherans; they carried Luther's own gospel to its logical outcome, and claimed in their turn that freedom of belief which Luther had demanded from Rome for himself, but which he practically refused to others. Luther saw that the mass of the people were drawn rather to this primitive faith than to his peculiar dogmas, and as Melancthon and he were unable to convince these sectaries by argument, at first banishment, and then the sword and the stake, became the chief weapons of Protestant logic.\* In such a book as Luther's 1532 tract "Upon Sneaks and 'Hole-and-Corner' Preachers," we have all the hatred of an established and privileged Church against any trespassers on its domain. Closely related to the Anabaptists were the

---

\* Luther attributes the obstinacy of the early Anabaptists to the "influence of the devil." The writings of Luther, Melancthon, and other Protestants against these simple folk are the quintessence of bigotry and the narrowest theological intolerance.

oppressed peasants, only these latter found out their delusion at an earlier date and suffered complete discomfiture. In 1525 the brutal tyranny of princes and nobles reached its height, and the peasants broke into open rebellion. We have lying open before us now the original Twelve Articles printed and circulated by the peasant leaders. This curious tract tells its own tale of oppression and delusion. It appeals throughout to the "Holy Evangely" as Luther's teaching was then termed. Article 6 demands that all parsons and vicars shall be called upon to teach and preach the "Gospel," and on their refusal shall be dismissed from office. The claims of the peasants would appear to most modern readers very far from unreasonable. Noteworthy is the naming of umpires to decide between the peasants and their oppressors; immediately following the Imperial Stathalter are placed Duke Friedrich of Saxony, together with Martin Luther, Philip Melancthon or "Pomeran" (Bugenhagen). We have thus the most complete evidence of how the peasants interpreted Luther's teaching. From the purely historical standpoint it is absolutely impossible to deny that the preaching of Luther and his followers was the *immediate* cause of the peasant rebellion. Doubtless Luther's doctrine of "evangelical freedom" was grasped by the peasants in a cruder fashion than he meant, yet it was most certainly the spark which set on fire the inflammatory material collected and heaped up by oppression.\* A man, who appeals to the unlearned masses, is responsible, not only for his direct statements, but for the results which may arise from the misunderstanding of his audience. Luther's position was at the time of this outbreak an extremely difficult one. In his first book on the 'Twelve Articles he endeavours to act the part of umpire. He tells the princes that the peasants' demand for the "pure gospel" is a most justifiable one, and does not hesitate to attribute the outbreak to the conduct of the princes and nobles, "more especially to you, ye blind bishops, ye mad priests and monks." On the other hand, he defends serfdom to the peasantry on Biblical grounds. "There shall be no serf, since Christ has made us all free! What is that? That is making Christian freedom purely of the flesh. Had not Abraham and other patriarchs and prophets serfs also? Read St. Paul what he teaches of servants, who in his day were all serfs." "Therefore this article is directly against the Gospel, and robbery, since each takes from his lord that body which belongs to him." But this position of umpire was impossible for Luther; it would in all probability have led to the collapse of his Gospel between

---

\* This has been very strongly expressed by Maurenbrecher, "Die katholische Reformation," Bd. i. p. 257. Cf. also p. 275.

the two parties. After a few weeks' consideration Luther threw in his lot with the princes. His tract "Against the Murderous and Rapacious Rabble of Peasants" (1525), is the most terrible appeal to bloodshed ever published by a minister of Christ's Church. It is the first manifesto of the doctrine, afterwards generally adopted by the Reformers, of the divine institution of all civil authority, and the duty of implicit obedience on the part of all subjects, alike in matters spiritual and temporal.\*

"A rebel," he writes in this book, "is outlawed by God and Kaiser, therefore who can and will first slaughter such a man, does right well; since upon such a common rebel every man is alike judge and executioner. Therefore who can, shall here openly or secretly smite, slaughter, and stab, and hold that there is nothing more harmful, more poisonous, more devilish than a rebellious man. . . . O Lord God, when such spirit is in the peasants, it is high time that they were slaughtered like mad dogs."

Luther tells the princes that they are commanded by the Gospel, so long as the blood flows in their veins, to slay such folk. Those who are killed in such contest are true martyrs before God. Carlyle has described Luther's conduct in the matter of the Peasants' War as showing a "noble strength very different from spasmodic violence." We again venture to express our opinion, "that it is the most terrible appeal to bloodshed ever published by a minister of Christ's Church." Nothing could excuse it, not even the news of the Weinsberg atrocities, had it reached Wittenberg before the publication of the book. It was the death-blow of Lutheranism as a popular movement; henceforth the Reformation was carried out by the order and force of the temporal powers, the folk being indifferent or even hostile; henceforth Luther depends for support on the greed of princes or the rapacity of town-councillors. Before 1530 he has lost the support not only of the Humanists, the party of culture, but even of the mass of the folk. The tyranny of petty princes has received the sanction of the Reformers, and learning has been crushed under the heel of theological dogma. It remains only for us to consider how a Reformation carried through under these auspices affected the social and moral condition of the people.

A comparison between the condition of the masses in 1500 and 1550, far exceeds anything which can possibly be attempted within the limits of an article of the present kind. It is a ques-

---

\* See, however, Luther's "Von weltlicher Obrigkeit," 1523. Luther himself declares that he was the first to state the divine origin of all civil power. (Werke, Bd. xxxi. S. 24). See also Melancthon's "Wider die Artikel der Bauernschaft," where the argument is based on Rom. xiii. 1.

tion purely of statistics, and these often of the dullest nature. Hitherto the question has been entirely neglected by Protestant historians, and we owe most of our information on the subject to Catholic authors writing with an obvious tendency. Notwithstanding this, however, we have evidence more than enough to show a complete break-up of the social and moral condition of the German people. How far this was due to the direct teaching of the Reformers is a matter of the utmost importance. If the Reformation only checked culture, if freedom of thought and the rational method have only grown up in spite of the Reformation—because the theologians were not sufficiently united to suppress them—then the influence of the Reformation upon the social and moral welfare of the people will be the crucial question which must determine our judgment of Luther and his movement. Mr. Beard has thought fit to refer to this crucial question in a short note only to his Fourth Lecture. He there comes to the conclusion that “the Reformation did not at first carry with it much cleansing force of moral enthusiasm.” If Mr. Beard is referring solely to Germany, we are compelled to add that neither “at first” nor “at last” did the Lutheran movement carry with it any force of moral enthusiasm. It reduced the parts of Germany it touched to a moral torpor; for almost the whole of the two following centuries Germany’s social as well as literary life was “stale, flat, and unprofitable.” Only the emancipation of thought, the reaction against all religious dogma in the eighteenth century, awoke Germany from her slumbers. What Mr. Beard relegates to a note is, we hold, the ground upon which the Reformation must ultimately be judged. We have before remarked that the Catholic Church was the basis of mediæval social life; we have drawn attention to the triumph of the Roman over the Canon Law, and the reduction of the peasant to a serf; we have noted how intimately the decay of the guild system was connected with the collapse of the Church; we have yet to place before the reader some evidence of the direct influence of the Lutheran doctrines upon the morality of the folk. We shall confine ourselves here to two of them: the one relating to redemption by faith alone, the other to the meaning of marriage. On both these points we must again repeat a caution we have given above—namely, that it is not sufficient excuse for Luther to say that his doctrines were misunderstood. He did not publish them in a form intended only for scholars, he thrust them into the hands of the ignorant, and he must be held responsible for the results of their interpretation.

The emphasis which Luther laid upon the doctrine of justification by faith alone has identified it for ever with the Reformation; so greatly was he enamoured of it, that he introduced in

the ardour of his passion the word "alone" into his translation of Romans iii. 28, a passage which certainly does not contain any such word in the most corrupt manuscript. Any dogma which lays, or appears to lay, stress only on the inner faith of the individual, is liable to most dangerous misconceptions. It misses what now-a-days would be so generally acknowledged as the chief function of religion—the insistence on an upright, loving, pure life. Instead of making it the first concern of man to live well in this world, it busies him particularly with the method of obtaining a satisfactory life hereafter. The individual retires into himself, he is satisfied that his faith will save his own soul, he becomes almost, or quite, regardless of the material welfare of his neighbour. It is not surprising, then, to find that sects grew up—even as under similar circumstances they had done among the Mahomedans—who based upon this doctrine the theory that to the believer all things (even the most immoral) are permitted. Luther, of course, would have rejected any such enormity; still it was the logical outcome of his statement, that the works of the righteous, or rather elect, are all alike good; the most unimportant actions, and the greatest self-sacrifice, have the same worth before God. Obviously, such a theory destroys the possibility of a moral ideal, which, only by continuous struggling, man can gradually approach. "God," said Luther, "does not ask how many and how great are our works, but how great is our faith? . . . Thou owest God nought but confession and belief. In all other matters thou art free to do as thou wilt, without any danger of conscience." It is perfectly true that if real faith be defined as that which is always followed by good works, such expressions are harmless. But the danger of emphasizing a merely subjective state of the emotions instead of a particular course of action as the key to salvation can hardly be over-estimated in treating of the moral value of a dogma. To the great uncultured masses it is all-important to insist upon good works, upon a pure, charitable life, as the means to redemption. Is it not easy to understand how teaching like the following was misinterpreted by the folk? "The proposition that good works are needful for salvation must be entirely rejected, since it is false and fabricated that good works are needful, either to justification or salvation." "There is no law sanctioned by God Himself which demands a single work from the believer as necessary for salvation." "Works do nothing; only consider one thing as needful—to hear God's Word and believe it—that suffices and nothing else." How the folk understood these expressions was very soon obvious. "Under Popery," Luther himself writes, "people were charitable and generous, but now under the Gospel nobody gives any longer; now every man skins



his brother, and each will alone have all. The longer the Gospel is preached, the deeper people sink in pride, greed, and luxury." What a strange confession of failure lies in this, though Luther hardly recognized its cause! Such complaints as to the absolute decay of charity are constantly repeated by the Reformers; they can obtain no support for either the clergy, the churches, or the schools. Formerly, Luther tells us on another occasion, every town according to its size supported several convents, to say nothing of mass-priests and charitable foundations; but under the new dispensation, men refused to support two or three preachers and instructors of youth in a town, even when it was not out of their own property, but out of that which had been left from Popish times. It is a fact, which is no less true of Germany than of England, that of the property of the old church, which passed into the hands of the princes and town councillors, but very little was again applied to charitable or public purposes. Most pitiable are the lamentations of the Church Visitors over the decay of charity. The lower orders throughout Saxony refused not alone voluntary but even legal church dues. In 1525, Luther wrote, that unless very stringent measures were taken there would soon be neither preachers nor parsonages, neither schools nor scholars. In some villages, the religious spirit had entirely died out; three or four person went to church; the peasants marched about with drums during the service; or even the building itself had been converted into a sheepstall, or made a depository for Whitsun-beer; still in other cases we read of the beer-cans being handed about during the sermon, or of the peasants threatening to stone their parsons. The clergy itself had sunk frightfully. One minister had three wives living, another did not even know the Ten Commandments, a third earned his living as a weaver, while in many cases two or more livings had to be thrown together in order to obtain support for one preacher. In some villages the Visitors declared that the only remedy was the "executioner and the stocks." The moral decay of both peasantry and clergy is extraordinary; both are given to drink, both to sexual vice. In one small village alone there were fifteen illegitimate children in one year. One parson is described as "tolerably good," but he does not receive unqualified praise, because of his passion for drinking. Most charitable foundations had disappeared, to a great extent appropriated by the nobility; the revenues of the parsons had melted away; the parsonages were tumbling down, and cattle fed in the open churchyards. The schools were in a most pitiable condition, even if they continued to exist, and the monastery schools had of course disappeared with the monks. Villages had sold their church ornaments and vessels to pay the commune debts,

or appropriated church funds for a like purpose. Scarcely anywhere in the rural districts was there the faintest trace of enthusiasm for the new dispensation. In one town, however, we find a Lutheran Council had been elected; they had bought out the nuns and shut up their convents; they had dismissed the eighteen monks with thirty gulden apiece, and their guardian with double that sum. All the provisions or movables of the convent had been given away or sold; the windows had been transferred to the "Kaufhaus"; innumerable persons had been found ready to take charge of the large stock of cheese and lard left by the monks. "One sees," as the historian of the events naïvely remarks, "in what a short time a town government, inclined to Luther's views, could accomplish an immense amount; it is the towns peculiarly that we have to thank for their great services in forwarding the Reformation."\* Such was the state of the Saxon Church under Luther's very nose in 1528. We by no means propose to place all these failings upon his shoulders; some of them were undoubtedly a legacy from Papal times, others (more directly due to the Reformation) were a result of the Peasant War; but enough remains to show that the destruction of the Catholic Church involved a break-up of social life in Saxony. It is quite sufficient for our purpose if we can convince the reader that the so-called Reformation did not improve the condition of the people, clergy and laity alike; if it did not, it failed in its object. What we have here described, on the report of the Visitors in 1528, is very closely akin to what we learn from Church Visitations, even till the Thirty Years War destroys all possibility of judging between cause and effect. It is quite true that the number of "stubborn Papists" with whom the Visitors met, became fewer and fewer, but as one of the chief functions of successive Visitations had been to get rid of them, this is scarcely to be wondered at. In 1539 we find the schools still in a miserable condition, and the people themselves quite indifferent to education. The general tendency of the time was, as Musa reports, against learned, but especially against clerical, occupations; above all, charity no longer provided for the poor strolling scholar. The Reformers found themselves in absolute need of men of the most moderate education for their Church. In 1532, in the second Visitation, we find the old complaints as to the unthankfulness of the people towards the new gospel. On the other hand uniformity has become an absolute law. All who defend articles of belief, other than appear in the printed "Instruction of the Visitors,"

---

\* Burkhardt: "Geschichte der sächsischen Kirchen- und Schulvisitationen," 1879, p. 67, *et ante*.

are to be banished from the country. The increasing moral decay of the folk is to be checked by stringent regulations ; crime, swearing, gambling, drunkenness, adultery and the "passionate discussion of the dogmas of religion in the taverns" are to be investigated and punished by ecclesiastical superintendents. We find the same difficulties as to the support of the clergy, the same complaints as to the concession of churches and church property ; one church has become a granary, the property of another has been used to build a tavern and so forth. Childish were the means the Visitors took to bring people into the church ; those who did not attend the baptismal service were not to partake of the baptismal feast ; irregular communicants were to be banished from the parish.\* We note the beginning of a new and worse ecclesiastical tyranny.

At the same time in the Wittenberg district itself matters were still more deplorable. The laity were given not to charity but to dissoluteness in its widest meaning ; many had quarrelled with the clergy and for long years abstained from the sacrament. Parsonages were in ruin, the cattle frequented or were even driven to the churchyard. The villagers refused the preacher his dues, or met together to consume them in drink. In the lordship of Schwarzburg the Visitors found forty-six Protestant and seven Catholic priests. Eight or nine Protestants, although permitted to marry, were living with concubines, as also five of their Catholic brethren. Not only are these early Church Visitations strong evidence of the want of a "force of moral enthusiasm" in the Lutheran movement, but they are the best record we have of the method of the Reformers. Most strange is the picture of the manner in which the evangelical faith was forced upon the semi-dependent principalities and bishoprics ; they were compelled to accept Lutheranism whether they would or not ; monks and nuns were forbidden to wear the dress of their Order, were pensioned off, or allowed to await their end in a convent where the old religious life had been entirely prohibited. Many, who thus found themselves deprived of the only reasons for the ascetic life returned again into the world, or wandered into Catholic countries ; thus assisting the rapid process of secularization. In 1535 we find much the same condition of things ; the Visitors complain of an increase of godlessness, contempt of the divine Word, small attendance at church, and almost total refraining from communion. Then we hear of most extraordinary behaviour during Divine service, increase of vices of all kinds in a most marked degree, and, above all, of the *sad collapse of conjugal relations*.† Even the conduct of the clergy calls for the gravest

---

\* Burkhardt, p. 140.

† *Ibid.* pp. 198-9.

reprobation. Everywhere there was a want of that spiritual supervision which had ceased with the old Church. Such must suffice to give the reader some conception of the Saxon clergy and laity under the influence of the Reformation. There was most undoubtedly a break-up of social and moral relations, and more than one Protestant of that day was bold enough to attribute it directly to Luther's doctrine of redemption. Noteworthy is the almost unanimous rejection of the same doctrine by the sects of primitive Christians which grew up so rapidly among the folk. They declared that Christ had given a model for life, rather than a mere matter for belief. To this "babble of faith" they attributed the increase in adultery, greed and drink. We will conclude this subject by a characteristic but by no means unique passage from the writings of Schwenkfeld:—

"One may reasonably accuse the Lutherans of discarding external matters as unnecessary for salvation, since they not only teach that faith alone, *sola fides*, makes a man righteous and holy, but with complete indiscretion write and have written so sharply and severely against the good works of faith that many have entirely discarded all good works and godliness, while an atrocious godless manner of existence has become frequent. Alas! it is everywhere obvious that the masses do not know what to make of good works. How can it be otherwise, since these men have taught and written from the beginning that good works, even the best, are sins; nay, even that a righteous man sins in all good works!"\*

Turning to our second point, the theory of marriage, we have first to note the historical fact and then to search for its cause. The undoubted fact is the decay of social purity, the collapse of the sanctity of marriage in Germany during the sixteenth century. Not only do we find strange evidence of this in the reports of the Visitors, but both Protestants and Humanists bear witness to the same effect. In one Protestant university we hear of the moral conduct being such "as Bacchus and Venus might prescribe to their following." Luther himself is continually crying out against the moral collapse in Saxony itself, and even compares it unfavourably with what had been under Popery. Weary of battling against this increasing mass of disorder, he exclaims in despair: "It would almost seem as if our Germany, after the great light of the Gospel, had become possessed of the devil." Melancthon attributes the greater difficulties of government to the increasing immorality of the folk. Luxury, shamelessness and riotousness are ever extending. Bugenhagen, Osiander,

\* Many expressions in Luther's works quite justify what some might fancy to be an exaggeration of Schwenkfeld's.

Mathesius, and other evangelical preachers bear evidence to the decay of social purity; they attribute it not to the collapse of the old religious sanctions, but to the singular activity of the devil. The growth of little communities and sects, who not only taught but practised polygamy and even promiscuous intercourse, is one of the peculiar features of the time. It is necessary to inquire whether any ground can be found for these results in the teaching of the Reformers. There has been much discussion recently with regard to Luther's sermons on marriage, and it is necessary to say a few words about them here. These sermons bear dates varying from 1519 to 1545, and we may state generally that the same conception of marriage runs through all of them; they contain Luther's views as a Protestant, and are essentially opposed to the doctrine of the Catholic Church. The most characteristic of these sermons were preached by Luther as an evangelical teacher from the Wittenberg pulpit. They were likewise preached to an audience mixed as to age and sex. We will say nothing here of their coarseness, allowing that to be peculiar at least to a certain section of the age;\* we have to consider only their teaching. The Catholic Church had before Luther taught that marriage was a sacrament. We should be the last to defend the truth of such a conception, but we must call attention to the fact, that it emphasized something beyond the physical in the conjugal relation, it endowed it with a *spiritual* side. The conception of marriage as a spiritual as well as physical relation, seems to us the essential condition of all permanent happiness between man and wife. The intellectual union superposed on the physical is precisely what raises human above brute intercourse. Those marriages which arise purely from instinctive impulse are notoriously the least stable. We believe that the spiritual side must be kept constantly in view, if the sanctity of marriage is to be preserved. Here it is that Luther, rejecting the conception of marriage as a sacrament, rushes with his usual impetuosity into the opposite and more dangerous extreme. He lays entire stress upon the physiological origin of the conjugal union. He teaches not only truly that chastity has no peculiar value in the eyes of God, but also that it is *impossible*, and directly contrary to the divine mandate. The vows of monks and nuns are void because they have vowed an

---

\* Sebastian Brant set his face against all forms of coarseness. "A new saint has arisen," he writes, "called Grobian, whom now all men on every side worship and honour with coarse words and dissolute works." Of this passage, Gervinus writes, "There was something great in attempting to stem such a torrent as this then was, and this aim Brant had." If the author of the "Ship of Fools" could resist the tendency of his time, might we not expect the same of the "hero as Priest?"

impossibility. He repeatedly proclaims from the pulpit that neither man nor woman can control the sexual impulses. He tells boys and girls that they cannot, nor does God bid them, resist their passions. They must either marry or do worse. A boy at latest when he is twenty, a girl between fifteen and eighteen, must marry, and "let God take care how the children are to be supported." This revolutionary doctrine of the impossibility of chastity Luther carries into the sanctity of wedded life; and makes statements at which the modern reader can only shudder. What Luther taught to the folk, old and young, man and woman, from the Wittenberg pulpit was repeated throughout the Protestant churches of Germany. Is it not necessary to connect the decay of social purity with the propagation of such doctrines as these? We are quite willing to allow that Luther's primary aim was to sweep away the mass of immorality which undoubtedly existed in the cloisters, and for this purpose it was needful to assert that the ascetic life was not a peculiarly holy one. But Luther, with his usual love of extreme dogma, propounded a doctrine which must be subversive of moral order. He took the lowest conceivable view of marriage, and the masses of the folk, ever ready to accept a physical impulse as a divine commandment, did not hesitate to embrace his theory, and carry it to most disastrous results.\*

There is another point to which his purely physical conception of marriage led him—namely, to what we are almost justified in terming, an approval of polygamy. It is a common, but quite erroneous, opinion to suppose that Luther only expressed his view on this matter in relation to the bigamy of Philip of Hesse. So early as 1521, Luther declared that polygamy was not forbidden by the word of God, but to avoid scandal and preserve decency, it was necessary to reject some things which were permitted to Christians. "It is well that the husband himself should be firm and certain in his own conscience that by the word of God this thing is allowable. . . . I must forsooth confess that I cannot prohibit any man from taking several wives, nor is it repugnant to the Scriptures." Melancthon went still further, and advised our Henry VIII. not to divorce his first wife, but to take another, because polygamy was not forbidden by the Divine law. We by no means assert that either Luther or Melancthon openly taught polygamy; but they did not strongly oppose it, and the result was obvious in their followers. Carlstadt was not the only

---

\* In 1518 Luther writes entirely from the Church standpoint. He remarks that God grants grace to unfruitful marriages, and concludes:—"Hæc si quis animadverteret, *facillime* concupiscentiam carnis refrenaret." De Matrimonio. Conciones, Opera Latina. Wittenberg, 1545, i., fol. xc.

Protestant who expressed open approval of polygamy, and in the tragedy of Münster, the doctrine was carried to the most direful extreme. It is precisely in the spirit of the above quotations that in 1540 Luther and Melancthon reply to the Landgrave of Hesse on his proposal to take a second wife. A special dispensation may be granted to him, if bigamy be the only means of preserving him from worse vices. Such bigamy is allowed in the law of Moses, and not forbidden in the Gospel. At the same time, it would not be wise to allow polygamy to the common folk on account of the scandal to which it would give rise. On this ground it is necessary that the second marriage be kept an absolute secret. There is no mention whatever that a second marriage is null and void, or tears up by the very roots the hitherto accepted Christian theory of marriage. Other Protestant divines, such as Bugenhagen and Butzer, gave their sanction to this wretched affair; and Philip's court chaplain preached after the ceremony on the legitimacy of polygamy! We cannot help seeing in the whole matter that doctrine of marriage which, disregarding the spiritual, lays all stress on the physical relation. The Protestant "sanction" did not arise merely from political necessity; as we have seen, Luther in 1524, and Melancthon in 1531, expressed opinions of an exactly similar kind. It was not out of keeping with a movement which throughout appealed rather to the passions than to the intellect, which at every turn sacrificed reason to the dictates of undisciplined emotion. With this slight reference to that which even Protestant theologians admit to be the black spot of the Reformation, we must close our consideration of the influence of that movement upon the moral condition of the German folk. That influence, as we have endeavoured to show, was not in favour of progress.

The facts which we have now laid before the reader will, we hope, enable him to form some judgment of how Luther must be considered in relation to modern culture. We are perfectly aware that it is possible to cite passages from his writings full of truth and piety; we leave to Catholic theologians the task of denouncing Luther as a knave, a sensualist, or a heretic; we decline entirely to discuss whether his dogmas were better or worse than those of the Catholic Church. We recognize to their full extent the abuses which that Church presented in the sixteenth century; we only ask, did Luther give the world anything of greater purity? Is it a fact that there was nothing to choose between the immorality and bigotry of Catholic and of Protestant clergy in the second half of the sixteenth century? We ask bluntly what have we to thank Luther for? For a particular set of dogmas? Dogmas are to us a matter of perfect indifference. For our freedom of thought? We reply that freedom of thought was

more possible in 1500 than a hundred years later, and that our present freedom is not the result of Luther's teaching any more than of Eck's. It arises merely from the fact that Luther, Eck, and their followers could not agree. The Protestants banished the free-thinking painters from Nürnberg, they burnt Conrad *in der Gasse*, in Basel, they executed Krauth, Moller, and other Anabaptists in Jena and elsewhere; they burnt Servetus in Geneva, they beheaded Hetzer in Constance (as is said on a charge of polygamy!). Shortly, their intolerance was, if anything, narrower than that of their Catholic brethren. We owe our freedom not to their doctrine but to their impotence. Toleration has grown to be a leading factor of our modern faith, in the very teeth of Protestant or at least Lutheran opposition. Again, does any one ask us to be grateful to Luther for modern culture? We answer, that he checked the growth of culture; that literature, and art, and scholarship, decayed under the influence of the Lutheran Church. Nay, if we are told that we must sacrifice intellectual progress for the sake of the moral and social welfare of the masses, we reply: willingly; but the German Reformation was a moral catastrophe to the folk. We refuse entirely to fall down and worship this man; we do not recognize him as a hero, or mark in him a great moral teacher. We see a reformation attempted by an appeal to passion, where we allow only the gradual influence of education to be effectual. We note the frustration of Erasmus's attempt at rational reform by a violent conjuration of emotional ignorance. History, it is true, cannot be rewritten; but the reason why we separate myth from fact is that we may learn history's true lesson; and the lesson of the Reformation is that all true progress of the folk at large can only be attained by a gradual process of education. Appeal to popular passions, and scholarship, culture and true morality will be dragged into contempt, and narrowness, intolerance, and ignorance will triumph. It is because we believe in the former as true essentials of human progress, that we sympathize with Erasmus, and see in his methods the methods of the future. It is on this ground that we hail the recent refusal of the University of Oxford—within whose walls Erasmus taught—to take any part in the glorification of Luther, as a manifesto of the modern historical spirit. We see in this decision, no victory of High Church over Low Church, but the triumph of the party of progress over obscurity.



## ART. II.—RACINE.

*Œuvres de Jean Racine.* Nouvelle Edition, avec Vie, &c.  
Paris : Garnier Frères. 1869-77.

IT must be frankly admitted that our neighbours across the channel of these days exhibit a veneration for the memory of their great classic writers which sometimes almost puts us to shame. We consider that we have done quite enough in England if we reproduce, from time to time, the works of one absorbing and favourite author. The predilections of the French are wider and more inclusive. The magnificent series of the leading authors of France, lately brought out by Messrs. Garnier Frères, is one of the best proofs of this enduring interest; and we have certainly nothing to show at all comparable to it as regards uniformity, typography, or completeness. Such a *renaissance*—if we may venture so to call it—is highly creditable to the enterprise and literary taste of the nation, and we may add that so good an example is by no means unworthy of imitation by other countries. Every new edition of a recognized classic, however superfluous it may seem to be, is only a gentle reminder of the homage we are bound to pay to the great spirits of the past. Like the Mussulman's call to prayer, it wakes us to a sense of our duties, and we are not among the faithful if we allow the tension of worldly things and passing concerns so far to engross our thoughts as to turn us aside from the soothing influences of a communion with the inspiring genius of literature. The gift of retrospect is one of the great consolations of our human condition, and an undoubted alleviation of many of the ills around us. It is not only a relief but an encouragement to reflect on the good we have inherited, and the great debt we owe to those mighty minds which have preceded us. Such a retrospect has been the frequent resource of genius under affliction, and we know that one of the finest passages in Cicero is an apostrophe to his books. But such an exercise also, in an æsthetic point of view, has the additional advantage of bringing again under review the favourites of bygone years long laid aside, and inducing us to test them by the severest, yet truest of all canons—the test of time and frequent perusal. We are thus enabled to correct first impressions, to reform our opinions, and finally to pronounce with confidence such final judgment as possibly we shall never have occasion to change in future.

But although individual judgment may be thus fortified, and we may feel our ground assured with every step, it cannot be

forgotten that public taste is liable to its lapses and revolutions, and, when such a revolution is actually before us, it becomes a nice question for the critic to say how far he is loyally bound to conform to a change of opinion. In the case of the writer whose name stands at the head of the present article, his destiny, in many respects, has been remarkable. Although, in the opinion of the best qualified and severest judges in France, Racine has always held the highest place, yet he has never been truly a prophet out of his own country or beyond his own kin; and it must be confessed that, even in France, the charmed circle of readers and admirers continues daily to diminish, and that the representation of his works on the stage, for which they were originally intended, may be said virtually to have ceased. This at first sight would appear to be a serious state of facts in relation to one whose creations are supposed only to find their parallels in the best inspirations of antiquity. But, on a calm review, it will be found that sound criticism has nothing to abjure, and that it is simply a case of the ascendancy of rival forces and the appearance on the scene of new and daring competitors for public favour. We have the overflowing testimony of two hundred years recorded on the side of the great dramatist, and we may feel assured that a reputation so solidly established cannot be shaken by the fluctuating aspect of public opinion without falsifying all the higher and accepted maxims of criticism and good taste. So, we had better accept the judgment of the great critics, and take it for granted that when M. Thiers, the statesman and historian, recorded, a little before his death, his enthusiasm for Racine in almost the same terms as Boileau and Voltaire had done before him, he probably never went to bed without a volume of his favourite author under his pillow.

But, granting the soundness of the orthodox judgment, the question arises: Why has Racine never received an appreciation beyond the limits of France consistent with his undoubted claims as an author of the very highest rank? Why is he even, perhaps, less well known in England than Corneille and Molière? To this we reply, not because he is in any peculiar sense national, but that to fully appreciate his excellences he must be dealt with as a veritable classic. We must make him, in short, a familiar spirit, and not lay him aside after a light and cursory reading because we are not carried away at first sight. Racine is one of those writers who especially improve on acquaintance, and to whom we may confidently apply the Horatian maxim:—

“Nocturnâ versate manu, versate diurnâ.”

His touch is so fine and delicate that, like the tones of a violin in the hands of a master, his beauties may escape recognition

from sheer want of culture and attention. Though we grant that he is neither a Shakespeare nor a Sophocles, he yet possesses an originality and charm peculiarly his own—an exquisite power of touch and delicate delineation which he was the first to introduce upon the scene, and which may be said to have actually expired with him. But, most of all, he possesses a rare and singular virtue—which is not always the accompaniment of genius, though it is its undoubted mark and signature—namely, that however high he rises, he rises invariably without strain or effort, and still seems to hold a reserve of power in store, and something, as it were, left to give away. Hence it was that he went on improving to the close of his career, and his last drama, in the opinion of some of the best critics, though on a sacred subject, is considered to be the finest production of his genius. It is this fine repose in the style and manner of Racine which has so little of *ad captandum* in it, but which becomes so engrossing on acquaintance, that necessitates the frequent study of his works and an examination of all the nice mysteries and resources of the language; and hence it is that perhaps the very last thing which an Englishman learns in his study of French authors is a full and enthusiastic appreciation of the incomparable merits of Racine.

For the reasons we have given we question very much if the suffrages of the majority of English readers were taken at this moment, whether even Corneille does not hold a much higher place in their esteem than Racine, regarded as a dramatist and poet. Corneille's beauties are more visible, because they lie more on the surface, and being less profound are more evanescent. We are indeed captivated at first, and particularly on our earliest initiation into French literature; but the charm is liable to be diminished on a subsequent perusal; and we hold that failure under so crucial a test is almost fatal. Yet Corneille has had many great men as his admirers; Byron, who should have been a good judge, declared that he liked Corneille, but never could see anything in Racine; and Napoleon, we know, was so enthusiastic regarding the merits of the former that he declared if the Grand Corneille had been alive he would have made him a member of the Council. In one very important respect Racine will be found to have the advantage over his rival—namely, in being far more *subjective*; for Corneille does not look either so deeply nor so frequently inwardly upon himself; and we know that the use of this *subjective* faculty, though, perhaps, the most difficult to handle of any, constitutes, within reasonable limits, one of the highest resources of the dramatist. In the case of Racine it is largely resorted to, but the intention is so little apparent that he hardly gets credit for possessing the

faculty. In short, the effect is produced in a natural, unconscious and consequential, rather than by a formal, process. This, instead of detracting from his merits or indicating a deficiency, we consider to be a proof of the possession of an innate gift which intuitively divines and uses what art lays down as a theory, but which some famous writers so protrude into their pages that they seem to suppress everything to their knowledge of the rules of art, and give us a dry treatise rather than a creation. Racine, shunning all contact with the Spanish school, built his method mainly upon the rule and practice of the ancient classic writers, with certain modifications of his own; and hence it is that, although eminently French, he, of all the moderns, most nearly resembles the ancient standard, and his dramas lie much more within the Aristotelian canons than any which have been composed since those famous rules were promulgated. Yet Racine is by no means a servile imitator, though he may be at times only a free translator, and even an actual appropriator of some of the choicest passages from the Greek masters. He is, on the whole, however, rather to be considered as an admirer and emulator, desirous of testing his powers on the same ground, and if he can, of defeating them; and the transmutation effected is often so skilful that we are sometimes forced to give him credit for an original creation, and in one instance to admit that he has even surpassed his model.

Compared with Corneille, who was more than thirty years his senior, Racine's success was long doubtful and far more slowly acquired. No play written by him ever produced the wild enthusiasm created by "The Cid" in 1635. He did not aim, like Corneille, at sensational effects, nor does he possess the same sublimity of language, nor the secret of the electric shock which even a single line may convey to the breasts of the audience. We have no such thrilling expressions as the "Qu'il Mourût!" and few lines which contain the condensed energy and sonorous ring of

"À vaincre sans peril, on triomphe sans gloire."

Racine does not shine generally in rapid action nor in stirring movement on the stage. He is more elegant and polished, but far less rhetorical, than his great rival, whose manner tended to degenerate into stage rant and bombast, particularly when some of his characters fell into the hands of an inferior actor. On the other hand, it may be affirmed that good acting is less essential to the success of Racine's plays than to those of Corneille, and that an actor of the stamp of Talma, for instance, would double their effect on the stage by able representation, while in the case of Racine—at least as regards

his male characters—the actor's art has considerably less scope for display. Are we then not bound to conclude that, since dramas are essentially for the stage, Corneille understood his art better? No; but rather, that Racine did not stoop to certain stage effects which obtain applause and make the fortune of actors. He seems to have regarded authorship conscientiously, and considered that a drama should stand on its own foundation without adventitious assistance; and hence he has discarded all emphasis, all false glitter, sonorous phrases and exaggerated sentiment. Everything with him is subdued to a severe and just propriety, and neither in language nor situation nor incident does he ever suffer himself to lose his balance or wander from the limits of decorum and good taste.

Much of Racine's successful handling arose undoubtedly from the character and temperament of the man. Educated at Port Royal and intended for the Church, he was seriously trained from the outset. Many of his family connections were ecclesiastical, and he derived the peculiar advantage of being initiated into the study of the classics under the best masters from his earliest years. To this study he was ardently devoted throughout life; so absorbed indeed was he in the love of the treasures of antiquity that in his old age, when disturbed by the noise of his children playing in the house, he expressed his bitter regret that he had not made the Church his bride, as he then could have pursued his darling studies without the danger of interruption. But Racine was no recluse; he loved the society of authors, and always kept up his connection with the brilliant literary fraternity which numbered such men as La Fontaine, Molière, La Bruyère, Bourdaloue, and Boileau. His temperament, however, inclined strongly to gravity and the love of repose, though he had all the natural qualifications which procure success in public life. He was not only a singularly handsome man, but a man of fine manners and superior presence. We consider also that in all respects he was a good man, whatever Madame de Sévigné may, in one of her gay moods, say to the contrary. True, he was said to be attached to the Champmeslé; but we must not accept too literally the history of successes which were imputed as much to his fine person as to any opportunities that may have been thrown in his way. Be this as it may, all we can say is, that if he sinned like all his compeers of that brilliant era, no man ever condoned in a literary point of view the guilt more completely; for there is not throughout his plays a single situation, nay, a single thought, which does not either more or less bear a moral stamp; and as to anything like indelicacy, he seems from his writings to have been morally incapable of it. The truth is, Racine had a good many

enemies and detractors, and as regards the allusion of the incomparable letter writer, we fancy we can detect a spice of female jealousy in it; nor is it a small compliment to pay an author to say that in depicting his heroines he is only painting from the life as the result of his personal experiences. It is very probable that Racine, like the majority of Frenchmen in all ages, had a good deal of vanity in his composition, and was in no haste to disown what the small voice of scandal imputed to so many of more exalted rank than himself, and which some perhaps regarded rather as a compliment than a reproach. Indeed, of so conscientious a disposition was he that, in later years, he was overcome with anxiety to make some moral atonement for having adopted the calling of a dramatist in revocation of the early vows which he had taken on his first initiation; and he seriously thought of entering some religious fraternity. Instead of becoming a monk, however, he decided on taking a wife, and though she was said to be a most sensible and excellent woman, Racine continued to sigh after the quiet and independence of contemplative life. Of one thing we may feel assured, that without the training of Port Royal and the serious nature of his early associations, his dramas would not be the pure and elevated examples they are; we should miss the calmness and repose which is everywhere visible, the lofty measure of the style, and those fine touches which seem but the echoes of a voice speaking from a world so different to our own.

But Racine also owed as much to his connection with the Court and the friendship of a monarch, who, if he was not the greatest of kings, was possibly—to make use of a saying of Bolingbroke — “the greatest actor of majesty that ever existed.” He attended the king in his capacity of Royal Historiographer in most of his military expeditions; and in some of the fine pictures from the pencil of Vandermeulen, depicting these royal progresses, we might almost fancy that the handsome face and portly figure of Racine often served to swell the group of courtiers and dependents who are there seen to throng round the royal carriage. This intercourse with Louis beyond doubt amounted to confidence and familiarity, as an incident will suffice to show. On one occasion, when Racine and Boileau were invited into the private chamber of the king, they found him in bed. Racine, seated by the bedside, commenced to read his manuscript, and while so engaged Madame de Maintenon entered, not suspecting the presence of two gentlemen. The king expressed no embarrassment at the interruption, but the royal favourite had the presence of mind, and we may add, the good breeding, to conceal her feelings by proceeding to snuff the candle before she retired, to enable the author the better to

read his manuscript. We think it is possible that Racine may have owed something directly to the patronage and countenance of Madame de Maintenon, since we know that her indiscretion in showing a paper which he had drawn up remonstrating with the king for bringing misery on his country by the religious persecutions, was the cause of Racine's disgrace at Court, and the change which took place in the feelings of the king towards him. We may, however, regard it as a well-established fact that Racine enjoyed important advantages from the accident of his official connection, that the reminiscences of courtly life and manners are everywhere visible in his dramas, and that his characters either more or less receive a tinge from this contact. Nor can we forget that this was especially the age of refinement and sociability, when men of genius who made literature a profession derived important advantages from the contact with rank, and either more or less caught the influence of its tone and manners. Nay, we conceive it possible that Racine wrote to please "an audience fit, though few," and framed his plots, and adapted his thoughts and language to the sphere which he judged the best of all qualified to accord praise or censure. And when we speak of the criticism of a Court like that of Louis XIV., we must not forget that two factions were ever *en présence*, and that praise even when merited was not always a matter of course. In one dramatic contest, when the Court was divided into two hostile camps, the great Condé gallantly took the side of Racine against his competitor, and carried the day by a happy quotation from his play of "Bérénice"—lines which seem formed to suit every sphere, and which may be confidently recommended to all who desire to pay their court to the *beau sexe* under any conditions:—

" Depuis cinq ans entiers chaque jour je la vois,  
Et crois toujours la voir pour la première fois."

What other author could make an emperor speak with more genuine homage of the object of his adoration? What lady of the Court—least of all she who had undergone the trials of many seasons, or she, who by a long series of triumphs, always expected what was her due—could resist such a compliment or disown the impeachment? Assuredly Racine did not write at random, or shape his phraseology without a purpose; and we strongly suspect that the nice appreciation of female beauty for which Madame de Sévigné gives him credit was first learnt by Racine as a grave looker-on in the most brilliant courtly circle the world has ever seen. With beauty's tutors ever before him, and within ear-shot of the fine gallantries and studied compliments which passed from lip to lip, is it any wonder that his characters

speak a language dictated by courtesy, and that even his pictures of ancient manners and heroic times retain the tinge which belongs only to an aristocratic and courtly atmosphere? May it not even be that the admiration which so many still persist in feeling for the creations of Racine, is in a measure due to the fact that in these degenerate days they fancy they must go back to his page to find the ideals which he painted so truly from the life? And let us remember these were the days of the La Vallière, the Montpensier, the Grammont, the Villars, the Princesse des Ursins, and the whole galaxy of beauty which has been perpetuated on the enamels of Petitôt—the age, too, of such fine gentlemen as Condé, Dangeau, Bussy Rabutin, the Comte de Guiche, Count Hamilton, and others. Racine also had the advantage of living in the most prosperous period of the reign of Louis XIV., when good fortune was in the ascendant, and great talents still survived to direct the national policy, and before the long series of disasters set in which cast such gloom and mourning over the whole country.

In examining the works of Racine, therefore, the influence of this double education—the education of the Church and the education of the Court—must not be lost sight of. They are the two facts which enable us to account for, what many regard as faults and shortcomings, but which we would rather incline to class as enhancements of value. It is easy for those who know antiquity from the page of the Greek dramatists to deduct the modern varnish by which Racine has set off and enriched the original groundwork. Take away the modern ornament due to the influence of Christian sentiment and Feudal gallantry, and you deprive the picture of the very charm which now makes it priceless. A hard, literal rendering of a Greek author was never esteemed any great feat except by a pedant, and an attempt to tread in the footmarks of an ancient dramatist, line for line and word for word, would prove a dull performance on any modern stage. Racine is quite classic enough as it is. With a Greek plot and a Greek model before him, he filled in the picture out of the resources of his own mind, enriched by reading and inspired by the associations he saw around him, resolved to win the applause of the most refined judges among his countrymen and countrywomen. Hence we have “*Iphigénie*,” which Voltaire considered as the finest work the French stage has ever produced. In this judgment we do not concur, professing to be of Racine’s own opinion, and regarding “*Phèdre*” as in all respects his highest effort.

“*Iphigénie*” and “*Phèdre*” are the two dramas by which Racine is best known, and which have longest kept possession of the stage, as well as afforded the highest scope for female delineation.



The story of Iphigénie has been in all ages a peculiar favourite with dramatic writers. It has been treated by Euripides, by Seneca, by Goethe and Schiller, and harmonized by Glück. No doubt Sophocles wrote a drama on this subject, and perhaps in his hands it may have proved the most highly-wrought and sensational of all his efforts. We are inclined to think that he may have chosen the more nationally-accepted form of the Greek legend, and made the actual sacrifice of Iphigénie at the altar by her father the culminating point of the catastrophe. Euripides took the milder and more humane view by saving her just before the sacrifice is consummated, possibly in order to reproduce her afterwards under happier auspices at Tauris in a new drama. It is obvious that, however harsh the issue, the old national acceptance of the myth is not only more consistent with the doctrine of destiny which pervaded the Greek mind, but that it forms a more powerful resource in the hands of a dramatist to excite horror and pity. Racine was fully at liberty to do as he pleased with the story; but he had not the courage to face so tremendous a *dénouement* as that involved in the cruel sacrifice of a beautiful and innocent girl. It would have shocked not only his own feelings, but those of the Court, and accordingly he makes use of an invention entirely his own by the introduction of Eriphile, a Lesbian slave under the protection of Achilles. Here Racine was on the right track, had he only consented to pursue the path on which he seems to have set out, by making the issue turn on the jealous rivalry of Iphigénie and Eriphile. But, after raising our expectations to the highest point by his magnificent manipulation of the first three acts, he casts all down which he has been building up, and weakens the effect of the entire piece ever after. Up to the close of the third act we see what Racine can do; we recognize the incomparable hand of the master; but, after soaring in glorious flight up to this point, he here unaccountably seems to lose his balance, and falls slowly—floating, like the inverted car of Icarus, languidly to the earth. Enough, however, has been done in these three incomparable acts to prove the superiority of Racine, but to leave us almost irritated at the issue. If he had only depicted the struggle of jealousy between the Lesbian captive and Agamemnon's daughter, and made the former the instrument by which Iphigénie was to be brought to the sacrifice—the victim alike of female duplicity and superstitious faith—what a harrowing scene we should have had from the hand of Racine, than whom no one was better qualified to depict such emotions? But, instead of making Eriphile artful and unscrupulous, he ends by making her comparatively amiable, and thus we have two interesting beings contending for the sympathy of the audience. The result is that they nullify each

other, and there is the want of the proper dramatic contrast. Had he only made Eriphile—a woman of low origin—as full of malice as he has drawn Œnone in his “Phèdre,” we should then probably have had the terrible and ruthless Sophoclean *dénouement*. We are therefore forced to be content with those early scenes, which are incomparable gems in themselves, but which have little effect in shaping what follows. The ultimate conduct of the plot, therefore, disappoints expectation. But let us examine those early scenes in proof of what we advance.

Our interest, in the drama commences from the first moment of the entrance of Agamemnon, whose gloomy anxieties constitute the solemn key-note of the piece. The verse is flowing and melodious. Nothing can be more impressive than the words he puts into the mouth of Agamemnon, no doubt with a glance at the cares of his royal master and patron:—

“Triste destin des rois! esclaves que nous sommes,  
Et des rigeurs du sort, et des discours des hommes  
Nous nous voyons sans cesse assiégés des témoins  
Et les plus malheureux osent pleurer le moins.”

Ulysses seeks to console him by reminding him of what posterity will afterwards say of their glorious deeds, which are destined to become the Iliad of the future:—

“L'éternel ententien des siècles à venir.”

Iphigénie then enters, a charming picture of filial attachment and frankness, reproaches her father with looking so sad, and not giving her the greeting which she expected after a long separation. Seeing the preparations for a sacrifice, she innocently asks if any of his family will be present. The answer of Agamemnon, which sounds like a groan of despair,

“Vous y serez, ma fille!”

must have electrified the house, coming from the mouth of Le Kain or Talma. Such simple touches, never overdrawn, show the fine judgment of Racine on occasions where an inferior dramatist would be disposed to spend all his force in giving undue emphasis to what is sufficiently apparent without effort. As for Clytemnestra, she is depicted as a mother, eager and anxious for the happiness of her daughter, rather than severe and dignified as in the old drama. Fancying that Achilles has grown cold, and is about to refuse the proffered nuptials, her womanly spirit rises, and with sharp indignation she counsels Iphigénie to respect herself and her proud lineage, in language that is mundane enough to suit all times:—

“Ma fille, c'est à vous à montrer qui nous sommes  
Et de ne voir en lui que le dernier des hommes.”

Some, no doubt, will be of opinion that such a character as that of Clytemnestra should have been drawn in less worldly colours, and with something of the inflexibility of the old Greek standard; but Racine seems to have preferred to bring out the maternal instincts as more consonant with the situation. The marriage, indeed, is the crowning attraction in her mind, as well as in that of Iphigénie, who is stung with jealousy the very first moment the Lesbian slave makes her appearance, and in whose person she instinctively recognizes a dangerous rival to herself. This burst of passion in so young a bosom is admirably drawn by Racine, who makes Eriphile, on being accused of secretly loving Achilles, artfully protest against the absurdity of such an idea. "Who could possibly love a furious conqueror whose hands were stained with blood, and who had even reduced her paternal Lesbos to ashes?" To which Iphigénie retorts in rage which reveals too truly her own passion:

"Oui, vous l'aimez perfide!  
Et ces mêmes fureurs que vous me dépeignez,  
Ces bras que dans le sang vous avez vu baignés  
Ces morts—cette Lesbos—ces cendres—cette flamme  
Sont les traits dont l'amour l'a gravé dans votre ame :  
Et loin d'en détester le cruel souvenir,  
Vous vous plaisez encore à m'en entretenir."

This is a fine stroke as a commencement, and gives us an idea of what Iphigénie might one day become if she lived to be as old as her mother. In all other respects, however, except as regards jealousy of Eriphile, the daughter of Agamemnon is depicted in the most amiable colours. The concealment of the real victim to be offered at the sacrifice is most ably managed up to the third scene of the third act. All but those few who are in the secret suppose that a marriage is on the *tapis*. The altar is decked, the flowers have been strewn on the way, the procession is ready to move—all is announced as prepared for the celebration which is to consummate the happiness of Iphigénie, when suddenly Arcus, the messenger of Agamemnon, enters and declares that the King of Men waits at the altar and only wants the victim.

"The victim?—what victim?" is the inquiry all round. Arcus, with admirable *aplomb*, at first declines to give a direct answer, but warns the assembled party not to send the princess to her father at that moment. "Why should she fear to go?" angrily demands Clytemnestra. "Because," returns Arcus, with terrible calmness, "he waits at the altar to sacrifice her."

The short, abrupt exclamations which burst from each severally on hearing this dreadful summons are highly characteristic of

each speaker. Achilles gives way to the expression of his astonishment at such a lapse in Agamemnon by the simple ejaculation of "Lui?" Clytemnestra, equally astounded, exclaims: "Sa fille!" Iphigénie, overcome with pity rather than terror, exclaims, "Mon père!" while Eriphile gives way to a triumphant scream of joy:

"O Ciel!—quelle nouvelle!"

The admirable management of this incident shows how far Racine anticipated some of the resources of the modern sensational school; but it also shows that he knew how to keep within the strict bounds of propriety and good taste.

This terrible disturbance is the real climax of the piece; but, as we have observed, it occurs too soon—before the end of the third act—and the inevitable consequence is a lame and impotent conclusion. On the whole, however, Iphigénie is so beautiful an impersonation of filial affection that we continue to like her to the close and wish for her happiness. Had it been her fate, however, to have perished at the altar, entangled by the machinations of a successful rival, she would have commanded quite as much sympathy with the audience, and the requirements of the tragic drama would have been better satisfied. We think Racine committed the very same fault in "Mithridate," where, after giving the word of promise to the ear, he loses the opportunity of making a powerful tragic *dénouement* out of the rivalry of the two brothers for the hand of Monime which the reader almost looks for. But harrowing scenes are not to the taste of every audience, and we must remember that it is the high privilege of the stage to proclaim and uphold the reign of human felicity.

In "Phèdre" we still find the same incomparable ease and harmony of verse which distinguishes Racine above all his contemporaries; but here he has the "Hippolytus" of Euripides to contend with, and that drama is, perhaps, after the "Medea," the finest effort of the Greek poet. In the case of his "Iphigénie," Racine was entitled to consider himself as having taken original and independent ground, so much has he diverged from the plot of the Greek play which suggested the idea. In the present case there is not so much divergence, and if it were in our power to abstract the fine scenes he has literally translated from the Greek, we should almost be disposed to affirm that he has surpassed the original, though he does not succeed in effacing Euripides. And here we may take leave to observe that it is a nice point to decide how far borrowing from or imitating the ancients detracts from the merit due to the work of the modern author. No greater borrower, not to say plagiarist, ever existed

than Milton, whose works abound either in sweets purloined from the pages of classic writers, or in what are mere imitations. Except where Racine has deliberately translated some of the finest passages from the Greek, which it would have been almost a pity to have deprived the audience of, we do not think he is liable to the charge of plagiarism. What he does, is done openly and deliberately, and where he diverges materially from the plot, he shows a skill and invention which, while they never make us forget the source of his inspiration, lead us to award nearly all the praise we should bestow on an original creation. In the transformation he has made use of with regard to the character of the Nurse, CEnone, however, we think he committed an error as regards consistency and truth. The nurse of antiquity we must remember is always depicted as a model of good sense and devotion to duty, uttering fine moral reflections, and commanding our reverence and esteem throughout. In the "Hippolytus" she is one of the most pleasing and natural characters that Euripides ever drew, anxious and devoted to her mistress and the fortunes of the house, but with no malignancy. What she does is with the best intentions, though it ends fatally. Nothing is more kind and touching, as well as simple and natural, than her remonstrance with the love-sick and afflicted Phædra, of the secret of whose guilty passion she is ignorant, and which before the confession, she attributes to some incurable illness. But Racine has made his nurse rather a malignant fury than a calm and gentle friend. The result, however, is that we have a drama of the highest tragic power, and quite as much adapted to the taste of an Athenian as to that of a modern audience. In one prominent situation, however, we think Racine forgot the supreme value of the unutterable on the stage—that which must not be spoken, but merely supposed or darkly hinted at. This, as we know, was the master faculty of Sophocles, in which he surpassed all other men. The confession of Phèdre we fancy would have been much more appropriate if told by another. It is almost too dreadful coming from her own mouth. Theseus is horrified. Nothing can heal the wound given. The gods themselves are powerless to aid him, and he becomes almost impious in his outpourings of despair. His defiance, as expressed by Racine, is sublime but terrible.

"Quoi qu'ils fissent pour moi, leur funeste bonté  
Ne me saurait payer de ce qu'ils m'ont ôté."

The description of the death of Hippolyte, which is only a paraphrase from Euripides, is by no means the most successful part of the modern drama; but here Racine undertook to rival one of the finest examples of gorgeous imagery and description

which is to be found in the whole Greek repertoire, and which necessarily suffers from being deprived of its ancient dress. Throughout the piece many vigorous and effective lines abound ; such as where C enone endeavours to stir up the ambition of Ph edre by suggesting that she may yet become queen. The antithesis is quite worthy of Corneille, and shows that Racine was not altogether neglectful of the hints given by his great predecessor, who was never wanting in energy :

“ Esclave si vous perd, et reine si vous vivez.”

The allusion to the youthful errors of Theseus seems gently to hint at some of the weaknesses of Louis himself, for the language can hardly be said to be condemnatory :

“ Volage adorateur de mille objets divers.”

The rage of Ph edre on hearing of the rivalry of Aricie gives a fine opportunity for the display of the peculiar power of Racine ; but perhaps some will be inclined to consider it as somewhat too vigorously expressed, and in too marked contrast with her previous weak and dying state. But in Racine’s hands she is perpetually passing from one violent extreme to another, and in this respect there is greater divergence from the conception of the early drama. But by far the most ingenious and successful stroke is that which is due solely to the invention of Racine, by the introduction of the rumour of the death of Theseus and his sudden appearance on the scene just when Ph edre begins to brighten up with the hope of marrying Hippolyte. The grand climax of sorrow and disappointment, however, is only reached when she learns that it is Aricie and not herself that Hippolyte really loves. Then she gives way to the madness of despair, and her reflections at the close rise to the full sublimity of the Greek drama, and inspire a touch of pity which is there sometimes wanting. Finding that all is over, she exclaims :—

“ La mort est le seul dieu que j’osais implorer !”

And yet she sees no refuge, even in death itself—

“ Death ?—No ; for if I seek the infernal shades,  
 Shall I not find my father Minos there—  
 The inexorable judge who in his hands  
 Poises the fatal urn as minister  
 Of vengeance on the guilty ? If he met  
 His daughter, branded with such crimes as mine,  
 He would let fall his urn with horror at the sight,  
 And I should be his executioner !”

This fine soliloquy did not need the genius of a Rachel to give effect to it on the stage ; but in her hands we know it was almost

terrific in the expression of self-abandonment. It is more mournful and tragic than anything put into the mouth of Dido by Virgil. We are not even sure that, having regard to the guilty passion of Phèdre, and her conflict with such a variety of miseries, it is not the most sublime and classic allusion to be found in any modern drama whatsoever. Its only parallel, in point of appropriateness, is in the "Agamemnon" of Æschylus, where Clytemnestra reminds the Chorus, with bitter exultation, that her husband, when he paces the banks of the sad river below, will be met by the daughter whom he slaughtered, who will hang fondling on her father's neck and kiss him. After so successful a burst of inspiration, let no one deny to Racine either the supreme knowledge of his art, or the power to move the spectator at the theatre. As he prided himself particularly on this drama, we think he threw it down as a defiance to those detractors who thought him unequal to a great tragic effort, and who affirmed that his talent consisted merely in elegant polish and harmony of versification.

As regards the two Roman plays of "Britannicus" and "Bérénice," both of which are *chef-d'œuvres*, the contrast between them and those on the two Greek subjects which we have noticed, in tone and handling is in every way remarkable. So different, indeed, is their general style and character that they hardly appear to be by the same author. This, we think, is a testimony to Racine's unquestionable versatility. These two latter plays, which are exact pictures of Roman life under the Empire, must be studied as a whole to be fully appreciated, though many fine passages abound. The general character throughout is that of quiet and refined finish, and the subjection of all the parts to a perfect harmony. The character of Junie in "Britannicus," particularly when contrasted with the fierce Agrippine, offers a beautiful example of disinterested affection and gentleness. The passage in which she reveals her love is peculiarly touching. We allude to the lines which commence with:—

"De combien de soupirs interrompant le cours."

Even when rendered into an English dramatic form they are not without a certain sympathetic appeal:—

"How many aching sighs in their swift course  
Have I not stifled, fearing your sad looks?  
What silent torments, hid within my breast,  
Have I not cherished, lest that you should sigh,  
And suffer like affliction with myself?  
So, trembling for my constancy and truth,  
I was but falsely kind and told nothing—  
Nay, even hid the paleness of my brow,

Lest by my looks I should be forced to say—  
Would that for your sweet sake I ne'er had loved."

Tacitus has been the acknowledged source from which the materials of these two dramas have been taken; and yet how limited is the foundation? Out of a single expressive line he constructs a complete drama. So faithful, indeed, is his delineation that we may almost consider them as an expansion of the "Annals," so remarkable for condensed energy, or sometimes that we are reading the notes of a commentator. The character of Agrippine is very vigorously drawn, and she may be classed as one of the most *mdle* creations of Racine. The scene which takes place between the exasperated mother of Nero and Burrhus, his governor, in the third act, is as spirited as anything Corneille ever wrote, though his forte lay in similar passages where mutual retort gives effect to the dialogue. Agrippine threatens him with exposure as an accomplice with herself:—

"De nos crimes communs je veux qu'on soit instruit  
On saura les chemins par où je l'ai conduit:  
Pour rendre sa puissance et la vôtre odieuses  
J'avoûrai les rumeurs les plus injurieuses,  
Je confesserai tout—exils, assassinats,  
Poison même. . . ."

The calm and insolent retort of Burrhus must have told with thrilling effect on the stage:—

"Madame,—ils ne vous croiront pas:  
Ils sauront récuser l'injuste stratagème  
D'un témoin irrité qui s'accuse lui-même."

This play, indeed, abounds with many points which are calculated to give scope to the powers of an actor. Thus the line spoken by Burrhus, when he wishes to stir up Nero, is capable of great effect in the delivery:—

"On n'aime Seigneur, si l'on ne veut aimer."

The "veut" is a powerful monosyllable, and, according to the emphasis laid on it, the whole meaning is affected. It seems something between a hint of encouragement and a reproach. Again, many lines in this drama are striking merely as descriptive of character or circumstances. For example, where Nero speaks of the oppressive presence of Pallas:—

"Mon génie étonné tremble devant le sien."

But perhaps the nearest approach to the condensed vigour of Tacitus is in the description of the restoration of order by the elimination of the dangerous spirits who had been the pest and terror of Rome:—



“ Le déserts autrefois peuplés de sénateurs  
Ne sont plus habités que par leurs délateurs.”

We may just add that, when this play first appeared and was coldly received, probably because it was too severe and faithful a study, Boileau consoled Racine by telling him that, in his opinion, it was his *chef-d'œuvre*, whatever he might write in future.

In “*Bérénice*” we discover a much more delicate touch, and discern perhaps more than anywhere else the peculiar genius and character of the author himself. This play has throughout a singularly moral and elevated tone, with an air of gentle sadness pervading it, which has led some critics to class it as an elegy rather than a drama. Never was a queen drawn more gentle and lovable than *Bérénice*. She is purity and goodness itself; and we cannot help feeling for Titus, who, out of respect for the prejudices of the Roman people, sends her away, stifling within his breast a passion which patriotism and the interests of state forbid him to indulge. Racine has given us a complete picture of the interior life of the Imperial Court, though his ideal sketch of the character of Titus, whose attitude is always dignified and self-denying, is perhaps more exalted than he deserved; but it is the gentle reluctance of *Bérénice* to leave, described with such delicacy and refinement as to make us sigh at the close to have to part for ever with so amiable a creation, which constitutes the charm of the piece.

We pass over all consideration of “*Audromaque*,” “*Esther*,” “*Bajazet*,” and the admirable comedy of “*Les Plaideurs*,” his sacred songs, odes, and epigrams—the last of which contain a bitterness and pungency hardly to be expected from a man of Racine’s kindly nature—as beyond the scope of this article, our main object being to give an idea of what Racine was capable of in more congenial walks.

On the whole, notwithstanding his disposition to complain of his lot in life, Racine must be regarded as blest with more than usual good fortune. In 1673, he obtained a seat at the French Academy, and, 1675, was nominated a Member of the *Conseil Royal*. Nor did he go without his reward in the shape of the sweets of Church preferment, being installed into the livings of *St. Jaques de la Ferté* and *Saint Nicholas de la Chésy*, which his nominal connection with religion enabled him to hold. Perhaps it was this connection with the Church, and the *penchant* for a life of contemplation and repose which always affected him and increased as he grew older, that led him to compose his religious dramas, of which “*Athalie*” is the best, and in the opinion of some is considered to be his most perfect

work. "Athalie," however, is not remarkable for fine and polished passages, like all his former plays. It must be regarded as a whole, and under that aspect it is unquestionably a drama of great sublimity and power. With the extraordinary talent which Racine always possesses for bringing before us the life of the past, we have here a faithful picture of one of the most stirring and bloody periods in Jewish history; and, in the character of Joad, the high-priest, we see transfigured one of the great dominant agents that held sway among a people whose whole life was one absorbing religious manifestation. Joad has no counterpart in any other drama that we know of. He belongs not to modern days, but is to the ecclesiastical life of the past what Homer's Achilles is to the heroic age—

"Impiger, audax, inexorabilis, acer,"

—a potent exhibition of alternate rage and exaltation. Lofty ambition, intense nationality, undying hate, tremendous energy, and fanatic faith are all embodied in this grand creation. Voltaire's Mahomet is a mild and subdued figure compared with Joad, who moves through the piece, subjecting everything to his will and purposes, yet winning our admiration at the close, because of his resolute firmness and the sincerity of his religious fervour. The handling of this drama also proves that it is an error to suppose that Racine was capable of drawing female characters of gentleness only. The vindictive bearing of Athalie is even more severely depicted here than the fiery ambition of Agrippine in "Britannicus." But the subject does not possess interest for every lay mind; and, as we read, we begin to grow tired of the songs of praise and triumph, and the mutual recriminations of the two hostile camps, and perhaps consider that by this too realistic creation of one of the most critical periods in Jewish history, Racine has not greatly served the cause of pure and meek religion, which he no doubt intended to do. As we witness the strife, the passions, and the alternate hope and despair of the rival parties—who equally claim spiritual gifts and peculiar privileges to the prejudice of the other—we are almost tempted to exclaim, with Lucretius:—

"Tantum religio potuit suadere malorum!"

This drama may be regarded as Racine's *Nunc Dimittis*. He considered possibly that he had now made an ample atonement for the sins of his nonage, and had testified how much he preferred the inspiration afforded by a sacred subject to the profane creations which had fixed the foundation of his fame for ever. In conclusion—in whatever department we regard Racine, he is always a great poet, and in perusing his page we sometimes

fancy that we are, as it were, brought nearer to the gods. In Molière we recognize the masterly force of particular scenes and the cunning delineation of certain phases of national character. In Corneille we are struck with the majestic flow of the verse, and admire the lofty sentiments which inspire the soul to action and to duty; but Racine claims our admiration as a whole. Beautiful passages abound; harmony, polish and eloquence are everywhere visible; but it is the general adaptation, the perfect consistence and harmony of the parts which most of all leave an indelible impression on the mind, and induce us to accord to him the possession of perhaps the highest gift a dramatist can possess—the gift of artistic construction, and the power of manipulating a great subject, just as a great general moves large masses of men with certain and irresistible effect. True it is that Racine has laid himself open to the charge of allowing his language occasionally to degenerate into mere prose and commonplace. This we remember was one of the faults imputed to Euripides by the hostile critics of his day. He too was charged with forgetting the stately dignity of the classic drama; but if so, we rather think posterity is not displeased at an innovation which was the herald of that far greater innovation which took place when the modern drama arose. If some of the lines of Racine are only prose, they are such prose as it would be very difficult to better; and on the principle advocated by Pope—

“What oft was taught, but ne'er so well expressed,”

we are bound to concede liberally to an author who improves upon the language of his country. Many of these commonplace lines have thus become household words; for instance, the well-worn one:—

“Ceil! que lui vais-je dire—et par où commencer?”

Still we must admit that the commonplace character of some lines strikes us frequently on reading. Nothing certainly could be tamer or more prosaic than the following:—

“Mille soupçons affreux viennent me déchirer;”

or,

“Plaignez votre malheur, sans vouloir l'augmenter;”

or,

“Soyons-nous donc au moins fidèles l'un à l'autre.”

But in spite of all that has been said in these æsthetic days of the superiority of “the poet of philosophy,” or “the philosophy of poetry,” the transcendent excellence of his general treatment will be the means of perpetuating for all time the fame of Racine as a classic. His other qualifications, though undoubtedly great,

we regard as of minor import, and instead of attempting minute criticism of particular passages, we would prefer to follow the example of Voltaire, who when asked to write a commentary on Racine, answered: "Il n'y a qu'à mettre au bas de toutes les pages—beau, pathétique, harmonieux, admirable, sublime!"

But what shall we say of the signs of the times, and of the revolution which has dethroned Corneille and Racine after holding the favoured place on the stage for upwards of two hundred years? We may simply reply, that it is not more remarkable than the revolution we see in other things around us. The drama is essentially the representation of human feelings and passions; and whatever be the subject represented, or whatever be the period, the audience either more or less transfer their own feelings and sentiments into the scene before them. Hence it is necessary that a successful representation should elicit sympathy and awaken a responsive chord in the breasts of those who witness it. If the dramatist does not consult this requirement, he is *non compris*. When, therefore, a great revolution of society and manners has taken place, a new exponent is required as the scenic interpreter of his age. We are now in the midst of such a revolution, though the change in our own particular case may have been so gradual as not to strike us until we begin to suffer. Yet it is nevertheless true, that both Corneille and Racine survived the Revolution, and that some of their greatest exponents on the stage lived after that period—Talma, Mademoiselle Mars, and Rachel. But the society of the Empire and the Restoration was still the society of old France, which, though it had received a great shock, had not been transformed. That transformation has only taken place in our own generation; and hence it is that it is only yesterday that the standard, legitimate drama has actually disappeared from the French stage.\* Further, public taste depends on patronage as well as genius. If the influential classes are no longer able to lead, or will not encourage, the mass can hardly be expected to follow; and if talent of a new order appears, bringing on the scene novel and startling effects, the mass may incline in that direction. As regards the power of patronage, whether it be of the few or of the many, no more pregnant illustration can be found than in the history of Racine himself,

---

\* In the great war which took place between the Romancists and Classicists in 1829, when Dumas the elder produced his "Henri III.," the first serious effort was made to produce a change of public taste. On this occasion, as Dumas humorously wrote afterwards, "When the curtain fell the audience became revolutionary in their enthusiasm; and if any one had dared at that moment to say a word for the legitimate drama, he would have been met by a universal cry of *à la lanterne!*"

who paved his way to public favour mainly through the countenance of the Court. Let us also remember that taste is not intuitive, but entirely a matter of education, and that without proper nourishment it must necessarily decline. It degenerates likewise under the reign of bad example and evil patronage; and when a new generation has grown up which knows not the virtues of that which went before it, it can be no matter of surprise if there is no perpetuation of Classicism.

But, on the other hand, novelty and change are a necessary *pabulum* for humanity. The appearance of Pierre Corneille as the author of "The Cid," in 1635, was a startling innovation, and, in point of fact, constituted an intellectual revolution. The revivalism by Racine of the Greek drama with all its sublime and stirring incidents, was the reopening of a new world of imagination to thousands. With the exception of the brilliant triumphs of the Elizabethan era in England, nothing at all comparable to such a burst of dramatic genius had been seen for two thousand years—that is, since the age when Euripides wrote for Athens. A far wider gulf separates the ideas of the antique world from our times than was the case even a century ago. It is only natural that modern society should demand its own exponents; and, if no mighty genius arises to meet the call—if no Sophocles or Shakespeare appears to fill the vacant place, we must be content with what we can get. We concede in all frankness that the lines laid down by the Classicists are somewhat too stiff and formal for our times, the speeches too long, the polish much in excess, and the ground over which they travel too hackneyed and uncongenial to afford sufficient recreation to minds jaded with intense labour. But we must at the same time confess that the sensational school, which has now succeeded in pushing even the Romancists from the stage, is sadly neglectful of the finer qualities which were predominant in the elder drama. One thing is clear; the stage in our age, whether in France or England, is no longer a great moral teacher, and no dramatist undertakes to make the reform of manners or morals his aim and motive. He considers he has done quite enough if he has diverted an idle or a weary hour, created a sensation, and earned the substantial *honorarium*. And yet we know that the teaching of morality, the inculcation of a respect for religion, and the exaltation of the glories of the nationality were the absorbing motives which influenced the fathers of the art from the period when Thespis descended from his waggon and the second actor and chorus were instituted. Nor were those wholesome traditions forgotten by those who handed on the torch from century to century. All honour, therefore, to those great names, in whatever form they may sur-

vive, who, like Racine, revered the sacred source from whence they drew their inspiration, and considered they were loyally bound to perpetuate the gift in the exalted ethical spirit of the ancient day.

---

ART. III.—LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT IN INDIA.

1. *Return to an Address of the House of Lords, dated February 22, 1883, for Correspondence on the proposed Measures for the Extension of Local Government in India.*
2. *Indian Administration Reports, Gazettes, and Newspapers, 1881–1883.*

THE conditions of government in India are in the present day undergoing rapid and radical change. Measures of the most domestic type—of which only a few years back nothing would have been known outside the India Office—are now no longer finally and quietly settled by the Secretary of State, but are widely discussed in the English Press, and made the subject of fierce party conflict on the platform and in Parliament. In India itself the Services, the non-official Europeans, and the educated Natives are very generally ranging themselves in Liberal and Conservative camps: the European for the most part adopting the tenets of the “Carlton,” while the educated Native echoes with almost comical unctiousness the Shibboleths of the “Caucus.” The Cabinet at Simla is thus being necessarily driven into closer affiliation with the Cabinet in Downing Street. The Viceroy is fast ceasing to be a “bright particular star that dwells apart”—an all but independent Governor representing to subject-races the majesty of England and the entity of British rule. His function is visibly dwindling into the charge of a Ministerial “department;” and he will, if the present tendency continues, tender his resignation as of course when his colleagues at home lay down their seals.

That all this is for India a grave misfortune is the conviction of not a few of the more earnest Indian officers. They rejoiced to see that growing interest in the affairs of their adopted country which formed the preliminary symptom of the new order of things. They deemed this to be the natural and welcome consequence of improved communications and of the more widespread, if still superficial, knowledge that increasing travel and the development of the European element in the population had

served to foster. But when they find that Indian questions are not to be discussed upon their abstract merits and in a spirit of strict impartiality ; when they see measures of cardinal moment made the stalking-horses of Tory and Radical contention—liable to be spoilt and mutilated for mere party ends—they feel inclined at times to groan with Mercutio—“ A plague o’ both your houses ! Why the devil came you between us ? ” They have, as it seems to them, no longer any guarantee of continuity or certainty in Indian policy.

This mischief—the intrusion, that is, of English party feeling into the field of Indian policy—has been practically constant since 1876 ; but it has received a remarkable development within the last two years. The Conservatives, as the party in opposition, are now to be found attacking, in season and out of season, the present Viceroy of India, and have introduced for the first time the reckless and dangerous practice of throwing oil on the flames of local excitement and agitation. In the interests of India we trust that both the great parties of the State will soon come to see the mischievous folly of thus administering the affairs of a vast and distant Empire. We have meantime, however, to recognize the fact that Indian domestic policy must at present pass through the furnace of party criticism at home ; and it is therefore essential that correct information as to the schemes and full explanation as to the aims of the Indian Government, should be laid before the public which has in the end to judge between the rival factions.

The two measures of Lord Ripon’s administration that have been most assailed by his political opponents are the European Criminal Jurisdiction Bill and the Local Self-government Scheme. It cannot be denied that the former of these measures has now banded against it a considerable number also of so-called Liberals both in India and England. But this is mainly because the original agitators contrived, with great astuteness, to excite in connection with the Bill those feelings of race-pride and race-intolerance that lie deep in the hearts of so many average Britons, be they Whig or Tory. These are ready enough to profess Liberal principles, to admit the propriety of recognizing equal merits wherever found, to uphold in theory the terms of the Queen’s Proclamation of 1858, declaring that none of her subjects shall be barred from office by the mere colour of his skin ; but when it comes to a question of securing these ends by surrendering an invidious personal privilege, and of practically recognizing this equality before the law, John Bull’s love of right too often fails to bear the strain thus put upon it. As the American satirist wrote of his behaviour in the great struggle between North and South :—

“ I guess  
 John *preaches* well ; . . . .  
 But sermon thru' and come to du,  
 Why there's the *ole* J. B.  
 A crowdin' you and me.”

A Native Civilian Magistrate, however able and however experienced, and working under the strictest supervision, is forsooth “unfit” to try a European or even a Mulatto loafer—unfit to pass a three months' sentence on a European British criminal, although Native Judges have for forty years been disposing satisfactorily of civil cases of all kinds, irrespective of the race or colour of the parties, and although the European has all the advantage of an English Government and English superior courts to redress injustice and punish partiality. Were Native Magistrates even less fit than they certainly are for the trivial powers which it is proposed to give them, John Bull might, after all his fine professions, take to heart that other word of Mr. Biglow :

“ The surest plan to *make* a man  
 Is to *think* him so, J. B.  
 Ez much as you or me.”

That the Government of India would not have introduced this Bill at the present time had it foreseen the storm of unreasoning violence for which it now serves as an excuse may frankly be admitted. “*Est prudentis sustinere ut cursum sic impetum benevolentia.*” It is in itself a measure of no special importance, and it is perhaps a pity that it was so shaped as directly to raise the question of race distinctions—a question that might easily have been left to sleep, while the main object of the Government was otherwise secured. But the leaders of the Opposition have themselves made the mountain out of the mole-hill, and it has now become clear that the spirit which animates them is one of deadly hostility to that policy of “levelling up” upon which India has been uniformly governed since the Charter Act of 1833, section 87 of which was declared by the Court of Directors to mean “that there shall be *no governing caste* in British India,” and that “fitness (not distinction of race) was thenceforth to be the criterion of eligibility” for an office. Of that policy both Conservatives and Liberals have hitherto been staunch supporters; and it indicates to our thinking a serious moral lapse when a whole party can be found ready now to repudiate accepted principles, and join in condemning action which is strictly in accord with their own proceedings in bygone years. It was open to the Conservatives perhaps to declare the measure inopportune, but it was not open to them to support



and adopt the platform of the Anglo-Indian opponents of the Bill. If the question is to be fought out on that platform they ought in all consistency to support Lord Ripon's Government.

It is not, however, our special object at present to defend or examine the Ilbert Bill, but rather to explain more fully than has heretofore been attempted the meaning and scope of that other project of the Indian Government—the Local Self-Government Scheme—which is believed by many to have done much to strengthen the opposition to the Criminal Procedure Bill.

This, too, has been made to a great extent a party question, and the scheme has been surrounded with the usual web of party misrepresentation. "Plato," says Montaigne, "requires three things in him that would examine the soul of another—knowledge, goodwill, and boldness." Boldness of assertion—brazen boldness—we have seen in plenty among the critics of this scheme both in India and England; but if they have had knowledge of their subject, they have carefully perverted it, and goodwill of any kind they have never professed. It is not to be wondered at that a policy which has been thus assailed—and which requires more local knowledge for its due unfolding than most of its friends in England can boast—has been viewed with mistrust in many quarters. "Particular error first makes the public error, and afterwards in turn the public error makes the particular error; so all this vast fabric goes forming and confounding itself from hand to hand, so that the remotest testimony is better instructed than those that are nearest; and the last informed better than the first. 'Tis a natural progress; for whoever believes anything, thinks it a work of charity to persuade another in the same opinion; which the better to do he will make no difficulty of adding as much of his own invention as he conceives necessary to encounter the resistance or want of conception he meets with in others."\*

Lord Ripon's scheme of local self-government is said by its opponents to have for its object the introduction of local self-government "not step by step, but at once in every province," by "the creation of Native Committees, who are to be entrusted with the absolute control of local funds, and the construction of local public works without the least aid, advice, supervision, or control of any English official whatever." "This brand-new constitution is to be made to fit provinces so dissimilar as Bombay, the Central Provinces, Oudh, or Behar." The Indian Government is represented as announcing—"We admit that under our scheme the work will be worse done, but we don't care for a more efficient administration."

---

\* Montaigne, "On Cripples." Made English by Charles Cotton, Esq., 1700.

All this is, however, mere caricature. Let us see what are the true lines of the original picture.

For many years past, in all the settled districts of India, the funds locally raised for purposes of police, sanitation, communications, education and the like have been administered by Committees on which non-official members, European and Native, have always been associated with the local officers of Government. In towns\* the ordinary forms of municipal government have prevailed, but the Magistrate of the district has invariably been *ex-officio* the Chairman or President of all the municipalities within his jurisdiction, and the Vice-Chairman also has generally been an officer of Government subordinate to the district Magistrate. Initiative and executive functions have therefore centred for the most part in a Government officer, and the Municipal Committees have, with rare exceptions, been mainly consultative or advising bodies. In the great majority of cases, moreover, their members have been appointed by Government on the nomination of its local officers. It is only in the North-Western Provinces and the Central Provinces that any free recourse has been had to an elective system. Still the fact remains that in some 800 towns of British India a certain amount of local self-government has for many years obtained, and the Annual Reports show that of late years many municipal boards have made decided advances in independence, intelligence, and devotion to the public good. The following table exhibits the principal statistics of municipal administration for the year 1881-82:—

Province.	No. of Municipalities.	Population within towns.	NUMBER OF MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE.							Income during 1881-82.	
			<i>Ex-officio</i> .	Nominated.	Elected.	Total.	Official.	Non-official.	Europeans.		Natives.
Bengal .....	185	3,005,029	471	1,790	37	2,298	604	1,094	526	1,772	Rs. 27,33,140
Bombay .....	161	1,845,761	704	1,823	..	2,526	901	1,625	382	2,114	29,64,514
Madras .....	47	1,204,987	79	643	18	740	319	421	267	473	13,52,354
North - Western Provinces and Oudh .....	109	3,099,869	438	328	694	1,460	477	983	317	1,113	29,92,559
Punjab .....	195	2,085,401	648	1,488	34	2,170	686	1,494	401	1,769	26,67,798
Central Provinces .....	61	697,271	235	8	397	640	239	401	139	501	11,57,223
British Burma .....	7	312,155	32	65	..	97	43	54	62	45	24,86,517
Assam .....	9	58,444	30	70	..	100	47	53	37	63	92,769
Berars .....	6	101,205	37	60	..	97	50	47	37	60	1,03,320
Coorg .....	5	16,653	17	32	...	49	17	32	7	42	15,919
Total .....	788	12,476,744	2,690	6,307	1,180	10,177	3,383	6,794	2,195	7,982	162,64,316 =£1,626,431

\* In what follows we leave the three Presidency towns out of sight. These have each a special constitution and their circumstances are very different

Besides these town boards, there have also been constituted in most parts of the older provinces "District Committees," to which has been entrusted the control of the funds levied under various local laws for the maintenance of communications and other local objects. In forty districts of Bengal, committees of this class administer funds aggregating £345,000 for the keeping up of roads and communications. Other committees regulate the distribution of educational funds supplied by Government, and control the charitable dispensaries scattered over the province. Similar arrangements exist in Assam, which follows in all such matters the Bengal model. In Bombay and Madras the Local Funds Laws provide for the constitution of district and subordinate boards to administer the funds raised under those enactments for communications and educational purposes. In Madras the revenue of these boards was in 1881-82 over half a million sterling, of which four-fifths came from rates and taxes. The district road and educational funds in Bombay aggregate about £380,000. The North-Western Provinces and the Punjab have also district committees administering funds raised by local taxation, and allotted to them by Government for similar objects. The funds under local control in the North-Western Provinces and Oudh amount to some £360,000, and in the Punjab to about £200,000. Only in the Central Provinces and British Burma are no district committees of this class to be found. The revenues at the disposal of these committees are thus seen to be very considerable, and the reports show that much useful work has been done by them. The members have hitherto in all cases been appointed by Government, and the district officer has always been the Chairman or President.

This, then, was the state of things which Lord Ripon found on his arrival in India.

Long before that event it had been an object with the best class of Indian statesmen to associate the leading non-officials of the districts more freely with the officers of Government in the task of local administration; but whenever the conditions of the problem were fairly investigated, it appeared that independent outsiders, whether European or Native, would not consent to devote their time and labour to the public service unless they were vested with some real authority and discretion in the conduct of the business nominally entrusted to them. In the case of the natives, those who know them best have always held that in the matter of municipal administration at any rate there were good grounds for anticipating the successful development of local

---

from the towns of the interior to which our statistics refer. The figures in the table for Bombay and Madras are those of 1880-81, the reports of those Provinces for 1881-82 not having reached us.

self-government, if proper facilities for free action were afforded them. Thus of the Punjab, Sir Donald McLeod wrote so far back as 1860 :—

“The genius of the natives is essentially suited for municipal organization, and as rightly observed by the Supreme Government, municipal institutions are as well adapted to the natives of India as to those of England. This municipal organization still exists in every trade, and did exist, previous to our rule, in every village. But their experiences have been of a microscopic character. In social matters the representative element was almost the only regulating principle. In the affairs of State none was ordinarily allowed to interfere. Hence municipal organizations among the natives have been limited to small sections of society having common interests.

“This should be borne in mind in all our endeavours to turn municipal organization to account. We should commence with the atoms of which native society is composed, and work upwards in such a manner as they may themselves suggest, or as may be found most congenial to them.

“To give the people a real interest in the arrangements contemplated, it is absolutely essential that they should be given a large discretion in the matter of expenditure. To work any practical use out of the people, they should not continue ever to be treated as children or imbeciles. . . .

“In short, the municipal body should be, as regards essentials, really independent, so far as the interference of our officials goes.

“If, however, we begin, as we have been wont to do, from the top instead of from the bottom—*i.e.*, nominate a council of men of rank and consideration, and then descend to details as best we may—the whole thing will become a sham and a delusion; and still more so if we associate our own officers with them in their proceedings, whether deliberative or executive.”

Again, Sir George Campbell,\* writing of Bengal in 1871–72, remarked :—

“His impression was very strong that if educated gentlemen connected with various towns in various parts of the country are asked to give their assistance and time and labour for the public good, it is clear that we should entrust them with very considerable powers.”

“Municipal institutions were indigenous to the country, and we might hope that in a country where those institutions were in full working order, long before we had them in the British Isles, in a country in some respects that of their birth, such institutions might flourish and rapidly succeed.” “Self-governing institutions were a very essential part in the very constitutions of the Aryan race.” He did not agree in the argument that municipal institutions must be the precursor of free political institutions. He believed that human reason was so

\* “Extracts from Speeches and Letters regarding the Bengal Municipalities Bill.” Calcutta. 1873.

constituted that what was called patriotism and public spirit were the natural accompaniments and result of self-government.

“ . . . . . If you made a beginning of self-government, public spirit and patriotism would result. His object (as Lieutenant-Governor) was to give municipalities real self-government, and not to make them sham institutions (by subordinating them to the magistrates). No effort should be wanting on his part to render municipalities self-governing bodies. He had nothing more at heart, believing that municipal government is the shape in which a measure of freedom may best be given to, and exercised by, the people of this country in the present stage of their national existence. He would rather see a little done voluntarily by the people themselves through their representatives than a good deal done under pressure from above.” “ I hold,” he said, “ very earnest views on the subject of local self-government. I believe it is our duty to educate the people, as far as in our power, to govern themselves: I believe that the power and the habit of self-government must come from below upwards, and that it must come from municipal institutions first—going upwards to higher and larger institutions.” “ I should myself be willing to run the risk of a check to improvements, feeling that the power of self-government is even more important than material improvement.” “ If you are gradually to bring the people to appreciate the system of self-government, to lead them to take an interest in their own affairs, they must have real and practical powers in their own affairs, and the greatest power of all being taxation, they must have real power in respect of taxation.”

Mr. A. O. Hume, C.B., formerly Secretary to the Government of India, an officer whose knowledge of native life and character in the North-Western Provinces is exceptionally wide, wrote thus in 1872 :—

“ So long as people are absolutely *in statu pupillari*, so long as they are really wholly unable to think and act for themselves, an absolute paternal despotism may be desirable, and is certainly defensible; but when this incapacity for thought and action ceases, or diminishes, so too does the expediency and the justification for despotic rule; and a persistence in this latter after it has ceased to be suitable can only end, sooner or later, in a violent convulsion.

“ My contention is that amongst the leaders of the population of the larger towns in many parts of India, but specially in Bengal, this incapacity has disappeared. They may not be willing to think precisely as we do, or to act to such an extent as many think desirable, but they are no longer absolute children; they have made vast progress during the last twenty-five years (a progress due not to our sham municipal institutions here, but to our literature, our history, our triumphs in physical science, all of which are now theirs almost as much as ours), and they have become entitled to at least moderate share of municipal self-government.

“ And here let me enter my earnest protest against the fallacy so often and so complacently reiterated which assumes that the playing

at municipalities by Government nominees who are at every step and every point subject to the control of the magistrate of the district, the Commissioner and the Lieutenant-Governor, can ever pave the way or train men for real self-government. What man was ever made a good shot or qualified to handle safely loaded fire-arms by being exercised with a wooden musket? The mechanical motions, whether of rifle practice or administration, are soon enough acquired at any time: it is perception, judgment, discretion, care, and accuracy that have to be acquired, and what of these is taught by 'dummy' exercise? Nay more, without real power and real responsibilities, you will never succeed in inducing the best men—be they Indians or Europeans—to do their best at any work; and so long as a system is adhered to, which renders municipal commissioners mere instruments of a despotic Government, bound to carry out measures they by no means themselves approve, and which the people absolutely dislike, so long shall we fail to secure any practical exhibition of those qualities and capacities which stamp men as fitted for more or less independent administration."

Similar quotations might easily be multiplied, and the force which they possessed some ten or twenty years ago has gathered weight and intensity by the remarkable advance which the country has since made in the rapid spread of education, the development of the Press, and the increase of intelligence and public spirit that is year by year reported to be manifesting itself in every province of the Empire. But although the true theory of local self-government was thus early recognized, the Government was slow to act upon it; and in the great majority of instances the local bodies, municipal and district, were uniformly subjected to close and direct official control.

How the subject forced itself upon Lord Ripon's attention, he has himself explained in a speech replying to an address of the Lahore Municipality on the 8th of November, 1882, from which we take the following extract:—

"The main and primary object of the Government of India in the steps which it is taking at the present time for the development and extension of self-government in this country, is to advance and promote the political and popular education of the people, and to do what may be done, under the circumstances of these times, to induce the best and most intelligent men of the community to come forward and take a share in the management of their own local affairs, and to guide and aid and train them in the attainment of that important object. We have not been led to adopt this policy at this time in consequence of any mere inclinations of our own, but I may truly say that we have been almost forced to adopt it by the circumstances of the times with which we have had to deal. We had last year, as you are aware, to make arrangements for the renewal of those quinquennial provincial contracts which were originally introduced in the time of Lord Mayo,

and which formed one of the distinguishing features of that great policy of decentralization which will always constitute one of the greatest claims of that distinguished statesman upon the gratitude of India.\* Those five years' contracts were running out, and we had to consider upon what terms they should be renewed; and when we came to turn our attention to that question, we thought it our duty to see whether the time had not come to apply more fully, and to carry out yet further, the policy which Lord Mayo had inaugurated; for it must ever be borne in mind that that policy, in its full intention, was not only of provincial decentralization, but that Lord Mayo looked with the eye of a statesman to promote also the great object of self-government; and it seemed to us that we could not better apply the principles which he laid down than by carrying decentralization beyond the stage at which—not, I believe, in accordance with his desire, but owing to circumstances which followed his unhappy decease—it had been arrested, and to advance it from decentralization as between the Government of India and the Provincial Governments, to decentralization as between those Provincial Governments and the local bodies within their jurisdiction. But when we came to look at this problem and to seek for a solution of it, we found that it would be essential to infuse new life and fresh vigour into those local bodies on which we desired to confer fuller and more extended powers.”

Accordingly in announcing to the Provincial Government the terms of the revised financial contracts made with them last year, the Government of India, in a Resolution of the Financial Department of the 30th of September, 1881, invited them to consider (1) what items of receipt and charges could be transferred from Provincial to local “heads” of account for administration by committees comprising non-official and, wherever possible, elected members, and what items already treated in the accounts as Local, but not so administered, might suitably be so; (2) what redistribution of items was desirable, in order to lay on Local and Municipal bodies those which are best understood and appreciated by the people; (3) what measures, legislative or other, were necessary to ensure more local self-government. Incidentally

---

\* The policy of financial decentralization India owes mainly to the brothers Strachey; and it is fully explained in their book on “The Finances and Public Works of India.” Briefly stated it amounts to this:—The Imperial Government makes over to the various Provincial Governments the management of the principal heads of Provincial Revenue, and the control of most branches of Civil Expenditure (subject to certain general rules and conditions) on contracts, the monetary terms of which are fixed for five years at a time. The Local Governments are allowed to benefit by their own good administration and economy, and are relieved from the interference of the Supreme Government in details. On the other hand the Supreme Government ceases to be worried by constant proposals for increased expenditure—its liabilities are precisely known, and its work very greatly lightened. Above all else, friction between the Supreme and Local Governments is reduced to a minimum.

they were requested also to consider (4) ways of equalizing local and municipal taxation throughout the empire, checking severe and unsuitable imposts, and favouring forms most in accordance with popular opinion and sentiment. In separate letters addressed to each Local Government, the Provincial authorities were at the same time furnished with a brief analysis of the existing distribution of items as shown in the imperial accounts, that they might see the points which had chiefly struck the Government of India in connection with these suggestions being made that Municipalities would be relieved of charges now laid on them for police (the control of which must remain with Government) and *per contra* be entrusted with larger jurisdiction in respect of education and medical charity, sanitation and local works.

Meantime a general inquiry had been instituted by the Government into the working of the elective system in those municipalities where it had already been introduced, and a general examination had been made of the position of the local boards throughout the country. The result of this inquiry went to confirm the truth of the experience above referred to, that non-official gentlemen are not, as a rule, willing to give up their time to serve on Boards where they are expected merely to register the decisions of the presiding official, but that in the few cases where reasonable freedom of action had been allowed, the non-official members had shown much zeal and intelligence. The reports proved clearly enough that in most instances, as we have already said, the true principles of local self-government had been to a great extent lost sight of or set aside. Sir A. Eden, the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, was found to have expressed repeated and emphatic opinions that where committees had in that province failed to show interest in their work, the fault generally lay with the presiding Government officer; and there could be no reasonable doubt that most district officers preferred to keep their committees at arm's length as much as possible, and to do the work themselves. (Mr. Seton-Karr, we observe in passing, practically admits this in his plea that local work, which the law certainly entrusted to the corporate local boards, "has hitherto been the least irksome and the most gratifying part of the public duty" of the district Magistrate—*i.e.*, of the presiding officer of the board in his individual capacity.) It was found, moreover, that under some local laws the powers of the boards as such were so restricted by the requirement of superior sanction to expenditure and action of all kinds that they could not be expected to take any keen interest in their duties.

On a review of all these circumstances, the Governor-General in Council proceeded to indicate the views of the Government on



the general question of local self-government in the Resolution of the 18th of May, 1882.

After reciting the heads of the policy of financial decentralization and localization, laid down in the previous Resolution of September, and adverting to the fact that communications had been received from all the Local Governments accepting that policy, Lord Ripon went on to set forth his further views at length. He explained at the outset that the Government was quite prepared to face the fact that at the first start of a system conferring enlarged powers upon local bodies, mistakes would probably be made by them, and the work would possibly for a time not be quite so well done as if it had remained in the hands of Government officers. The Government, it was said, viewed the scheme not so much as one for securing, *primarily*, improved administration as "an instrument for political and popular education." The Government, however, relied on its officers to so assist in giving effect to its views, by bringing to bear on the development of the scheme "administrative tact and directive energy," as to reduce to a minimum this period of failure, should such occur. It was pointed out that the task of administration was yearly becoming more onerous, and that it was yearly becoming harder for Government officers unaided to get through their tasks, while there was at the same time rapidly growing up, all over the country, an educated and intelligent class, which it was most desirable to utilize for public purposes. It had now, in fact, become imperative to lead the people more generally into paths of self-help, and induce them to manage as far as possible those local matters that need not, for Imperial reasons, be kept strictly in the hands of the paid officers of Government.

All this must to an unprejudiced critic appear the merest truism. It remained for Conservative ingenuity to discover in it a "deliberate insult and degradation of the whole body of district officers," and a general handing over of the work of the country to "irresponsible bodies of ignorant and apathetic villagers and interested place hunters." The views expressed are merely those of many experienced Indian administrators in bygone years; and to dispute them is really to discredit the whole policy of England towards the natives of India for the last half century. It is true that the term "political education" has been taken up in a manner not fully contemplated by the Government of India. The native newspapers, for instance, forthwith built upon it an airy and gaseous fabric of their own, culminating in an Imperial Indian Parliament, to which, as they fabled, all power would very shortly be transferred, and in which even the Viceroy in Council might eventually merge.

Lord Ripon was hailed as the deliverer of a new political gospel, and, popular as he had been before, became at once the idol of the whole educated native community. In some quarters indeed it was solemnly proposed to admit him forthwith to a place in the Indian Pantheon. His political opponents at home with less justification seem to have imagined that he was plotting to convert the whole of India into a sort of Radical school and arranging to train up the educated youth of the country in all the tenets of the Cobden Club. The Viceroy had, however, before him no such foolish or felonious ideals. He simply contemplated allowing the people to manage in future their local roads, drains, dispensaries, and schools, with less active interference on the part of Government, believing that men who are competent to conduct the business of bankers, merchants, lawyers, landlords, and the like, with profit to themselves, may fairly be expected to manage the most ordinary public business with advantage to the community.

Sir John Strachey\* tells us truly that municipal institutions are in India, as they have been elsewhere, the "first practical step in political education." But between the first step and the last there is a long and weary road to travel. We may look forward to a time in the far distant future when the people of India shall no longer be held in leading-strings; when education, intelligence and public spirit shall have become so general that there will be no longer place there for bureaucratic Government; when the various provinces, and even the empire itself, shall be managed on constitutional principles and by representative methods. We believe it to be the lofty mission of England in India to make the dawn of that day possible. But ideas of this kind are at present far outside the range of practical politics. They certainly never entered into the mind of Lord Ripon's Government. "The object we have had in view" (said the Viceroy to the Lucknow Municipal Commissioners) "has been to induce the best, the most intelligent, and the most influential men in the country to come forward and take a larger part than hitherto in the management of their own local affairs, and gradually to train them to do so more and more." And these "local affairs" have been over and over again declared to be such matters as municipal and county boards ordinarily deal with. The sternest warnings have been given that political discussions of any kind will not be tolerated.

In regard to the constitution of the Local Boards, the Government of India fully recognized the impossibility and absurdity of

---

\* "The Finances and Public Works of India," p. 8.

attempting to introduce any uniform system throughout the whole of India. The circumstances of each province differ so widely, the people are in such various stages of advancement, and political considerations are so diverse, that large latitude of discretion was necessarily left to the local authorities.

Lord Ripon\* explained his views on this point on various public occasions as well as in the Resolution of May. We may quote here what he said to the Delhi Municipality in November last :—

“ We did not desire to introduce into India any cut-and-dried system framed upon an English model, or based upon specially English political theories. We did not desire to lay down any uniform system to be adopted under all circumstances throughout the length and breadth of this great land, whether in regard to the composition of local bodies, to the extension of the franchise, or to the system of control. On the contrary, no one who reads the Resolution of the Government of India of last May can fail to perceive that what we wished was to see a variety of systems tried in different parts of the country, in order that we might find out by actual experience what was the system, or what were the systems, best suited to each province and to each portion of this great peninsula. And we desired also, above all things, that the new arrangements of self-government should as far as possible be those which were most consistent with the habits and the customs of the people in the different parts of India; that they should be drawn up in close consultation with representative men of different classes and districts; that they should be based so far as may be upon the indigenous native institutions which still exist; and that we should avail ourselves to the utmost of those “ organic groups ” which are still to be found amongst us, so that the system to be founded might be one consonant with the traditions of the country and the feelings and requirement of the people.

“ Then again, gentlemen, we did not require that the system which we propose to inaugurate should be applied by the various Local Governments to every portion of the territory under their respective control. We were not so foolish as to believe that all parts of India were fitted for a system of this description; we know very well that in this great land there are men of many races and in many stages of civilization, and that while you may find, in the most advanced parts of India, men of developed intellects and great intelligence, skilled in the management of their own private affairs, and well capable of managing the public affairs of their own localities, there are also parts of the country which are inhabited by races still scarcely removed from the savage stage; and that it would be utterly absurd to introduce any system of self-government among Sonthals, or Bhils, or Khoods.”

---

\* We have thought it best to allow Lord Ripon to explain the leading features of his policy in his own words. His speeches in India have been collected and published by an admiring Native editor.

There were, however, certain general principles which the Government of India desired to see followed, wherever possible. These were (1) restriction of the areas to be placed under rural boards so as to ensure local knowledge and interest on the part of the members, provision being made, if thought desirable, for District Councils or Controlling Boards to deal with matters of wider importance; (2) a decided preponderance on the boards of non-official members—a principle already recognized in all the local laws creating Municipal or District Committees; and (3) the adoption of some sort of elective system wherever practicable. In sketching out the mode of applying these principles, Lord Ripon naturally kept most prominently in view those places where they could be safely and fully worked out. But the Local Governments were given the widest possible discretion to decide as to the manner and the extent of the application in each case. Nothing, therefore, can be more unfair than the assertion that “this brand-new constitution” (as if anything that could be called a constitution had been positively laid down) “was to be made to fit provinces so dissimilar as Bombay, the Central Provinces, Oudh, or Behar.” The published papers show that as a fact the Local Governments have been allowed the utmost freedom in their arrangements, and have received cordial support from the Government of India in every deviation they have thought it desirable anywhere to make from the perfect ideal of the May Resolution. Yet ignorant critics have ventured to congratulate the public on the judicious way in which Local Governments have managed to get “round” the policy of the Supreme Government, when in fact they were only giving effect to its positive orders. It may also be remarked in passing that the peculiar features in the Bengal scheme which have provoked the most hostile criticism are entirely the work of that Local Government; they were only accepted by the Governor-General in Council out of his earnest wish to leave the Lieutenant-Governor (who by the way is a strong Conservative) to do what he thought best for his Province. There are perhaps points in the scheme to which exception may fairly be taken, but for these the Lieutenant-Governor and his advisers are solely responsible.

Having explained his views as to the constitution of the boards, Lord Ripon went on to touch briefly upon the question of the control to be exercised over them by Government and its local officers. We cannot explain the intention of the Government of India in this respect better than by reproducing the following quotations from its letter of the 4th of October, 1882, to the Bombay Government:—

“Furthermore, the powers which it is proposed to entrust to local boards are not in any sense unlimited, but are in fact most strictly limited.

The local objects to be entrusted to their management are merely those which they already administer, and which are described in the Resolution of Lord Mayo's Government above quoted; and although it is contemplated that in the performance of their functions they should be less subject than at present to official directions, it is clearly laid down in the Resolution of the 18th of May that in respect of several of those functions, such as the raising of loans, the imposition of new taxes, the alienation of property, interference with matters involving religious questions or effecting the public peace, &c.—the sanction of authority would be necessary, as heretofore, to give validity to their proceedings. Besides this general form of control it was explained in the Resolution (paragraphs 17 and 18) that it was the intention of the Government of India that the district officer should supervise and control from without the proceedings of the local boards within his district, while the Government were to retain all necessary powers for dealing with any board that failed in its duty—powers extending from simple remonstrance up to an absolute, though temporary, supersession of the defaulting body, and, of course, including such intermediate measures for the prevention of serious and persistent neglect of duty as might be determined upon in consultation with Local Governments."

The precise amount of control, as Lord Ripon himself has elsewhere pointed out, "must vary with the advancement of the people and the circumstances of the district." But the point to which the Viceroy attached cardinal importance was that wherever those circumstances did admit of it (a point for Local Governments to decide) the Magistrates of the districts or subdivisions should cease to be the chairmen or even members of all purely administrative boards. It was desired that they should supervise and control the proceedings of the boards from without, but should not interfere personally in the deliberations or usurp the initiative in matters entrusted to the management of the Committees. The Resolution of May stated the view of the Government thus:—

"There appears to be great force in the argument that so long as the chief executive officers are, as a matter of course, chairmen of the Municipal and District Committees, there is little chance of these Committees affording any effective training to their members in the management of local affairs, or of the non-official members taking any real interest in local business. The non-official members must be led to feel that real power is placed in their hands, and that they have real responsibilities to discharge. It is doubtful whether they have under present arrangements any sufficient inducement to give up their time and attention to the transaction of public business. There is this further objection to the district officer acting as chairman, that if the non-official members are independent and energetic, risk may arise of unseemly collision between the chairman and the Board. The

former would be in a far more dignified and influential position if he supervised and controlled the proceedings of the Board from outside, acting as arbiter between all parties, and not as leader of any.

“The Governor-General in Council therefore would wish to see non-official persons acting, wherever practicable, as chairmen of the local Boards. There, may, however, be places where it would be impossible to get any suitable non-official chairman, and there may be districts where the chief executive officer must for the present retain these duties in his own hands. But his Excellency in Council trusts that the Local Governments will have recourse sparingly to the appointment of executive officers as chairmen of local Boards; and he is of opinion that it should be a general rule that when such an officer is chairman of any local Board, he shall not in that capacity have a vote in its proceedings. This arrangement will, to some extent, tend to strengthen the independence of the non-official members, and keep the official chairman, where there must be such, apart from the possible contentions of opposing parties.”

Now this is the feature in the general scheme which has chiefly drawn down upon it the censures of adverse critics, and it is worth while to submit it to further examination.

It is admitted by the Viceroy and his advisers that there are many districts in which, owing to political considerations, or the backwardness of the people, the district officer must remain the chairman of the Boards where such exist, or continue to be the local executive where Boards are impossible. The Local Governments must decide, on their responsibility, what districts are in this ‘parlous’ state, and they will do so, we may be sure, without running any risks by an undue leaning to liberality. Even Sir Charles Aitchison, the Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab, whose views are more advanced on this subject than those of any other Provincial ruler, has shown, by his published orders on the reports of his district and divisional officers, that the land of the Five Rivers will not be lost in his time by any rash supersession of the district officers. But there are many of the older districts in Bengal, Bombay and Madras, and some in other Provinces also, where the State can command the services of intelligent non-officials, European and Natives, who are perfectly competent to look after local matters without being subject to the immediate supervision and personal direction of the district magistrate. As a matter of fact, in some few districts the magistrates, especially those who have a real talent for administration and are something better than mere grinding machines, have for years past left their committees almost entirely to their independent working, contenting themselves with keeping an eye upon all that goes on, discussing frankly with them points of difference, and only interposing effectively when interposition is seen to be necessary in the public interests. In the majority of instances,

however, the local committees of all kinds have, as we before explained, hitherto been shams. The magistrate goes to the meeting with all the business cut and dried. He has not unfrequently given effect to his proposals in anticipation of what he takes to be a mere formal sanction. The members are expected simply to register his resolutions, and any attempt at inquiry or opposition is summarily snubbed. A district magistrate in the interior has too much power in his hands for any native gentleman to feel happy in crossing him. He finds it simpler to stay away from the Board meetings altogether, and the annual reports have hitherto been full of complaints of the scant attendance on the part of members. European members are even less willing to attend meetings of this sort, but generally they and the magistrate pull together, and they are content to leave their interests in his hands. In a few of the more advanced districts something like an "opposition" has, however, of late years, been organized among the non-official members, and a reasonable Constitutional check has been at times placed on the autocratic action of the magistrate. In such cases the ruler of the district has to descend to the arena of wordy conflict, and, if he would carry his proposals, has to gather round him and keep together a "chairman's party"—not by any means a dignified position for a Government officer to fill. This tendency to independence of action on the part of the non-official members is rapidly extending.

Now, under Lord Ripon's scheme, the district officer will, as a matter of fact, be more absolutely independent than he is at present, even while presiding over the most servile of these Boards. He will now simply have to watch their proceedings, having power to inspect their works and to call for reports and explanations on any matters about which he desires to satisfy himself. If all goes well he will remain quiet. If anything goes wrong, instead of having to call a meeting and fight the question to an uncertain issue, he will refer it for opinion to his professional adviser—medical, engineering, or educational, as the case may be. Fortified with their report he will invite the Board to reconsider its plans. In nine cases out of ten the Board will yield. In the tenth it may be recalcitrant or show cause for the view taken by it. If the magistrate is still unconvinced the whole question will go to higher authority for final settlement. If a Board is persistently obstructive or useless the Government can suspend it, carry out its works at its cost, and reconstitute it with fresh members thereafter. It appears to us that the powers of district officers, so far from being minimized or set aside, are really under this scheme enhanced and improved, while at the same time a fair opening is left for the independent action of the

local boards. Every provision is certainly made for reducing the risk of bad work to a minimum.

But there is another advantage in severing the direct connection of the district officers with the Boards, and that is the superior administrative training which their new duties will give to those officers themselves. During the last fifteen years or so the volume of a district officer's work has grown in a way of which the worthy retired Indians in London who criticize this scheme have absolutely no conception. Their idea of a District Magistrate is that of the good old days, when there was plenty of time for pig-sticking and "shikar" of all sorts; when men went to "Cutcherry" at 2 P.M. and came away at 5 P.M.; when the work was done mainly in the saddle, under the tentflap, or beneath the village mango tope. The Magistrate-Collector of the present day is an anxious, hardly-driven man, "the drudge of many Departments" (as Sir G. Campbell called him), who is tied to his office desk from 10 A.M. to 6 P.M., buried in masses of petitions, reports, statistics, files of every kind; to whom each day brings demands for information or calls for opinion upon new fibres, new laws, new fads of all sorts. Lost in the mass of detail, too many of these officers have failed to learn the true art of administration. They are not so much the executive controlling heads of the various branches of district Government as the chief clerks of a huge district office. To relieve them of the detail of municipal business, of roads, sanitation, medical relief, and school management, is to set them free to learn the proper functions of an Indian administrator, to make it possible for them to take a wider view of the requirements of their charge, and to train them up for filling usefully the higher offices of the State. We say emphatically that the administrative work of the districts has shown distinct signs of deterioration of recent years; and if space permitted we would undertake to prove this. The first step towards improvement must be to relieve the overworked district officer, and give him time for the higher duties of his arduous and honourable profession.

How Lord Ripon views the position of the district officer may be gathered from another passage in his Lahore addresses—

"I believe that there cannot be a greater error than that of those who suppose that, by this system, the just and legitimate influence of district officers will be diminished. I hold, on the contrary, it will be found that that influence will be increased. No doubt such a system as this will make a call upon somewhat different qualities from those which have been brought forward under the present system of more direct administration. I should say that, for the future, we shall require rather the qualities of the statesman than the qualities of the administrator; and, for my own part, I think that the qualities of the



statesman are the higher qualities of the two; and though it may be true that the qualities of statesmanship called forth by a policy of this description differ somewhat from those which have been exhibited in the past, yet I for one cannot admit that, in the guidance, the training, and the leading of a great and intelligent population in times of peace, there are not just as high qualities required as those which are brought to light in days of war and of diplomacy."

It is probable that in some provinces, under the legislative projects now on the anvil, the district officer will, while he is withdrawn from direct connection with the local *administrative* boards, be constituted the President of a district *Controlling* Council, composed of delegated, nominated, or elected members. This arrangement will perhaps satisfy those who dread, though without reason, the apparent effacement of the district officer. It must at the same time be clearly understood that this plan really *reduces* the independent powers of control which the Government of India contemplated his possessing.

We have left ourselves no room to deal with the general charge brought against the whole native community, to the effect that "combination among its various classes for public objects is unknown and impossible;" and that the results of trusting local affairs to local boards will only be to "perpetuate corruption and venality." A statement of that kind "smells musty" to those who know the India of to-day. It has no foundation in fact, and is contradicted by every-day experience, and by the witness of the Indian Press. The argument, moreover, overlooks the fact that the Government has not proposed to limit the membership of the boards to natives. It desires to avail itself of the services of non-officials of all classes—native, European, and Eurasian. In Assam the tea-planters may, if they choose, practically assume the entire management of their local communications. In Behar the indigo-planters have a field of improvement open to them such as even they have never had before. The railway employés may demand their fair share of representation. Coffee-planters, settlers of all kinds, are entitled to insist on the local governments making provision to meet their wants, and bring them in upon the boards. There is no anti-European exclusiveness to be found in any part of the scheme.

It is doubtless, however, true that the natives are those who are most interested in its success, and it must be defended or condemned mainly in its relations to them. In itself it involves, as we have shown, no such revolutionary programme as its opponents assert or as injudicious advocates may fancy. Neither is it a cut-and-dried "constitution" imposed by arbitrary power on dissimilar provinces. It is a broad, generous, and elastic

measure which will be cordially carried through by the Indian services when once they have fully grasped its bearings. It is in perfect harmony with and issues directly out of the deliberate policy of the State towards the subject peoples of India, and is justified by the remarkable advances they have made within the last twenty years. We are satisfied that this policy will never be deliberately reversed by Parliament. The Government of India must in the very nature of things be a progressive Government. Its whole task is to lead its subjects up to better things and higher levels. This it must do cautiously but steadily; "not swift nor slow to change," but never shrinking from such changes as appear to it to be needed in the true interests of the Indian people.

---

#### ART. IV.—ANTHONY TROLLOPE.

*An Autobiography.* By ANTHONY TROLLOPE. In Two Vols. Wm. Blackwood & Sons: Edinburgh and London. 1882.

"EACH human soul gifted above the souls of common men," so it has been said, "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 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."\*

Let us turn, then, to the popular writer whose *Autobiography* is before us, and see what lessons we can learn from his life and character. His object in writing his life was "the benefit of those who may read it, and, when young, may intend to follow the same career;" he continues: "*Nulla dies sine linea*—let that be their motto, and let their work be to them as is his common work to the common labourer."† In truth, the lesson of Anthony Trollope's life is but a fresh illustration of the rule that success almost always in the end rewards plodding, persevering diligence when animated and supported by "cheerful, lasting hope."

---

\* From Dean Stanley's Sermon on Lord Palmerston: "Oratorical Year Book for 1865," p. 325.

† Vol. ii. p. 224.

Perseverance and hope carried him through the first twenty-six years of his life—"years," he calls them, "of suffering, disgrace and inward remorse;"\* and then through a career of constant labour, of many changes and of failures, both frequent and absolute, until he gained, as a public servant, the respect and confidence of his official chiefs, as a writer, popularity and at least moderate wealth.

Anthony Trollope was born in Keppel Street, Russell Square, in 1815. Like Macaulay and John Stuart Mill, he had a most unpleasant father. Were we called on to decide which of the three men—Zachary Macaulay, James Mill, or the elder Trollope—is entitled to the bad eminence of being among disagreeable men the most disagreeable, we should be puzzled.

Readers of Mr. Trevelyan's life of his uncle, and, even more, readers of the "Autobiography" of J. S. Mill, on reading the following extract from A. Trollope's autobiography will recognize a strong likeness between the three fathers:—

"My father had constantly an eye to my scholastic improvement. From my very babyhood, before my first days at Harrow, I had to take my place alongside of him as he shaved, at six o'clock in the morning, and say my early rules from the Latin Grammar, or repeat the Greek alphabet; and was obliged, at these early lessons, to hold my head inclined towards him, so that, in the event of guilty fault, he might be able to pull my hair without stopping his razor or dropping his shaving-brush. No father was ever more anxious for the education of his children, though, I think, none ever less knew how to go about the work. Of amusement, as far as I can remember, he never recognized the need; he allowed himself no distraction, and did not seem to think it was necessary to a child. I cannot bethink me of aught he ever did for my gratification, but for my welfare—for the welfare of us all—he was willing to make any sacrifice."

On the same page we read of an application of Scripture of which even Zachary Macaulay would have disapproved—

"In passion my father knew not what he did, and he has knocked me down with the great folio Bible which he always used."†

He was of the same opinion, perhaps, as the Sunday-school teacher who, when reproved by his superintendent for hitting a scholar over the head with a Bible, quoted in his justification the text, "Scripture is profitable for correction."

The elder Trollope was in his early days a man of some and had hopes of higher fortune. He was educated at Winchester,

\* Vol. i. p. 79.

† *Ibid.*, pp. 19, 20; conf. J. S. Mills's "Autobiography," chap. i. *passim*.

and became a Fellow of New College. He was called to the Bar, and at the time of Anthony's birth practised in Chancery. He had the reputation of being an excellent and most conscientious lawyer, but his intolerable temper drove away his clients and ruined his professional prospects; his other hopes were also frustrated. An old uncle, to whom he was heir-presumptive, married and had a family. The unsuccessful lawyer and disappointed heir was of the opinion, entertained to their ruin by so many who have failed in other trades, that farming is a business in which money may be made without special education or apprenticeship, instead of its being, as his son well says, "Of all trades the one in which an accurate knowledge of what things should be done and the best manner of doing them is most necessary, and it is one also for success in which a sufficient capital is indispensable." The father had no knowledge, and what capital he had was soon exhausted. He took a large farm at Harrow, then a completely country parish, and, holding only a lease, committed the additional imprudence of building his house on another man's land. This house ere long he was compelled to let, and the family descended to a farm-house on the land which, by the name of "Orley Farm,"\* was afterwards made well known to many by the pen of Anthony Trollope and the pencil of John Millais. The father's connection with "Orley Farm" was disastrous. Not so that of his son. It stands the fourth highest in his list of the sums he gained by his works.

● The elder Trollope endeavoured, and with equal want of success, to combine with his calling of a farmer the additional one of an ecclesiastical encyclopædist. He commenced what he termed an "Encyclopædia Ecclesiastica," on which, to the moment of his death, he laboured with the same unflagging industry which his son showed in his literary career. At the time of the father's death a portion of his book had been published by subscription, but "it has long since been buried in the midst of that huge pile of futile literature, the building up of which has broken so many hearts."†

If Anthony Trollope was unfortunate in his father, he was fortunate in his mother. Of her it may truly be said that she carried her whole family on her shoulders. When her husband's misfortunes increased she, with three of her children, went to America with the view of establishing Henry, the second son, in one of the Western States. She opened a bazaar or large shop in Cincinnati; it was a failure. She was a shrewd observer and carefully noted the, to her, strange people amongst

---

\* Published in 1862.

† Vol. i. p. 19.

whom her lot was cast. She was then fifty, and had never written a line or earned a shilling, but she knew that unless she could make money there was no money for any of her family. She determined to write a book on America, and she produced "The Domestic Manners of the Americans." It was published in 1832, and its author was fortunate enough to receive for it £800. Thenceforth, for more than twenty years, she derived a large income from her writings.

Her son describes her as—

"An unselfish, affectionate, and most industrious woman, with great capacity for enjoyment, and high physical gifts. She was endowed, too, with much creative power, with considerable humour, and a genuine feeling for romance. But she was neither clear-sighted nor accurate, and, in her attempts to describe morals, manners, and even facts, was unable to avoid the pitfalls of exaggeration."\*

Elsewhere he says of her—

"No observer was ever less qualified to judge of the prospects or even of the happiness of a young people."†

Charles Dickens, after his first visit to America, and the publication of his "American Notes," wrote that, allowing for the change the publication of Mrs. Trollope's book had worked "in many social features of American society," and for the time (ten years) that had passed since she wrote, he was convinced that there was no writer who had so well and accurately described it in many of its aspects. ●

"I do not recollect," he adds, "ever to have heard or seen the charge of exaggeration made against a feeble performance, though in its feebleness it may have been most untrue. It seems to me essentially natural, and quite inevitable, that common observers should accuse an uncommon one of this fault."‡

The profits of the American book caused a transient gleam of prosperity at "Orley Farm." Then there came the final catastrophe. The father fled to the Continent; his wife and four of the children followed him. The family settled at Bruges, then a Cave of Adullam for impecunious Englishmen. More troubles were at hand. Consumption showed itself in the second son and the younger daughter; the father was broken-hearted, and disease soon showed itself in him. The maintenance of the whole family depended on the mother's earnings by her pen. She was at her table at four in the morning, and had finished

\* Vol. i. p. 44.

† *Ibid.*, p. 31.

‡ "Letters of Charles Dickens," vol. i. p. 80.

her work before the world had begun to be aroused.\* But from the time that sickness appeared in the household—

“My mother’s most visible occupation,” writes Anthony, “was that of nursing. There were two sick men in the house, and hers were the hands that tended them. The novels went on, of course. We had already learned to know that they would be forthcoming at stated intervals—and they were always forthcoming. The doctor’s vials and the ink-bottle held equal places in my mother’s room. I have written many novels under many circumstances; but I doubt much whether I could write one when my whole heart was by the bedside of a dying son. Her power of dividing herself into two parts, and keeping her intellect by itself clear from the troubles of the world, and fit for the duty it had to do, I never saw equalled. I do not think that the writing of a novel is the most difficult task which a man may be called upon to do; but it is a task that may be supposed to demand a spirit fairly at ease. The work of doing it with a troubled spirit killed Sir Walter Scott. My mother went through it unscathed in strength, though she performed all the work of day-nurse and night-nurse to a sick household, for there were soon three of them dying.”†

Nevertheless, it was under these circumstances that Mrs. Trollope’s best novels were written.

“My boyhood,” writes Trollope, “was, I think, as unhappy as that of any young gentleman could well be.”‡ And certainly in wretchedness it equalled, if it did not surpass, the boyhood of Charles Dickens and of Oliver Goldsmith. The father, himself a Wykehamist, had decided to send his sons to Winchester; but various reasons, the strongest of which probably was his ever-increasing poverty, led him to avail himself of the almost gratuitous education which Harrow School, according to the will of its founder, then§ offered to the children of residents in the parish, and there he sent his three sons. They went as day-boarders. Day-boarders at Harrow were not received on equal terms by the aristocratic crowd, composed of sons of peers and the sons of tradesmen who had made their ten thousand a year. The two elder Trollopes seem, however, to have been treated as other day-boarders. “I do not suppose,” adds their brother, “that they were well treated, but I doubt whether they were subjected to the ignominy which I endured.”|| It would not be an exaggeration to apply to him Macaulay’s description of Goldsmith’s school-days:—

\* Vol. i. p. 33.

† *Ibid.*, pp. 38–41.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

§ We say “then,” as of late years many changes have been most properly made in the regulations of the old endowed schools, of which, so far as regards Harrow, we know nothing.

|| *Ibid.*, p. 5.

"He became the common butt of boys and masters, was pointed at as a fright in the playground, and flogged as a dunce in the school-room."\*

Trollope himself says he endured "a daily purgatory." The father's poverty increased; the boy was neglected, his clothes were shabby, his appearance dirty—the dirt of poverty.

"I remember well," he records, "when I was still the junior boy in the school, Dr. Butler, the head-master, stopping me in the street, and asking me, with all the clouds of Jove on his brow and all the thunder in his voice, whether it was possible that Harrow School was disgraced by so disreputably dirty a little boy as I!"

What follows illustrates the brutality of the public schoolmasters of that day, and tends to confirm the accuracy, so far as their schoolmasters are concerned, of the reminiscences of Mr. Serjeant Ballantyne and Mr. T. Mozley:—

"I do not doubt that I was dirty; but I think he was cruel. He must have known me had he seen me as he was wont to see me, for he was in the habit of flogging me constantly. *Perhaps he did not recognize me by my face.*"†

After three years, Anthony was removed to a private school at Sunbury, kept by a former tutor at Harrow—

"During the two years I was there," his narrative continues, "though I never had any pocket-money, and seldom had much in the way of clothes, I lived more nearly on terms of equality with other boys than at any other period during my prolonged school-days."

But even here he was always in disgrace, and, on at least one occasion, was treated with the most cruel injustice. Trollope, and three other of the boys, were suspected of being guilty of some nameless horror, of which Trollope was not only innocent, but, even when he wrote his autobiography, did not know the nature. The master condemned him as the worst of the four because, to use Trollope's words, "I, having come from a public school, might be supposed to be the leader of wickedness." As the master had been a Harrow tutor, it is clear what was his estimate of the morality and discipline of public schools.

"The other three accused," Trollope says, "were no doubt wicked boys, but were the curled darlings of the school, who would never have selected me to share their wickedness with them."‡

\* Macaulay's "Miscellaneous Writings and Speeches," p. 363, edition 1871.

† Vol. i. pp. 5-6.

‡ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-7.

The penalties inflicted on the offenders illustrate the irrational system of punishment then, and perhaps now, common in schools, and the nature and value of the so-called religious education there given :—

“ We had each to write out a sermon, and my sermon was the longest of the four. During the whole of one term we were helped last at every meal. We were not allowed to visit the playground till the sermon was finished. Mine was only done a day or two before the holidays. The master’s wife, when she saw us, shook her head with pitying horror : there were ever so many other punishments accumulated on our heads.”\*

A surfeit of sermon and an inferior and probably scanty supply of food was no doubt admirably suited to cure the moral infirmities of the offenders. At the opening of the next term the master whispered to Trollope that perhaps he had been wrong in condemning him ; but he had not the manliness or honesty to make a public confession of his injustice. It is refreshing to read Trollope’s outburst of honest indignation at his unjust treatment :—

“ All that was fifty years ago, and it burns me now although it were yesterday. What lily-livered curs those boys must have been not to have told the truth!—at any rate, so far as I was concerned.”†

But worse remained behind. From Sunbury the unfortunate boy was sent to Winchester. Here he had for teacher and ruler his eldest brother, Thomas Adolphus, who not only had studied but in those capacities put in practice the theories of Draco. The result was that, as part of his daily exercise, he thrashed Anthony with a big stick. The brothers, when they attained to man’s estate, became fast friends, but in their schooldays Adolphus was of all Anthony’s foes the worst. The holidays brought this miserable boy a change but not happiness. The mother and most of the family were in America, and he once passed the Midsummer holidays in his father’s chambers in Lincoln’s Inn.

“ On this occasion,” he says, “ my amusement consisted in wandering about amongst those old deserted buildings and in reading Shakespeare out of a bi-columned edition, which is still among my books. It was not that I had chosen Shakespeare, but that there was nothing else to read.”‡

---

\* Vol. i. p. 7.

† *Ibid.*, p. 8.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 12.



These compulsory readings of Shakespeare were destined to bear good fruit in days to come. When Anthony had been a year and a half at Winchester his brother went with his father to America. Anthony's condition then became worse than that of Charles Dickens at a like age, and worse even than the highly-coloured description of it which Dickens gives in "David Copperfield." No provision was made for him; his college bills were left unpaid. The school tradesmen were told not to trust him, his pocket-money (a shilling a week) was stopped, the master whose duty it was to advance the money not unreasonably declining to continue his advances, as those for the last half-year had not been paid. Anthony skulked about, ill-dressed and dirty, and became, as it were, a pariah amongst his school-fellows, who treated him with cruelty so great that, young as he was, he, as the only means of escape from his sufferings, thought of suicide. Such ill-treatment produced its natural effect; he became hardened and reckless. He thus describes his state:—

"I feel convinced in my mind that I have been flogged oftener than any human being alive. It was just possible to get five scourgings in one day at Winchester, and I have often boasted that I obtained them all. Looking back over half a century, I am not quite sure whether the boast is true; but if I did not, nobody ever did."\*

After about a year and a half of these sufferings the father returned from America, and took Anthony from Winchester to live in a wretched, tumble-down, ill-furnished farmhouse at Harrow Weald—"the gloom of that house," he says, "he is unable to describe. He was again sent as a day boarder to Harrow School, where he was as much a pariah as he had been at Winchester. Every hand, both of the masters and boys, was against him. In his own words, "the indignities I endured are not to be described."† At length the much-enduring boy was driven to rebellion against his persecutors. He must be allowed to describe in his own words what he thinks the only satisfactory thing in his school career—

"There came a great fight, at the end of which my opponent had to be taken home for a while. If these words be ever printed, I trust that some schoolfellow of those days may still be left alive who will be able to say that, in claiming this solitary glory of my 'school-days, I am not making a false boast."‡

His father desired to send him to either Oxford or Cambridge.

---

\* Vol. i. p. 24.

† *Ibid.*, p. 16.

‡ *Ibid.*, pp. 17-25.

There were exhibitions from Harrow. Twice he tried for a sizarship at Clare Hall and failed. He made another futile attempt to gain a scholarship at Trinity, Oxford. After that the idea of a University career for him was abandoned. In such trials it was scarcely possible that he could succeed. In the twelve years of his stay at Harrow no attempt had been made to teach him anything but Latin and Greek, and very little attempt to teach him those languages. In the second period of his time at Harrow his father could not afford to pay the tutor's fees. The masters neglected the boy, as a natural consequence the boy neglected his lessons. "There were twelve years of tuition," he says, "in which I do not remember that I ever knew a lesson."\* The after-career of a clever, successful schoolboy often belies the promise of his schooltime. It would be curious to know how many of Anthony Trollope's contemporaries who were winners of Harrow prizes and exhibitions got on in the world as well as he did.

We have related the circumstances under which the Trollope family emigrated to Bruges. At that second-rate continental town Anthony found himself

“An idle, desolate hanger-on, that most hopeless of human beings, a hobbledchey of nineteen, without any idea of a career or a profession or a trade. . . . As well as I can remember,” he adds, “I was fairly happy, for there were pretty girls at Bruges with whom I could fancy that I was in love, and I had been removed from the real misery of school; but as to my future life I had not even an aspiration.”†

At this time a commission in the Austrian service was offered to him. For that service a knowledge of German and French was an indispensable qualification. Of those languages he knew almost nothing. To gain the necessary knowledge he became, as at one time of his life Goldsmith also did, an usher at a school; “my heart still sinks within me,” is his comment on this event of his career, as I reflect that any “one should have intrusted to me the tuition of thirty boys.”‡ In comparison with a lot so wretched as that of an usher we should think that of a crossing-sweeper infinitely preferable. For Anthony Trollope a better deliverance was at hand. His mother's influence with the then Secretary of the General Post Office procured for him the offer of a clerkship in the office. He gladly accepted it, and left Brussels for London, passing through Bruges, where for the last time he saw his father and his brother Henry.

---

\* Vol. i. p. 25.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 39.

† *Ibid.*, p. 37.

Anthony Trollope's life was divided into two careers—the one official, the other literary. During a considerable part of his life they were pursued at the same time—sometimes the two blended together. So far as his memory lives—which he does not anticipate\*—it will live by his literary work. Though he was an energetic and efficient public servant, his services were not generally known—scarcely by his chiefs sufficiently recognised, and it is not by his services that he will be remembered; although he helped in bringing about many improvements in the postal service. To him we dwellers in small, remote villages are indebted for the free and early delivery of our letters, and for the privilege of being able to buy postage-stamps at our village post-office. The pillar letter-boxes, now to be found, not only in the streets of our towns, but in the hedgerows of the highways and byways of our country districts, were originated by him. He was also the friend of the helots of our public service—the overworked and underpaid letter-carriers and sorters. As far as he could, he took care they should not be overworked, that they should be adequately paid, and, on the other hand, that they should be made to earn their wages, that they should have some hours to themselves, especially on Sunday, and, latterly, that they should not be crushed by what he calls “the damnable system of so-called merit.† He certainly would have opposed the illiberal rule by which country postmen are now deprived of their holidays on Good Friday and Christmas Day.

The poverty and misfortune which overclouded his school-days pursued him into the early part of his post-office career. He tells a sad tale:—

“My salary was to be £90 a year, and on that I was to live in London, keep up my character as a gentleman, and be happy. That I should have thought this possible at the age of nineteen, and should have been delighted at being able to make the attempt, does not surprise me now; but that others should have thought it possible, friends who knew something of the world, does astonish me.”‡

The natural consequence followed. He soon became deeply in debt. He fell into the hands of a money-lender—

“A little, clean old man, who always wore a high, starched white cravat, inside which he had a habit of twisting his chin as he uttered his cautions.”§

Daily visits from this gentleman damaged Trollope in the

\* Vol. ii. p. 3.  
‡ Vol. i. p. 46.

† *Ibid.*, p. 118.  
§ *Ibid.*, p. 65.

opinion of his official chiefs, nor were his relations with them improved when the air was darkened by a woman walking into the room in which he sat with six or seven other clerks, "having a large basket on her arm and an immense bonnet on her head, and who addressed him in a loud voice, 'Anthony Trollope, when are you going to marry my daughter?' We have all," he adds, "had our worst moments, and that was one of my worst. I lived through it, however, and did not marry the young lady." He protests that "no young man in such a position was ever much less to blame than he had been in this."\* From his own admissions it is plain that he was habitually unpunctual, and that his behaviour to his chiefs was brusque and disrespectful. This fact gives colour to a somewhat ill-natured description of him "as banging about the world."† The powers of endurance of his chiefs must have been strained to the utmost by their unruly subordinate. Of this we give an illustration in his own words:—

"On one occasion, in the performance of my duty, I had to put a private letter containing bank notes on the Secretary's table, which letter I had duly opened, as it was not marked private. The letter was seen by the Colonel,‡ but had not been moved by him when he left the room. On his return it was gone. In the meantime I had returned to the room again in the performance of some duty. When the letter was missed I was sent for, and there I found the Colonel much moved about his letter, and a certain chief clerk, who, with a long face, was making suggestions as to the probable fate of the money. 'The letter has been taken,' said the Colonel, turning to me angrily, and, by G—! there has been nobody in the room but you and I.' As he spoke, he thundered his fist down upon the table. 'Then,' said I, 'by G—! you have taken it,' and I also thundered my fist down, but, accidentally, not upon the table. There was there a standing movable desk, at which, I presume, it was the Colonel's habit to write, and on this movable desk was a large bottle full of ink. My fist, unfortunately, came on the desk, and the ink at once flew up, covering the Colonel's face and shirt front. Then it was a sight to see that senior clerk, as he seized a quire of blotting-paper, and rushed to the aid of his superior officer, striving to mop up the ink; and a sight also to see the Colonel, in his agony, hit right out through the blotting-paper at that senior clerk's unoffending stomach. At that moment there came in the Colonel's private secretary with the letter and the money, and I was desired to go back to my own room. This was an incident not in my favour, though I do not know that it did me special harm."§

---

\* Vol. i. pp. 63-4.

† Vide the *Saturday Review*, Oct. 20, 1883.

I.e., Colonel Maberly, then Secretary of the General Post Office.

§ Vol. i. pp. 62-3.

In parliamentary or official life we can call to mind no such scene as this except the memorable occasion in the House of Commons, when William Wilberforce emptied the contents of the ink-bottle, which he always wore at his button-hole, on the white cords of Sir Thomas Acland, and then, snatching blotting paper from the clerk's table, rushed, amidst the cheers and laughter of the House, to his friend to repair the mischief done to his apparel. Under the circumstances we do not wonder at reading that Trollope, for the first seven years of his public service, bore in the office a decidedly bad character. This is his own description of himself:—"I was always on the eve of being dismissed, and yet was always striving to show how good a public servant I could become if only a chance were given me."\* At length the chance was given. There had been created in the service a new body of officers called surveyors' clerks. A vacancy in one of these clerkships occurred, but it was in Ireland, and "there was a conviction [in the office] that nothing could be worse than the berth of a surveyor's clerk in Ireland."† Trollope was now twenty-six. He felt that his circumstances were desperate, and that he must do something to retrieve his position. He went, therefore, boldly to his enemy, the Secretary, and volunteered for Ireland if the Secretary would send him. The Secretary was glad to be so rid of him, and to Ireland he went. The salary and allowance of this clerkship made up a yearly income, after deducting expenses, of £400. "This was," Trollope says, "the first good fortune of my life."‡ Certainly it did not come too soon. Hitherto he had been regarded by those connected with him "as an evil, an incumbrance, a useless thing, a creature to be ashamed of." His friends seem to have thought that no good would come of his Irish scheme, though they did not dissuade him from it. One of them who advanced him money for his outfit "looked on him with pitying eyes," and shook his head after the fashion of Lord Burleigh in the *Critic*. "After all you were right to go," was his admission, made a few years afterwards, when Trollope repaid him the loan.§ "The twenty-six years of suffering, disgrace, and remorse" were now over. He landed in Dublin in September, 1841, and called on the Secretary of the Irish Post Office, where he found his reputation had preceded him in the shape of "a very bad character," ungenerously sent over by the Secretary of the English Office. The Irish official informed Trollope that he had been told he was worthless, and must in

---

\* Vol. i. p. 62.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 78.

† *Ibid.*, p. 77.

§ *Ibid.*, pp. 79-81.

all probability be dismissed, but, he added, "I shall judge you on your merits." The narrative continues:—

"From that time to the day on which I left the service I never heard a word of censure, nor had many months passed before I found that my services were valued. Before a year was over I had acquired the character of a thoroughly good public servant."\*

His duties were at first those of "a deputy-inspector of country post-offices," and amongst other things to be inspected were the postmasters' accounts, an "odd destiny for one who had never learned the multiplication table, nor done a sum in long division."† A defaulting postmaster gave Trollope an opportunity of mastering the details of the accounts, which were then very intricate. With the industry and perseverance which were ever characteristic of him, he availed himself of this opportunity to the utmost, and never had any further difficulty in the matter of office accounts.‡ But his chief work was the investigating of complaints made by the public as to postal matters. He tells a very amusing story of an Irish squire who had a postal grievance so unendurable "that he had written on it many letters couched in the strongest language." Trollope was sent to his house to investigate the complaint, and was most hospitably received. His reception was an illustration of the social habits of the Irish gentry of a bygone day. "I shall never forget," Trollope relates, "the squire's righteous indignation when I brought up the postal question after the departure of the young lady. 'Was I such a Goth as to contaminate wine with business.'" The next morning Trollope again proposed to discuss the question. His host wrung his hands in unmistakable disgust. "But what," asked Trollope, "am I to say in my report?" "'Anything you please, don't spare me, if you want an excuse for yourself. Here I sit all day with nothing to do, and I like writing letters.'" Trollope reported that "the gentleman was now quite satisfied with the postal arrangements for his district;" he felt, he says, a soft regret that he had robbed his friend of his occupation. No more was heard at the post-office of that gentleman.

Trollope's life in Ireland was, he says, "altogether a very jolly one." After three years he married; and after ten years of Irish service he was temporarily removed to England to carry out a plan which had been formed for extending the rural delivery of letters. He spent two years on this task—

\* Vol. i. pp. 83-4.

† *Ibid.*, p. 78.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 83.

§ *Ibid.*, pp. 88, 89, 90.

"During these two years it was the ambition of my life to cover the country with rural letter-carriers;" and, with pardonable pride, he adds: "I was, in truth, a beneficent angel to the public, bringing everywhere with me an earlier, cheaper, and much more regular delivery of letters"\*

—a benefit for which we and all others who dwell in remote villages can never be sufficiently grateful.

"I began," he says, "in Devonshire, and visited, I think I may say, every nook in that county, in Cornwall, Somersetshire, the greater part of Devonshire, the Channel Islands, part of Oxfordshire, Wiltshire, Gloucestershire, Worcestershire, Herefordshire, Monmouthshire, and the six southern Welsh counties, and in this way I had an opportunity of seeing a considerable portion of Great Britain with a minuteness few have enjoyed; and I did my business after a fashion in which no other official man has worked—at least for many years."†

This was true, for he went almost everywhere on horseback, riding on an average forty miles a day, and combining with business a good deal of hunting. Hunting was, if not the greatest pursuit, one of the greatest pursuits of his life. He began hunting in Ireland, and learned to love it with an affection which he could not himself fathom or understand. His devotion to it illustrated the applicability to him of the description of the old Roman hero, "*Quidquid vult id valde vult.*" On no such subject did he write with such delight, and he admits that he has dragged it into too many of his novels. Our readers will remember his controversy on hunting with Mr. E. A. Freeman, in which Trollope, as the advocate of fox-hunting, maintained that the fox rather likes being hunted than otherwise.‡ And yet:—

"Surely," he says, "no man has laboured at it as I have done, or hunted under such drawbacks as to distances, money, and natural disadvantages. I am very heavy, very blind, have been, in reference to hunting, a poor man, and am now§ an old man. I have often had to travel all night outside a mail-coach, in order that I might hunt the next day. Nor have I ever been, in truth, a good horseman, and I have passed the greater part of my hunting life under the discipline of the Civil Service. But it has been for more than thirty years a duty to me to ride to hounds, and I have performed that duty with a persistent energy. Nothing has ever been allowed to stand in the way of hunting—neither the writing of books, nor the work of the Post Office, nor other pleasures."||

\* Vol. i. pp. 119-121.

† *Ibid.*, p. 17.

‡ See Trollope's own account of it, vol. i. pp. 256 *et seq.*

§ Written in 1876, when he was sixty-one years old.

|| Vol. i. p. 85.

He continued his favourite pursuit up to 1876. "I think," he says, with calm satisfaction, "that I may say with truth that I rode hard to my end."\* After hunting was once given up, "he never," his son tells us, "spoke willingly on hunting matters."†

Trollope's mission to England being accomplished, he returned to Ireland, and was then promoted from being a surveyor's clerk to be a surveyor. His reputation as an effective public servant led the Post-Office authorities to send him to Egypt to make a treaty for the conveyance of our mails through Egypt by railway, and, after the usual amount of shuffling and delay on the part of the Pashas, he settled the terms of a treaty. Then he was sent to Glasgow to revise the post-office there, and thence to the West Indies, "to cleanse the Augean stables of our post-office system," and while there wrote "The West Indies and the Spanish Main," which, of all his books, he considered the best. He returned again to Ireland, and shortly afterwards changed his Irish district for an English one.‡ The change was not made without difficulty. Though he was by this time, to use his own words, "known to be a thoroughly efficient public servant," he did not "stand very well with the dominant interest at the Post-Office." His old enemy, the Secretary, had, as Trollope oddly expresses it, been "squeezed into," which we interpret to mean "squeezed out." At any rate, he had given place to the late Sir Rowland Hill. Trollope does not draw a very flattering portrait of the originator of the penny post—

"With Hill," he says, "I never had any sympathy, nor he with me. In figures and facts he was most accurate; but I never came across any one who so little understood the ways of men, unless it was his brother Frederick (the Under-Secretary). The servants of the Post-Office—men numerous enough to have formed a large army in old days—were so many machines, who could be counted on for their exact work without deviation, as wheels may be counted on which are kept going always at the same pace and always by the same power. Rowland Hill was an industrious public servant, anxious for the good of his country; but he was a hard task-master, and one who would, I think, have put the great Department with which he was concerned altogether out of gear by his hardness, had he not been at last controlled."§

It is evident that in a different way Trollope when "he ranked among the most conspicuous members of the Post-Office,"|| was

\* Vol. ii. 207.

† Preface vii.

‡ Vol. i. pp. 171-176.

§ *Ibid.* pp. 178-9, conf. ii. p. 119.

|| From the official letter acknowledging his resignation in 1867, vol. ii. p. 115.



equally trying and embarrassing to his chiefs as when he stood lowest among the junior clerks. He calls to mind with evident pleasure "the feuds, such delicious feuds," with his chiefs. Also that he was always "an anti-Hillite;" complacently adding, "It was a pleasure to me to differ from him on all occasions;" and, looking back now, I think that in all such differences I was right.\* His self-complacency is only equalled by his candour, as is shown by this frank admission:—

"When matters came to be considered, I generally had an opinion of my own. I have no doubt that I often made myself disagreeable. I know that sometimes I tried to do so."†

Again:—

"How I loved, when I was contradicted—as I was very often, and no doubt very properly—to do instantly as I was bid, and then to prove that what I was doing was fatuous, dishonest, expensive, and impractical. . . . I have revelled in those official correspondences, and look back to some of them as the greatest delights of my life. But I am not so sure they were so delightful to others."‡

He gave official offence by the publication of his novel, "The Three Clerks," which reveals some of the *arcana* of the Civil Service;§ and he gave greater offence by giving to the clerks of the Department a lecture on "The Civil Service" in the General Post-Office itself. The lecture was permitted, and he disobeyed no order, but he avows

"that in it he advocated the doctrine that a Civil servant is only a servant so far as his contract goes, and that he is, beyond that, entitled to be as free a man in politics, as free in his general pursuits, and as free in opinion, as those who are in open professions and open trades."

These views were at that time contrary to the traditions of Government Offices and to the prejudices of their chiefs. The Secretary, therefore, reported to the Postmaster-General that Trollope ought to be dismissed. The Postmaster sent for Trollope, and informed him of the Secretary's recommendation. Trollope knew himself to be too good to be treated in that fashion, and, being on good terms with the Postmaster, simply inquired whether his lordship was prepared to dismiss him, at which the Postmaster merely laughed, and the matter ended.

Officially trying as Trollope was, he was not only an efficient public servant, but he was attached to the Post-Office. "I," he tells us, "had imbued myself with a thorough love of letters—I

\* Vol. ii. p. 119.

† Vol. i. p. 179.

‡ Vol. ii. p. 118.

§ Vol. i. p. 47.

|| *Ibid.*, i. p. 179.

mean the letters which are carried by the post, and was anxious for their welfare as though they were all my own."\* He strove also gallantly to improve the style of writing official reports, never being contented with his own reports—in writing which he took extreme delight—unless they seemed to be so written as to be pleasant to read. He does not feel certain that he succeeded in this attempt, for he felt it was not regarded with favour by his chiefs. He heard horror expressed because the old forms were disregarded, and language used which had no savour of red tape.† During the period of his service in the Office he did very much special work, for which he neither asked nor received any remuneration, though in such cases it was then usual to give remuneration. When he determined to write a book on "The United States" he asked for nine months' leave of absence, which, after a good deal of demur, was granted, but with an intimation from the Secretary that it was to be considered as a full equivalent for the special services Trollope had rendered to the Department. If it was to be a question of remunerating him, Trollope did not choose that his work should be valued at the price put upon it by Hill, he therefore declined to accept the leave clogged with the stipulations imposed by Hill, and it was withdrawn by order of the Postmaster-General. This success of Trollope was not likely to improve the relations between him and Hill. By 1867 his literary reputation was established, his literary earnings were great and still increasing. In the Post-Office he was disappointed at not being promoted to the vacant office of Under-Secretary. Although he had been thirty-three years in the Office he was not qualified to claim a retiring pension, nevertheless he determined to end his connection with the Department. He resigned, and he received an acknowledgment that his "Post-Office work had been faithfully and indeed energetically performed."‡ There was a touch of irony, he thought, in the use of the word "energetically," for he believes that his "energy" was the reason why the secretaries and assistant-secretaries very often would have been glad to get rid of him. We think he is unjust to his colleagues. That he was highly thought of by them is shown by the fact that, after he had quitted the service, the Post-Office authorities requested him to go to Washington to negotiate a postal treaty with the United States. Regarding this request as a compliment he went, and the result was a treaty more or less satisfactory. The negotiation of it was a task requiring all the energy which he so abundantly possessed.§

---

\* Vol. ii. pp. 113-119.

† Vol. ii. p. 116.

‡ Vol. i. p. 181; ii. p. 217.

§ Vol. ii. p. 146.

After Trollope left the Post Office, he for a short period became editor of the *St. Paul's Magazine*, and for a still shorter time an active politician. He thought a seat in the House of Commons should be the highest object of ambition to every educated Englishman, "that to serve one's country without pay is the grandest work a man can do."\* He had formed this opinion so far back as the days of his degradation and misery at the Post Office. An uncle asked him what destination he should like best for his future life; he said that he should like to be a Member of Parliament. The uncle sarcastically replied that, as far as he knew, few clerks in the Post Office became members of Parliament. This jeer Trollope never forgot or forgave. The opinion so early formed was one motive which, when made free to do so by having quitted the public service, determined him to seek a seat in Parliament. But there was an even stronger motive. Like all men of strong character he was a good hater. His uncle's jeer was to him *lethalis arundo*, the wound it had caused was not even then cured. This appears from his own words—

"My uncle was dead, but if I could get a seat, the knowledge that I had done so might travel to that bourne from whence he was not likely to return, and he might there feel that he had done me wrong."†

The belief in human immortality surely never before had so odd a practical application. Few, if any, of those who most firmly hold that belief would incur the cost of a contested election on the chance that the news of success, if gained, might reach a departed friend or enemy, especially if the candidate bore in mind that, if the news of success could reach the departed, so also could the news of failure—and if that reached him he might say or think, "Ah! that fellow is as great a fool as ever."

Trollope knew himself to be wholly unfitted for Parliamentary life. "I was aware," he owns, "that I could do no good by going into Parliament; that the time for it, if there could have been a time, had gone by." He was then fifty-three—an age at which it is hopeless to begin a Parliamentary career. He had, he owns, no special gifts to make him naturally a good speaker and had not studied the art early enough in life to overcome natural difficulties. As to his political creed he enters into a long metaphysico-theological argument, which he thus concludes: "Holding such views I think I am guilty of no absurdity in calling myself an advanced Conservative Liberal."‡

---

\* Vol. ii. p. 128.

† *Ibid.* p. 128.

‡ Vol. ii. pp. 130 *et seq.* 135.

In fact he was more advanced as a Conservative than a Liberal. Not only was he opposed to the ballot, support of which has always been one of the notes of Advanced Liberalism, but he had strong aristocratic tendencies and prejudices. This is illustrated by the grounds of his objection to the competitive examination system, which by their narrowness remind one of the captain in Swift's poem who says

“To give a young gentleman right education,  
The army's the only good school in the nation”—

“I dare to say what no one now does dare to say in print, though some of us whisper it occasionally into our friends' ears—there are places in life which can hardly be well filled except by ‘gentlemen.’ The word is one the use of which almost subjects one to ignominy. If I say that a judge should be a gentleman, or a bishop, I am met with a scornful allusion to ‘Nature's Gentlemen.’ Were I to make such an assertion with reference to the House of Commons, nothing that I ever said again would receive the slightest attention. A man in public life could not do himself a greater injury than by saying in public that the commissions in the army or navy, or berths in the civil service, should be given exclusively to gentlemen; he would be defied to define the term, and would fail should he attempt to do so. But he would know what he meant, and so very probably would they who defied him. It may be that the son of the butcher of the village shall become as well-fitted for employments requiring gentle culture as the son of a parson. Such is often the case. When such is the case, no one has been more prone to give the butcher's son all the welcome he has merited than I myself; but the chances are greatly in favour of the parson's son. The gates of the one class should be open to the other; but neither to the one class nor the other can good be done by declaring that there are no gates, no barrier, no difference. The system of competitive examination is, I think, based on a supposition that there is no difference.”\*

Elsewhere he says:—

“I had always been aware of a certain visionary weakness about myself in regard to politics. I knew that in politics I could never become a practical man. Still,” he continues, “I had an almost insane desire to sit in Parliament and be able to assure myself that my uncle's scorn had not been deserved.”†

It was suggested to him by the late Mr. Charles Buxton that he should stand for the new division of Essex, created in 1867, and which, as it adjoins London, was thought would prove Liberal. Had he stood at the general election of 1868 he would have

---

\* Vol. i. pp. 53-4.

† Vol. ii. pp. 134-6.

been returned without a contest, but when the Liberal candidates were chosen he was in America, and another Liberal was selected. He returned from America in time for the general election, but somewhat late to look for a seat. Beverley was proposed to him and to Beverley he went. A more unfortunate choice he could not have made. The borough was rotten to the core. From 1832 the seats had been held by a succession of members who, to use the slang of electioneering agents, had "nursed" the borough. Sir Henry Edwards, one of the sitting members, had nursed it so much and so long that he thought he had gained fixity of tenure next door to permanence in the representation. To add to Trollope's misfortunes he was yoked as a colleague with a Romanist; any one acquainted with the feeling on religious matters of the smaller English Parliamentary boroughs knows the impossibility of a Romanist gaining a seat for such a constituency. It was on this ground that Lord Beaconsfield, when, in 1859, he introduced his first Reform Bill, justified preserving the borough of Arundel, although he owned it was "absolutely the nomination borough" of the Duke of Norfolk, because there alone the 900,000 Roman Catholics of England, "a number more than the population of the West Riding of Yorkshire and double that of the Tower Hamlets," could, in the person of the Duke's nominee, send a representative to Parliament. Nevertheless, Lord Beaconsfield, by his Reform Act of 1867, disfranchised Arundel.

On Trollope's arrival in Beverley the experienced agent for the Liberal party met him—

"'So,' said he," as Trollope tells the story, "'you are going to stand for Beverley?' I replied gravely that I was thinking of doing so. 'You don't expect to get in?' he said. Again I was grave. 'I would not,' I said, 'be sanguine, but, nevertheless, I was disposed to hope for the best.' 'Oh, no,' continued he, with good-humoured raillery, 'you won't get in; I don't suppose you really expect it. But there is a fine career open to you. You will spend £1,000, and lose the election. Then you will petition, and spend another £1,000. You will throw out the elected members. There will be a Commission, and the borough will be disfranchised. For a beginner, such as you are that will be a great success.'"\*

*Il faut souffrir pour être belle,*" says a French proverb. If we change the word "*belle*" to "*grand*," Trollope in his Beverley experience abundantly verified this proverb; he describes the time he spent there "as the most wretched fortnight of his manhood." "I felt myself," is his lament, "to be a kind of

---

\* Vol. ii. p. 139.

pariah in the borough, to whom was opposed all that was pretty and all that was nice and all that was ostensibly good." He was subject "to a bitter tyranny from grinding vulgar tryants," who would not let him go to church, and, far worse, would not let him go out hunting. His days were spent in the lanes and byways of that uninviting town, exposed to the rain and up to his knees in slush, canvassing voters who expected, in order to induce them to give their votes, a *lene tormentum* in the shape of a five-pound note. Every night he had to speak somewhere, "which was bad, and listen to the speaking of others which was much worse." Of course he was at the bottom of the poll. "I paid £100," he says, "for my expenses and returned to London."\* For a man who had fallen among thieves he got off very easily, the expenses even of unsuccessful candidates at Beverley usually amounted to thousands. A petition followed, though not from Trollope, and Beverley ceased to be a Parliamentary borough.

We now turn to Trollope's literary career, in which he worked with as much earnestness as he showed in the Post Office and in the hunting-field. He is proud to say that he, his mother and brother wrote more books than were probably ever before produced by a single family.† In 1876 he found that his works were then more in number than those of any other living author, and he afterwards added to them considerably.‡ He had then published "much more than twice as much as Carlyle," and considerably more than Voltaire, even including his letters.

"We are told," he continues, "that Varro, at the age of 80, had written 480 volumes, and that he went on writing for eight years longer. I wish I knew what was the length of Varro's volumes. I comfort myself by reflecting that the amount of manuscript described as a book in Varro's time was not much."||

After he left school it was borne in upon his mind "that the only career in life within his reach was that of an author, and the only mode of authorship open to him was that of a writer of novels." And he very early resolved that an attempt at novel-writing must be made, but the attempt was long delayed. To prepare himself for his career as a novelist he began to read French and Latin: he made himself familiar with Horace, and acquainted with the works of our greatest poets. Another

\* Vol. ii. p. 140 *et seq.*

† Vol. i. p. 28.

‡ Conf. his list of his books, vol. ii. p. 222, with the supplemental list given by the Editor, preface, ix.

§ Vol. ii. p. 221.

|| Vol. i. pp. 70-72.

course of preparation he had earlier begun. He resembled Macaulay in the habit which the Greeks called *κενη μακαρια* ("empty happiness"), the habit of building castles in the air, which Macaulay said he and his sister, Lady Trevelyan, indulged in beyond any people that he knew.\* Macaulay's sister Margaret records an interesting conversation with him on this habit and its effects:—

"I said, I was surprised at the great accuracy of his information, considering how desultory his reading had been. 'My accuracy as to facts,' he said, 'I owe to a cause which many men would not confess. It is due to my love of castle-building. The past is, in my mind, soon constructed into a romance.' He then went on to describe the way in which from his childhood his imagination had been filled by the study of history. 'With a person of my turn,' he said, 'the minute touches are of a great interest, and perhaps greater than the most important events. Spending so much time as I do in solitude, my mind would have rusted by gazing vacantly at the shop-windows. As it is, I am no sooner in the streets than I am in Greece, in Rome, in the midst of the French Revolution. Precision in dates, the day or hour in which a man was born or died, becomes absolutely necessary. A slight fact, a sentence, a word, are of importance in my romance. Pepy's Diary formed almost inexhaustible food for my fancy. I seem to know every inch of Whitehall. I go in at Holbein's gate, and come out through the matted gallery. The conversations which I compose between great people of the time are long and sufficiently animated, in the style, if not with the merits, of Sir Walter Scott's. The old parts of London which you are sometimes surprised at my knowing so well, those old gates and houses down by the river, have all played their part in my stories.' He spoke, too, of the manner in which he used to wander about Paris, weaving tales of the Revolution, and he thought that he owed his command of language greatly to this habit."†

We would add that to this habit we owe the description of the battle of Sedgemoor, of the offer of the crown to William and Mary, of the trial of Warren Hastings.

Trollope was equally under the influence of this habit of castle-building; he often reflected with dismay on the hours devoted to it, but he adds:—

"I suppose it must have tended to make me what I have been. . . . I was always going about with some castle in the air firmly built within my mind. Nor were these efforts in architecture spasmodic or subject to constant change from day to day. For weeks, for months, if I remember rightly, from year to year, I would carry on the same tale, binding myself down to certain laws, to certain proportions, proprieties, and wishes. Nothing impossible was ever introduced, nor

\* Trevelyan's "Macaulay," vol. ii. p. 451, note.

† *Ibid.*, vol. i. pp. 153, 144.

even anything which from outward circumstances would seem to be violently improbable. There can, I imagine, hardly be a more dangerous mental practice; but I have often doubted whether, had it not been my practice, I should ever have written a novel. I learned in this way to maintain an interest in a fictitious story, to dwell on a work created by my own imagination, and to live in a world altogether outside the world of my own material life.”\*

It determined the character of his writings: † “I am realistic,” he says of himself. Speaking of Barsetshire, “the new shire he had added to the English counties”—

“I had it,” he says, “all in my mind—its roads and railroads, its towns and parishes, its Members of Parliament, and the different hunts which rode over it. I knew all the great lords and their castles, the squires and their parks, the rectors and their churches. ‘Framley Parsonage’ was the fourth novel in which I had placed the scene in Barsetshire, and as I wrote I made a map of the dear county. Throughout these stories there has been no name given to a fictitious site which does not represent to me a spot of which I know all the accessories as though I had lived and wandered there.” ‡

Again:—

“It is so that I have lived with my characters, and thence has come whatever success I have obtained. There is a gallery of them, and of all in that gallery I may say that I know the tone of the voice, and the colour of the hair, every flame of the eye, and the very clothes they wear. Of each man I could assert whether he would have said these or the other words; of every woman, whether she would then have smiled, or so have frowned.” §

Of Thackeray, he remarks: “It is evident from all his best work that he lived with the characters he was creating,” and Trollope attributes the decline towards the close of Thackeray’s career of his power of charming to the fact that he allowed his mind to become weary of the fictitious life which is always demanding a new creation, and thought of his characters only when at his desk. ||

It has been well said—

“That Anthony Trollope’s fictions are photographs of nineteenth century life in pen and ink. They do not represent a great force of literature, though Mr. Trollope may have many imitators, like George Eliot, but they give hundreds and thousands of men and women, of all ranks, exactly what they want—light easy reading, that requires no special thought, that is at once a pure recreation, and that presents to them, as if reflected in a mirror, the society in which they live.” ¶

\* Vol. i. pp. 56–58.

† Vol. i. p. 204.

§ Vol. ii. p. 51.

‡ Vol. ii. p. 41.

|| Vol. ii. pp. 64

¶ “England,” by T. H. S. Escott, chap. xxviii. p. 481.



With this agrees Nathaniel Hawthorne's criticism on Trollope, which Trollope owns to be true in its nature.

"Have you ever read the novels of Anthony Trollope? They precisely suit my taste, solid and substantial, written on the strength of beef and through the inspiration of ale; and just as real as if some giant had hewn a great lump out of the earth and put it under a glass case with all its inhabitants going about their daily business and not suspecting that they were being made a show of, and these books are just as English as a beefsteak. Have they ever been tried in America? It needs an English residence to make them thoroughly comprehensible: but still I should think that human nature would give them success anywhere."\*

Hawthorn's criticism reminds us of that of the *Times* reviewer of one of Trollope's earliest novels, which the reviewer likened to a leg of mutton, and described it "as substantial but a little coarse."†

Trollope's habits of castle building and of living with the characters of his novels make them real in a manner that could only be achieved by a master of the craft of novel-writing; they are mostly what he calls "the simple results of efforts of his moral consciousness." His mother, in her "Vicar of Wrexhall,"‡ essayed to draw the portrait of a clergyman and produced an unpleasant caricature. In the Barsetshire novels, the bishop, the dean, and the archdeacon live and move on the page before us, yet Trollope never lived in a provincial cathedral city, he was never intimate with a cathedral close. He had never even spoken to an archdeacon, but Archdeacon Grantley has been declared by competent authorities to be a real archdeacon down to the ground.§ Equally living is Mrs. Prowdie (the bishop's wife), about whom Trollope delighted to write—

"So thorough," he says, "was my knowledge of all the little shades of her character. It was not only that she was a tyrant, a bully, a would-be priestess—a very vulgar woman, and one who would send headlong to the nethermost pit all who disagreed with her: but that at the same time she was conscientious, by no means a hypocrite, really believing in the brimstone which she threatened, and anxious to save the souls around her from its horrors. And as her tyranny increased so did the bitterness of the moments of her repentance increase, in that she knew herself to be a tyrant, till that bitterness killed her."||

\* Vol. i. p. 193.

† *Ibid.*, p. 105.

‡ The vicar was said to be meant for the Rev. J. W. Cunningham, then vicar of Harrow, a leader of the Evangelical party, and author of a book called "The Velvet Cushion," p. 68.

§ Vol. ii. p. 124.

|| Vol. ii. p. 109.

In spite, perhaps because, of Mrs. Prowdie's numerous bad qualities she was to Trollope what "Little Nell" in "The Old Curiosity Shop" was to Dickens, and "My Uncle Toby" to Sterne.\* Tears did not lie so near the surface with Trollope as with Dickens, and he did not cry, as did Dickens, when he killed his favourite; yet Trollope confesses that it was with many misgivings that, in a misplaced deference to some impertinent and frivolous criticisms not meant for his ear, but which he happened to overhear,† he killed his old friend. As by his "moral consciousness" he created an archdeacon so also did he a journalist. In "The Warden" he introduces one "Tom Towers" as being potent among the contributors to the *Jupiter*—under which name he owns that he alluded to the *Times*; he was as ignorant of journalists as of the clergy, and had not then so much as heard the name of any of the *Times* writers, but so real and lifelike was "Tom Towers" that the *Times* in favourably reviewing "The Warden," added a gentle word of rebuke at the morbid condition of the author's mind which had prompted him to indulge in personalities in reference to an editor or manager of the *Times*.‡ Two of his characters in "The Three Clerks" he confesses are drawn from real persons. Sir Gregory Hardlines was intended for, and recognized to be, Sir Charles Trevelyan, then "the Great Apostle of the (by Trollope) much loathed scheme of competitive examination," and therefore a special object of his dislike. By the feebly facetious name of Sir Warwick West End it is intended to denote Sir Stafford Northcote.§ In "The Small House at Alington" another hero of the Civil Service, Sir Raffle Buffle, is introduced; but "Sir Raffle was intended to represent a type, not a man; but the man for the picture was soon chosen, and Trollope was often assured that the portrait was very like. He had never seen the gentleman with whom he was supposed to have taken the liberty."||

It is noteworthy that in his two Parliamentary novels, "Phineas Finn" and "Phineas Redux" he distrusted his moral consciousness, and pursued the methods of observation and experience to make himself conversant with the ways and doings of the House in which some of the scenes were to be placed.

"The Speaker," he says, "was very gracious, and gave me a running

\* "I am for the time being nearly dead with work and grief for the loss of my child" (*i.e.*, Little Nell).—"Letters of Charles Dickens," vol. i. p. 38. "So much am I delighted with my uncle Toby's imaginary character that I am become an enthusiast."—"Letter of Sterne to a Friend."

† Vol. ii. p. 108.

‡ Vol. i. p. 133.

§ *Ibid.*, p. 149.

|| *Ibid.*, p. 239.

order for, I think, a couple of months. It was enough at any rate to enable me often to be very tired, and, as I have been assured by members, to talk of the proceedings almost as well as though Fortune had enabled me to fall asleep within the House itself.\*

In another oratorical arena he was pressed also to try the inductive method. During his connection with the *Pall Mall Gazette* it was suggested to him that he should attend the whole yearly series of May meetings in order to give "a graphic and, if possible, amusing, description" of them. He went to one meeting, but three hours of "the bray of Exeter Hall" was more than enough for him, and he abandoned the task in disgust.

It is interesting to compare great men of letters as respects their different methods of, and habits as to, composition. Mr. Matthew Arnold says of Johnson—

"To write *con amore*, with fondness for the employment, with perpetual touches and retouches, with unwillingness to take leave of his own idea, and an unwearied pursuit of unattainable perfection, was no part of his character."†

"A man," Johnson said himself, "may write at any time, if he will set himself doggedly to it."‡ He was constitutionally indolent, and subject to a frequent depression of spirits, and we think he oftener wrote because he set himself doggedly to writing than *con amore*. We know that many of his "Rambles" were written in haste,§ as the moment pressed, without being read over by him before they were printed. Mr. Trevelyan tells us that the person who knew Macaulay best said of him, "Throughout life he never really applied himself to any pursuit that was against the grain."|| He did not carry on the business of his life by desultory efforts or in the happy moments of an elegant inspiration,¶ but, except when at his best, he never would work at all. "I am too self-indulgent in the matter it may be," he writes in his journal, "and yet I attribute much of the success which I have had to my habit of writing only when I am in the humour, and of stopping as soon as the thoughts and words cease to follow quickly."\*\* Trollope held a sort of medium position between Johnson and Macaulay. He certainly wrote *con amore*, but he doggedly set himself to write. We do not know that it can be said of him,

\* Vol. ii. p. 160. † *Vide* his "Six Principal Lives" in "Johnson's Poets."

‡ Boswell's "Johnson," p. 45, Standard Library edition.

§ *Ibid.*, *ubi supra*.

|| "Life of Macaulay," vol. ii. p. 215.

¶ *Ibid.*, vol. i. p. 109.

\*\* *Ibid.*, p. 224.

as Thackeray said of Macaulay, "that he read twenty works to write one sentence, and travelled twenty miles to make a line of description,"\* but in Trollope's books, especially his earlier ones, there is abundant evidence of "touches and retouches" and that "pursuit of unattainable perfection" which was alien to Johnson.

The doctrine, that literary men should wait for the happy moment of inspiration, Trollope believed in as little as Macaulay—

"To me," he says, "it would not be more absurd if the shoemaker were to wait for inspiration, or the tallow-chandler for the divine moment of melting. I was once told that the surest aid to the writing of a book was a piece of cobbler's wax on my chair. I certainly believe in the cobbler's wax much more than in the inspiration."†

His habits of composition were, if not mechanical, in the highest degree methodical. He found it expedient to bind himself by certain self-imposed laws.‡ It was his practice to be at his writing-table every morning at half-past five, and in this respect to allow himself no mercy. He worked for three hours, the time he found sufficient to produce as much as a man ought to write at a time.§ The first half-hour was devoted to reading the work of the day before, in order to catch the tone and spirit of what he had last written, and avoid the fault of seeming to be unlike himself. This task consisted chiefly in weighing with the ear the sound of the words and phrases ||—

"When," we resume his own words, "I have commenced a new book, I have always prepared a diary, divided into weeks, and carried it on for the period which I have allowed for the completion of the work. In this I have entered, day by day, the number of pages I have written, so that if at any time I have slipped into idleness for a day or two, the record of that idleness has been there staring in my face, and demanding of me increased labour, so that the deficiency might be supplied. According to the circumstances of the time, whether my other business might be then heavy or light, or whether the book which I was writing was or was not wanted with speed, I have allotted myself so many pages a week. The average number has been about forty. It has been placed as low as twenty, and has risen to 112. And, as a page is an ambiguous term, my page has been made to contain 250 words; and as words, if not watched, will have a tendency to straggle, I have had every word counted as I went. In the bargains I have made with publishers I have—not, of course, with their knowledge, but in my own mind—undertaken always to supply

\* *Ibid.*, vol. i. p. 216.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 159.

§ Vol. ii. p. 103.

† Vol. i. p. 162-3.

|| *Ibid.*, p. 103-4.

them with so many words, and I have never put a book out of hand short of the number by a single word. I may also say that the excess, has been very small. I have prided myself on completing my work within the proposed dimensions. But I have prided myself especially on completing it within the proposed time, and I have always done so. . . . I have known no anxiety as to 'copy.' The needed pages far ahead—very far ahead—have almost always been in the drawer beside me."\*

How many an editor, printer, and publisher, will on reading the last passage, unfeignedly say, *O si sic omnes!*

It was Trollope's practice—a practice in which, as time went on, he became more lenient to himself—to write with his watch before him, and to require from himself 250 words every quarter of an hour; he found that the 250 words were forthcoming as regularly as his watch went. His method enabled him to produce over ten pages of an ordinary novel a day.† In official documents—we do not know whether in his novels—Trollope thought that a rough copy, or what is called a draft, written in order that it may be touched, and altered and put upon stilts occasions a terrible waste of time.‡ Macaulay in writing his history composed a rough draft, and when that was finished his "daily task," which, if he did not complete, he was never quite easy, was to copy the draft at the rate of six pages of foolscap written in so large a hand and with such a multitude of erasures and corrections that the whole six pages were on an average compressed into two pages of print.§ The greater need of accuracy in an historical work, and the longer time required to weigh evidence and collate authorities, and in a general revision, than merely to write a narrative already composed in the writer's mind, accounts for the differing amounts in the results of labour produced by two writers equally industrious. Trollope was told that his methodical ways were "beneath the notice of a man of genius." "I have never fancied myself," he continues, "to be a man of genius, but had I been so I think I might well have subjected myself to these trammels."|| If it be a correct definition of "genius" that it is a capacity for taking infinite pains, then beyond all doubt Trollope was a man of genius. We cannot discover Trollope's habit as to revising and correcting his MSS. "Every MS.," he says, "should be read twice at least before it goes to the printers;¶ but he also says, speaking, however, then only of his official reports, "If a man knows his craft

\* Vol. i. p. 159–61.

† Vol. ii. p. 103–4.

‡ Vol. i. p. 180.

§ "Life of Macaulay," ii. p. 225.

|| Vol. i. p. 160.

¶ Vol. ii. p. 104.

with his pen he will have learned to write without the necessity of changing his words or the form of his sentences.”\* Reynolds once inquired of Johnson how he had attained the accuracy and flow of language which enabled him often to dispense with the revision of his MSS. ; Johnson replied, “that he had early laid it down as a fixed rule to do his best on every occasion and in every company, to impart whatever he knew in the most forcible language he could put it in, and that by constant practice, and never suffering any careless expressions to escape him, or attempting to deliver his thoughts without arranging them in the clearest manner, it became habitual to him.”† Macaulay was as great and accurate a talker as Johnson, but we know that scarcely five consecutive lines in any of his Indian minutes were unmarked by blots or corrections. What were the corrections in his History we know by the “manuscript page thickly scored with dashes and erasures” preserved at the British Museum, along with a revised proof sheet of Hume’s History and other like treasures.‡ It would be interesting to compare with these relics of Hume and Macaulay a sheet of one of Trollope’s manuscripts, and see how far he agreed or differed with them in his habits of revision and correction. Mr. Trevelyan makes a remark which we enlarge and to which we assent—

“That such corrections are exceedingly valuable. When the great masters of the English language correct their own compositions which appeared faultless before, the correction must be based on the highest rules of criticism.”

Trollope took a high view of his work as a novelist. He admitted that from the wide extension of novel-reading in the present day that very much good or harm must be done by novels—but, referring to the objections of those who think novel-reading a sin and of those who think it to be simply a waste of time, and who agree in regarding novel-writers as mere panderers to the wicked pleasures of the world, he thus states and defends his own position—

“I have regarded my art from so different a point of view that I have ever thought of myself as a preacher of sermons and my pulpit as one which I could make both salutary and agreeable to my audience. I do believe that no girl has risen from the reading of my pages less modest than she was before, and that some may have learned from them that modesty is worth preserving. I think that no youth has been taught that in falseness and flashiness is to be found the road to manliness ;

\* Vol. i. p. 180.

† Boswell’s “Johnson,” *ubi supra*.

‡ *Vide* “Life of Macaulay,” ii. p. 392.

§ *Ibid.*, p. 225, note.

but some may perhaps have learned from me that it is to be found in truth and a high but gentle spirit."\*

This idea of himself as a preacher of righteousness some times led him on to dangerous ground. The "Vicar of Bullhampton" was written chiefly with the object of exciting not only pity but sympathy for a fallen woman, and of raising a feeling of forgiveness for such in the minds of other women. To obviate by anticipation mistakes as to the position he took on this subject he, contrary to his common usage, wrote a preface to this novel. "I do not know," he says, "that any one read it, but as I wish to have it read I will insert it here again."† It is certainly well worth reading. In "Can You Forgive Her," he subjects a young wife to the terrible danger of overtures from the man to whom her heart had been given before her marriage. A dignitary of the Church remonstrated with him: "Did he think that a wife contemplating adultery was a character fit for his pages?" Trollope asked him in return whether from his pulpit or at any rate from his Communion Table he did not denounce adultery to his audience; and, if so, why it should not be open to Trollope to preach the same doctrine to his? The clergyman felt worsted and abandoned the controversy.‡ This high view of his position did not incline him to the absurd notion of those who think that an author should not regard money. He did not agree with Johnson "that no man but a blockhead ever wrote except for money."§ His experience gave him opportunity to verify Macaulay's remark "that the pleasure of writing always pays itself," and we believe that on that point he agreed with Macaulay. He ably vindicated the position that the literary, like every other labourer, is worthy of his hire, and shows that those who hold the absurd opinion we allude to are "like clergymen who preach sermons against the love of money, but who know that the love of money is so distinctive a characteristic of humanity that such sermons are mere platitudes called for by customary but unintelligent piety."||

If Trollope had not possessed what our Puritan forefathers called "the grace of final perseverance" he would never have become a writer. Discouragements of every kind marked the beginning of his literary career. His three first novels were "absolute failures."¶ "The Warden," published in 1855, was his first successful book, but that was not a "pecuniary suc-

\* Vol. i. pp. 195-6; conf. ii. p. 32, where the same view is enlarged upon.

† Vol. ii. pp. 176 *et seq.*

‡ Vol. i. pp. 242 *et seq.*

§ Boswell's "Johnson," Standard Library edition, p. 262.

|| Vol. i. pp. 140 *et seq.*

¶ *Ibid.*, p. 106.

cess." "Indeed," is his own remark, "as regarded remuneration for the time, stone-breaking would have been better."\* Three years afterwards he published "Dr. Thorne," in respect of which he received £400. In another three years came out "Framley Parsonage," which he thus describes:—

"The story was thoroughly English. There was a little fox-hunting, and a little tuft-hunting. There was no heroism and no villany. There was much church but more love-making. Lucy Roberts [the heroine] is I think perhaps the most natural English girl that I ever drew—the most natural, at any rate, of those who have been good girls."†

This book produced him in all £1,000. The next year appeared "Orley Farm," thought by many competent judges to be his best novel, in which opinion he did not concur; from this he received £3,135. This was the largest amount but one he received from any one novel. After its publication he received £3,200 from each of his novels "Phineas Finn" and "He Knew He Was Right." Altogether, between 1847 and 1879, he earned by literature £68,937 17s. 5d.,‡ and after the completion of his autobiography he published thirteen other works. His receipts from these are not given, but, calculated at the same rate as those from his other works, they probably brought him in from eight to ten thousand more, making his total literary earnings about £80,000—a large sum to be so earned had he been only a prolific writer, and not also, at the same time, an industrious public servant and a devoted fox-hunter.§

We regret that we are obliged to pass over the chapters "On Novels, and the Art of Writing Them,"|| and "On Criticism,"¶ both of which are full of instruction and entertainment, as is also the chapter "On English Novelists of the Present Day,"\*\* from which, however, we must find space for one extract, as it is the judgment on Lord Beaconsfield's pretensions as a novelist, of a great master of fiction and of English style. Speaking of Lord Beaconsfield's novels, Trollope says:—

"To me they have all had the same flavour of paint and unreality. In whatever he has written he has affected something which has been intended to strike his readers as uncommon and therefore grand. Because he has been bright and a man of genius he has carried his object as regards the young: he has struck them with astonishment, and

\* Vol. i. p. 131.

† *Ibid.*, p. 191.

‡ Vol. ii. p. 222, 3.

§ The editor states (preface, p. vii.) that the autobiography was concluded in April, 1876, but Trollope's own list of his publications (Vol. ii. p. 223) is brought down to 1879.

|| Vol. ii. p. 25.

¶ *Ibid.*, p. 88.

\*\* *Ibid.*, p. 263.

[Vol. CXXI. No. CCXLI.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. LXV. No. I.



aroused in their imagination ideas of a world more glorious, more rich, more witty, more enterprising than their own. But the glory has been the glory of pasteboard and the wealth has been a wealth of tinsel. The wit has been the wit of hairdressers, and the enterprise has been the enterprise of mountebanks. An audacious conjuror has generally been his hero—some youth who, by wonderful cleverness, can obtain success by every intrigue that comes to his hand. Through it all there is a feeling of stage properties, a smell of hair oil, an aspect of huhl, a remembrance of tailors, and that pricking of conscience which must be the general accompaniment of paste diamonds. I can understand that Mr. Disraeli should by his novels have instigated many a young man and many a young woman on their way in life, but I cannot understand that he should have instigated any one to good. Vivian Grey has had probably as many followers as Jack Sheppard, and has led his followers in the same direction.\*

After describing "Lothair" "as undoubtedly its author's worst book," Trollope continues:—

"If his mind were so occupied with greater things that he can write such a work, yet his judgment should have sufficed to induce him to destroy it when written. Here that flavour of hair oil, that flavour of false jewels, that remembrance of tailors comes out stronger than in all the others. Lothair is falser even than Vivian Grey, and Lady Corisande, the daughter of the Duchess, more inane and unwomanlike than Venetia or Henrietta Temple. It is the very *bathos* of story-telling."†

There was still a lower depth into which Lord Beaconsfield descended, as was shown when "Endymion" was published.

We must here part with Trollope, and it is with the same feeling with which we always closed his novels—gratitude for the pleasure—in the case of this autobiography, for the instruction also—which he has afforded us.

Towards the close of his life its first twenty-six years of suffering, disgrace, and inward remorse faded in the distance, and he looked back on his career in the spirit of epicurean self-complacency which was one of his characteristics.

"It will not," he writes, "I trust, be supposed by any reader that I have intended in this so-called autobiography to give a record of my inner life; no man ever did so truly—and no man ever will. Rousseau probably attempted it; but who doubts but that Rousseau has confessed in much the thoughts and convictions rather than the facts of his life? If the rustle of a woman's petticoat has ever stirred my blood; if a cup of wine has been a joy to me; if I have thought tobacco at midnight in pleasant company to be one of the elements of an earthly paradise; if now and again I have somewhat recklessly fluttered a five-pound note over a card-table,—of what matter is that

\* Vol. ii. p. 85.

† *Ibid.*, p. 86.

to any reader? I have betrayed no woman. Wine has brought me to no sorrow. It has been the companionship of smoking that I have loved, rather than the habit. I have never desired to win money and I have lost none. To enjoy the excitement of pleasure, but to be free from its vices and ill effects; to have the sweet and leave the bitter untasted, that has been my study. The preachers tell us that this is impossible. It seems to me that hitherto I have succeeded fairly well. I will not say that I have never scorched a finger, but I carry no ugly wounds."\*

He had expressed the hope that when the power of work was over with him, God would be pleased to remove him from a world where there could then be no joy. That hope was fulfilled. He continued his literary work until November 3, 1882, when he was seized with paralysis, accompanied by loss of speech and a partial failure of mind. On December 6 he was released from an existence which could not longer have joy for him. "Who has had a happier life than mine?" he wrote when he had just passed his sixtieth year. On Macaulay's fiftieth birthday he wrote in his diary, "I have had a happy life; I do not know that anybody, whom I have seen close, has had a happier." We cordially assent to a contemporary's comment on these two retrospects:—

"There is something singularly pleasant and wholesome in such confessions from men who have fought the battle of life with their own good hearts and hands alone to help them; who have taken with an equal mind the frowns of fortune and her smiles; who in their own times of failure have never envied their fellows, in their times of success have never neglected nor despised them, and can thus look back with grateful eyes over the long and toilsome, but not distasteful road by which they have travelled to their rest."†

---

## ART. V.—ENGLAND IN EGYPT.

*Egypt and the Egyptian Question.* By D. MACKENZIE WALLACE. London: Macmillan & Co. 1883.

IT is not worth while dissembling the fact that the tragic success of the false prophet has been the ugly means of preventing the English Government falling into a grave, an almost irreparable error. The order had been given for the return of three thousand of the British troops now in Egypt to this country. This order was the result of various causes. There are certain

\* Vol. ii. p. 225, 6.

† *Saturday Review*, *ubi supra*.

European Powers that are jealous of our position in Egypt. There is a certain section of the Liberal party which believes that temporary occupation is apt to "evolve" into annexation, and who are particularly anxious to see the Government conforming its conduct to their ideas of policy.\* There are some, too, who think that the burden of supporting the army, of occupation, which has been laid upon Egypt, is too heavy for the country. All these circumstances weighed with the Government, and the opinion of Sir Evelyn Wood, that the safety of the capital could be ensured with a smaller military establishment, no doubt had influence in determining the Government to take a step, some part of the responsibility of which had been taken by our commanding officer in Egypt.† The order, as every one knows, was given—

\* Sir Wilfrid Lawson, in speaking on the 5th of November, said that as to the withdrawal of the troops "he was sure Mr. Gladstone was just as anxious as he was to get those troops out of Egypt as fast as possible, and the Cabinet were trying to get them out. The troops were only there to assist to maintain a Government which the people of Egypt loathed and detested; to assist a grinding taxation of the people, to assist to pay the usurers who had lent money to the Egyptian Government. At this moment the wretched Egyptians were more miserable and plundered than they had ever been before. He hoped there was not a single Liberal in Parliament or out of it who would refuse to support the Government in removing the troops. No doubt such a course would meet with the strong opposition of the Jingo and the military and glory lot. Lord Salisbury had said this was to be the test question. Well, he (Sir Wilfrid) accepted the challenge of Lord Salisbury. He accepted it on behalf of the Government, on behalf of the Liberal Party, and he believed on behalf of the great body of the people of this country. When they understood this question they would declare that the might of England should not be used to rivet a chain upon a downtrodden and oppressed nation."

† Sir E. Baring in writing on the 9th of October, 1873, to Lord Granville in answer to the two questions "1. Is it safe to withdraw the British garrison from Cairo? 2. To what extent is it consistent with the preservation of public order that the total British force in Egypt should be reduced?" said, "As regards the first question, I am of opinion that the British garrison at Cairo may be with safety withdrawn. As regards the second question, I am of opinion, after consultation with General Stephenson, that the total force in Egypt, which consists at present of about 6,700 men, may be reduced to three battalions of Infantry, one battery of Field Artillery, one battery of Garrison Artillery, and one company of Engineers, making a total of about 3,000 men and six guns. I agree with General Stephenson in thinking that this force should be concentrated at Alexandria. General Stephenson has informed me that a small expenditure of money will permit of barrack accommodation for this number of men being provided at Alexandria. Should her Majesty's Government be pleased to approve of the proposals which I have now the honour to make, the British force in Egypt will be amply sufficient to preserve order in Alexandria, and to maintain the honour of her Majesty's arms against any force that it may be supposed, with any reasonable degree of probability, it may have to encounter. Moreover the moral effect produced by the presence of this force, or even, indeed, of a force considerably smaller than that proposed, will of itself, in all probability, suffice to insure the tranquillity of the country. It should, however, be clearly understood that the main responsi-

foolishly given ; for although we admit at once that possibly the three thousand men might have been a sufficient force to retain in Egypt, could that force at the same time have secured the safety of Cairo and of Alexandria, we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that the contemplated withdrawal of the British flag from Cairo was a serious error.\* Governments are very often dependent for their power upon symbols. A look of power is often as efficacious as a blow. It may be true that while we held Alexandria we had our foot in the door-way, and prevented the door being shut against us ; but our object ought to be not to secure a means of return to Egypt, in case of necessity, but to obviate the necessity of any return. " Stay a little that we may make an end the sooner," is an apothegm of Bacon's which is applicable to our duty in the Levant. The possession of the capital was to the native mind an indication of the power of Britain which was worth many displays of physical force. The withdrawal from the seat of government to the seaboard of the Mediterranean—or, a few months later, for that too seems to have been in contemplation, to Cyprus or Malta—would have been to the Egyptian mind a confession of weakness which, with Orientals, is almost an invitation to violence and aggression. It is for these reasons that we say that the events which have led the Government to countermand that order have been the means of extricating them from a difficulty into which their too scrupulous regards for the opinions and sensibilities of certain jealous Powers, and of a certain fanatical section of their supporters in the House of Commons, was about to precipitate them. The whole action of the Government in Egypt has, we think, been right, but it has been action which had the weakness of excuse in every fibre of it. " Rightly to be great is not to stir without great argument," but the great argument goes too far if it unnerves the hand of action. The Government has, we think, always done right, but it has been at the point of the sword of circumstances. They have hung fire on most occasions, until it was almost too late. They have forgotten Napoleon's maxim that " incidents ought to be governed by policy, not policy by incidents." There is really some pith in the Tory criticisms of our hesitating action—a hesi-

---

bility for preserving order throughout Egypt will devolve on the Egyptian Government. I trust that they may rely upon the full moral support of her Majesty's Government in the execution of that task."

\* In this view we are at one with Mr. Mackenzie Wallace, who in a note written after his work had gone to press, p. 506, states his views clearly and strongly. " So far as the moral effect on the population, on the ulemate, and on the native Government is concerned, the presence of a single battalion in the Cairo citadel is worth more than the presence of half a dozen regiments at Alexandria or Ramleh."

tation which has gone far to mar the effect which it was the object of our policy to produce. However, the Government has, on the whole, prospered upon the policy of waiting on events. It was forced to take an active part in the settlement of the Egyptian question when important opportunities were being frittered away in conference, it has now been forced to continue its present hold upon the country by the events which have happened in the Soudan. We can now see with some certainty the good consequences of the first step which the Government took under the duress of incidents, and we can see how fatal further delay would have been to the whole fabric of our Eastern policy. We cannot but think that "luck" has again stood our statesmen's friend and that time will show how foolish was the step which their feet were raised to take.

It may often be thought that it is a serious objection to Party Government that there is a danger that the necessary continuity of foreign policy may fail to be consistently preserved. Indeed, there is a temptation to a Ministry that has risen to power on the mistakes of its predecessors, and while the public mind is smarting with the stimulus of having administered deserved punishment, to reverse the policy of the Government which has fallen into popular disgrace in particulars quite unconnected with the party triumph; and it is probable that if this temptation were frequently acted upon by the party coming into power the institution of government by party would before very long fall into deserved contempt. The possibility that a Government could be seriously inconsistent to its own policy of the past in its actions of the present, when that past policy had not involved the Administration in failure, while the present was only slowly bearing the wholesome fruit that was to be expected from such cultivation, is one which does not seem to have been seriously contemplated. If, however, we are to believe the current actions of the Government, if we are to credit the statements made on their behalf, that is the position that they seem anxious to occupy. A series of actions which have been forced upon them have made them masters of a situation the holding of which at the present time seems of paramount importance, and the Government propose to withdraw from the position. If they succeed in their endeavours they will, before many years have passed, cut one of the sorriest figures that ever a Ministry did in history. In the meantime, as we see, their action has been again happily frustrated; but as the events which have stayed their hand may soon leave them free to carry out their previous intention, it becomes a matter of great importance to inquire into the history of our policy in Egypt, that we may determine what our duties to the people of the country are, how our interests are affected by the condition of that

country, and what our policy in relation to the Egyptian question ought to be in the future.

As we have said, we understand that the motive for this purposed aberration on the part of her Majesty's Ministers is that a section of the Liberal party disapprove of the action of the Government in the past, but is willing to let bygones be bygones if they will act upon its scruples in the present and withdraw the troops from Egypt. That section of the party is by no means the largest or most powerful; but it is a section that is gaining ground, and whose influence is more and more felt in the government of this country. It is a section, therefore, which it is well, if possible, to conciliate. The other strong reason for the Government "turning its back on itself," as Sir Boyle Roach said, is, that it must have regard to the susceptibilities of Continental Powers, and especially to those of France. It is somewhat strange to have those occult influences—the morbid scruples of some extreme politicians, and the susceptibilities of our Continental neighbours—to consider in determining the probable action of our Government. These elements are worthy of consideration, but if they are to have such commanding weight *now*, they ought to have been called in to assist in the shaping of our policy sooner. We have, by our acts, pledged ourselves not to be influenced by the trivial fears of a wing of a Party, or the jealousies of a rival Power which finds out too late that it made an egregious mistake some eighteen months ago, and desires to recover the advantage out of the foolishness of a friend which it lost through its own vacillation and timidity. We are by our acts embarked on a policy, and these scruples and regards for the feelings of France come too late. If they were to be regarded they ought to have shut the mouths of the guns at Alexandria. They ought to have kept alive—what we are convinced was a serious evil—the Dual Control. We disregarded the voice of Sir Wilfrid Lawson when we went to war, we disregarded the susceptibilities of France when we put an end to that instrument of joint control and divided interest, and it is too late now to have our policy determined by any such trivial considerations.

We propose to show that the continued occupation of Egypt by an efficient force is at the present time absolutely necessary, and we are strengthened in the conviction which we desire to express by the belief that the opinion of the best authorities coincides with our own; and that the valid reasons which can be shown to exist for our being in Egypt at all are valid against a precipitate withdrawal from that country. So far as we have been able to ascertain, public opinion is against the Government, if their project is to withdraw the troops from Egypt at an early day. We are aware that it is an exceedingly difficult thing to

determine the drift of public opinion, and many men are in the habit of thinking that their own thoughts must be current, they are so reasonable *to them*. We do not desire to fall into such an error, and to correct it is, as we say exceedingly difficult. To trust to the Press is not altogether wise, for there is a section of journalism which thinks to make public opinion by its blatancy of assertion instead of by its weight of reason; and that section, knowing that very often to say public opinion is in a certain direction is to lead public opinion in the direction indicated, does not hesitate to use that rhetorical figure. Still, as it is necessary to attempt to discover in what way the majority of our fellow-countrymen view this question, we have done our best to arrive at a conclusion, and are prepared to take the responsibility if we are in error. Our opinion is that the majority reason somewhat in this way—

“ We spent a great deal of money in sending out ships and men to Egypt. We sacrificed a great number of lives, and we were prepared at one time—for no one but a very confident and fortunate General thought that Arabi’s power would crumble at a touch—to sacrifice more. We have even, after our victory, assumed duties in the country. We have been re-organizing its Courts, its Army, its Police. Why? merely to trundle out again because France is susceptible, and Sir Wilfrid Lawson and a few more like him, suspect that occupation is a word which, when a little blurred by time will read, ‘ annexation ’? No, that would be foolish, unless we can have a guarantee that the circumstances which took us to Egypt will not recur; that the interests for which we fought will be respected; and that with a view to both these ends the country will be well and wisely governed.”

But apart from the opinion which is in the mouths of men, there seems to be very weighty arguments in favour of a patient policy in relation to Egypt. With the view of ascertaining what we are bound to do in the future, it may be worth while to look at one or two matters of recent history. How do we come to be in Egypt at all? There is always a difficulty in writing of events very soon after they have happened. We cannot judge real proportions if we are very near to the object of vision, or the circumstances of history. One holds a friend at arm’s length to judge how time has handled his features; and we must hold events at arm’s length to be able to judge fairly of them. The history of the rebellion in Egypt cannot yet be written. Many of the circumstances of it are detailed with minute accuracy by Mr. Mackenzie Wallace in his work on Egypt, but there are some obscure questions which we must wait on time to clear up for us. One error has been very persistently committed in certain important quarters and that was, the misconception of the nature

of the revolt. It is a mistake to regard Arabi as a mere military adventurer without any real popular support. It seems certain that he was the leader of a very strong public opinion—an opinion which would have hustled Tewfik from his throne if he had not been propped there by the arms of England. This view, and the reasons which make it a sound conviction, are clearly stated in the work before us, and we do not propose to reproduce any part of the proof in this place. Whether that popular movement was fostered by encouragement from without, what amount of extraneous recognition was given to Arabi, and by whom, are questions which it is impossible at the present time to answer. Light upon that matter would be exceedingly valuable at the present juncture ; but it is not to be had. The revolt, then, whatever its true significance may have been, and whatever encouragement may have been given to its leaders, assumed such proportions as to threaten the lives of Europeans in the country, and all the European Powers, with the exception of Turkey, came to the conclusion that it must be put an end to by force of arms. The Sultan was invited to intervene, but did nothing. The National Party was daily becoming stronger. The demands of the English and French Governments that the Cabinet—which was the creature of the revolt, and which, while it had Sherif Pasha at its head, had Mahmoud Sami as its War Minister—should resign ; and that Arabi and his two colleagues in revolution should be removed from Cairo—had been refused. Still, neither of these Governments followed up their ultimatum with war. The National Party, however, followed up its successes with the Alexandria massacre of June 11. Meanwhile, the Conference was sitting, and nothing was being done. Admiral Seymour, however, was threatened by the forts at Alexandria, and opened fire, and then Lord Dufferin announced to the Conference the intention of the British Government to take a more active part in the work of restoring order in Egypt, and Lord Granville invited the French Government to cooperate. Then, strange to say, France hesitated. M. de Freycinet had not been successful in Tunis. There was—there always is now in France—a curious apprehension that Germany is looking for a suitable opportunity while France is unprepared or otherwise occupied to anticipate and prevent the retaliation which will one day requite the insults of the campaign of 1870. There were, too, in Paris, miscalculations as to the proportions of the enterprise, and M. de Freycinet made a pretence of co-operation while really folding the hands of France in her velvet lap. The endeavours made by Russia and by Italy to frustrate the operations of England had no effect. So it was with the sanction of Europe that we undertook the work of restoring order in



Egypt. It seems to have been argued that when we entered upon the enterprise Europe made some conditions with us, and that faithfulness to the letter or spirit of these makes it incumbent upon us to withdraw our troops at the earliest possible moment. We confess that we do not find that the sanction of Europe was conditioned in any way whatever. It is true that M. de Nelidoff, on behalf of Russia, tried to make terms for the Anglo-Turkish military convention, but Lord Dufferin was firm, and M. de Nelidoff's suggestions were still-born. It is true, too, that Italy desired to make the permission conditional, but owing to the stubborn sense of Prince Bismarck, that trammeling suggestion also died a natural and early death. So it came about that England alone was prepared to do what all Europe recognized as necessary to be done, and that consequently it was with the unconditioned sanction and approval of all the European Powers that we went to Egypt.

But it is evident that the good wishes of Europe, although withdrawing diplomatic obstacles to the project, was not the cause of the enterprise. Order is a very precious thing, but the nation is a Quixote which tries to rule political waves straight in any part of the world in which they happen to stagger a little off the perpendicular. The desire for the peace and prosperity of the people of Egypt might possibly be a pleasant after-dinner topic for a philanthropic statesman, but it would not have justified the interference of a Power which could not possibly be affected by the disorder which it deprecated. It is evident that the rebels who threatened the Khedive in some indirect way threatened England, and that England cannot afford to be callous to popular fevers in Egypt, and consequently we not only had the approval of Europe for our action, but we had the strongest motives to do what we actually did. Our interest in Egypt has long been tacitly recognised. The fact that we joined with France in so many of the untoward incidents in the past political and financial history of that unhappy country was an assertion of the fact that our interests were deeply involved in the country which lay between our Indian possessions and our home dominions. The fact is that between India and England there is only sandy Egypt, and some seas which are insignificant to a sailing nation. Even before there was a Suez Canal—which made these seas, as it were, continuous, and brought us into a sort of physical contact with our Indian Empire—it was felt that Egypt was an important element in the Eastern Question. Since the Canal was constructed, and since we, as *the* great commercial Power trading between the East and the West, have become dependent upon it for our commerce, and we, as a great military Power, have become dependent upon it for the ready access of

our troops to India, and the ready access of our Indian troops to Europe, the importance of dominating the Power which dominates that water-way has become infinitely greater. Here there is no question of party politics. A fanatic may desire to see the British Empire lopped of its great Eastern and Western arms, and nothing but the island trunk remaining. But such vapoury policies have not been broached by any practical statesman, and all practical men are of one mind as to the expediency of continuing our association with our great Indian dependency. Lord Beaconsfield's purchase of the Khedive's shares in the Suez Canal was a proper monetary recognition of our interest in that ribbon of sea through the desert, and it was because of our paramount political and commercial interests in the Suez Canal that we were justified in interfering in the recent troubles in Egypt. This, then, is the permanent interest which we have in Egypt—an interest which we are bound to have regard to, which we have undertaken a war on behalf of, and which it is necessary, it seems to us, to recognise in our future action with regard to that country. Mr. Mackenzie Wallace tells a story of Lord Palmerston which shows that in statesmen of all complexions the necessity of a careful supervision of Egyptian affairs has been recognized as a paramount political duty. He says that Lord Palmerston's objection to the construction of a practicable water-way between the Gulf of Pelusium and the Red Sea was founded on the belief that, if such a canal were constructed, England would be compelled, sooner or later, to annex Egypt. He was averse to such annexation, and hence his opposition to the scheme of M. de Lesseps. Now, we also reject at present the idea of the annexation of Egypt, but we are persuaded of the necessity of our retaining a very strong hold over the Canal. If we retain the position we at present enjoy in Egypt, if we remain there long enough to make Egypt a firm and sure ally, if we carry out the work of reform which we have begun, which will, in the end, have the effect of preventing the interference of other States with the internal affairs of Egypt—interference which is always a menace to our interests in that great highway—then we believe that no such necessity as that which was contemplated by Lord Palmerston will ever arise. But if, on the other hand, we throw away our present golden opportunities, if we leave the country to be again a prey to anarchy, and a prey to the vulture nations which gloat where anarchy is, we see the probability of war to regain an ascendancy which we seem willing to throw away, and of an ultimate annexation of the country to prevent further relapse from that order which we are willing to leave only half established. It is our duty now to take such steps as will prevent, either directly or indirectly,

the annexation of Egyptian territory by any rival Power. It is our interest to train Egypt in such a way that she may by her future conduct give no pretext for any foreign intervention ; it is our clear policy to secure that the influence of no nation shall predominate over our own at Cairo, and the only feasible way that we see to attain all these objects is by retaining our military hold upon Egypt at the present time. We cannot but think that here our views, candidly expressed, are at one with the more valuable and instructed opinions which are only covertly hinted at in Lord Dufferin's General Report :\*—

“ A great part,” he says, “ of what we are about to inaugurate will be of necessity tentative and experimental. This is especially true as regards the indigenous Courts of Justice and the new political institutions, which will have to be worked by persons the majority of whom will be without experience or instruction. Had I been commissioned to place affairs in Egypt on the footing of an Indian subject State, the outlook would have been different. The masterful hand of a Resident would have quickly bent everything to his will, and in the space of five years we should have greatly added to the material wealth and well-being of the country by the extension of the cultivated area and the consequent expansion of the revenue ; by the partial, if not total, abolition of the *corvée* and slavery ; the establishment of justice, and other beneficial reforms. . . . Her Majesty's Government and the public opinion of England have pronounced against such an alternative . . . but though it be our fixed determination that the new *régime* shall not surcharge us with the responsibility of *permanently* administering the country, whether directly or indirectly, it is absolutely necessary to prevent the fabric we have raised from tumbling to the ground the moment our sustaining hand is withdrawn. Such a catastrophe would be the signal for the return of confusion to this country (Egypt), and renewed discord in Europe.”

Under all the circumstances we see that we were right in going to Egypt ; we had a right and a public mission to reduce the ragged elements of rebellion to order, we had deep interests in undertaking the duty Europe intrusted to us, and we shall only secure those interests by continuing to discharge patiently the arduous duties which devolve upon us as a nation.

Nubar Pasha, one of the ablest Egyptian statesmen, if not the only Egyptian who deserves the name, said that the Egyptian question is a question of irrigation ; and any one who makes himself acquainted with the present condition of the country will come to the conclusion that the epigram was justified by the facts. Egypt is an agricultural, not an industrial, country, and its great wealth depends upon the great productiveness of its soil. For hundreds of centuries the Nile has been carrying

---

\* General Report, dated February 6, 1883.

the rich fields of Central Africa into the Mediterranean, and burying them beneath its blue waters. But in doing so it has created the Delta, and its floods have spread much of the fertile mud upon the surface of the Desert. The real wealth of Egypt is in that mud. But the causes which created the Desert, over which the mud is, as we said, in some places spread, are still extant, and would very soon turn the garden into a desert again, were not something done to prevent such atavism. To secure crops from the latent fertility of the Nile mud it is necessary that the land should be watered, and as rain does not fall in Egypt\* it is necessary to inundate or irrigate the land. In this matter, the Nile again comes to the help of the Egyptian, and by overflowing its banks supplies the moisture at the same time that it deposits the fertile mud. But that moisture would not be supplied, that deposit would not be made, unless the people of the country exerted themselves to secure these blessings. Torrents for the most part take what torrents bring, and in order to secure that the Nile may not take away with one wave what it has given by the other, it is embanked, and long ditches are constructed from the embankments to the slopes of the hills which form the Nile valley. These dams or embankments form great basins (the largest covers about 80,000 acres) which are filled when the Nile rises in July, and are emptied when the Nile begins to fall either by sluices where such things exist, or by cutting the embankments where there is no such engineering appliance. It is upon the land so prepared, that the crops are sown which are to be harvested in the following March. This primitive system of Egyptian agriculture is still practised in Upper Egypt. But below Assiout a more civilized system, known as that of perennial irrigation, as distinguished from that which we have described, which is spoken of as annual inundation, is practised. There the agriculturist protects his fields from inundation during high Nile by means of embankments, and waters his land during low Nile by means of various contrivances. By means of this process, the lands are made far more continuously productive than those of Upper Egypt, which are condemned to flooding for a great part of the year and to sun-baked sterility for another. Under the system of perennial irrigation the lands become suited for the growth of more remunerative products, such as maize, cotton, and sugar-cane, than those which can be secured by the more primitive method. The nice questions which have to be practi-

---

\* There are occasional showers in the northern part of the Delta, but these seem to have occurred only in recent years, and are by some said to be due to the construction of the Suez Canal.

cally answered in connection with this "higher" farming we need not enter upon here. Of course, seeing that the Nile water not only supplies moisture but fertilizing mud, any system which allows of a deposit of the mud from the water before the water is applied to the land which is to be cultivated would be a faulty one. And, again, seeing that the water of the Nile is useful not only for giving moisture and fertility, but for cleansing the sub-stratum from the saline flood which annually percolates through the land of Egypt, the nice adjustment of the supply to these various requirements becomes a matter of very considerable difficulty. These matters, although interesting and important, are beside our present purpose. What we desire to point out is, that the introduction of the perennial irrigation system has enormously increased the productiveness of the soil of Egypt. The exports in 1862 were estimated to be of a value of  $4\frac{1}{2}$  millions, and in the year 1874 they amounted to £14,000,000. Under these circumstances, the importance of irrigation to the future of Egypt can be readily understood. Many of the evils of the past have been connected with the forced labour upon the public works, which were necessary to the continued prosperity of the country. But now that Egyptian rulers have burdened their country with debt, now that a grave economic crisis is threatening the country,\* it becomes all-important to consider the irrigation question; and the truth that the Egyptian question is in one sense the question of irrigation dawns upon one. If we remember that but for a greatly improved irrigation system the soil will not continue to produce with an abundance sufficient to enable the rural population to pay the taxes; that the failure to do so will increase the immense burden of private debt under which the fellahen are labouring; that debt will prevent prosperity, and that distress and adversity will lead to that discontent which is the cause of national disorder, which in its turn is the pretext for, or the invitation to, international interference,—we will see that it is no longer a time to rely upon mechanical contrivances like *shadoufs* and *sakkihs*, it is no longer expedient to allow the canal system, upon which, of course, the prosperity of the country mainly depends, to be in a state of lamentable deficiency. There are three methods by which water can be supplied to the land of Egypt: by a canal leading the Nile water by an easy gradient to the lands in question; by filling canals while the Nile is high, and allowing them to retain the water, as reservoirs, until it is wanted when the Nile is low; by raising the Nile water into the canals by means of pumps, or by raising the water in the river by means of a barrage or weir. Each of these systems has its advocates, for each

---

\* Wallace, p. 465.

of these has its merits and defects. But, as we understand, the present very able Inspector-General of Irrigation is inclined, and wisely inclined, to use any means which may be at hand to secure his object, and with this view the Government have, we hear, upon his advice, purchased of an English company an important pumping station, where the pumps are capable of supplying water for some 200,000 feddans. But one of the great difficulties that Colonel Scott-Moncrieff will have to contend with is the condition of the arterial canals. Many of these have been allowed to silt up. Although forced labour has been rigorously exacted of the fellaheen, the labour seems to have been injudiciously expended; and when we remember that the whole system of administration was corrupt and cruel, that circumstance cannot excite surprise. But the evil that men do lives after them, and the terrible results of the corruption of *baksheesh* have to be met and overcome to-day. The *kurbash* is no longer to be used, even the soldiery are to be paid two-and-a-half piastres a day, and the *corvée* can no longer be relied upon for the work which will be necessary to make the arterial system of canals once more efficient, and ready to answer to the throbbing of English engines which will send the precious blood of Nile water through every arid fibre of the country. That this is necessary to the future well-being of the people of Egypt none can doubt. That it is essential to the peace, independence, and good government of that country, no one will deny; and yet that these great works can be effected without the aid of capital which is to find its way into the country it is ridiculous to suppose. There is no capital in Egypt which can be applied to these purposes. That capital will find its way into Egypt if such useful work is to be done, is very evident. But it will find its way there only on condition that it is guaranteed either actually by some solvent guarantor, or indirectly by the presence of England in Egypt. While we remain there we are responsible for the peace of the country, and it is that peace which is the highway to prosperity. The very uncertainty as to the intentions of our Government in that regard has put an end to, or delayed enterprise which would have carried out a system of perennial irrigation on a larger scale than has hitherto been tried with British money, and must necessarily prevent capitalists from dabbling in affairs in which they have so often had their fingers burned. Again we say, then, that the irrigation question—if not *the Egyptian Question*—is intimately associated with it, and that the continuance of the British troops in Egypt is, even when looked at in this aspect, necessary to the prosperity of the country. If we desire to avert a grave economical crisis with a view not only to the happiness and welfare of the fellaheen, but with a view

to that quiet and contentment which is essential to the preservation of the interests we have in Egypt—interests which took us there with war in our hands—interests which keep us there at present with constitutions and reorganizations in our mouths—we must endeavour to encourage the flow of capital into the country, without which the necessary irrigation works cannot be efficiently carried out, and without which the great resources of the country cannot be adequately developed.

We have only mentioned incidentally the many economic questions which, if Egypt is to be the home of quiet, and not the hotbed of annoyance, must be solved.\* The indebtedness of the fellaheen is a very serious evil. One of the best bids Arabi made for popularity was the wiping out of this burdensome debt which oppresses a heavily-taxed people. And the effect of our interference has been to re-impose these burdens from which the people imagined that they were relieved. This circumstance has had the effect of rendering our rule irksome and unpopular; and it will take some time before we secure that confidence and good-will which are so essential to the maintenance of our paramount influence in Egypt. The fact that the debt is heavy, and that if the peasants are allowed to settle their differences with the Greek money-lenders, the result will be in all probability the expropriation of a very large number of the fellaheen—are not matters which we can afford to overlook or ignore.† Peasant-proprietorship is a prescription which we are never tired of formulating for home evils, and we cannot therefore be callous to the dissociation of the peasantry of Egypt from the land of that country. How to meet the difficulty, is however, an exceedingly

---

\* The announcement that the revenue of Egypt for the current year will fall short of the expenditure ought not, if the history, civil, military, and sanitary, of the year is remembered, to be a matter of surprise. But that the deficit will amount to two millions eight hundred thousand pounds (Egyptian) is a matter for serious regret. But it is not merely that Egypt cannot make both ends meet at present, there is a necessity for undertaking further liabilities, which will make this economic problem more difficult in future. It is probable, although the Indemnity Commission has not completed its labours, that the claims by foreign residents against the Government will amount to about four millions of pounds. The war expenses, which Egypt must necessarily incur at this perilous juncture, will be another source of debt. How Egypt is to be exonerated from these financial difficulties without the help of this country it is difficult to see. That the position of solvency is not irretrievable we are certain, but it can be secured by means of a financial readjustment which can only be undertaken with the active co-operation of England. We cannot, as Mr. Forster said at Bradford in December, "govern these Oriental countries merely by advice."

† A commission is at the present time sitting to take evidence as to the condition of the tax-paying fellaheen, with a view to determine how their heavy debts are to be paid.

difficult question to answer. We do not believe that the cause of the evil is the incorrigible improvidence of the Fellaheen, as some would persuade us; and we rather see the explanation of this painful social condition in the bad government, and the inordinate taxation of the past. If the latter suggestion is the true one, then it is evident that we ought to ensure the better government of the country in the future, and endeavour to see that our puppet government does not fall—as it is only too apt to do—into the oppressive and rapacious ways of its predecessors. While this indebtedness lasts—and it will last and increase while the system of taxation and corruption is unreformed—while expropriation is on a large scale possible; while the economic crisis which we have hinted at threatens, our best efforts for the peace of the country are thrown away, for we have here in the midst of the people the whole of the elements of a dangerous social explosive.

Mr. Mackenzie Wallace, in his first chapter, likens Egypt proper to a long walking-stick or fishing-rod, surmounted by a small fan—the fan representing the Delta; and his work deals principally, as was to be expected, with the very important questions which have to do with that portion of the country which is represented by the fan, and the top-joint of the fishing-rod. Apparently his pen travels where his feet have gone, and we do not gather that he has visited the Soudan. Wherever he has been he has carried very careful eyes, a very judicious mind, and where he leads we are well satisfied to follow. But it does strike one as a little strange that he should have been able to write such a large book—perhaps a little too large for the matter it contains—without mentioning the slave-trade, or alluding to the very many important problems in the life of Egypt proper which are intimately associated with the future of the equatorial provinces. Recent events have, however, shown that no careful historian of Egypt can, with any hope of writing accurately of the future, afford to neglect many important considerations which lie outside of the horizon of Mr. Mackenzie Wallace's work. Until Nov. 19 most of the critics of the policy of our Government in Egypt had apparently confined their attention to what was happening in Egypt proper. The proposal of the Government to withdraw the British troops from Cairo, showed that no danger was anticipated in that quarter, and the assurance of Sir Evelyn Wood that he would answer for the preservation of order in Egypt if a certain number of the troops were withdrawn from the country, seems to have been made without any reference to possible reverses in the Soudan and on the shores of the Red Sea. The defeat of the Egyptians at Toka, and their precipitate flight—the annihilation of the force under the command of Hicks Pasha



—the subsequent defeat of some seven hundred men who were sent out of Souakim to reconnoitre, these circumstances have made many persons aware that the Egyptian question has wider issues than they had hitherto imagined, and that the work which England had to do in Egypt might be much more onerous than many persons in England would have us believe. It is quite true that the objects with which we went to Egypt, the purposes for which we remain there, have never been explicitly stated by the Government. Vague statements of intentions are, no doubt, prudent when the shifty future is far from certain. It is always more convenient to say what your intentions were after events have happened, than before you, by your actions, contribute to results. We do not say that that has been the morally pusillanimous attitude of the Government in relation to the Egyptian question. But we do say that all their explanations have been vague, and our actions and policy in Egypt seem to have crept through the holes of accident instead of walking boldly towards some well-defined and clearly perceived end and object. There have been assurances that we had duties to perform in Egypt, and that we would not remain there after these had been performed. There have been statements that we went to Egypt with a view to attain definite ends, and that when these have been attained and secured, our mission will have been completed. The country would be better able to judge of the performances of the Government if they had more explicit promises to measure them by. But, no doubt, from the point of view of those who have to make the promises, the more general these are, the greater latitude is given to conduct, and possibly the greater credit may be gained if the chapter of accidents turns out to be readable in any way in favour of this country. Still certain very definite conclusions may, we think, be drawn, if not from the words of the Government, from the acts which they have been compelled to do. We opened fire upon the forts of Alexandria because the defences of that port were being strengthened against us. We landed troops and fought Tel-el-Kebir with a view of putting an end to the revolt against the Khedive. We interfered in the question of the disposal of the prisoners which we had taken, who had not offended against us but against the ruler of Egypt. We appointed inspectors-general of irrigation, surveyors-general of the land, and we assisted in the re-organization of the army, the police and the judicature. Now, from these circumstances, some valid inferences can be drawn as to our mission in Egypt, as to the duty we have gone there to perform. It is evident that, in the opinion of the Government, a state of disorder in Egypt is in some sense a danger to this country. It is evident, that any

circumstance which would prevent British influence being felt at all in Egypt, would be regarded as a serious evil, and that it was not merely because Arabi was at the head of a very threatening revolt against the Khedive that we went with arms to Egypt, but that any revolt against the ruler of that country might in the end prove inimical to the interests of Britain. If these principles were not at the roots of our policy, we do not understand the policy at all. We cannot see why we, why Europe, should have thought armed intervention necessary in Egypt unless there were other interests involved than those of a weak ruler and an insurgent national party. Indeed, apart from our own interests, our whole sympathy ought to have been with the wordy programme of Arabi and his accomplices; and we think it would be wrong to shut our eyes to the fact that, had we not interfered, had we not overthrown the power of Arabi which had come to such a sudden height, the result to the people of Egypt might have been as happy as it will be under the British tinkered rule of Tewfik, and much happier than it would be if we quitted the country and allowed the old order of things to take the place which it used to occupy. It is true that foreigners would have been excluded from the country; it is true that Turko-Circassians would have been excluded from the offices which they had for years monopolized; it is true that there might have been a massacre of the Copts; but that ultimately the condition of the Fellaheen would have been improved, seems to us more than probable. The reason of our interference, the right we had to interfere, was that we had vital interests in Egypt, and that these interests were safer in the hands of Tewfik, strengthened and supported by our countenance and guidance, than in any other hands. The reason of our meddling in the organization of public departments, of law courts, of police, of army, is that the order and well-being of the mass of the inhabitants of the country is a condition of orderly and quiet government, and that our interests are bound up with the internal peace and the rule of law in Egypt.

Under these circumstances, our work is not done when we have overthrown one military rebellion; we must take steps to prevent another. It is not against the shock of Arabi's arms that we must defend the Khedive, but against any shock which may threaten, until he is strong enough to repel force without our assistance. It is these considerations which make the overthrow of Hicks Pasha, and the other events which have happened in connection with the rebellion in the Soudan, matters of grave import as affecting the question of our position and continuance in Egypt. We cannot leave Egypt while danger threatens. Our influence in Egypt must be maintained. That, we understand, to

be ground which we hold in common with those gentlemen who clamour for the withdrawal of our troops. Their contentions, as they can be gathered from their somewhat hysteric utterances, we take to be that we have to consider the British taxpayer rather than the Egyptian fellah; that we ought to cut down rather than enlarge the foreign responsibilities of this country; that we promised Europe that we would withdraw from Egypt when our work was done, and that it would be dishonourable to remain now that our work is completed; and, finally, that our moral influence will be greater in Egypt if we withdraw the hand of violence and recall our troops. These arguments we have already dealt with in some detail; but as to the one point concerning our influence, we cannot but add a word in this place. To us it seems certain, that if in the face of reverses in the Soudan we withdraw our troops from Cairo or the country, we shall strike a blow at our influence in Egypt which will be irreparable. If we were convinced, as some politicians seem to be, that our influence in the country is baneful, then, by all means, strike a blow at it. But in that case, we fail to see any meaning in all the carefully-planned events of the past eighteen months. If our influence is, as we believe, beneficent, then it is a kind of political suicide to do anything which will jeopardize its continuance. But it behoves us to remember that if we should annihilate our influence in Egypt, that is not the end of the matter. We might be content to retire from our dominant position in that country if no other European Power were to take our place. If we could simply leave our shoes without their being held to be an invitation to other feet. But one thing is very certain, and that is that France, which made one great mistake, is most anxious to retrieve it. Circumstances, as we have seen, were exceedingly favourable to us and exceedingly unfavourable to France. A policy of timidity upon the part of M. de Freycinet threw the game into our hands; but ever since Tel-el-Kebir the French have been conscious of the error of their timidity. Now, however, the position is different. England has got the chestnut out of the fire, and France wants to benefit by the temerity which ran the risk of burning its fingers. There can be no question that France is jealous of our position in Egypt. That after Tel-el-Kebir she despaired of regaining the footing which she formerly held in that country, and that it is only since we have seemed so anxious to abandon all that we gained by our "walk-over," that her hopes of being once more dominant in Egypt have revived. It is no secret, that recently, our neighbour has become more solicitous to ascertain the intentions of our Government as to the withdrawal from Egypt, and has even endeavoured to strengthen the expressed intention to

withdraw the crutches which keep Egypt from falling, and to expedite the execution of what, looking at our earlier actions, would be little less than a practical joke in diplomacy. Will this country be content to leave Egypt to be the seat of French influence? Shall we have done our duty if we leave that country to be again, as it was before, the scene of an unhallowed struggle between our own subjects and those of France for predominating influence? It is possible that either nation might alone exercise a control which would be beneficial to the people of Egypt. But we cannot conceive that anything more inconsistent with the true interests of the populations of the valley of the Nile could exist than the rivalry of two great Powers for the controlling voice in the Councils of Cairo. These are very grave questions, which it behoves the Government to consider before they act in this matter. The people of England will certainly consider them and watch their solution in the fulness of time, when they determine whether the conduct of our present rulers has been wise or foolish.

Whenever one argues in favour of the continued occupation of Egypt, one is met by a cry "But the Government pledges. Are the Government to set an example of duplicity? Are they to go to Egypt with certain assurances, and when the time comes to act upon their promises, to ignore the fact that they ever made any?" Now all this assertion is so general, that we do not feel inclined to dispute it. We would rather have the pledges of the Government definitely stated, and see whether there is anything inconsistent with our continued occupation, in what may have been said upon some other occasion. We believe that when the promises of the Government are put into simple language, it will be found that they do not bind them to withdraw the troops at present, but that they do bind them to continue the occupation of Egypt. The Government has said that the occupation is temporary, that it will not be unnecessarily prolonged, that there will be a prudent development of popular institutions in Egypt, and that there will be such a re-organization of the State as will secure permanent order. Now it will not be denied that the promise to secure to the population of Egypt permanent order and good government in future, is by far the most important. The question as to how long a "temporary" occupation may last, must depend upon the answer to the question—Is the country in such a condition as to be able to maintain order, and to secure good government? If that is not so, if "temporary" means at the earliest possible moment, whether the country has secured peace and stability or not, then our going there was an absurdity, and our promises a snare. If a revolt, which threatened and would have wrecked the

throne of the Khedive eighteen months ago, was a sufficient reason for armed intervention on our part, it would necessarily be an equally good reason for a similar intervention at the present time. But would it be common prudence, if we believe that there may be another outbreak which may necessitate our return to the country with force and arms, to leave it at such a moment? No! The Government promise was that England would remain in Egypt as long as it was necessary to secure a stability of conditions which would render an immediate re-appearance of our troops on that troubled scene unnecessary. There can be no other meaning in the promise than this.

But it may be said, "The time you indicate has arrived. True, everything is not completed and developed but that can only be effected in a long course of years. And while it was the intention of England to see Egypt regenerated, it was not our intention to see Egypt grow up. All we desired was, that the condition of the country should be such as to guarantee peace and order; the slow development of national prosperity; the growth of the institutions which we have designed and inaugurated must be left to the Egyptian people and time." Now of course the question as to whether the time for withdrawal has arrived is one of opinion, and it is one which can be best answered by those who are most familiar with the present condition of Egypt. After making ourselves as intimate with the past history, with the present social and political conditions of the country, and, looking as far forward into the future as a knowledge of the past and the present enables us to do, we unhesitatingly say that that time has not arrived, and that the withdrawal of the troops at the present juncture, or in the immediate future, would be a rash, impolitic, and inconsiderate act. We are, however, confirmed in this belief by many persons, far more competent to judge of these intricate matters than we are. Mr. Wallace is a very careful student of race problems, and he, after a very painstaking inquiry, has come to the same conclusion. In his opinion the presence of our troops in Egypt is necessary, because it ensures public tranquillity. Their presence is necessary to accelerate the introduction of the proposed reforms, to secure the services of foreign capital, and he gives weighty reasons for his belief.\* But it is not so much from his arguments as from the inadvertent signs of a deep-rooted belief, that we are convinced of his conviction. We find, in speaking of Colonel Scott-Moncreiff's work, that he points out that it is certain to fail, unless it is vigorously supported by the British Foreign Office.† The more equitable distribution of the Land Tax is a matter which demands imme-

\* Wallace, pp. 380-383.

† *Ibid.*, p. 481.

ciate attention. But, of course, as the future incidents of the tax will, contrary to its manner in the past, fall upon those who are able to bear it, instead of those who are not, there will be great opposition to this, as to the other reforms; for it is just those who are able to bear it who are at the same time able to resist its imposition. The task of redistribution is in the able hands of Mr. Gibson, but, here again, Mr. Mackenzie Wallace informs us "that it will be necessary to give him the same kind of extraneous support as his colleague, Colonel Scott-Moncrieff, will so urgently require."\* And, again, in speaking of the reforms in the judicial system, which were to be made under the learned supervision of Sir Benson Maxwell, he says "the proposed scheme was nearly finished before his arrival, so that he cannot entirely undo what the Commission, composed of Egyptian jurists, had done; but he may do much to mitigate the evil effects of the above-mentioned tendencies of his colleagues, provided he has the energetic support of the English Government. Whether he will receive the necessary support remains to be seen." †

It would seem, then, that in every department the reforms which are so urgently needed can only be effectuated if England is in earnest in supporting those she has entrusted with the task of inaugurating these improvements. We are not playing with Egypt to mock it with paper constitutions and debating society reforms. We meant to do something which would have the practical results of peace, order and prosperity. That these will follow, if the schemes so carefully framed are wisely carried out, we believe; but that they are to be carried out only with the help of Britain, and that not the distant help of Britain at home, but the intimate assistance of Britain in Egypt, seems to us absolutely certain. The influence of this country, to be effective, must be felt, and the presence of our troops in Egypt is the best, the only guarantee that our wishes will be respected. Arguments with the masters of legions are always more convincing if the legions are at hand. The expedient which some have suggested, that, while withdrawing from Egypt, we should prowl in the neighbourhood at Cyprus, would not affect the objects we have in view. Mr. Mackenzie Wallace shows this, we think, conclusively. We have not the time to follow him through his very careful argument, but we may say that we thoroughly concur with him in thinking that none of the ends we had in view when we went to Egypt, will be accomplished, unless we are prepared to have patience in the task we have undertaken. National consciences are not created in a day, and without a conscience the best-framed institutions are but bodies

---

\* Wallace, pp. 481-482.

† *Ibid.*, pp. 456-457.

without souls, and in their corruption taint and poison the national atmosphere. If we are to effect anything in Egypt, if our armed visits to that country are not to be repeated from time to time, let us have patience to do the work well now. The people are like clay in strong hands, and very quickly take the shape the modeller desires to give them. But the very plasticity of the nature will make the impressions as transitory in their continuance as they have been easy to impose. To make the populations understand and work the institutions and reforms we have given them is a matter of time. In our own country public conscience is not strong enough to overcome the traditional corruption of election campaigns, and we have to use the force of law where the potency of reason and conscience fails. Can we expect that the people of Egypt, who have been steeped in corruption for centuries, whose conscience has been cut to shreds by the kurbash, whose institutions, such as they were, have been shattered by rebellion and conquest, can in a few months learn the lesson to be honest, upright citizens, working free institutions under the influence of Britain, who sits in fine separateness in her own island, some thousands of miles away, and who, even if when she retired had all the intentions of returning in case of another revolution, might find her strong hands tied by circumstances when the revolution came about? No, the presence of latent force is necessary to the reforms we desire, to the peace which we have established, and to the continued order which it is our interest to preserve. We cannot but think that Lord Dufferin holds the same view. We have given some of his words which seem to indicate what he would have advised, had not Her Majesty's Government, and public opinion in England, pronounced against his alternative. We may, however, quote a few more from his general report :—

“ At the present moment we are labouring in the interests of the world at large. The desideratum of every one is, an Egypt, peaceful, prosperous, and contented, able to pay its debts, capable of maintaining order along the Canal, and offering no excuse, in the troubled condition of its affairs, for interference from outside. . . . But the administrative system . . . must have time to consolidate in order to resist the disintegrating influences from within and without, and to acquire the use and knowledge of its own capacities. . . . Unless they are convinced that we intend to shield and foster the system we have established, it will be in vain to expect the timid politicians of the East to identify themselves with its existence. . . . Under these circumstances, I would venture to submit that we can hardly consider the work of re-organization complete, or the responsibilities imposed upon us by circumstances adequately discharged, until we have seen Egypt shake herself free from the initial embarrassments which I have

enumerated. This point of departure once attained, we can bid her God-speed with a clear conscience, and may fairly claim the approbation of Europe for having completed a labour which every one desired to see accomplished, though no one was willing to undertake it but ourselves. Even then the stability of our handiwork will not be assured, unless it is clearly understood by all concerned that no subversive influence will intervene between England and the Egypt which she has re-created."

Remember that the reforms which we are carrying out for the benefit of the population of Egypt, are very much against the grain of the governing classes. All bad systems are for the benefit of some person or persons, and many persons have fattened on the cruelty, the corruption, and the extortion which have had such a vigorous growth upon that feeble mud of character which is known as the Oriental conscience. Their interests are entirely against those of England in this matter. They will have all the wish in the world to return to a system under which they flourished, and it would be no difficult thing to persuade the common people once again, as Arabi did, that it would be to their advantage to turn all foreigners out of the country. The immediate advantages which such an adventurer as Arabi could offer them, would far outweigh the distant gains which would result from free institutions and good government, and in politics, immediate gains weigh far more than large sinking funds. Here then there is a serious danger, which can be guarded against only by habituating the people to the new régime of justice. And that is only to be effected if we have patience to consolidate the work which has been so hastily built. Our last word is that which Sir Evelyn Wood used when he was speaking to the people of this country, and that is, "Patience."

---

#### ART. VI.—THE DWELLINGS OF THE POOR.

1. *The Artisans' and Labourers' Dwellings Acts*, 1868, 1879, and 1882.
2. *The Artisans' and Labourers' Dwellings Improvement Acts*, 1875, 1879, and 1882.

**P**UBLIC attention has been thoroughly aroused on this subject, which is full of the gravest difficulties. Everybody is agreed that something must be done, and at once, but nobody knows precisely what should be done. Lord Salisbury says it is the duty of the State to intervene, but he does not



tell us in what way. Many schemes have been laid before the public, which, though well-meant, would be most dangerous to the State, and would probably aggravate rather than cure the evil. We cannot pass an Act making it penal for landlords to receive the highest rents they can get. This would be in flat contradiction to the laws of supply and demand. And it is difficult to see how the poor can combine to reduce the high rents they pay for such miserable accommodation, because they must live somewhere, and there is no room for them elsewhere. Nor can we pass an Act compelling employers of labour to pay their men higher wages. That again would be disregarding every principle of political economy. And, moreover, it would be futile, for the prices of everything would immediately rise in proportion; and the higher wages would purchase just as much as the lower wages used to and no more. In the meantime, also, English trade would have been ruined by foreign competition. Again there are very strong and obvious objections to any scheme by which the State should become landlord on any large scale. Even supposing it to be right to tax the upper and middle classes still further for the support of the poor, it would be a question whether such a plan would really benefit the class for whose good it was devised. The poor wretches who had never been used to any decent habitation would soon be ejected for breaking the Government regulations which they could not understand, and their places would be taken by clean and tidy artisans. On the other hand, if the plan succeeded, this question would at once arise:—If it is the duty of the State to house the people, is it not also the duty of the State to feed and clothe them too. And thus those whom we seek to teach to help themselves would be hopelessly pauperized, and a premium set upon idleness and sloth.

But this is no new subject. The matter has been many times before Parliament, and there are no less than six Acts directly bearing on the question. But their provisions are little known, and have consequently been suffered to become a dead letter. Even Mr. Chamberlain does not appear to be perfectly familiar with the Acts he proposes to amend.

In the first place, there is the Artisans' and Labourers' Dwellings Act, 1868 (31 & 32 Vict. c. 130), generally known as "Torrens's Act," because it was introduced by the senior member for Finsbury. This Act extends to all towns which contain a population of 10,000 inhabitants, including the whole Metropolitan area, as well as the City. In any such town or place, if the officer of health finds "that any premises therein are in a condition or state dangerous to health, so as to be unfit for human habitation," he shall report the fact to the local authority

(s. 5). And if the officer of health is remiss in discharging this duty, any four or more inhabitants residing in or near such premises can compel him to inspect the premises and report thereon by merely serving him with a representation in writing. "But the absence of any such representation shall not excuse him from inspecting any premises and reporting thereon" (s. 12). The report of the officer of health is then submitted to the surveyor, who, in his turn, is to report whether the evils can be remedied by repairs, or whether the premises should at once be demolished (s. 6). If the surveyor reports that the evils can be remedied by repairs, he prepares plans and specifications which are served on the owner, who is required to execute the same to the satisfaction of the surveyor (s. 7, 18). If the owner does not commence the works within two months, and diligently proceed with and complete the same in conformity with the specification, the local authority has three courses open to them—they can either order the premises to be shut up, or to be demolished, or they may themselves enter and execute the work, and make the owner pay for it (s. 18); the cost of such work with interest at four per cent. is to be a first charge on the building as though it were mortgaged to the local authority with power of sale, &c. (s. 19). If in any case the local authority decide that the premises should be demolished, no compensation shall be paid to the owner, but "the local authority shall proceed to take down and remove the same," if the owner fails to do so within three months; "and the local authority shall sell the materials, and after deducting the expenses incident to such taking down and removal, pay over the balance of monies, if any, to the owner" (s. 20). And no house or other dwelling which shall be injurious to health shall be erected on any part of the site; but the new building shall be subject to the supervision of the local authority, who are empowered to compel alterations therein in course of or after erection (s. 23). Should the local authority be remiss in discharging its duty, the four householders who signed the representation mentioned above "may address a memorial to the Secretary of State, stating the circumstances, and asking that an inquiry be made; and the Secretary of State may thereupon direct the local authority to proceed, and such direction shall be binding on the local authority" (s. 13). Any one obstructing the officer of health or the local authority in the execution of their duty under the Act is liable to a penalty not exceeding £20 a day (s. 36).

This is a well-drawn Act; its provisions are stringent and clear. It has been twice amended. The first amending Act is the 42 & 43 Vict. c. 64, passed in 1879, which enables an owner, who is ordered to execute any works or to demolish any premises,

to call on the local authority to purchase the land and the buildings thereon, at a price which is to be fixed by arbitration, if it cannot be otherwise agreed on. When the amount is to be settled by arbitration,

“the estimate of the value of the premises shall be based on the fair market value, as estimated at the time of the valuation being made of such premises, and of the several interests in such premises, due regard being had to the nature and then condition of the property, and the probable duration of the buildings in their existing state, and to the state of repair thereof, and *without any additional allowance in respect of compulsory purchase*” (s. 7 a). And further: “The arbitrator shall have regard to, and make allowance in respect of, any increased value which, in his opinion, will be given to other premises of the same owner by the alteration or demolition by the local authority of the premises” (s. 7 b).

The land thus acquired by any local authority within the Metropolis, is primarily to be employed for the erection of new buildings suitable for the residence of the labouring classes (s. 14), such buildings to be erected under the superintendence and to the satisfaction of the surveyor (s. 15), and to be afterwards regulated by by-laws made by the local authority (s. 20). And whenever a local authority within the Metropolis neglects to discharge its duty under this Act, the Metropolitan Board of Works may take that duty upon themselves, and enforce the Act as though they were the local authority (s. 12). And by a further Amending Act, passed in 1882 (the 45 & 46 Vict. c. 54), if the local authority does not take prompt action, the Board of Guardians in whose union the unhealthy buildings are situate, or the owner of any property in their neighbourhood, may call on the Metropolitan Board of Works to give notice to the local authority, requiring them to put these Acts in force. This Act of 1882 also extends the provisions of Torrens' Act to any building, although not in itself unfit for human habitation, which “is so situate that by reason of its proximity to or contact with any other buildings, it stops ventilation, or otherwise makes or conduces to make such other buildings to be in a condition unfit for human habitation, or prevents proper measures from being carried into effect for remedying the evils complained of in respect of such other buildings.”

But, beside Torrens's Act and its two amending Acts, there is another equally beneficial measure known as Sir Richard Cross's Act. This was passed in 1875, and is called the Artisans' and Labourers' Dwellings Improvement Act, 1875 (38 & 39 Vict. c. 36). This Act deals, not with single houses, but with unhealthy *areas*, embracing several contiguous courts and alleys, which re-

quire to be dealt with in one scheme. The Act applies to the City, to the Metropolis, and to all towns having a population of 25,000 inhabitants or upwards. The objects sufficiently appear from the preamble, which recites that.

“ various portions of many cities and boroughs are so built, and the buildings thereon are so densely inhabited, as to be highly injurious to the moral and physical welfare of the inhabitants :

“ That there are in such portions of cities and boroughs as aforesaid a great number of houses, courts, and alleys which, by reason of the want of light, air, ventilation, or of proper conveniences, or from other causes are unfit for human habitation, and fevers and diseases are constantly generated there, causing death and loss of health, not only in the courts and alleys, but also in other parts of such cities and boroughs :

“ That it often happens that, owing to the above circumstances, and to the fact that such houses, courts, and alleys are the property of several owners, it is not in the power of any one owner to make such alterations as are necessary for the public health :

“ That it is necessary for the public health that many of such houses, courts, and alleys should be pulled down, and such portions of the said cities and boroughs should be reconstructed :

“ And that in connection with the reconstruction of those portions of such cities and boroughs it is expedient that provision be made for dwellings for the working class who may be displaced in consequence thereof.”

The first step in any proceeding under this Act is an official representation made by the medical officer of health to the local authority, which is defined to be in the City the Commissioners of Sewers, in the Metropolis the Metropolitan Board of Works, in any other large town the urban sanitary authority thereof—that is, as a rule, the Town Council. But if the medical officer of health is remiss in discharging this duty, any two magistrates, or any twelve ratepayers, can put him in motion by complaining to him of any specific unhealthy locality, and he thereupon is bound at once to inspect such area and make an official representation respecting it (s. 4). If the medical officer reports that the district is, in his opinion, not unhealthy, the twelve ratepayers may appeal, if Londoners, to the Secretary of State, if not Londoners, to the Local Government Board, who shall thereupon appoint a medical officer of their own to inspect such area and make an official representation to the local authority (s. 15).

On receiving an official representation

“ that any houses, courts, or alleys within a certain area under the jurisdiction of the local authority are unfit for human habitation, or that diseases, indicating a generally low condition of health amongst the population, have been from time to time prevalent in a certain area within the jurisdiction of the local authority, and that such prevalence

may reasonably be attributed to the closeness, narrowness, and bad arrangement, or the bad condition of the streets and houses or groups of houses within such area, or to the want of light, air, ventilation, or proper conveniences, or to any other sanitary defects, . . . the local authority shall take such representation into their consideration, and if satisfied of the truth thereof, and of the sufficiency of their resources, shall pass a resolution to the effect that such area is an unhealthy area, and that an improvement scheme ought to be made in respect of such area, and after passing such resolution they shall forthwith proceed to make a scheme for the improvement of such area. No person who is beneficially interested in any lands within such area shall vote as member of the local authority upon such resolution, or upon any question relating to the purchase or taking of lands in which he is so interested, under a penalty not exceeding £20" (s. 3).

If the local authority fails to pass such a resolution on receipt of such official representation, the Secretary of State or the Local Government Board can call upon them to state their reasons for not acting upon the representation (s. 8).

Every such order for the improvement of any unhealthy area must be confirmed by a "provisional order" granted by either a Secretary of State or by the Local Government Board, which will subsequently be embodied in an Act of Parliament (s. 6).

Every such scheme must provide "for the accommodation of at least as many persons of the working class as may be displaced in the area with respect to which the scheme is proposed, in suitable dwellings, which, unless there are any special reasons to the contrary, shall be situate within the limits of the same area, or in the vicinity thereof" (s. 5). But the Secretary of State or the Local Government Board may relax this rule if there be any special reasons for their doing so—*e.g.*, if it be proved to their satisfaction that equally convenient accommodation can be provided elsewhere for those displaced (s. 4 of the Amendment Act of 1879, 42 & 43 Vict. c. 63). But such relaxation is always to be limited to one-half of the persons so displaced (s. 3 of the Amendment Act of 1882, 45 & 46 Vict. c. 54). Hence, in every case suitable dwellings to accommodate at least half the population displaced must be erected on the area cleared; and any other land for the time being belonging to the local authority may be appropriated to the accommodation of the other half, or such further lands as may be convenient may be purchased for the purpose (s. 4 of the Amendment Act of 1879). Exception has sometimes been taken to this power of relaxation; and it has been declared that in every case the local authority should be compelled to provide on the spot they have cleared accommodation for the entire number of persons displaced. But a little reflection will show us that

this cannot wisely be required. One great cause of unhealthiness is overcrowding; and in many cases we hear of people sleeping in rooms only eight feet square. How then is it possible to accommodate on the area cleared, in rooms of a proper size, the whole population that formerly herded together within its limits? Either the overcrowding would be as bad as ever, or the new dwellings would have to be built to a height which would be dangerous and at the same time unhealthy, as excluding all sunshine.

The expenses of carrying out the scheme are to be paid, either out of the rates or out of money borrowed for the purpose, under the powers expressly given by the Act (ss. 21, 22).

In assessing the compensation payable in respect of any land or of any interests in any lands proposed to be taken compulsorily in pursuance of this Act,

“the estimate of the value of such lands or interests shall be based upon the fair market value, as estimated at the time of the valuation being made of such lands, and of the several interests in such lands, due regard being had to the nature and then condition of the property, and the probable duration of the buildings in their existing state, and to the state of repair thereof, without any additional allowance in respect of the compulsory purchase of an area, or of any part of an area, in respect of which an official representation has been made” (s. 19).

And, further, if the arbitrator is satisfied that the premises were, at or since the date of the official representation, a public nuisance, by reason of their unhealthy state, or by reason of overcrowding or otherwise, he shall

“determine what would have been the value of such house or premises, supposing the nuisance to have been abated, and what would have been the expense of abating the nuisance; and the amount of compensation payable in respect of such house or premises shall be an amount equal to the estimated value of the house or premises after the nuisance was abated, and after deducting the estimated expense of abating the nuisance” (s. 3 of the Amending Act of 1879).

And, further, by s. 4 of the Amendment Act of 1882, the arbitrator is to allow nothing for any improvement made or interest acquired after the fact that an improvement scheme has been resolved on has been advertised in the district.

How, then, can Mr. Chamberlain say that these

“Acts, as at present worked, offer a premium for neglect and wilful indifference to sanitary provisions. They say, in effect, to the bad landlord: ‘Allow your property to fall into disrepair, to become a nest of disease, and a centre of crime and immorality, and then we will step

in and buy it from you at a price seventy per cent. above what you could obtain in the ordinary market if you attempted to dispose of it without our assistance !”

We think it is clear that these Acts are sufficiently severe upon the owners. They practically receive only the fair market value of the land as cleared, and the value of the old materials which were formerly a house. Surely they are entitled to as much as that. For it is not the “owner” who is to blame for the state of the premises. Mr. Chamberlain appears to be wrath with the wrong man. The person who ought to be fined, the person who deserves to have his property taken from him, is the *lessee*, the man who has, week by week, been wringing the utmost penny from the miserable occupiers. It is the *lessee* who, by himself, or his collector, visits the premises every Monday, and *sees* the evils existing, and yet permits them to continue. The man against whom public indignation should be directed is the man who is in receipt of the *rack-rent*; and we rejoice to say that under Torrens’s Acts, at all events, there is no compensation for *him*—there is no provision entitling *him* to a single farthing. The compensation is only for the “owner,” and the word “owner” is strictly defined by s. 3 of the Act of 1869, and all persons holding “a term of years of which twenty-one years do not remain unexpired” are excluded. The owner then is the man who only receives a fixed ground-rent, and who practically parted with all control over the premises some fifty, sixty, or eighty years ago. He has no interest whatever in the weekly rents paid by the occupier, and it is clearly *against* his interest that the premises should be suffered to fall out of repair.

But our chief object in thus abstracting the provisions of these Acts was to call attention to the important part which we, as private citizens, can take in enforcing these Acts. Under Torrens’s Acts *four* ratepayers, under Cross’s Acts *twelve* ratepayers, have it in their power to put the machinery in motion, and, what is still more important, to start it again at each successive stage should there be any hitch in the movement. And in a clear case this can be done without any risk of costs.

It is *our* fault then and not the fault of the State, if these Acts are suffered to remain unused. As the Rev. Samuel Barnett said in a letter to the *Times* (Nov. 20, 1883): “The prime source of the evil is not in the law, but in the local administration. . . . The best system of government, like the best laws, will be ineffective, until Londoners take a more active and individual interest in the condition of the people.” Let us insist on the existing law being rigorously carried out; not sit with folded hands awaiting further legislation. Why call out

on the State for help, when full powers are already in our hands?

But besides these six Acts there are many other provisions which bear directly on the question. The Public Health Act, 1875 (38 and 39 Vict. c. 55), contains a very wide definition of a nuisance (s. 91). And by s. 92 it is enacted that "it *shall* be the duty of every local authority" to cause their district to be periodically inspected with a view of ascertaining whether any nuisance exist, and, if so, immediately to take steps to abate it. And should the local authority neglect to discharge their duty, then any policeman or any two inhabitants may serve a written notice on the local authority, calling their attention to any alleged nuisance (s. 93). And, thereupon, if satisfied of the existence of a nuisance, the local authority *shall* serve a summons on the owner or occupier of the premises or other the person in default (s. 94). This word "shall" is imperative, and creates a duty, which the Board must perform. If they fail the Local Government Board can insist on its performance under s. 299. The greater part of this Public Health Act does not, it is true, apply to the Metropolis, but there are very similar provisions in other Acts to which a Londoner can have recourse. Thus, under the 18 & 19 Vict. c. 121, ss. 12 & 13, on proof of the existence of any nuisance *it is the duty* of a police magistrate to order the nuisance to be removed and the house to be thoroughly cleansed and whitewashed, and to direct steps to be taken to prevent any recurrence of the nuisance, and especially to disinfect the house if there has been any infectious disease, and to close any house that is unfit for human habitation. See also the 25 & 26 Vict. c. 102, ss. 91, 105; 29 & 30 Vict. c. 90, ss. 16, 19, 20, 21, 31, 34, 36; 37 & 38 Vict. c. 89, ss. 19, 53; 38 & 39 Vict. c. 55, s. 108. And note again that under these Acts, if the local authority fails to perform its duty, any *inhabitant* of the parish or district may complain to a magistrate and cause the owner or occupier of the premises to be summoned (23 & 24 Vict. c. 77, ss. 13, 16; 37 & 38 Vict. c. 89, s. 53.)

Again, there are numerous provisions relating to common lodging-houses, and also to what are called "tenement-houses," that is, lodging-houses of a slightly better class, which are occupied by members of more than one family. For the sections regulating common lodging-houses in the Metropolis, see 14 & 15 Vict. c. 28; 16 & 17 Vict. c. 41; 29 & 30 Vict. c. 90, s. 41; 37 & 38 Vict. c. 89, ss. 46, 49; elsewhere in England, 10 & 11 Vict. c. 34, ss. 116-118; and 38 & 39 Vict. c. 55, ss. 76-89. As to "tenement-houses" in the Metropolis, see 29 & 30 Vict. c. 90, ss. 35, 36; 37 & 38 Vict. c. 89, ss. 47, 56; elsewhere in England, 38 & 39 Vict. c. 55, s. 90.



Other statutes absolutely prohibit the use of cellars as dwelling-places. Any person letting any cellar as a dwelling-place is liable to a penalty of 5s. for every day during which it is so occupied. See 10 & 11 Vict. c. 34, ss. 113-115. Similar enactments with regard to the Metropolis will be found in the 18 & 19 Vict. c. 121, ss. 103, 104; 25 & 26 Vict. c. 102, s. 62..

Provisions against overcrowding will be found in the Public Health Act, 38 & 39 Vict. c. 55, ss. 91, 109, and in the 41 & 42 Vict. c. 16, s. 101; and for the Metropolis in the 18 & 19 Vict. c. 121, s. 29, and the 29 & 30 Vict. c. 90, ss. 19, 36.

Surely, then, here is legislation sufficient if mere legislation can avail at all in this matter.

But it may be said, "these are preventive and prohibitory measures. Is there no constructive measure for creating proper dwellings for the poor?"

Yes, there is one solitary Act, which every one had forgotten till Lord Shaftesbury called attention to it in the *Pall Mall Gazette* for November 26, 1883. It is an Act which was passed so long ago as 1851, the 14 & 15 Vict. c. 34. It is called "an Act to encourage the establishment of lodging-houses for the labouring classes." It empowers the town council of any borough, or the local board of health of any district, to purchase or rent any land, and erect thereon buildings suitable for lodging-houses for the labouring classes, or to convert any existing buildings into such lodging-houses, and "from time to time to alter, enlarge, repair, and improve the same, and fit up, furnish, and supply the same with all requisite furniture, fittings, and conveniences" (s. 36). The cost is to be paid out of the rates, and power to borrow money is given in ss. 31 & 32. If after seven years any lodging-house proves unnecessary or too expensive, it is to be sold "for the best price that can reasonably be obtained for the same," and the proceeds returned to the rates. The town council or local board are to make by-laws for the management, use, and regulation of such lodging-houses, for the breach of any of which a penalty not exceeding £5 shall be paid (s. 46), and a copy of such by-laws, or a sufficient abstract of them, "shall be put up, and at all times kept in every room therein" (s. 47). Every such lodging-house "shall at all times be open to the inspection" of the officers of the council or board.

And here, again, if the town council or local board declines to adopt this Act, it is in the power of ten or more ratepayers of any parish to compel the churchwardens to convene a meeting of the vestry (s. 14), and if at such meeting a resolution to adopt the Act be carried by a majority of two-thirds, the vestry shall appoint three or more ratepayers of the parish

“Commissioners of Lodging-houses,” and such Commissioners shall have all the powers conferred by the Act on town councils and local boards as stated above.

This Act, Lord Shaftesbury tells us, has only been adopted in *one* instance. I am not surprised. What town council or local board would willingly add the management of a large lodging-house to their other duties, and an almost certain loss to their other expenditure? The rates already press severely on the hard-working and deserving poor; shall the rates be increased to provide at less than cost price homes for those who are less hard-working and less deserving? This is to make charity compulsory. Or, if it be not intended to let the lodgings at less than cost price, why should public money be employed? Bodies such as the Peabody Trustees already exist, and their number might readily be increased. For by the Public Works Loans Act, 1879 (42 & 43 Vict. c. 77, s. 6),

“The Public Works Loan Commissioners may lend to any company, society, or association established for the purpose of constructing or improving dwellings for the labouring classes, any sum or sums to be applied towards the construction of dwellings suitable for the labouring classes, and towards the purchase of land for that purpose. Every sum so lent shall be advanced in accordance with the Public Works Loan Commission Act, 1875, and shall be repaid within fifteen years with interest at not less than three-and-a-half per cent.”

To this section, enabling any committee of gentlemen to borrow money for so good a purpose at a moderate percentage, I see no objection. But there are dangers, both moral and political, underlying the Act of 1851. This Act is essentially different in principle from either Torrens's Acts or Sir Richard Cross's Acts. It is right, I think, that the inhabitants of a particular district should be taxed, in order that the sanitary condition of their district may be improved by stamping out the plague-spots in their midst, by widening streets for larger traffic, and providing parks or open spaces free to all; for this benefits all the inhabitants in that district, rich and poor alike. But it is a different matter, in my opinion, to tax the whole community in order to provide healthy houses at a nominal or greatly reduced rental, for the benefit of one particular class, and for that class alone. Mr. Chamberlain would no doubt reply, “I do not desire to tax the whole community; I would tax the landowner alone, who has for years been fattening on the ‘unearned increment.’” But how does Mr. Chamberlain propose to prevent the landowner from gradually transferring this new burden from his own back to the shoulders of his tenants. Would not the rents in the neighbourhood increase till the landowner was recouped? And

would not the tax thus be shifted from the landowner to the community at large? This result is inevitable, unless the State or the vestry embarks in the business of a lodging-house keeper on a most extensive scale, and then only if such State dwellings are let at less than the fair market rent.

It is unnecessary to argue further against such a scheme as this in the pages of this REVIEW, which has so long and so consistently advocated the necessity of restricting the functions of Government within very narrow limits. It is clearly unfair that a landowner should be compelled to find the money which is to be employed in underselling himself. It is, perhaps the duty of the State to provide hospitals and asylums for those who, by reason of bodily or mental infirmity, are unable to maintain themselves, if the accommodation provided by voluntary charity prove inadequate. But, at present, no sufficient reason has been shown for imposing on the State the duty of providing the labouring classes with dwellings. The State always builds slowly and expensively. There are, at this moment, Mr. Barnett tells us, close to one of the worst districts in London, decent rooms in decently managed houses standing empty, which the owners would gladly let for 1s. 6d. or 1s. 9d. a week (*Daily News* for Dec. 6, 1883). Could the State ask less rent than this? And if it did, would not the inevitable result in the present state of the labour market be a decline in the rate of wages? The outcasts who succeeded in getting rooms in the State barracks would underbid better workmen who still lived outside, and the Government bounty would ultimately find its way into the pocket of the employer of labour.

For, after all, this question is only a fragment of a far mightier one. The "Bitter Cry of the Outcast Poor of London" has been written for them, most emphatically, most graphically. But I doubt if such would be their "cry," could they speak for themselves. They are used to their present quarters, and have learnt to endure them. Their "cry" would be for *more work, for regular work*; not for better dwellings.

They are willing to work hard, terribly hard, for the most meagre wage; they will disdain no drudgery; they will shrink from no amount of toil, if only they can so earn enough to keep soul and body together. And they cannot. They are slowly starving. They stand idle in the market-place because no man hath hired them. Their cry is inarticulate at present, but this, I think, is what they would say if they could plainly speak:—"The world owes us a living; we are born into the world and must live somehow; the Government or some one must find us work, and we will do it, and they must pay us for it; a fair day's work deserves a fair day's wage." To-day they are willing

to work ; to-morrow they will take to begging ; by-aud-by to stealing, to riot, to revolt.

What can we reply ? Can we tell them it is their own fault that no one hires them ; that they are unskilled workmen, rejected when others were chosen, because they are stupid or untaught. Shall one remind them that in better times when they were in receipt of good wages, they were drunken, reckless, and laid by not a single penny to meet the days when they should be weak and old. All this is true, no doubt ; and it would be strange if the State were compelled to employ all the bad workmen whom private citizens refused to engage. Yet it is sad to think that in this "Merry England" of ours any man or woman who is able and anxious to work should be compelled to choose between starvation and the workhouse. And without capital they cannot emigrate.

Sad as this is, it affords no sufficient ground for calling on the State to find them work. It is a very good ground for appealing to private charity. Instances of men and women who cannot find employment, though able and willing to work, are not frequent among the labouring classes, though they do occur. Such instances are known to the Rev. G. T. Cull-Bennett, St. John's Vicarage, 400, Commercial Road, E., to the Rev. Samuel A. Barnett, Vicar of St. Jude's, Commercial Street, Whitechapel, to the Rev. Septimus Hansard, Rector of Bethnal Green, N., and to the Rev. A. G. Brown, of the East London Tabernacle, any one of whom will distribute with discrimination the contributions of the charitable. And there is sore need for such contributions at the East-end of London this winter. But while in this way temporary distress may be relieved, the poor must be taught that for any permanent amelioration of their condition, they must rely upon themselves alone. There are plenty of professional men willing and able to work who cannot find employment ; plenty of clerks, plenty of servants, out of place. Shall the Government find work for them all ? If a carpenter or glazier is to be supplied with work for eight hours a day at the expense of his fellow-citizens, why not an architect, a surgeon, or a barrister ? There always will and must be in every trade and in every profession a residuum of unintelligent or improvident persons, whose labours are not appreciated, and who cannot "earn their salt." It may be their misfortune and not their fault ; but how can the State compel any particular citizen to employ them. Each of us must learn to do the best for himself and for his children, and improve by his own energy and exertions his own character, condition, and surroundings. Any measure which would sap the self-reliance, the prudence, the thrift, or the industry of the British workman, or which would induce him to look to aid from the State

instead of to his own efforts and resources would be a national disaster. The only direction in which, in my opinion, the State could interfere with advantage is perhaps in aiding the emigration of widows and orphans when the bread-winner has been removed. A society has been started with this object, called the Central Emigration Society, of which Mr. James Rankin, M.P., is the President, and the Secretary is Mr. Walter B. Paton, of 3, Paper Buildings, Temple, E.C., who will gladly afford any information as to the objects of the Society.

No doubt there is a glut at present in the labour market. But we must remember that trade has been slack for many years. And the labouring classes by their early marriages and large families so rapidly increase the population that wages *must* decline. When a working man asks "How can I keep a wife and six children on twenty-five shillings a week?" one is tempted to reply, "On twenty-five shillings a week there ought to be no wife, or certainly not the six children." In the middle and upper classes a young man does not marry till he sees some reasonable prospect of maintaining a wife and family. But it is far otherwise with the lower orders: they marry before they have saved a single sovereign. A dissenting minister at Bristol, not long ago, stated to his congregation that having occasion to visit the office of the Registrar of Births, Deaths, and Marriages he turned over the banns of marriage that were posted up, and found to his surprise that half the intending brides were but seventeen years of age, and half the intending bridegrooms were under twenty! Does not this account for much poverty, for much infantile disease, and for much overcrowding?

And there is an especial reason why the State should not assume the position of universal landlord of the poor. The only chance of reforming them, of making them ashamed of their filthy and unhealthy habits, is by the direct personal influence of educated visitors. The only persons who have a right to enter periodically the dwellings of the poor, and who when there can speak with any authority, are the Sanitary Inspector and the landlord's rent-collector. The former is the tenants' natural enemy; he is the man who burnt their only bed after the baby had died on it of scarlet-fever. But the latter may be, and under Miss Hill's system is, their best and kindest friend. It is he, or she, that teaches them to take a pride in being clean and neat themselves, and in keeping the room clean and neat as well. The happiest thing that can happen to the outcasts of London is that they should come under the care of a truly philanthropic landlord. Those, then, who desire to permanently relieve the distress in the East, and who have money to invest, should write to Miss Octavia Hill, at 14, Nottingham Place, W. She has

hitherto always succeeded in paying a fair percentage on all monies lent to her. And those who have no money, but have leisure, should also communicate with her, and under her guidance visit the poor tenants week by week. There is great scope here for the energies of shrewd but kindly ladies, who can be strict when it is necessary, who will be keen to detect anything amiss, and at the same time will be able gently but firmly to point out the remedy. Such suggestions, coming from the representative of the landlord, will be obeyed when the orders of the Sanitary Inspector or even of a Magistrate would be wholly disregarded. This noble opportunity would be wholly lost if the poor were relegated to the tender mercies of a Government Official, the Bumble of some new State Lodging-house.

Lastly, there is much scope for energy and goodwill on the Sanitary Aid Committees, started by the late Arnold Toynbee, and again strongly recommended by the Rev. Llewellyn Davies. The object of these committees is to make known and to enforce the existing law, to direct and organize the efforts of isolated workers, and to secure the election of suitable persons on the Vestry and Board of Guardians. Mr. Loch, of the Charity Organization Society, 15, Buckingham Place, W.C., has prepared a detailed scheme for the guidance of such committees, and all willing to aid in this good work should at once communicate with him.

---

## ART VII.—THE FUTURE OF SINGLE WOMEN.

*Whom Nature Leadeth.* By G. NOEL HATTON. Longmans, Green & Co. 1883.

**E**XCEPTING the very few reformers whose vision has swept clean above the head of local passing fears, and of the small anxieties of those who keep one eye on the truth and the other restlessly watching what the world says—excepting from such teachers we have never had any bold, unconditional claims made on behalf of women; there has always been a tone of apology or assurance of continued good conduct after the accordance of the desired privilege; always has there been an anxious pointing to examples of women who were excellent wives and mothers, and also, in parentheses, distinguished artists, writers, and so forth.

First and foremost, they say, women must be wives, mothers, housekeepers; after that they may with propriety, and even with merit, become something more.

“If you have true genius,” they assert, “the trifling interruptions of a family, household cares, social claims that every individual is free to make upon a woman—will not seriously

interfere with the development of your powers. Do not urge that such things not only swallow up your time, but make it impossible to secure the needful conditions or experience for the cultivation of your art. We know better. Genius laughs at obstacles. If you allow these things to crush you, it shows you are weak ; if you fail, we shall have another instance of unfounded claims of women to equality with men.

To do any consecutive work, to avoid the terrible waste of energy, wear and tear upon the health consequent on interrupted mental labour, a single life is almost necessary for a woman. She must refuse all that a man can freely accept and enjoy ; he accepts it not only without risk of having to pay for it too dearly, but with positive gain and impetus to his career. Where the husband derives support and spur to his labour, wholesome relaxation, and the inspiration of affection and happiness—a woman is crushed and annihilated ; marriage demands from her, with almost savage jealousy and greed, that every thought, every talent, every power and project should be subordinated to its overwhelming claims.

We rejoice to find these views ably illustrated by G. Noel Hatton. To-day blows fall fast and thick upon the old assumptions that condemned every woman to be a wife and a mother, and stamped the unmarried with reproach.

The first effect of the emancipation of women is that they are gradually liberated from the thralldom of such dogmas.

A process is going on in civilized communities which is called by some timorous spirits the decomposition of Society ; it may more truly be described as the differentiation of a portion of its members in a certain direction. This process indicates a state not of decay, but of progress.

“The best definition of Progress ever given is Von Baer’s, which rests on the amount of differentiation and specialization of the several parts of the same being.” His definition refers to organic advancement, but it applies with equal force to social progress. It follows from this definition that when a young Society is increasing in size and number, its special characteristics will be more marked. As it grows larger the individuals that compose it tend to become grouped into different classes, each class having its own work to do. Or to reverse the statement, the whole work that has to be done in the community becomes subdivided, and each kind of work becomes the special function of a group of persons, and ceases to be the general duty of all. In a young community each individual is able to do a little of everything—fishing, hunting, cooking, making implements, &c. ; later on the cooking is all done by one person, the fishing by another, the making of implements by a third.

It stands to reason that this subdivision is necessary, because,

as a society grows in size and its elements become more heterogeneous, a more perfect organization becomes an administrative necessity. It is under the influence of this principle that a certain body of women appear to be led away from marriage and domestic life towards social and public work.

All women are modified by progress generally, as are all men, but this special process of differentiation, to which we now refer is modifying the lives—not as some people fear of *all* women—but only of a certain number, in the direction of public usefulness. Speaking broadly, women have up to the present time been excluded from the operation of this law of differentiation. It has been legitimate for them to fulfil one function alone, that of race preservation. Wifehood and motherhood—or whatever function that might be which was involved in their relations with men—have hitherto been considered the function of *all* women.

Now the great fact of life is womanhood, with all its possibilities and varieties—wifehood and motherhood are incidental parts, which may or may not enter into the life of each woman. Womanhood and wifehood are not co-extensive, but up to this time we have acted as though they were. It is true that there always existed a small class who have led isolated lives in convents, and whose function was religious; but there has never until to-day been found an appreciable number of celibate women who have filled worthily a wide sphere of social and public usefulness. Hitherto celibacy has meant conventual life for women; to-day it means something entirely different, and it is this difference that we ought to consider.

Many among us still fail to grasp the true significance of the new movement for the emancipation of women; many are still under the yoke of old opinion, and they fail to recognize the more healthy nature of the new type of celibate women as compared with that of former days.

Mr. Lecky says:—

“The complete suppression of the conventual system was very far from a benefit (!) to women or to the world. It would be impossible to conceive any institution more needed than one which should furnish a shelter for the many women who, from poverty or domestic unhappiness or other causes, find themselves cast alone and unprotected into the battle of life . . . it would largely mitigate the difficulty of providing labour and means of livelihood for single women, which is one of the most pressing, and in our own day one of the most appalling, of social problems. Most unhappily for mankind, this noble conception was from the first perverted.”\*

Although, according to Mr. Lecky, the convent became the perpetual prison of the daughter whom a father was disinclined to endow, yet, he concludes, “There is no fact in

---

\* “History of European Morals.”



modern history more deeply to be deplored than that the reformers should have levelled to the dust, instead of attempting to regenerate, the whole conventual system of Catholicism." The single women of the future or of the present day will not join in Mr. Lecky's regrets. However hard the battle of life may be, we all prefer to have our share in it. It could only be taken as a sign of weakness and the degradation of the spirit of women if they feared to meet the ordinary ills of life, or if they welcomed a deliverance from them by any such artificial and unwholesome scheme as a regenerated conventual system.

We maintain that the present condition, imperfect as it is, is better than the old; we maintain, too, that the mere struggle to secure improved conditions is a bracing and wholesome stimulus for the character. The discipline of ordinary life, the invaluable lessons of experience, are as necessary to the development of a woman's character as of a man's; their instinct has led them, in common with men, to hail the modern awakening in national feeling. The increasing power of public spirit has touched and profoundly modified their nature, it has made a breach in the old condition of things which relegated them to a life of domestic duty or to the convent, and denied to any of them a share in public responsibility. But this change is not an abrupt departure from the old lines. It is a logical necessary sequence of what has gone before, as are all profound and extensive modifications of society. The change has been anticipated by many writers. Mr. Lecky himself points a prophetic finger in the direction of an important variation in the types of womanhood.

"A very large and increasing proportion of women are left to make their way in life without any male protector, and the difficulties they have to encounter through physical weakness have been most unnaturally and most fearfully aggravated by laws and customs, which, *resting on the old assumption that every woman should be a wife*, habitually deprive them of the pecuniary and educational advantages of men, exclude them absolutely from very many of the employments in which they might earn a subsistence, encumber their course in others by a heartless ridicule, or by a steady disapprobation, and consign in consequence many thousands to the most extreme and agonizing poverty, and perhaps a still larger number to the paths of vice. At the same time, *a momentous revolution has taken place* in the chief spheres of female industry that remain. The progress of machinery has destroyed its domestic character. That the pursuits and education of women will be considerably altered, that these alterations will bring with them some *modifications of the type of character* may be safely predicted."\*

Individual women of exceptional powers have stood apart from the majority at all times of the world's history, but never before

---

\* "History of European Morals."

has there been a common impulse amongst influential women of different countries to claim an important share in public affairs. The original impulse was given by the teaching of Christ that there are duties outside the home for every one. Until very lately their non-domestic work has been limited to charitable or parochial matters, chiefly to establishing organizations for relief of distress which too often did more harm than good; everything was done by isolated individuals; there was no national unity or spirit of co-operation between the many independent workers. But now the principle of organization has spread like a network over the country, the necessity of mutual help and co-operation is everywhere recognized. This change has had its effect on women. The nature of their duties and work has been lifted, not by conscious effort on the part of any one, but by natural circumstances from the domain of private enterprise to that of national usefulness.

We thus come to the three steps in the history of celibacy: first, the isolated life in the convent or the temple of ancient times; second, the less restricted sphere of individual or private work; third, the fullest development of all the powers consequent on co-operation in national aims. In illustration of the last two stages, we may note that elementary schools were formerly supported, managed, and assisted very largely by women, these schools were private or parochial. On the passing of the Elementary Education Act, those interested in them became, as managers of Board schools, part of a great national system under Government control. The work of women as Poor-Law guardians is another instance, from administering charitable relief privately, they now apply their parochial knowledge and experience in connection with Poor Law administration. Thus it is that by almost imperceptible changes have been brought about those steps towards higher organization and differentiation which exercise so great an influence in a civilized society and on the single women of to-day.

The old-fashioned tyranny which allowed to women no real life but marriage is truly passing away, and it begins to be recognized that special qualities are necessary for married life which all people do not possess.

There still exists a very large number of persons whose intolerance of celibacy is only equalled by the religious intolerance of former days. It comes as a new and startling fact to them that there are women in England at this day who, having weighed the advantages and disadvantages of married and single life, deliberately choose the latter. The intolerance of society, on what is after all a matter of taste, is so overbearing, that if a woman frankly states her preference, she is told that celibacy being distasteful to her neighbour cannot be agreeable to herself.

As we remarked a little time ago,\* “If the normal condition of woman is to be a wife and a mother, as such she is heavily weighted in the industrial market, but *this only applies where the woman chooses to allow herself to be thus handicapped. She may or may not prefer what is called the normal condition.* There is nothing to prevent her enjoying what Mr. Higginson calls an industrial picnic in solitude. It appears to us that the proportion of women *who like to enjoy their industrial picnic in solitude is increasing, and, moreover, that it is voluntarily increasing and not as of necessity.* It is also very capable of contention that this applies to those of the female sex who are intellectually superior to the average man or woman.”

The normal condition of wifehood and motherhood, with the multifarious domestic duties involved, is a serious drawback to industrial, public, or professional life; such employments may be, and are, successfully carried on occasionally by those who are married and have children to care for. A married woman is happier for having some congenial non-domestic pursuit, some interest which relieves her from the monotony of household cares, but these are exceptional cases. The principle of race-preservation, which is fundamental in a society, has by differentiation now become the prime function of those women who are married; they carry out this aim to which, for them, all others are subservient, and to which they are especially fitted by character and taste; therefore it can only be in spite of great difficulties that outside interests are maintained by married women.

No one denies that the conditions under which race-preservation is carried on are open to reform. Some of them could be immediately improved, others need greater knowledge of the laws of health in civilization than we already possess. If marriage is a natural condition, it ought to be a pleasurable and painless one; if it is not pleasurable and painless, we may conclude that our ignorance and negligence are leading us into grave error.

The moment a woman marries she is more or less the subject of every existing authority. Conventional society dictates her how, where, and in what manner it is proper for her to live. In the eyes of the law her personal liberty and her status are *nil*, her husband may lock her up and refuse her friends access to her:—the guardianship of her children is not hers; again, marriage involves her in personal discomfort, suffering, and danger to life. She is not able, however much she may deplore it, to continue those habits of physical exercise and healthy recreation which maintain the elasticity and vigour of her unmarried sister; she cannot command for herself those conditions of life which conduce to health.

---

\* See the WESTMINSTER REVIEW, January, 1883.

## *The Future of Single Women.*

It is often argued that statistics show a higher death-rate for the unmarried than the married, and it is concluded that married life is most conducive to health ; but such statistics may be interpreted as proving nothing more than that beauty and health being attractive, well-favoured persons marry sooner than ill-favoured, delicate ones. This difference between married and the single is in no sense caused by, but, on the contrary, precedes, marriage ; therefore the conclusion, in so far as it is based on these statistics, that the health of married women is greater than that of single women, is not necessarily correct.

We ought to apply to both sexes the words which Mr. Stevenson\* seems almost inclined to apply only to men. He says, "Marriage if comfortable is not at all heroic. It certainly narrows and damps the spirits of generous men. In marriage a man becomes slack and selfish, and undergoes a fatty degeneration of his moral being." It is not surprising then that celibacy, whatever may be its disadvantages, should become attractive to women of a certain temperament, and that they should feel that their highest, noblest, and strongest characteristics can only be developed and maintained in conditions of liberty. It is objected that their highest qualities are tenderness and motherly love, &c., and that these can only be developed through marriage, and that therefore an unmarried woman is undeveloped and incomplete. This objection is based on two assumptions—first that marriage includes the highest love ; second that marriage gives a woman complete development. We will deal with the second assumption first. It is granted that when a young woman is kept by her friends in a state of enforced idleness, of strict tyrannical tutelage, is denied all healthy interest in life, all engrossing occupation and mental activity, it is granted that wifhood and motherhood would mean for her an added interest—a certain amount of development. So her marriage would be a gain. The starvation of her life requires immediate satisfaction at whatever cost. But this is not true of the unmarried woman who has interests and occupations of her own, and who has no personal preference for marriage. The assumption that marriage offers to a woman the highest development is open to question. The married woman develops the special qualities of wifhood and motherhood often, almost always, *at the cost* of her general development ; in proportion as her strength, her thought, her whole life is given to the special duties of race-preservation, they are necessarily withdrawn from the general duties of humanity. Thus a married woman may grow in the direction of wife and mother while her individuality is weakened and sometimes absolutely effaced. Although marriage sometimes develops the character in both

---

\* *Virginibus puerisque.*

sexes, in women it may secure this special development at a greater cost of general growth than is justifiable. When we are studying the development of the character for its own sake, and not for the sake of some special end, the nearest approach to a perfect character is reached by cultivating the faculties generally. If the absence of the special experiences of wife and mother are a loss to a woman, the loss may be more than compensated by the general knowledge of the world which her personal liberty places within her reach. "Aujourd'hui la femme commence à ne plus faire du mariage son seul but, et de l'amour son seul idéal."

Speaking of the new order of women A. Dumas says: "Elle peut se passer de l'homme pour conquérir la liberté; elle commence à l'entrevoir, sans pour cela faire abandon de sa pudeur et de sa dignité; tant au contraire, en développant son intelligence, en élargissant son domaine; et la liberté qui lui viendra par le travail sera bien autrement réelle et complète que la liberté purement nominale qui lui venait par le mariage. Une fois la fortune et la liberté acquises, que leur représentera le mariage sinon une dépossession, le mari étant le chef de la communauté, et un esclavage, la femme devant obéissance au mari?" If this is true of a single woman in France much more true is it in England. Bacon says, "The most ordinary cause of a single life is liberty, especially in certain self-pleasing and humorous minds, which are so sensible of every restraint, as they will go near to think their girdles and garters to be bonds and shackles."

The mental life of a single woman is free and untrammelled by any limits except such as are to her own advantage. Her difficulties in the way of development are only such as are common to all human beings. Her physical life is healthy and active, she retains her buoyancy and increases her nervous power if she knows how to take care of herself, and this lesson she is rapidly learning. The unmarried woman of to-day is a new, sturdy, and vigorous type. We find her neither the exalted ascetic nor the nerveless inactive creature of former days. She is intellectually trained and socially successful, her physique is as sound and vigorous as her mind. The world is before her in a freer, truer, and better sense than it is before any individual male or female. Her tastes are various and refined, her opportunities for cultivating them practically unlimited. Whether it be in the direction of society, or art, or travel, or philanthropy, or public duty, or a combination of many of these, there is nothing to let or hinder her from following her own will, there are no bonds but such as bear no yoke, no restrictions but those of her own conscience and right principle. She feels that it is in no sense her duty, since it is not her choice, to devote herself to securing the happiness of some one individual, nor to add to our difficulties

of over-population. From her stronghold of happiness and freedom she can help the weak and protect the poor. She is fitted to fill a place which has always stood empty in the history of the world, that of a loving and tender woman armed with official power to redress the wrongs of women and children, to stand as their representative before the nation, the creator of their rights, and the shield of their weakness; those whose nature and necessities are known only to her, and to her only because she is a woman, have found in her a guardian, an advocate, and a friend. While losing none of the fun and frolic and gaiety of life, she is called by a deep religious conviction to stand face to face and hand in hand with suffering; it is her holy mission to grapple with some of the most painful problems of modern civilization.

“So may life its solemn mysteries unfold  
To eyes not shy to see them nor too bold.”

A really happy woman of this type is an object of envy to many—to those who have gained something but lost freedom in marriage, to unmarried colourless women who deny our right at once to be virtuous and happy, to those men whose past has been for ever robbed of the bloom which is life's sweetest gift.

It may be asked does the community lose when she thus studies the welfare and full development of her own nature? Those principles of self-preservation and race-preservation which underlie all communities are the necessary elements of the permanent existence of a society. When once that permanence is secured, these principles it is found, are gradually replaced by others, the original law which pitilessly sacrificed the individual to the community is no longer needed, the community is established, and the welfare of the individual becomes first possible, then necessary, as a condition of communal health.

The relative importance of the principles of social and industrial liberty becomes reversed. In a young society, self-preservation of the whole is the primary necessity. Industrial welfare is and must be sacrificed to it; thus the aim to be reached is a maximum of social strength, and a minimum of individual freedom; but as the community grows, its self-preservation is secured, and the aim gradually changes in character, it seeks to combine the maximum of individual liberty compatible with social existence. Marriage was in early times the only or the most powerful bond that united the wandering, incoherent tendencies of peoples. It identified the interests of the individual with that of the community, and made him willing to sacrifice his own welfare for the general good. It therefore maintained a justly high place as a political institution. Now marriage is no longer the only incentive to peace and order.

A new factor has shown itself, exercising the same uniting influence—this is the social spirit or public conscience which makes self-government possible. When this stage of evolution is reached, the conditions are changed; the greater the number of persons, male or female, admitted to a share in the administration of law, the more public spirit is utilized in binding society together; every woman and every man that takes her or his share of social duty becomes a cementing element in society. When the class or sex hitherto excluded is admitted to these responsibilities, the first effect is and must be an increase of solidarity and unity throughout the nation. Such increased solidarity is always preceded by a process of differentiation. Every individual who desires to profit by this change in the social relations has the power to do so in his own hands, more or less. Those who through the circumstances of their life are able to minimize to the utmost the interference of law or society upon their actions, are fully able to do so, while strictly maintaining their ground as members of society. Not very long ago the bonds of conventionality were so galling that such liberty was difficult to all, impossible to a woman. It appears, therefore, that those women whose temperament leads them into new paths of usefulness, who are differentiated in the direction of general activity, are in no way bringing an element of danger or disruption into the community, but on the contrary, while extending its civil and social limits, they increase its solidarity and efficiency. The development of their own powers of public work, as distinguished from the special qualities required for race preservation, is consistent with the definition of progress given at the commencement of this paper, and merely results from the natural selection of those who live in conditions of liberty. Jefferson says:—"It is unfortunate that the efforts of mankind to secure the freedom of which they have been deprived should be accompanied with violence and even with crime." But the liberty for which women strive will be stainless. They use the weapons that Nature has given them of persuasion and agitation. "Agitation is an old word with a new meaning. Sir Robert Peel, the first Englishman who felt himself its tool, defined it to be 'marshalling the conscience of a nation to mould its laws.' The means are reason and argument—no appeal to arms. Wait patiently for the growth of public opinion. That secured, then every step taken is taken for ever."\*

Finally, does such a life of liberty and purity tend to destroy or create feelings of tenderness and loving sympathy in a woman? To be loving and tender is a woman's nature, but love and tenderness do not reach their *highest* expression in the personal relations; the highest, widest, and deepest love is the

---

\* Wendell Phillips, "The Scholar in a Republic."

love which is attracted by the highest, widest, and grandest object. It may express itself in passionate devotion to truth or goodness, or in that love of humanity which at once compassionates the weakness of humanity and worships its sublime possibilities.

No love needs be more tender in its dealings than that which spends itself on the helpless and unfortunate, none needs to be more deep than that which gives where no return is possible. Emerson says:—

“Thus we are put in training for a love which knows not sex, nor passion, nor partiality, but which seeks virtue and wisdom everywhere to the end of increasing virtue and wisdom. . . . There are moments when the affections rule and absorb the man, and make his happiness dependent on a person or persons. But in health the mind is presently seen again, its overarching vault bright with galaxies of unmutable lights, and the warm loves and fear which swept over us as clouds, must lose their finite character, and blend with God to attain their own perfection. But we need not fear that we can lose anything by the progress of the soul. The soul may be trusted to the end.”\*

On our own hypothesis, the unmarried woman who is modified in the direction of general activity “has interests and occupations of her own”—“she has an extended sphere of public usefulness.” The causes of liberty, of purity, of temperance, education, the liberation of the slaves in America, the reform of the laws in England, the progress of Liberty in Europe are to a man so many abstract political principles which he may endeavour to further from different motives, and to clothe with life as far as he can—to a woman they mean various expressions of the principle of good, and their obstruction represents to her human suffering in the concrete, which appeals to her with a keenness and urgency that takes no denial. But it is indignantly insisted that such interests as these do not bring out the lovelier side of a woman’s nature. Now we are told that a mother’s greatest usefulness is in securing better conditions of life to her children than would otherwise fall to their lot, and that the tie between husband and wife, or mother and child, is not in its highest aspect the merely physical one, but that its highest expression is found in the continuous and tender service rendered by each to the other, and in the need that each has of the love of the other.

It certainly is a noble work to improve the condition of the lives of children, but to do this it is not necessary to marry or to be a mother. An unmarried woman is able to secure better conditions of life to a nation of children who are neglected or abandoned, by devoting herself to public duties, to furthering

---

\* Essay on Love.



their education, or to enlightening the public on the laws affecting them. Their happiness and welfare become hers, their improved condition is essentially the product of her life, as a mother a woman may benefit two or three, as a single woman she benefits thousands.

If this is the purest and holiest meaning of the love of mother and child, it is also the true meaning of that love and pity for suffering that inspires a woman to give her life for those who have no personal claim on her. If the love of mother grows by continually rendering services to her child, the love of the woman grows by the protection she gives to the most helpless of humanity, and if the child has need of the mother, has not the unprotected girl much more need of the woman's help? Just as a mother's love leads her to cherish her child, so the woman's love leads her to protect the poor girl that crosses her path, and also to bring justice and mercy to the womanhood of the world. When she throws the weight of her highest gifts, her love, her intellect, her influence, her enthusiasm on the side of the neglected and friendless, she sanctifies those gifts to the noblest purposes of which humanity is capable. The social, legal, political interests of women, children, and young girls are those that specially call for a woman's protection; in this direction will be found the new and sacred function of the *femme libre* of the future. To protect the helpless and to guard the young, to enlarge the girdle of their liberty, to lay the foundations of their security and to build the house of their industry.

Thus, in rejecting the personal or the grosser form of love, a woman only leaves herself more free to give a larger, holier and deeper love to those who need it most. It is abuse of language to claim that love means only sexual or parental affection; it is false to assert that because a woman feels neither sexual nor parental affection, she is incapable of love.

The two-fold nature of love will be recognized in the future, as it has not been in the past. The love of humanity has still to take its place as the highest of which mankind is capable. Bacon recognized its two-fold nature when he said:—

“Nuptial love maketh mankind, friendly love perfecteth it.”

Such a life will bring to a woman a rich harvest of happiness, in that she leaves the world a little better than she found it, and she may join in George Eliot's noble wish:

“Oh, may I join the choir invisible  
Of those immortal dead who live again,  
In minds made better by their presence, live  
In pulses stirred to generosity  
In deeds of daring rectitude,  
In thoughts sublime that pierce the night like stars,  
So to live is heaven.”

## INDEPENDENT SECTION.

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

## PARLIAMENTARY REFORM: MINORITY REPRESENTATION.

IT is now a long time since the world was astonished by the ardour with which John Stuart Mill preached Hare's system of election of representatives as the one thing needful to make the true democracy both possible and perfect. How to ensure the due representation of minorities was at that time a question of purely speculative politics. Minorities and interests stood in no need of protection. They were so fully represented and over-represented that the efforts of practical politicians were solely directed towards securing some fragments of power for a down-trodden majority.

Consequently, the problem was discussed by Mr. Hare and others with a certain air of unreality. Mr. Hare, in his eagerness to prove the practicability of his scheme, so overloaded it by the elaboration of small details, and so mixed up its provisions with the discussion of other entirely distinct subjects, such as the ballot, the expenses of elections and the extent of the suffrage, that it assumed in his hands a form so complicated that few people are at the pains to unravel his book and to discover into what simple elements his principles may be resolved. Clauses embodying the scheme were proposed by Mr. J. S. Mill as an amendment to the Reform Bill of 1867, but his speech was scarcely listened to by the House, and the debate which followed was chiefly noticeable for the generous warmth with which Viscount Cranborne rebuked the House for its lack of attention.\*

An attempt to simplify the scheme was made in 1872 in the proportional Representation Bill introduced by Mr. Morrison, Mr. Auberon Herbert, Mr. Fawcett, and Mr. Thomas Hughes. At that time, however, reform was not a practical question, and

---

\* Hansard's "Parliamentary Debates," clxxxvii. 1343.

after occupying the greater part of a Wednesday in July with a debate in which scarcely any objection was raised to its principles, the Bill perished without a division at the stage of its second reading.\*

But now Parliamentary Reform is the foremost political question. A thorough redistribution of seats is certain, and electoral districts of uniform size, returning each a single member, are in men's mouths. At the same time all plans intended to secure the due representation of minorities have incurred general odium, partly from the defects of the schemes hitherto adopted, partly from accidental matters of prejudice. They have been discredited by the failure of the three-cornered constituencies, and the questionable results of cumulative voting, hitherto the only direct attempts to carry the principle into practice. They are endangered by the force of the reaction against a system which, as Mr. Chamberlain pointed out at Bristol, entitles a fifth of the electors to return a majority of the House of Commons. They are not heartily supported by the minorities who would profit by them, and by the country at large they seem to be regarded with suspicion as a kind of juggle by which minorities may continue to enjoy the preponderance of power now secured to them by the anomalies of the representative system. No one denies that it is essential to the proper working of the constitution that large bodies of opinion, though they do not command a majority in the country, should be represented in the House of Commons. Mr. Chamberlain at Bristol declared that the minority not represented at one place finds its exponent in another. Mr. Shaw-Lefevre, at the Gladstone Club—in the course of an argument wide enough to refuse all minorities any members whatever—carefully pointed out that the present representation of London is divided between the two parties in very nearly the proportion which the number of votes warrants, and therefore deprecated as unnecessary any artificial attempts to protect minorities.

Mr. Bright in his recent thunders at Keighley (*Times*, December 15, 1883), has declared that the majority in Liverpool represent the Tory party, not only in Liverpool, but throughout the whole kingdom on the benches of the House of Commons, and that the majority in Birmingham represent the majority there, and the majority everywhere else, who agree with them in opinion. Without discussing how far the relative numbers of the two parties correspond with the whole number of mem-

---

\* The most important clauses of this Bill are printed by Mr. Hare in his "Election of Representatives," fourth edition, p. 193. They are also printed as an appendix to Mr. Noble's "Parliamentary Reformer's Manual."

bers returned by them, it may be pointed out that to refuse the Conservatives at Birmingham a chance of returning a member, and to console them by demonstrating that their party return an excessive number of the members for Liverpool, in whose election they themselves have no share, is to encourage that very deadness which Mr. Bright considers so great an objection to three-cornered constituencies. Further, as Lord Cairns pointed out in the debates in 1867, the argument is one which goes to the root of our whole representative system. It was used with effect in 1832, and it would be an answer to all appeals for the enfranchisement of large and growing constituencies. Instead of striking an average of opposite unfairnesses it should be sought to establish a system which would ensure that both at Liverpool and at Birmingham each party should have a fair share and not more than a fair share of the representation. But if this be set aside as a theoretical grievance and a counsel of perfection, it would be easy to admit that the balance is sufficiently even at present, but to maintain, with J. S. Mill, that it by no means follows that the same will be true when the extension of the franchise and redistribution of seats have made the wage-earning classes supreme in every constituency. Further, granting even that a due balance will continue in England, the same cannot be depended upon in Ireland, where, under a Reform Bill such as Mr. Chamberlain advocates, we might find that almost the whole of the representation had fallen into the hands of that portion of the population which, in his own words, is hostile to imperial rule, and that the minority which is friendly to us was left altogether unrepresented.

It must be remembered that the partial attempts which have hitherto been made to lessen the power of particular majorities received much of their support not as being satisfactory in themselves, but as being the introduction and acknowledgment of a new principle. Mr. Mill, for instance, in the House of Commons spoke of a similar proposal of Mr. Lowe's as an "almost insignificant makeshift." In his autobiography he uses still stronger language. Speaking of the plan which Parliament adopted on Lord Cairns' suggestion. He says:—

"This poor makeshift had scarcely any recommendation, except that it was a partial recognition of the evil which it did so little to remedy. As such, however, it was attacked by the same fallacies, and required to be defended on the same principles as a really good measure; and its adoption in a few Parliamentary elections, as well as the subsequent introduction of what is called the cumulative vote in the elections for the London School Board, have had the good effect of converting the equal claim of all electors to a proportionate share in the representation, from a subject of merely speculative discussion

into a question of practical politics much sooner, than would otherwise have been the case" (p. 303).

Mr. Chamberlain's arguments against such attempts are unanswerable. But many of those who strongly feel the faults and failure of such attempts would hesitate to sit down quietly according to Mr. Chamberlain's invitation, and watch the results of his experiments before deciding whether they may continue to rely upon the accidental representation of minorities or whether they should seek to secure that end by deliberate, or what Mr. Shaw Lefevre dyslogistically calls artificial, methods. For they would feel that, if Mr. Chamberlain's comfortable predictions proved untrue, a minority which found it difficult even to obtain a fair hearing, could no more obtain the introduction of such measures of protection than put a hook into the nose of Leviathan.

Under these circumstances it seems important to endeavour to bring into public notice a scheme which, starting from the supposition of a uniform franchise throughout the country, aims at securing to minorities their fair weight in the representation, while it gives to the majority its due and proper preponderance of power, and secures them other incidental advantages. It is not liable to the special objections raised against three-cornered constituencies and cumulative voting. It does not involve the necessity of strict party discipline for success. On the contrary, its effect will be to deprive wire-pullers and party organizations of their excessive power, and so to remedy the greatest fault of the existing electoral system.

The scheme consists of two parts, the first defining the new constituencies, and the second describing the method of election to be used in them. These parts are quite independent, and even if the process of grouping advocated were rejected, the method of preferential voting described would remain equally applicable to differently composed constituencies. This method will be seen to apply to elections to a single seat, and thus to include the case of bye elections. Its merits are more indisputable when several seats are to be filled, but even in the case of a single vacancy it has considerable advantages. Except in a few points, the method here proposed makes no pretence at originality. It merely simplifies and arranges with slight corrections in an intelligible and practically possible form the results of the work of Mr. Hare and other writers. Under this scheme the country will be divided into constituencies and groups of constituencies, each returning half-a-dozen members more or less. The largest towns will form separate and independent constituencies, each returning a number of members in accordance with its size. London will be divided into several separate constituencies. The other constituencies, comprising smaller towns, country districts, and the universities, will be arranged in groups.

Excepting the case of the universities, these groups will be local and will usually consist of a county, or division of a county, with the boroughs inside it. The average size of a group will be rather larger than the present average English county division.\* There will be no necessity to make the groups of strictly uniform size, as the number of members may vary with the size of the group. Thus the existing county boundaries could, for the most part, be preserved without serious inequalities. The only important boundaries will be those of the independent constituencies and of the groups. Within a group the different constituencies will be marked off, but the boundaries, as will presently appear, will not be of much consequence.

In the large towns candidates will, as at present, stand for the whole town, and any elector will be able to vote for any one candidate.

In the grouped constituencies a candidate will stand either for the county district or for one of the towns returning members inside it. A voter will not only have the choice of the candidates standing for his own constituency, but may, if he prefers it, give his vote for any candidate standing for any other constituency within his group. The boundaries of the boroughs in such a group will no longer be of importance, for a voter, whether he lives inside or outside the borough, will not only have the same qualification, but will be able to vote for the same candidates. The question what towns are to be entitled to return members is also made easy, for a town large enough to deserve a representative, whether nominally entitled to a member or not, will be able, by concentrating its votes upon a single candidate, to ensure its practical representation.

The vote of each elector can only be used to support one candidate; but electors will be able, if they please, to mark on their voting paper the order of their preference between all the candidates. If the vote is used in returning the candidate who is the elector's first choice, these subordinate preferences will have no effect. If it is not so used, it will be applied for the benefit of one of the other choices of the elector, according to circumstances. For whichever candidate the vote is finally applied, its virtue is thereby completely exhausted, and it has no influence on the election of any other candidate previously or subsequently named upon it.

For the voter, the process of election will be scarcely more

---

\* In England, excluding Wales, the present average of members to a division is just 5.5. A clear idea of the nature and possibility of such groups may be obtained from a map just published by Mr. S. M. Milne, to show how the West Riding of Yorkshire might be divided into electoral districts, each with a number of members proportional to its population (*Pall Mall Gazette*, Dec. 24, 1883.

difficult than at present. In a large town he will find that he has to make a choice out of a dozen candidates, concerning whom he will have the usual means of information. In a small town or country district, while a voter will probably still prefer as his first choice one of the candidates for his own constituency, he will feel as the effect of the change that he has become able to vote either for a member for his county or for one for the town in or near which he resides, or for some town in the neighbourhood with which he has probably plenty of connection.\*

The actual process of recording his vote will be hardly more difficult than in a Parliamentary election under the Ballot Act and easier than in a School Board election. Upon entering the polling booth, the elector will receive a voting paper containing a printed list of the dozen candidates standing for the group in which he is voting. Against the names of the candidates whose return he desires he will be expected to put figures expressing the order in which he favours them. If this process is too complex, or if there is only one candidate whom he wishes to support, his vote will be perfectly valid and effective if he simply makes a distinguishing mark opposite the name of a single candidate.

This is the whole of the process, so far as the voter is called on to take part in it. All the complexity of the system lies in the machinery to be presently described for carrying into effect the power given to each voter of supporting several candidates alternatively. The arrangements for the due transference of such alternative votes are necessarily somewhat elaborate, but they can be reduced to perfectly definite rules. These rules affect only the conduct of the returning officer and his clerks. The work required of the clerks will merely be to count the votes, sort them into classes, and arrange them in numerical order, and will require no special degree of intelligence or of familiarity with the rules. A single officer, who will in fact be the only person required to have mastered the system, will receive the results from the clerks, will make the necessary calculations, will give the clerks their consequent directions, and will declare the final result. The whole process will be under the supervision of the candidates and their agents, and the electors will be enabled to satisfy themselves of the correctness of the calculations of the returning officer by the subsequent publication of the results of each stage.

The principles which govern the transference of votes are suf-

---

\* For candidates the result will be to make every contest for a grouped constituency assume in part the character of a county contest. If standing for a borough, they will rely mainly upon support in that borough; for a majority there would usually be sufficient to secure their return, but they will not be able to neglect the prospect of votes, or at any rate second preferences, throughout the district.

ficiently obvious. Every elector should, as far as possible, be represented by the candidate of his choice. Therefore every vote should, as far as possible, be made effective in returning some candidate. Every vote which a candidate receives above the number necessary to secure his election is superfluous and useless to him, except as a mark of confidence. Votes in favour of a candidate in a\* hopeless minority are lost, and persons who have so voted should have the option of using their votes so as to secure the return of some other candidate of their party. Accordingly, it is desirable to transfer the surplus votes of candidates who have received an unnecessary number, and the useless votes of those who have received too few to be returned, to some other person to whom the support of the elector will be useful. The total number of first votes received by each candidate is of importance as shewing the relative preferences of the electors, and should serve to determine the seniority of the members elected. But the share of representation secured by each party should depend upon their total numbers, and not upon the uniformity with which their favour is distributed between all their candidates. The necessary minimum, or quota, of votes which is enough to make the election of a candidate certain depends, of course, upon the total number of votes cast, and the number of seats to be filled. It is the whole number next greater than the quotient obtained by dividing the number of votes cast by the number next greater than the number of seats to be filled.\* That is to say, if in any election a candidate succeeds in securing this number of the votes, then, however the rest of the votes happen to be distributed, it is inevitable that he should be one of the candidates returned. For instance, suppose there are three members to be elected, the number of persons who vote is 12,000, and one of the candidates, A, receives 3,001 votes, or one more than a quarter of the whole number polled, then A

---

\* By Mr. Hare, and in the Proportional Representation Bill of 1872, the divisor was made the number of seats to be filled. That a smaller number of votes would suffice was, I believe, first pointed out by Mr. H. R. Droop in 1868. When the number of seats to be filled is small, the change is of considerable practical importance, and often serves to prevent an unduly small minority from securing the return of a member. Take, for example, a contest for three seats in a constituency of 12,000. Suppose the party in the majority can command 9,999 votes and the minority 2,001. The majority runs three candidates, A, B, and C, and the minority runs one, D. All the majority support all three of their candidates, but every voter puts C last. According to Mr. Hare's plan, 4,000 of the votes of the majority would be used to secure A's return, 4,000 more would be needed for B, and there would only remain 1,999 votes for C, who, consequently, would be beaten by D with 2,001. Thus D's party, with only one-sixth of the electorate, would secure a third of the representation. The illustration in the text will show how the present scheme avoids such a result.



will necessarily be returned, for there will only be 8,999 votes to divide among the other candidates, a number not large enough to allow more than two of them to receive more votes than A. To take the strongest case against A, suppose there are only four candidates altogether, and suppose B and C each to receive only 3,001 votes, still there only remain 2,997 votes for D.\*

As soon as the total number of voting papers has been counted, the necessary minimum will be calculated and declared by the returning officer. The voting papers being sorted according to the name standing first upon them, it will probably appear that certain candidates have received many votes more than the necessary minimum, and, consequently, that there are surplus votes to be transferred from them to other candidates. It has now to be determined which individual voting papers are to be transferred and which to be retained. This is a matter of considerable practical importance; for the names subsequently marked, or, at all events, their order, will vary much on the different voting papers of the same candidate.

Consequently the returning officer, if he were free to choose which votes he should retain and which transfer, might often be able by judicious manipulation to affect the result of the election. Suppose, for instance, that in an election where 3,000 is the quota, it is found that of 6,000 electors who have made A their choice, one-half have put B as their second choice and the other half C; in other words, one half have voted A B, the other half AC. If the AB votes only were used in support of A, all the AC votes would be transferred to C, and A and C would be the candidates returned. On the other hand, if the AC votes were used for A, the AB votes would be transferred to B, and A and

---

\* In the case just put it might happen that A, B, and C were all members of one party, and D was the candidate of the minority. Nevertheless, it would not be doubted that a system which secures the return of A, B, and C gives a more satisfactory expression of the existing division of parties in the constituency than one which, under the same circumstances, would return D as a minority representative. The latter result would obviously approach much nearer to strict proportional representation, but the former would be felt to be the most fair. Exact proportional representation, if the numbers of the votes would admit of it, would be satisfactory. But in all ordinary cases parties will not be divided in precisely proper proportions. In such cases schemes which aim at proportional representation will often result in giving the minority a disproportionately large number of representatives; thus, to a certain extent, justifying Mr. Chamberlain's objection to schemes of minority representation as giving too large an influence to the minority. This fault is avoided by the scheme in the text. The law which it seeks to embody may be expressed thus—each party is entitled to as many seats as it can fill with candidates, each of whom represents more voters than can possibly be sent by each of a number of the remaining candidates greater than suffices to fill the remaining seats.

B would be elected. This illustration shows the necessity of laying down a set of rules upon the point which shall be strictly fair as between the different candidates. In the case given above, the arrangement fair to both B and C would obviously be to make up A's quota by 1500 AB votes and 1500 AC votes, and to transfer 1500 votes to B and 1500 to C. If the numbers of the two classes of votes were different, the proportion taken out of each class should be the same. This result might be directly secured by a rule that the returning officer should divide the votes into their different classes and take the same proportion from each. This process, though simple enough with only three or four candidates, would be troublesome when a dozen persons were standing, because it would be necessary to examine the exact order in which every name upon each voting paper was marked, and to divide the votes with great care and into a very large number of classes. Moreover, the trouble is unnecessary, for by merely trusting to chance the same result will be attained.\*

If large numbers of different classes of voting papers were put into an urn, and a certain number drawn out at random, it can be shown mathematically that the probability is that the papers drawn out would be composed of the different classes of votes in almost exactly the same proportion as was the whole set of papers originally in the urn, and that the odds against any considerable difference between the proportions are practically infinite. The larger the numbers of votes dealt with, the more exactly does this become true.† This is the method which has been used in Denmark for the last thirty years in the election of members of

---

\* If there were six candidates, A, B, C, D, E, F, there would be 326 ways of marking the voting paper, A's name being always first. The following plan, however, seems a feasible one:—In counting A's votes arrange them in classes according to the second name marked. This divides them into A votes (*i.e.*, votes where A only is voted for), AB, AC, AD, AE, and AF votes. If A has received more than the necessary minimum, use first all the A votes, and then make up the deficiency by taking an equal proportion out of each of the other classes. This method would not wholly exclude the possibility of manipulation. Suppose, for instance, the returning officer favoured D. He might make up A's share of the AB votes of ABC votes only, and transfer all the ABD votes to B, which, if B has also a number of surplus votes, will be an obvious advantage to D. If the matter seems to be of sufficient importance, this danger might be avoided by drawing the requisite number of each class at random.

† For example, if there were 10,000 votes, composed of equal numbers of two classes, and 6,000 of these were drawn at random, it can be shown that it is more than an even chance that the number of each kind drawn would differ from 3,000 by less than 18, and the odds against any larger divergence rapidly increase.

the Rigsraad. But in contests which cause so much excitement as English parliamentary elections, it would be well not to leave open so obvious a door to fraud, but to remove all suspicion of possible unfair dealing by laying down a set of rules strictly fair as between the different candidates, and as far as possible reasonable in themselves. The observance of such rules could be enforced by the agents of the candidates during the process of counting the votes, and could, if necessary, be subsequently verified.

In the first place, it is clearly expedient that those voting papers upon which the name of only one candidate is marked should be first exhausted, for otherwise these votes would be wasted. In this way any one who had a strong desire that his vote should be used in support of one particular candidate could make sure of effecting his object. In the grouped country constituencies the next votes to be used for the candidate should be those given for him in the place for which he was standing, thus strengthening his local connection, and giving those who presumably have the strongest desire for his success the first chance of being his supporters. When these were exhausted, recourse should be had to the votes given for him in the other places of the group. Further rules are needed to arrange the order of the votes in these latter classes, and in town constituencies where such distinctions would not exist. For lack of a better ground of distinction, the voting papers at each polling place might be numbered consecutively, and those with the highest numbers might be first counted. This would give persons who polled early a somewhat greater chance of having their subordinate preferences attended to. It would prevent any tendency to reserve votes till the last, and does not seem to give opportunity to any other manœuvres of the kind. Except with regard to voting papers on which only a single name is marked, these rules do not carry conviction, and doubt may be felt as to the results obtained in so arbitrary a manner. So far as reasonable and fair distinctions can be suggested, it is desirable that the rules should be based upon reason. But this is rather for the purpose of disarming criticism than from any other cause. The law of averages is relied on with as much confidence as the uniformity of nature by every one who has to deal with figures in the mass, whether as statistics or observations, and the numbers of votes dealt with in contested elections will be so large that this law will have full scope, and will reduce to an inappreciable amount the accidental loss or gain to any candidate by the particular process adopted.

Thus, provided the rules are not such as obviously to prejudice any particular candidate, and provided they are fixed and certain so as to avoid the possibility of wilful selection by the

returning officer, their form is a matter of small importance. For it is obvious that any arbitrary set of rules, provided they fulfil these conditions, will be as mathematically certain to bring out the proper proportional result as is the arbitrary process of drawing the votes out of an urn at random.

After all surplus votes have been re-distributed, it will usually be found that the number of candidates who then have the necessary minimum credited to them is still not sufficient to fill all the seats. The remaining seats might of course be filled by simply declaring elected those of the remaining candidates who, as the result of the processes already performed, had most votes credited to them. But, with preferential voting, a much truer expression of the desires of the constituency may be obtained by a gradual process of elimination. Take the candidate who has received fewest votes, original or transferred, and declare him not elected. If there still remain more candidates than there are seats to be filled, take the voting papers of the candidate just eliminated and distribute them to the candidates whose names stand next upon them. When this has been done, eliminate in the same way the candidate who then stands lowest, and, if necessary, distribute his votes and proceed in the same way until no more candidates remain than there are seats to be filled. The special advantage of this method of elimination and the way in which it may operate in favour of a majority, in case that majority happens to be divided in opinion, appears most simply in the case of a contest for a single seat. Take, as an extreme case, a constituency of 12,000 composed of Conservatives, Whigs, and Radicals, in nearly equal numbers. Each party starts a candidate and every man supports the candidate of his party; but Whigs and Radicals are agreed in preferring a Liberal candidate of any shade to a Conservative. Neither Whigs nor Radicals give way, and the consequence is that the Conservative is found to have 4,001 votes, the Whig 4,000 and the Radical 3,999. Under the present system, the Conservative would be declared elected against the wishes of two-thirds of the constituency. Under the system now being described, none of the three candidates having obtained the necessary minimum—in this case a half—of the votes, the process of elimination would be applied. The Radical, having fewest votes, would be declared not elected. His voting papers would then be transferred, and as all his supporters have been supposed to prefer the Whig to the Conservative, the final result would be that the Whig would be credited with 7,999 votes against the 4,001 of the Conservative. The Whig would consequently be declared elected, the result obviously most in accordance with the wishes of the constituency.

The examples given above show how valuable the processes of transference and elimination may be to a majority. In fact, their value lies not so much in securing representation to the minority as in ensuring the due preponderance of the majority. In any system which admits of minority representation, all that is required of the minority is to concentrate their votes upon a single candidate. But the task of the majority in endeavouring to secure the return of several members is usually much more difficult. According to most systems, in order to obtain the number of representatives to which they are entitled, the individual voters have to be schooled how they shall deliver their votes. According to all systems which do not include preferential voting, a miscalculation by the managers of the strength of their party may lead to ruin. Whether the system admits of minority representation or not, local schism or the standing of an independent candidate may give over the representation into the hands of the minority.

The only way in which the majority can avoid suffering from these defects in the system is by strict adherence to party discipline. But the general complaint of thoughtful men against the working of the present system, whether in three-cornered constituencies or in other places, is that it throws an excessive amount of power into the hands of the wire-pullers and party organizations. For this reason Mr. Forster deprecates the introduction of many-membered constituencies or elaborate methods of voting, thinking that the complications thereby made necessary must increase the influence of those who will make a business of understanding them. But the evil lies too deep to be cured by such expedients.

In the indiscriminate abuse poured upon the caucus, it often seems to be forgotten that co-operation is everything in politics, and that persons who take trouble and work in concert necessarily and legitimately secure a more extensive influence than their less energetic neighbours. But the present system of election goes beyond this, and gives to any set of persons who can profess to represent a party an unfair power over its other portions. It enables them to reduce every member of their party to the dilemma of either supporting the candidate brought forward by the association or of risking the loss of the seat by schism. It almost justifies Mr. Chamberlain in his declaration that so long as the system of election to the local hundreds was right, any Liberal who was disloyal to his association was a traitor to his cause.\* Even where the chosen candidate is unacceptable to many members of the party, they cannot take

---

\* Second Speech at Bristol. *Times*, November 27, 1883.

the judgment of the constituency on the subject, but are constrained to swallow their objections with the reflection that, however poor a member their candidate may make, he will upon party questions be found in the right lobby.

A system of preferential voting takes from party organization none of its legitimate influence and power, but it gives any section of the party dissatisfied with the choice of their local association an appeal from its decision. Without endangering the seat they may, if they can, start a more satisfactory candidate, and can take the opinion of the constituency upon the merits of the rivals, not by any fallacious party vote taken beforehand, but by a test-ballot forming part of the actual process of election. Under these circumstances the association will no longer enjoy the dangerous privilege of irresponsible and absolute authority, but will be in the position of a constitutional Ministry liable to have their decisions reversed and discredited unless they can carry along with them the majority of their party. The method of preferential voting thus claims not only to secure the due representation of the minority, but also to express the true opinion of the majority more perfectly than is otherwise possible. In this essay I have endeavoured to answer Mr. Forster's recent appeal to the supporters of such schemes to make them better known and to describe them more clearly. I have endeavoured to show that the principle can be freed from the practical complications which have been thought to make its introduction impossible. The plan is now commended not only to minorities and interests who dread that they may in future find themselves without a spokesman in the House of Commons, but to all who fear that the unquestioned supremacy of the democracy may lead to that suppression of individual opinion in politics which has long been deplored in American public life.

J. PARKER SMITH.

---

## THE GREATER BRITAIN TO COME.

TO the thorough understanding of the great political problem of the future with which the English race has to deal, is needful some knowledge of those forces that have acted upon the growth of other nations in the past. I shall therefore, at some risk of being wearisome, broadly sketch in one or two of the main elements that have contributed in all ages to the formation

of peoples, before I draw attention to the special characteristics of the English-speaking civilization to-day.

I shall be stating a fact that will not, I think, be cavilled with, even by the most puerile orthodoxy, when I say that the civilized races, as a whole, have emerged from a condition originally barbarous, and in very early times so entirely unorganized that, practically, no bond of social union prevailed. Such a condition was essentially one of weakness: for it is evident that, in whatever group a bond of social union was first recognized, there this bond, by enabling the separate individuals to unite in some definite action, would become so powerful a means of aggression that they would, necessarily, soon become the prevailing race, and so fix and perpetuate the organizing power, or, *legal fibre* as it is called. In all ages unity is strength!

“The characteristic of such a social type (says Mr. Spencer), of which Sparta furnishes us with a good example, are these—that each member of the ruling class is a soldier; that war is the business of life; that every one is subjected to a vigorous discipline fitting him for this business; that centralized authority regulates all social activities, down to the details of every man’s daily conduct; that the welfare of the State is everything, and that the individual lives for the public benefit.”

Similarly, upon this subject, Mr. Bagehot, speaking more recently, says:—

“In every particular state of the world, those nations which are strongest tend to prevail over the others; and in certain marked peculiarities the strongest tend to be the best.”

And, again, touching more recent history:—

“Since the long-headed men drove the short-headed men out of the best land in Europe, all European history has been the history of the superposition of more military races over less military: the first elements of civilization are great military advantages, and, roughly, it is a rule in the first times that . . . progress is promoted by the competitive examination of constant war, and this principle explains at once why the protected regions of the world are backward—outlying islands like Australia and New Zealand . . . are still in the preparatory school.”

Thus the effect of this constant tendency has been to subject the weaker tribe or nation to the stronger—the smaller to the larger; the result being always favourable to increasing aggregates, and productive of constant conflict between those aggregates. The general issue was in favour of peace; because, by increasing the size of the various nations, it decreased their number, and thus the number of chances of conflict between them. But this tendency did not go on unchecked. Large populations, under a single centralized government, are not easily

held together, and, in stages of imperfect political development, the better-placed section of the community always tyrannizes over or neglects the outlying provinces, which thus, when the strength of the influence that originally coerced them into union has in some measure relaxed, seek freedom under separate governments of their own, which will look more carefully after their particular interests. Thus, throughout the entire history of the civilized world, and especially of its European section, these two opposed agencies are visible; the one tending to unite peoples by conquest and favour ultimate peace, the other tending to separate peoples under distinct governments and increase the chances of international strife; and this double tendency is markedly illustrated in the histories of such conquerors as Darius and Alexander, the Cæsars and the Mohammedan Khalifs, Charlemagne and Frederick the Great, and, even more remarkably, in that of the first Napoleon—each and all of whom accumulated large sections of the world under one government only to exhibit their respective inabilities to govern them, and to ultimately see each of these great empires once more dissociated in consequence of the dissatisfaction of the provinces. It will be my aim to show how the most modern advances in the art of politics are only now rendering it possible to govern satisfactorily such vast empires, and how it is only by retaining them under one government, with due satisfaction to all the various interests concerned, that any solid and lasting peace is attainable.

Passing now for a moment from the general considerations with which we have been hitherto dealing, let us apply our data thencefrom obtained to the condition of Europe to-day. Much has been talked, for ages past, of the maintenance of the “balance of power” in Europe; the theory being that, if the four or five great empires are sensibly similar in apparent strength, no one of them will, unless under circumstances of extreme provocation, attack any other; and that, the normal condition of the greater Powers being then one of peace, such Powers will act as umpires in disputes between their lesser neighbours. No doubt there is much force in such reasoning, *if* this balance of power is attainable; but unfortunately it has never proved to be so. In each of the great Powers the constantly changing feelings of the peoples and the relative authority of the Government are factors continually varying their ability to support great and burdensome armies; and these, taken together with the ever-varying irritation due to their interests clashing with those of their neighbours, form together a set of disturbants which render the long maintenance of such a balance impracticable. The dissimilarity of speech alone forms a considerable barrier against a permanent



good understanding. The general admission of these facts makes war in the near future always looked upon as a probable contingency, and recurrent conquest would be fully balanced by provincial disintegration were it not for the fact that, in some of the States, the principle of provincial autonomy has been lately admitted. The terrible pressure of discontent, however, resulting from the necessary support of great armies is rendered strikingly obvious in Seebohm's article upon Imperialism and Socialism. He says :—

“The distinctive and alarming feature in this crisis is the terrible strain put upon Europe by the fact that her great empires are armed to the teeth, living in constant dread of one another, and in almost equal dread of their own people. Modern Imperialism, wherever tried, has produced *Socialism*. . . . In Russia, Nihilism haunts the air like an omnipresent spectre, and undermines the very palace of the Czar. The great military empires all have their skeleton in the cupboard. They are followed by a shadow—Socialism.”

Clearly, militaryism and internal development are factors mutually destructive.

And here let me spare a moment to point out once more a corollary which accounts for the spread of Socialism of late in Ireland. That country is being governed at present strictly by the united English vote in a House having a nominally democratic base. But, inasmuch as the people's representatives in England are governing the people of Ireland independently of the will of the Irish representatives, the former are assuming functions of an Imperial character, and such as carried the seeds of failure into the classical democracies. “There,” says Seebohm, “was a democracy among the citizens, but the curse of it was that it was an Imperial Democracy, which ruled its empire to enrich its own privileged, and therefore demoralized and enervated, class.” Thus here, at our own door, we have one more example of the misrule of provinces producing its natural reaction.

Everywhere upon the Continent of late years there has been a growing international sentiment, and a desire for some bond of union that would ensure peace—some code of law, or some responsible assembly to whom disputes could be referred. “In our own days,” says His Excellency, the public-spirited Don Arturo de Marcoartu, “we have witnessed another great evolution of internationalism . . . for the locomotive has not run in vain from one extreme frontier to another, among peoples derived from the same family of nations.”

But no one can peruse the careful prize essay of Mr. Sprague, United States councillor-at-law, which the above-mentioned gentleman's offer of £300 elicited, without seeing the over-

whelming difficulties by which the subject is surrounded ; due chiefly to the backward state of continental politics, and the selfish interests of Imperial rulers. He tells us, in the first place, that no permanent board of arbitration is possible, and that any code of international law, to obtain general acceptance, must be chiefly of a negative character ; that it must say nothing about disarmament (a fact that is confirmed by Count Moltke), nor about forms of government, nor about extent of territory : it must neither involve nor prohibit alliances, and must not affect relations with outsiders—in fact, it must be an international bond so extremely attenuated as to be a practical nullity, and the mere statement of which is equivalent to reducing it to an absurdity. Our own Cobden, thirty years ago, made practical efforts in favour of disarmament, and armies have been increasing ever since—in fact, in the present state of the world, the whole matter is an unsubstantial dream.

Obvious, however, as is the impracticability of all such schemes, even when most attenuated, among the diverse and politically backward nations of which the population of Europe is composed, there is a double truth which they render most conspicuous, and which is indeed obvious throughout history, and this truth is that, where possible, *both international and locally autonomous government is desirable.*

Before passing on to my proper subject, I will just state that the above-mentioned truth has already received partial realization in the federal constitutions of the United States, the Canadian Dominion, and the Empire of Germany. None of these groupings are broad enough to be of a strictly international character, but, within their own limits, they serve that supremely desirable end, the adjustment of internecine disputes, and effectually prevent these from taking the form of hostile or aggressive action.

Turning now to our own country, it is obvious that its history has differed from that of most nations in Europe, for the past two hundred years, chiefly in being of a less cataclysmic character. Since the Great Revolution occurred about the middle of the seventeenth century—when England unhappily fell, for a short time, under the rule of fanatical sectaries, who introduced a form of government far too advanced to be acceptable to the general body of the people, or indeed practicable in that early stage of political development, and thus paved the way for a reaction in favour of libertinism and corruption that is, I am happy to know, unexampled elsewhere in our history—since then the constantly recurring disputes between parties have never risen to such a height as to seriously affect the stability of the State. Most of these disputes have been settled

by party compromise—mutual concessions; of fact on the part of the aristocratic party, and of time to effect more drastic change on the part of the party of progress. The outcome has been a slow, but persistent and steady, advance towards a condition of stable and genuine democracy—a democracy which will not be, when perfected, the crotchet of an abnormally advanced minority, but the outgrowth of general political intelligence, based, indestructibly, upon the united will of an enlightened people.

“It is a nation of whom alone among the nations it can be said that her army is supplied entirely by voluntary enlistment, and that the masses of her people, if they chose to abstain from a few common luxuries, need hardly know that they are taxed at all; a nation in whose experience democracy has been trained and guided into peaceful paths.”

And further:—

“On the solution of this problem of democracy in England a great deal depends; for England at the present moment seems to be the only great European nation where it has a fair prospect of an early and steady solution.”

It is well to recollect that, notwithstanding the rapid growth of our dominions in every part of the globe, we have had no Sovereigns whose direct ambition it was to add new possessions to the Crown. And yet Great Britain occupies a unique position among European States that have at different times experimented upon the government of colonies, from the fact that she has succeeded in retaining the greater part of hers. Similar attempts, but with a far more “forward” policy, have again and again been made by France and Holland, as well as by Spain and Portugal. Little more than a century ago, France owned not only the chief part of Canada, but some of the most fertile districts now belonging to the United States. Less than two centuries ago Holland was a prominent colonizing State, and exerted her control at the Cape and in Ceylon, as well as in Guiana and at many isolated stations in the East. About the same time a large part of South Africa was at least nominally under the government of Spain, and it is said that at one time no less than one hundred and fifty sovereign princes paid tribute to the treasury of Portugal.

But the general disintegration that has ensued has not left us English-speakers untouched. Rather more than a century ago there came before the British House of Parliament a question in dispute about colonial duties of no particular interest, and, at first, of no apparent importance. The Government acted high-handedly—were they not the representatives of Imperial State?—what right had an outlying and thinly peopled province to

dictate? The matter *looked* insignificant—it, probably, *was* the most momentous question that ever came within the province of a few men to decide! “The Government denied them their just liberties,” said Mr. Gladstone at Gorebridge, “and in consequence they broke their great empire in twain.”

Is this event a cause of rejoicing or of sadness? Opinion seems to differ: let us look a little more closely into it. We know what *has* happened—how each country has advanced in every sense of the word since their separation; free America with mammoth strides: but we also know how dangerously strained our international relations have occasionally become; how on several occasions we have been brought to the very verge of strife. Let us attempt to reconstruct the past; to see what would have happened had the separation not taken place.

It was the attempt on the part of the New Englanders to control their own affairs that was the primary cause of the secession. I think we shall not be far wrong if we say that, had the parties not collided, and mutual concession been the order of the day, the Americans would have gained their point during the first quarter of this century, a point which, it will be recollected, has been conceded to our other colonies for the sake of mutual convenience. Having possessed herself of complete provincial autonomy (and there can be little doubt, from the known temper and power of the Americans, that they would have obtained this in the most absolute degree—a degree in which our less populous and powerful dependencies have never been able to exact it; for no one of them has been in a position to *compel* change in the law, as the United States would have been) having possessed herself of this complete autonomy, I say, she would have been able to advance as rapidly as at present constituted. But now the question of our foreign relations comes in. Is it for a moment to be supposed that this hypothetical transatlantic dependency, with its forty—nay, for Canada would have been added, fifty—millions of the most acute and wealthy citizens to be found upon the face of the earth, would have permitted this country to have determined questions of peace or war without consulting her, when such war would have involved her most cherished interests? Certainly not. As her population increased she would have demanded—and who can deny that, long ere now, she would have obtained?—representation in the English House which controlled such questions, and upon which her representatives would have exerted the most invaluable steadying influence. Our thinly peopled colonies have been long demanding it; but at present their voice is too weak to be heard. What they vainly petition united English-speaking America would have asked and readily obtained. Thus the most important function of the

American electoral system would have been to select representatives to appear in a House within which they would have sat side by side with representatives of our own; and the common sense of all would have tended to prevent the growth of the hideous system of place-mongering which is the chief disgrace of the United States. But, on the other hand, the natural and rightful tendency towards provincially autonomous government which has shown itself in its broadest and most conspicuous development among the rapidly expanding peoples of the West would have produced a reaction in this country, and given a leading direction to our own efforts towards reform. The fact that our present thinly peopled colonies are not able in any way to influence home politics is no argument against the belief that the fifty-five millions of English-speakers in a United North America would have produced definite and coercive effect for good upon our own political life. Their vote in the Imperial House would have been preponderant for some years past if numbers were fairly represented; and, after a struggle, numbers would certainly have obtained such fair representation. He who, rising above the petty devices of immoral political parties; deaf to the dictates of royalty and the seductions of a powerful aristocracy—though not necessarily opposed to either; willing to sink in the cause our country's national vanity—shall be able to force even into national prominence the great world need of unity among English-speakers, will be better deserving of the gratitude of the race, not only than any statesman living or dead, but possibly than any leader in any field of thought; even than that blameless gentleman—the grandest figure of his century—whose stormy life has so recently ended in honoured peace, and whose ashes have been laid, not only with the consent, but with the assistance, of his once enemies, near Sir Isaac Newton's, in that stately Minster whose most graceful office it is to enshrine England's immortal dead.

And, when the English foreign policy became thus influenced by the American vote, is it reasonable to suppose that she would have been content to pay for all the war material needed, and to provide all the men? Certainly not. Then how would this unity of the existing ninety millions of civilized democratic English-speakers have affected our foreign relations? First, we answer, it would have had an immeasurably steadying influence, reducing the chances of war. Then its enormous potential strength would have stood us in stead of millions of armed men; for none would have attacked those obviously unconquerable. And last, but not least, our gigantic *prestige* would have enabled us to have stepped in with calm and judicial humanity and effectually allayed the passion that has caused many a blood-

stained field! But why need we further look back? Such things were not to be. It is these beliefs, however, that make me think that the American secession, however much good it has worked, is perhaps, taken as a whole, the most colossal calamity that ever befell mankind.

Thus there are in the world at the present moment some 90,000,000 of English-speakers, of whom rather more than half—some 50,000,000—reside in the United States; about 31,000,000 in the old country; and the remainder dispersed over our various settlements in North America, South Africa, and Oceania. Omitting Ireland from Great Britain—and her national tendencies and political aspirations are of a distinctly colonial cast—its population (29,000,000) is to the rest of the English-speaking world (61,000,000) very nearly as 1 is to 2, or, in other words, this island contains *one-third only of the total number of English-speakers*. For the sake of accuracy, I should here mention that I have included in these figures certain French and Germans in America, and a few thousand Dutch and others in South Africa, that do not now in the strict sense of the word speak English, but who are so enormously outnumbered by their English-speaking compeers, that we may fairly assume that their language will be gradually replaced by ours.

But the British Isles are as full of people as they can well be, so that the rapidly growing population must principally expand itself in our new homes abroad. Thus area becomes a matter of vast importance; for, by relative area, better than by the present relations of population, can we judge of the number of English-speakers that will one day people the Greater Britain beyond the sea. The total area of the land owned by English-speakers (the United States being included and our Asiatic possessions—which will never, in the true sense of the word, become English—being excluded) is, I find, 85 times greater than the area of Great Britain and Ireland, and that part of the area at present vested in the British Crown is 56 times greater. Dealing with the United States alone, of which, including the territories to which State rights have not as yet been granted, there are 47 in all, we find that one of them (Texas) is more than double the entire area of the British Isles, and that Colorado, Dakota, Montana, and New Mexico, each and all exceed them in dimensions. The *average* size of each of these 47 States and Territories is just about equal to that of the whole of Scotland. The Canadian Dominion is about 29 times as large as the British Isles, but of course it contains an enormous area which, so far as we at present know, will always remain uninhabitable. Australia, New Zealand, and Tasmania, which are included under the common name of Oceania, are nearly 23 times as large.

Of this probable expansion Professor Huxley, speaking at Baltimore in September, 1876, said :—

“Forty millions at your first centenary, it is reasonably to be expected that at the second these States will be occupied by two hundred millions of English-speaking people, spread over an area as large as that of Europe, and with climates and interests as diverse as those of Spain and Scandinavia, England and Russia.”

And Seeböhm, writing in April, 1880, says :—

“The unique peculiarity of the English nation is this, that she is peopling the New World—the New Englands beyond the oceans in the West and South, the temperate zones of the world, where her people can live. Do we realize sufficiently what this great fact means? The English-speaking people in a very few years will number 100,000,000. Our children may live to see the numbers spread to hundreds of millions. The present rate of increase in the United States—by far the largest factor in the question—is said to be 2½ per cent. per annum. The question whether at the end of the next century the English-speaking peoples will number more or less than 1,000,000,000 is dependent, of course, upon other causes than the mere ratio of increase, but as a question of possible figures it depends simply upon whether the rate of increase in the future slightly exceeds or falls short of what it has been in our own times. And if by a vast free-trade system such a population can be fed, there is room in the territory of English-speaking America for 1,000,000,000 of population, without coming up to the limit of density which prevails at the present moment in the old country. Does England (he asks), the mother of these future nations, realize what this vast possibility means?”

And what shall we say of those lands which two-thirds of our countrymen have to delve and till? They are as various as are the natural features of the globe; and their climates include all varieties, between Arctic colds and Tropic heats. Trackless forests there are, but not such as those of the watershed of the Amazons; sterile plains, but not equal to the Sahara; inaccessible peaks, but none so high as those of the Himalaya; vast fertile plains, whose productiveness is unequalled throughout the world.

That the policy of the United States, the most important English-speaking country other than our own, is wise in most internal affairs, may be easily perceived, and is very conspicuous in her generous laws regarding emigrants.

— “For her free latch-string never was drawn in  
Against the poorest child of Adam's kin.”

It is also apparent in the regulation reserving extensive tracts of land, dispersed throughout the Union, free from settlement as public parks. This is especially done when the scenery presents

features of natural beauty, as in the case of the unique Yosemite Valley, which is surrounded on three sides, if I recollect aright, by perpendicular walls of primary rock, 3,000 feet in height, down one of which leaps a stream, in cataract on cataract, one clear spring of 1,500 feet being taken. The entire scene, men say, when the sun is high, is one glory of rich colour never to be forgotten.

Of men of science and literature our transatlantic cousins boast not a few. Graham Bell, the inventor of the telephone and the still more wonderful photophone, whose property it is to convey the vibrations of the human speech by means of so apparently insubstantial a medium as a beam of light; and Henry, "generous rival of Faraday in electro-magnetic discovery, and Piero" (I am now quoting Sir William Thomson's words) "the founder of high mathematics in America; of Bache, and of the splendid heritage he has left to America and to the world in the United States coast survey; of the great school of astronomers which followed; of Commander Belknap and his great explorations of the Pacific depths by the pianoforte wire with imperfect apparatus supplied from Glasgow, out of which he forced a success in his own way; of Captain Sigsbee, &c. &c." But I have quoted enough, and only reserve a place for the well-known name of Edison. Of literary men, Longfellow and Prescott, Washington Irving and John W. Draper, author of "The Intellectual Development of Europe," alone enable their country to rank high; but there is a host of others unnamed. I need not touch upon her industries—their progress is rendered obvious, as substantially represented, in every shop-window.

Of our own more thinly peopled dependencies I have not space to speak—their time, as yet, has been far too much filled up with work to spare men for such unremunerative fields as science and literature. But it in these particulars Australia and Canada are behind their great rival, it would be consummate folly to forget (for it is a fact of national importance, trivial as it may seem) that Canada has bred an oarsman that, at four-and-twenty, has whipped the world; and—still more suggestive fact—Australia sends us back the sons and grandsons of English settlers some three or four inches taller than their ancestors were. The Australian cricketers had among them a man said to stand six feet eight in height, and beside whom a friend of mine, himself nearly six feet two, said he felt like a pigmy.

In the States, readjustment of the franchise, which is based upon numbers (by far the fairest plan yet devised, though I would not say the best possible), takes place every ten years, and the main features of the Government are too prominently before the world to need description here. Of them Huxley says:—



“You and your descendants have to ascertain whether this great mass will hold together under the forms of a republic, and the despotic reality of universal suffrage; whether State rights will hold out against centralization, without separation; whether centralization will get the better, without actual or disguised monarchy.”

For my own part, I feel a strong trust that they will—their dual system of centralization tempered by local autonomy is certainly the only possible solution yet suggested of this great problem, and, handled with discretion and moderation, I believe it will accomplish the end in view.

Of representative government in the colonies I need say little. It was “manufactured by Lord John Russell and Lord Sydenham, and has since been tinkered by successive colonial secretaries and governors.” The principle will best be shown by the following resolution, which passed the House of Assembly of Canada in 1841 :—

“That in order to ensure between the different branches of the provincial parliaments that harmony which is essential to the peace, welfare, and good government of the province, the chief advisers of the representative of the Sovereign, constituting a provincial administration under him, ought to be men possessed of the confidence of the representatives of the people. Thus affording a guarantee that the well-understood wishes and interests of the people, which our gracious Sovereign has declared shall be the rule of the Provincial Government, will on all occasions be faithfully represented and advocated.”

Thus the Governor performs the functions of our Sovereign, and the Government is responsible to the Assembly much as ours is to the House of Commons. Practically, though many hitches and a few dead-locks have occurred through obstinacy on one side or the other, this arrangement works very well.

We saw some time ago how, among the different nations of Europe, military competition was inevitable in the present condition of the world. The separation of England from America has accentuated this fact; for, highly civilized, democratic, and unambitious of conquest as both nations are known to be, a naval competition has ensued,\* though happily it is not carried to such extremes as is the militarism of the Continent. Who can doubt that, if from want of consideration of this subject some statesman were to take the disastrous step of finally loosening the bond between ourselves and our colonies, other naval competitions will arise, and, when unfortunate circumstances favour them, wars? More than a century ago, David Hume, writing to Gibbon in reference to his projected “History of the

---

\* The Americans commenced building ironclads at the time when there was friction between them and ourselves; but the policy has since been in chief part abandoned.

Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," recommended him to write it in the English tongue; "because," said he, "our establishments in America promise superior stability and duration to the English language." Upon this subject Mr. Bright, speaking to the House of Commons, in 1865, said:—

"I believe that, in the centuries which are to come, it will be the greatest pride and highest renown of England that from her loins have sprung a hundred millions—it may be two hundred millions—of men who dwell and prosper on that continent which the grand old Genoese gave to Europe."

Already the separation of America has caused some dialectic divergence, though she is within a week's sail of us. Were England to cease utterly to be the metropolis of English-speakers, the history of the past teaches us that it is possible that new dialects might diverge into new languages; whereas, if we can but keep together, no other tongue has so good a chance of ultimately extending itself throughout the world; for already one can enter no harbour of importance, on however distant a coast, without finding English spoken, and it is the dominant tongue of at least two great continents.

It is seldom that Englishmen realize the cause of our insular greatness. It is not the extent of our natural resources, nor is it the military instincts of our people; but it is the fact that we have got the commerce of the world into our hands, and by this means obtained the many and varied advantages due to the command of wealth.

The relations of nations never stand still. If, in a given group, the tendency is not to draw nearer to each other—if it is not by mutual concession, and the due consideration by each of the others' interests, cementing their alliance—then, imperceptibly perhaps, but certainly, it is towards separation. The danger is in this case that if the mind of the country is not brought to bear upon this subject, so as to give statesmen the guidance of the popular voice, those statesmen will be allowed to act practically irresponsibly. If such is the case, and, at some critical epoch, a statesman is at the helm with narrow views as to the utility of the colonies, and regarding them, as some statesmen are said to do, as rather a burden than otherwise, disintegration will inevitably occur, and the units of this great and admirable family of nations will severally be allowed to drift into the impotence of isolation. Let us now turn, for a moment, to the consideration of the efforts and aspirations that are now exhibited that seem to tend towards a happy solution of this question.

Some time ago I incidentally referred to the efforts being made on behalf of Canada for representation in the Imperial House,

and, with the object of putting her claim in a more convincing light, I drew the parallel, but hypothetical, instance of a united American appeal for representation at Westminster. We saw that, in the latter case, although that appeal would have been at first resisted, the growing strength of the union would have forced it to an inevitable success. We saw that, while its justice must be admitted, its result would have been entirely beneficial, and would greatly strengthen the action of England abroad. Is the nation, then, prepared to say that it resists the appeal of Canada, if made officially, simply because she is not so strong as the United America would have been?—is it not rather wise to encourage, by all the means in our power, a movement so obviously healthful in the State as a whole? Were the English-speaking colonies allowed to send representatives to the English House of Commons, the last remnants of discontent would fade out of sight, and the Empire as a whole would be immeasurably strengthened. Some years back there was, it will be recollected, a strong feeling in Canada for union with the United States. It is said by the Canadians that the grant of responsible government, the Home Rule of Canada, has almost wiped out that desire for the time being, but that a turn in our foreign relations might renew it. They hold, however, that a grant of Imperial representation would entirely prevent such chance of renewal, and permanently consolidate the union. As Canada would be the battle-ground in an Anglo-American struggle, she surely ought to have some voice in a foreign policy so likely to embroil her.

But there is yet another demand being made, by a section of the British subjects, that is logically complementary to this, although unfortunately made on behalf of a race whom Nature, and long-continued adversity, have made so turbulent, that almost any proposition of theirs is looked upon as likely to be engendered by a hostile spirit. Taking Mr. Justin McCarthy as the spokesman on behalf of the sister Isle (and I know of none abler among Ireland's representatives), I find nothing in the natural desire for Home Rule that in the least involves the dismemberment of the Empire, any movement towards which, from what I have already said, my readers will not be likely to expect me to approve. Far from it, I, as an Englishman—and an Englishman who, prior to reading his admirable and moderate exposition, was most strongly opposed to all such ideas—I look upon it as one part of a system likely, in a pre-eminent degree, to consolidate the Imperial State. If Mr. McCarthy at all fairly represents his countrymen, they do not in any way desire to withdraw from the English House. Far from it; they would radically object to doing so, for the self-same reasons which the colonials

urge in favour of such representation. What they say is simply this: that questions relating to Irish affairs alone, and which do not touch the interests of England at all, they desire to have considered in a local national House, as Irishmen are the only persons who either understand or take an interest in them. They further say that they are quite as heartily in favour of the question of *merely* local interests relating to England and Scotland being also considered in separate chambers, so that the existing Imperial House may be reserved for the consideration of strictly Imperial questions, to be examined by representatives from all parts of the Empire. Well may they call such a scheme one of mere common sense.

They point to the fact that the House of Commons cannot at present, do what it will (and quite independent of obstruction), get through its ordinary work; and all because Birmingham Tramway Bills, and Bills relating to Scotch Hypothec and Irish Poor Relief, block the way. The English members simply walk out of the House; they say the whole thing is a farce, so much time thrown away. "We don't understand your local affairs, and don't want any hand in them; you don't understand our local affairs, and you won't as a rule take any interest in them; therefore let each nationality deal with its own local affairs, and let us, the Imperial representatives, concentrate our attention on questions of broad and Imperial interest." This is in effect what the abler and steadier section of the Irish party say, and I think it is right.

The Imperial functions of an Imperial Parliament controlling an assemblage of autonomous democracies are, however, in their purest form, equivalent to just what, in an earlier part of this article, we found was the ardent, but hitherto impracticable, aspiration of continental reformers—that is, International functions controlling Federalized States. I conceive it to be a thought that may well make the hearts of Englishmen rejoice that we are thus advancing, in practical every-day fact, on the road to the end towards which those military burdened people are struggling in vain.

Our colonies have then already attained to full local autonomy under what is merely a nominal control, and what they are now most in need of is participation in those functions of government which relate to the entire group of people which we call the British Empire. Under a sufficiently wide-minded administration, which at the same time recognizes the baneful influence of irritating interference in colonial affairs, and the urgent common need of an ever-strengthening bond of union for the due performance of those offices which are at the same time the duties and the privileges of each, they will in all probability ultimately

obtain a voice in the settlement of Imperial concerns. Ireland, on the other hand, already possesses her full share in these Imperial or Federal functions, and no one can have looked impartially upon the progress of politics during the past five years, or have recognized the true meaning of the utterances of the Prime Minister, without feeling assured that she will obtain locally autonomous government in her home affairs, or at any rate nearly approach that goal of her desire, during the present decade. It seems probable that, after the next Conservative Government has outlasted its lease of power, the education of England upon Irish affairs will have proceeded far enough to allow of the election of a House containing an aggregate of Home Rule members, sufficient to carry a moderate but sound Bill with that end in view, but probably that position will not be reached before the next general election but one. Following upon this great measure must come the adoption of measures relieving the House of the local affairs of England and Scotland, and thus leaving it time to give due attention to those larger concerns which relate to the Empire as a whole. If by this time the recklessness or stolid indifference of past administrations have not brought about the separation of the colonies from the mother country, it is probable that they will be ripe for accepting their due share and responsibility in the conduct of Imperial concerns; a privilege which would of course ultimately carry with it the acceptance by the colonies of a share in the burdens of protecting the entire Federation—burdens which the increasing strength and increasing moderation in foreign policy would be ever relatively reducing in weight. But it might not be wise to raise these irritating questions at the time of the admission of colonial representatives to participation in Home Government, as it would always be in the power of a Parliament possessed of Imperial dominion to bring about these changes at a more convenient season. It need scarcely be said also that all questions relating to the regulation of trade between the various parts of the Empire and the imposition of duties upon produce, whether exported to or imported from any of the colonies or the mother country, would be of a character that would bring them properly within the jurisdiction of the Imperial House to decide; and this, although a delicate and difficult matter to bring about in the first instance, would in the end prevent much irritation, induce a healthy and natural development of trade, and put a stop to the foolish and reactionary systems of tariff adopted by some of the colonies.

So far I have only dealt with questions within the radius of practical discussion—practical discussion, that is, among the advanced minority. Let us now assume that all these changes

have been brought about, and that a modified Legislative Assembly, disburdened of the great bulk of the more trifling subjects of its, at present often absurd, debates—and, let us hope, relieved of the presence and the unfortunate vulgarity of the more noisy and less intelligent of its members—was doing these united English-speaking peoples the inestimable service of devoting the time to their collective interests and concerns, say that the policy pursued might be the outcome of the common sense of all. Is this to be the Ultima Thule of democracy—the acme of political well-being; or is it only to form a new vantage ground—a modern Pisgah from which to view still distant Promised Lands?

It has been said that among this body of people each would have a relatively equal voice in the common concerns of all. The system would therefore be obviously applicable irrespective of the number of the federated peoples. For any nation to be a partner in such a federation of peoples would be a very different thing from its being a subject province under arbitrary rule. The latter would involve a loss of national freedom which the former would not involve; for no country can be considered coerced (and a country which is not free is a country which is coerced) by being under the control of a representative House in the responsibilities and duties of which it has itself voluntarily accepted a share. Indeed, the common benefits accruing would be greatly in excess of the common inconveniences involved. But the ratios in which these benefits would exceed these inconveniences would be in large measure proportional to the size of the group; for an increase in size would both increase the area within which the general facilities incidental to the co-partnership would prevail, and would, both by diminishing the number of foreign nations with whom conflict was probable, and by decreasing the vulnerability to attack of the federal group, diminish the chances of war and thus lessen the correspondent taxation. Consequently, it would be both to the interests of the federalized peoples to enlarge their number by the inclusion of hitherto alien nations within the group, giving them full federal privileges; and it would also be to the interests of outsiders to be so included for the sake of obtaining such privileges, together with the accompanying relatively more secure peace, and the correspondingly light taxation and rapid development of trade. It need scarcely be said that full local autonomy would be retained by such peoples, and recognized as their normal condition, never to be interfered with unless in such cases of gross violation of the standard of good government as would warrant the interference of one people in the affairs of another independent people; just as England is now interfering in the affairs of nominally inde-

pendent Turkey, because the latter State has so ostentatiously neglected her duties as to render it impossible for an outsider to stand by unmoved. Self-respect would, however, prevent communities of English-speakers from thus laying themselves open to the necessity of outside control; and indeed this remark would be equally applicable to any fairly civilized people, whether English-speaking or not.

Looking thus broadly upon the matter, it may therefore be recognized as quite possible that as democratic institutions increased, and narrow class influences diminished, among alien peoples, proposals might possibly be received from individual communities to unite in the federal group on condition of receiving full electoral privileges, protection from foreign aggression, and the retention of local autonomy in home affairs, in compensation for an acceptance of the common federal burdens and the light yoke of federal rule in which they would naturally desire to share. Such occasional inclusions in the federation need not necessarily involve the subversion of monarchical institutions, provided the representatives of such institutions would be willing to take the only negative position in government that has been occupied during the present reign by our own Sovereign, and would also be willing to be guided, as she has almost invariably been, by the will of the people when that will was distinctly expressed. If they were thus willing, they would remain pleasant memorials of the past, and useful as centres of a wealthy social class; if they were not so willing, they would be quietly displaced with the least possible social friction and personal offence. Factors in our national life they undoubtedly still are, but they are factors of ever-diminishing import.

But I have said, in a former part of this article, that the highest political life which Englishmen as Englishmen can have in view is that of a federated unity, accompanied by the local autonomy, of the whole English-speaking race. Let us now consider whether, under the conditions predicated, such a unity would be a thing to be hoped for by practical men, and what sacrifices would have to be made on the part of England and America to facilitate the attainment of a state of things so supremely desirable.

Let us freely admit, in the first place, that the hope of such a future unity would be quite out of the question if the only basis on which it could be formulated would involve even an appearance, however slight, of America occupying an inferior place in the commonwealth of nations. With her present solid independence and her rapidly increasing wealth such a thought is out of the question. Nor would England submit to the slightest suspicion of inferiority, for, although she must freely admit that the United States now counts as its own the greater

number of English-speakers, yet the world empire that owns Britannia's sway and the mighty *prestige* of her ancient name, to say nothing of her old warlike renown, enables her still to retain her place, without insistence and of natural right, among the world's greatest peoples. But when two men come together to make terms of partnership, an absence of inequality between them, far from being a barrier against a satisfactory arrangement, usually simplifies the matter and enables a basis of partnership to be the more readily drawn up. No inferiority existing in either obviously the basis of settlement must be that of equal rights to each and equal duties to each. The real reason why you would obtain a negative answer to the question, "Is such a unity possible?" from every professed legislator, whether American or English, is that they feel the enormous weight of the class influence that would be brought to bear against such a project and the inertia of the masses of the people themselves. It may be supposed that the whole weight of the English Court, and those classes that are influenced by it, would act directly against such a union. The democratic element would have to remove the resistance of the whole of the military, clerical, and legal classes. The probability is that the older and wealthier sections of the commercial and trading classes would also exhibit their usual political backwardness, and act as a drag upon the wheel. If the democracy were once to see that its true interests lay in the direction of an attainable unity of English-speakers, there is no doubt that it would shake itself clear of such opposition without more ado. Almost all great political reforms have more or less of this same opposition to withstand. It often produces delay, but it rarely does more serious harm. The weight of the wider substrata of the people—the individuals among which belong to large and widely spread classes, biassed only by large and widely spread interests, towards the due satisfaction of which all healthy political growth has been tending for centuries—is sufficient to neutralize all narrow class interests and opposition.

What then really would stand in the way of the accomplishment of such a unity of the English-speaking race would be the absence of a definite and determined movement in favour of it on the part of the masses of both peoples, and the chief power of resistance due to class influences would result from the fact that the members of the interested classes would be in a good position from which to speak to, and thus control, the opinion of the governing masses. But this is an effect that the promoters of every important reform have to overcome, and it has been dealt with too often to affect future reformers with despair. The effort might take a longer time or it might take a shorter time,



but certain it is that if once there spread among the many-millioned masses of these two great democratic peoples a yearning, such as has been felt among the Germans in recent times, for unity of race, sooner or later that yearning would be satisfied.

The benefits likely to accrue from such a unity of the English-speaking race would be such as would justify almost any sacrifices on the part of either people; and that people which was once most domineering and foremost in offence should surely also be the foremost in such sacrifices. It is scarcely to be expected, for instance, that, even assuming that the growing political life of this country had modified our representative assembly into a body whose functions were of a strictly Imperial character, and which was not perpetually swamped in the putrid puddle of peddling provincial politics, that America would be willing to join in that assembly. To such an act she would entertain the same objection as we should to become partners in and subject to the American Senate or House of Representatives. Just as, during the changing phases of a growing commercial business it is often desirable to adopt completely new names, by which to distinguish institutions that, though modified and enlarged in function, are not completely new, but on the contrary are essentially old in principle and are only novel in relation to the more extended application of that principle, so it might be desirable in the case under consideration to adopt a new name for the body of Federal or Supernational Representatives. The adoption of this plan in the large international concern of which I am now speaking would in no way involve a sacrifice of relative dignity on the part of either high contracting party; for, clearly, all the concessions would be reciprocal. Nor would it involve a sacrifice of actual dignity on the part of both: for unity is strength, and, *à fortiori*, the unity of the two strongest and wealthiest of the world's Western peoples would produce a concentration of strength of a compelling sort. The unity of Germany is coercive, even in its mood of mildest moderation. But the race of English-speakers is superior to the German race in almost every respect: in its cosmopolitan extension; in the fact of its being the dominant race upon at least two great continents; in the number of its subject peoples; in its almost exhaustless wealth; in its condition of political advancement, and the unoppressive character of its democratic sway; in the number of its scientific workers; in the colossal development of its industrial manufactures; in the perfection of its railway system, and in its world-wide commerce; in its ever-fertile inventiveness, and in the ninety millions of its high-spirited people: in all, save in the somewhat doubtful advantage due to the mere numbers included in its standing armies! In

the presence of a united English race all other races must stand second. We should not need to bear the burden of great armies to convince mankind that we were unconquerable. Our mildest advice would then be more efficacious in allaying the hostile passions of alien peoples than are now our most menacing manifestoes. Untroubled by the stultifying fear of those without, we should be free to devote undivided attention to the completion of our development within. Our little island on the margin of the Western deep, with its ancient traditions far reaching into the dim confines of the prehistoric past, and touching, in the time of the world's youth, its yet more ancient rock history, still instinct with the undecaying energy of its ever-active people, would become the natural centre and metropolis of our race—no need to assert its claim. Hereafter, as heretofore, but in an increased degree, the wealthy and the distinguished and the learned would cluster within our island home; and when, in centuries to come, the dominance of numbers gave the reins of real power into the hands of our kindred continental peoples of the West and of the South, its position and its traditions would still mark out the old country as the natural seat of inter-continental statecraft and legislation.

Such a federation might, indeed, become in future time a federation of mankind, and the poet's dream be realized of a parliament of men. If, even now, we linked together in the bond of political unity our own great Empire with the almost greater American Republic, the united control would directly dominate more than one-third of the human race, and would probably indirectly and in general terms bias the actions and influence the future of the larger half. In the working out of such a system upon the electoral basis, it is not likely that the crude simplicity of the present system of voting would be found applicable in all cases. For instance, it is not needful to the soundness of such a system, and I do not think it would in anything like all cases be expedient, that the vote of every individual should have the same political value. I presume that this is at present the theory in our own country, although it is certainly a theory that is very far from being carried out in practice; but that it is not so carried out is generally looked upon as a mere defect. The political value of the vote of an elector of the borough of Portarlington is more than 172 times as great as that of an elector of Lambeth, and almost exactly 150 times as great as that of an elector of Birmingham; and it is so obtrusive a fact that it would be better if such populous boroughs as Birmingham and Lambeth were more adequately represented, that it is usually held that political power should be evenly distributed among the electors. And assuredly such an even distribution

would be immeasurably better than our present system, the backwardness of which is due to the inertia that is in all cases experienced when attempts are made to remove the centres of political power. In America, where such a system is carried out with a fair degree of success, its bad points, although quite visible, have not yet become so prominent as they might do under certain conceivable circumstances. Suppose, for instance, that a large portion of the United States was peopled almost solely by Chinese; there would in that case, I suppose, be a very strong prejudice against giving the Celestials votes at all. But to shut them completely out of the representation would certainly not be just, as then they could not make themselves heard at all, even when real grievances existed. Surely the right plan would be to give them electoral power through representatives, but not in so large a proportion as that in which it was given to their more highly civilized neighbours. A similar rule might be applied to some of our own dependencies when first introducing them to a share in self-government, and it may be considered probable that the time would never come when it would be wise to reduce the votes of all the electors in a great and variously peopled civilization to one common level of value.

Can our actions in any way, however slight, tend towards ultimately assisting our less fortunate brethren hitherto without the pale of the Anglican protectorate? At a yet distant day they may. These Imperial functions, if fostered with an intelligent view to their future development and generous consideration for local interests, would ultimately form a nucleus round which the other democratic peoples, when prepared to do so, might cluster; the advantages due to the assurance of peace, derived from the fact of disputes being settled by international representation, taken together with the strength derived from a growing system of mutual protection against foreign aggression, outweighing the sentiment of national vanity, which would otherwise make them wish to stand alone.

It is not needful, however, in speaking of a state of affairs to be hoped for truly, but only as a condition possible in the far distant future, to discuss the needful organization; and I have touched upon it merely to show that it is quite practicable, and that already the lines are formulated upon a small scale on which a union of a greater portion of mankind is possible, so as to effect coherence upon a much larger scale. It may be that it will not be the good fortune of the English race to accomplish this beneficent end, as so many contingencies may arise to prejudice the result; but it is scarcely conceivable that when such a union does come about it will not be upon that federal plan which has been hitherto worked out most completely and most

successfully among English-speakers ; and, looking to this fact—and to its natural corollary that we are consequently in the best position from which to advance towards this issue—it seems to me that a clear statement of these future possibilities should serve as a guide in the general direction of our efforts after progress. We should keep them in view as the highest end attainable, and, without attempting to force them forward to an unnaturally early maturity, so regulate our present efforts after advancement as not to frustrate their achievement when they may have some chance, in the natural progress of our political growth, of coming about in the ordinary course of things.

JOSEPH J. BUTCHER.

*Postscript.*—The whole of the above article was written and in print before I had had the advantage of perusing Professor Seeley's "Expansion of England." The best tribute that I can now pay to the author is to express the hope that each of the few readers of this article will become one of the many readers of that admirable work. Is the time yet ripe for the formation of an association, supported by men of every political creed, and represented by branches wherever the English language is spoken, that would give expression to the desire to once more bind our race together by bonds which, if "light as air," might yet prove "strong"—nay stronger—"than iron"?

J. J. B.

## CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

---

### THEOLOGY.

THE "Tractarian Movement" in the Church of England having become what the late Lord Beaconsfield called matter of ancient history, the principal interest now attaching to the Rev. William Palmer's republication of his once celebrated "Narrative" is scarcely actual except in so far as it records, in the introduction and supplement of the present edition, the secret events in the public lives of some of the still-living actors in the movement.

It must sound a little odd to the young generation to learn from one of the prime movers that the proximate cause, the last straw, which determined the formation of the Tractarian group was the "sacrilegious bill" introduced by Mr. Stanley (afterwards Lord Derby) in 1833, during the administration of Earl Grey, for the suppression of one-half of the bishoprics of the Irish Church. "The shock was electric. It had an effect which was little anticipated. It created the Oxford Movement." Six-and-thirty years later, for all that, the whole establishment of that Church was "cut down, because it also cumbered the ground." Mr. Palmer proposed to a knot of religious young Oxonians, whose minds were filled with Carlyle's "dead dogs" of ritual and dogma, the foundation of an Association of Friends of the Church, which was duly formed, its Declaration being drawn up by Palmer and shaped by J. H. Newman. The original strings that went to form the knot were three—the Rev. William Palmer, the Rev. Richard Hurrell Froude, Fellow of Oriel, and after some months, the Rev. John Henry Newman, another fellow of Oriel; and no sooner was it formed than, as we shall presently see, Rome set busily to work to pull some of the said strings. To these were soon joined the Rev. Hugh James Rose, editor of the *British Magazine* and *Christian Advocate* at Cambridge, but residing in Essex, and the Hon. and Rev. Arthur Perceval, rector of East Horsley. This was all. Froude and Newman were disciples of Keble, then Professor of Poetry, who thoroughly sympathized with the Association though he did not join it. It was at once agreed that the publication of tracts or essays to advance their views was an imperative necessity, but its members were a good deal scattered, and Newman, who soon showed (with Keble) that he had no confidence in meetings or committees, in August, 1834, commenced of his own motion, though aided by letters from Keble, the publication of the "Tracts for the Times," which soon came to be known as the

---

<sup>1</sup> "Narrative of Events connected with the 'Tracts for the Times.'" By William Palmer. Rivingtons.

Oxford Tracts, and "gradually approximated to Romanism; issuing in a few years in the fall of Newman himself and his disciples." And here we must notice something which had previously occurred, and in regard to which it is interesting to compare the views of Mr. Palmer and of Cardinal Newman. In 1832, R. H. Froude had been in dangerous health, and Newman went abroad with him for the winter. At Rome they communicated with Monsignor (afterwards Cardinal) Wiseman, in order—let Froude speak: "Remains," pp. 304, 307—"to find out whether they would take us in on any terms to which we could twist our consciences, and we found to our dismay that not one step could be gained without swallowing the Council of Trent as a whole." This they did not make known to their friends on their return to England, and Mr. Palmer says that had he been aware of it, he does not know whether he would have been able to co-operate cordially with Newman. Newman in editing the "Remains" represented Froude's words as a "jesting way of stating that he and another availed themselves of the opportunity of meeting a learned Romanist to ascertain the ultimate points at issue between the Churches." It is an old proverb that says, There's many a true word spoken in jest, and thirteen years later the survivor of the two swallowed the self-same Council as a whole in downright earnest. Cardinal Newman still, however, insists, as against Mr. Palmer's statement in the *Contemporary Review*, that his is the true version of the affair; "a little piece of *finesse*," says Mr. Palmer, mildly, "which merits no grave animadversion." But, although the interest of the matter be chiefly sectarian, we must point to the immediate results of that too pregnant interview in Rome. Wiseman "had seen through the Catholic tendencies of the two English clergymen," and was ere long despatched to England as vicar apostolic, to follow up the clue. He founded and became editor of the *Dublin Review* (1836) as a means for reaching the class of minds at Oxford with which he had come in contact, and in 1839 Palmer became aware that "Newman's disciples" had already accepted the doctrines put forth in that periodical as to the invalidity of their ordination. But we must try back. Newman had by the publication of his tracts become leader of the bold and impetuous Tractarian movement to which they gave a name, and which was thenceforth "informed, guided, and presided over by him alone." It thus proceeded for six years with uninterrupted and increasing success. Pusey, in 1834, became a disciple and bosom friend of Newman, and among his other immediate followers were Ward and Oakeley, both Fellows of Balliol, Manning, Williams, and Robert Wilberforce. Newman had also become editor of the *British Critic*, a literary organ which exercised much influence over the clergy of the Established Church, and here and in the tracts Ward, with his "audacious intellect and immense fluency, was set free by Newman to deal with religion." The articles in the *Critic* became "of so evidently a Romish complexion that it was vain to deny the fact," and then came "Tract Ninety," in which all the Articles of the Church of England were interpreted in a Roman sense, and this at last set the country in a blaze, and the

Tractarian movement exploded. Wiseman joined in the *mêlée*, Palmer replied to him, Wiseman made a rejoinder, "apparently crushing and triumphant," but Palmer administered a closer, in which he completely turned the tables, and showed that Wiseman's quotations "were translated from spurious and fabricated works rejected by the first critics of the Roman Church." No reply was attempted. It was then that Mr. Palmer set about the "Narrative" here reproduced. It appeared in 1843, and sold in thousands in this country, while 100,000 were circulated in America. Being directed immediately against the Romanizing party, a reply was required, and Ward dashed off in a few weeks his "Ideal of the Christian Church," boldly justifying his school for advocating Roman Catholic principles and practice. Thereupon the University of Oxford deprived Ward of his degrees and expelled him—how monstrous does it seem now to us that any educational body should have had such blind powers of religious persecution!—and he openly seceded to the Church of which he had been so long the irresponsible advocate. Newman remained silent, and secluded himself, and Mr. Palmer re-echoes as follows what has more than once been stated in this REVIEW, as to Newman's scepticism. "From his different principles, it was difficult to say whether the event might be Romanism, or a return to the Church [of England], or the adoption of rationalism and infidelity. He had always rejected the external evidences of Christianity, and admitted none except those which are subjective" (p. 235). But "his work on Development had prepared the way, though ambiguously, for the reception of all the later superstitions of Rome, even in their last forms. Then appeared a document from him in which he retracted all the statements in his previous writings differing from the Church of Rome"—which might be called his *re*-tractarian movement—and finally he was, in 1845, received into that church, re-baptized, and in due time, after study under the Jesuits at Rome, re-ordained. He did not, however, join the Jesuits, but the Oratorians, who have been always regarded as their somewhat jealous rivals among the upper classes of Roman Catholic society; a vocation which Newman and his community in Birmingham and London, with the assistance of the late F. W. Faber, lost no time in pushing at the very highest pressure. Later, on, he has, as Mr. Palmer states, adopted from Bishop Fessler, the doctrine of Minimism, seeking to explain away and 'fine down many of the more imperious and repellent doctrines of Rome, even such as papal infallibility, "and for this (not for this alone, we fancy) he was rewarded with a Cardinal's hat." Thus, we may reflect that this Movement actually provided no less than three Princes of the Church—Wiseman, Manning, and Newman—and we may draw our moral accordingly, remembering that some of St. Bernard's requisites of perfect cardinals are that they should-be *parati ad obedientiam, subjecti ad disciplinam, catholici ad fidem, conformes ad unitatem, et ubique et in omnibus circumspecti*.

Even the gravest of theological reviewers may be permitted now and again an interval of refreshing mirth when he meets with such books as that of a "Septuagenarian Presbyter."<sup>12</sup> Based upon the

first nine chapters of Genesis, it is announced as "the produce of careful, independent research, combined with much prayer, during thirty years." Independent, indeed, this research has been of all the modern critical results, for the author never shows that he has even so much as heard of the acquired facts that Moses had nothing to do with his text, or that out of the 234 verses of which it consists, but 112 belong to what has been called the "Book of Origins," while 122 are from the totally independent source of the "Book of Genealogies" (Tödelöth). This "beneficed presbyter" receives it all as the work of the Deity inspiring Moses, and as for the double accounts of the creation and of the deluge, he swallows them whole, and the greater part of his difficulties arise from his endeavours to digest them, in which at times he manages to afford considerable entertainment. His first great point is made on Gen. vi. 4—"The giants were on the earth in those days," &c.—where the word *giants* mis-translates *ha Nephilim*, which the Presbyter maintains to be the name of one of many primeval races existing on the earth before the Adamite creation. They were not the genus homo, not the human race; though "mental and moral," they were inferior in creational status, but yet were intermarriageable with the sons and daughters of man. "In point of fact they did supply Seth, Enos, and others of Adam's sons with wives."<sup>a</sup> The Anakim were a variety of the Nephilim species (Numb. xiii. 33), but there were also the Rephaim, the Zuzim or the Zamuzumim, and the Emim. Many different species of rational creations lived on the earth before Adam.<sup>3</sup> The Nephilim spoke the primeval tongue, and while the human family inhabited only a small region in the district of Eden, they occupied the earth. They were the *Tertiarians*—this is a sop to science—and made "the implements of flint and bone which have been discovered in the drift," and which men of science have quite gratuitously assumed to be works of *human* art. They built "such structures as Stonehenge, but especially the great Pyramid of Egypt." Still, though "moral, intellectual, and speechful, as well as able to walk erect," they were inferior to Adam's race, and alas! they were "fallen creatures as are also the race of man," for Nephilim comes from *naphal*, to fall. And here is the place once again to contrast this "fallen" theory of Jewish (and

<sup>a</sup> "Genesis in Advance of present Science." By a Septuagenarian Beneficed Presbyter. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co.

<sup>2a</sup> The Jinn propagate their species, sometimes in conjunction with human beings. —Lane's "Arabian Society in the Middle Ages," p. 33.

<sup>3</sup> The Rev Edward White (who we have reason to believe is not the author of "Genesis in Advance of Present Science") holds similar views in another book which we notice—"The Atonement: a Clerical Symposium." "According to the Bible," he says, "the present Adamic race (it says nothing against the possible existence of *previous* races before or since the glacial ages) was a . . . recent creation of God, formed at the same time with certain animals" (p. 140). Dr. J. H. Gladstone, F.R.S., has remarked that if this hypothesis has the merit of removing several difficulties at once, it raises others of a theological character. And so it does. It raises very troublesome questions indeed about original sin and redemption, and, in fact, in the effort to save the letter, it attacks the very essence of the whole Jewish system.



Christian) cosmogony, which posits the radical abasement of our species, with the noble simplicity of the plan of progressive, ascending, evolution in which Science steadily contemplates its constant, continuous elevation. This view is naught but an abomination to the Bible theologian, who must drag all down into the dark Tartarus of his doom-haunted fancy. And not content with fallen men and fallen angels, even this weakly presbyter must add his fallen primeval races and his fallen earth. The wide divergence between the two schemes of the world might well be illustrated from the old contest between the music of Cecilia and Timotheus—

He raised a mortal to the skies :  
She drew an angel down.

The Nephilim lived on even into David's time ; but the five last of them, Goliath and his brother, and Ishbi-benob and Saph, and the six-fingered and six-toed giant, were killed by David and his servants (2 Sam. xxi. 15-22), and the race became extinct.

After this we are prepared to find that the Adamic creation was quite a small affair in point of extent ; but that is not to diminish its spiritual significance. "We must take the chronology of the first verse of Genesis as really at the beginning, millions of years ago, and that of the second verse as about 6,000 years since," and then all goes smoothly. "Hugh Miller's object was to harmonize the Bible and science, but he failed. The scheme here propounded succeeds." The Creation described in Genesis thus was merely a renovation, "a repair" of the small district of Eden alone, in part of which the garden was planted. For the earth after many ages had become ruined, and void of its fruitfulness and beauty.<sup>4</sup>

Then Elohim created "the first pair of the human species properly so-called"—the Adamites—and gave the name Ahdahm to this genus homo. The animals created at the same time were only the ordinary animals, domestic and other, useful to man, and these were all that afterwards went into the ark. "Geology," says the presbyter, "shows that successive and progressive *creations* had taken place"—clearly

---

<sup>4</sup> Here is the real point of departure of all those latest desperate efforts to save Genesis, and leave the geologists and palaeontologists high and dry, which we are noticing, and which are for the time fashionable among English Ecclesiastics. The book "Thirty Thousand Thoughts" (a Homiletical Encyclopedia : Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1884) quotes (p. 283) from the Rev. Brewin Grant's "Ktéma ;" "the geological epoch lies between the creation *in the beginning* and the re-formation or making of the world *in six days*." This "repair" theory, too, is to turn the old objection that the language of Genesis pointed rather to a re-arrangement of matter than to its production out of nothing. So great a favourite has this happy thought about "the beginning" become, that all the old endeavours to stretch the six days or maintain the creation of granite have ceased, and it is now even (p. 282) "a blunder about Bible cosmogony" to contrast the 6,000 years with the eons of geological time—a blunder which "even so eminent a person as Professor Tyndall commits and encourages." We refrain from employing a strong term for this shuffling change of ground and this juggling with texts. In fairness, too, we quote another passage (from the Rev. Charles Niel, p. 286) which admits that "the right principles upon which to interpret the Mosaic economy may not yet be fully understood."

this must be from some private geology of his own—and he adds that “at a future period, when the good time shall have come, a new earth shall be made, from which all evil and pain shall be for ever banished.” We are almost inclined to add with this fervent and too credulous septuagenarian “Happy time! May it soon come!” What he is proudest of, however, is his revival in another dress, of the old heresy or “lost doctrine” that Elohim, the “God” of the O.T.A.V. was Jesus. “Unanswerable proof is thus gained of the deity of the second person of the Trinity.” It may be wondered what meaning our loose-minded presbyter attaches to the word “proof,” for he is fond of saying ingenuously about his pet paradoxes, “many other things are received on far less evidence.” Elohim-Jesus was thus the first-begotten and first-born of all Creation (Colossians i. 15), and the “beginning of the creation of God (Rev. iii. 14). He, God the Son, it was, however, who created all other things, just like Ormazd (Ahura-Mazda) of the Zend-Avesta, the first-born of the eternal One; or the Assyrian Narduk, the eldest son of Hea, or the Chaldean Ido, the only-begotten son; or Krishnu in the Bhagavadgita, born of the virgin Devaki—for all these, too, were sons of God and creators. Elohim had a real, material body, which he could render invisible, and a real audible voice and real footsteps, which were heard when he walked in the garden.<sup>5</sup> After the image and likeness of this body Adam was formed: “this may be new to many, but it is true nevertheless.” Still we venture to think it is scarcely a “fact for Darwin.” The bodily Elohim it was who “with his own hands, laid out and planted” Eden “as a kind of model [? farm] of what Adam and his descendants were to do,” and who taught Adam to speak primeval Hebrew (which immediately “accounts in a rational and natural way for the origin of language”). This he did “while walking about in a peripatetic kind of way.” His visits for this purpose were frequent, and afterwards he added philology, natural history and “botanical lessons,” of one of which Gen. i., 29 and 30 is a kind of synopsis, and which enabled Eve to see that the tree was good for food (Gen. iii. 6) and Adam to distinguish the proper food for himself and his newly created cattle, and to name those cattle and the birds. It must not be lost sight of either, that “this naming process was a kind of examination by which Adam was to show what he had learnt.” But this is not all. Elohim also taught him writing, and even wrote with his own pen the first two verses of Gen. v. at the time of Adam’s marriage ceremony, which he performed himself. This was the commencement of a “system of registration!”—which, of course, accounts for the Bible genealogies. “In this theory everything is natural, and such as common sense itself would

---

<sup>5</sup> This is not Manichean, though Mânî held that God was Matter, but the Anthropomorphites who became prominent under the Emperor Valentinian and Pope Damasus A. D. 366, gave a human form to the deity. The sect was formed by Audeus, a Mesopotamian, who, having attacked the vices of the clergy, was expelled from the Syrian church about 338, and banished to Scythia. The presbyter says naught of this.

dictate: not a point is overstrained or far-fetched." We cannot help adding that it is a thousand pities Adam did not, as the saying goes, make a better use of his opportunities and employ even a score or so of his 930 winters in transmitting some of his lore. As it is, we had to wait some 6,000 years for our Grimms and our Bopps, for a Linnæus or a Cuvier. Enough has been said to show that there is nothing to interest Science in this sort of Talmud-and-water, fit only for the puerile ages of the world or the second childhood of man. We cannot follow the author through the Fall, the Flood, the Ark, the Soul, and much more. His last chapter "On Redemption" brings us to the subject of another book on our table, a Symposium on the Atonement.<sup>6</sup> The first remark we have to make upon this medley is that the term *atonement* is now somewhat out of date. It only occurred once in the A.V. of the N.T. (Rom. i. 11)<sup>7</sup> and has now disappeared in favour of *reconciliation*. In point of fact, the word, mainly because of the sacrificial and sanguinary connection in which it is found in theological works, has entirely lost its original mild signification of at-one-ment,<sup>8</sup> and has acquired an import of much asperity, and has come to mean the making of satisfaction by a transgressor. The Rev. J. P. Hopps here says it is now "unscriptural," and Dr. Gloag says it is "unfortunate." So be it, and so much for the word. As for the thing itself, Professor Cave says the doctrine requires reconstruction, maintaining that it is purely a matter of theological nomenclature and definition. Accordingly, taking shelter behind jargon, and writing, as Richter might have said, with cuttle-fish ink, he expects us to plunge after him into the piacular realms of eschatology and soteriology. But then that high

<sup>6</sup> "The Atonement: a Clerical Symposium," &c. [By Fourteen Clergymen.] London: Nisbet. Did we wish greatly to find quarrel in a straw we might express regret at the use of the word *symposium* which contains the Greek root *πo*, to drink, and is explained in the dictionaries as "a merry feast."

<sup>7</sup> "Jesus Christ by whom we have now received the Atonement." This appears in the Revised Version as "Jesus Christ *through* whom we have now received the *reconciliation*." The Vulgate has *per quem nunc reconciliationem accepimus*, which the Port-Royal Jansenists rendered into French as, *par lequel nous avons obtenu maintenant la reconciliation avec Dieu*. The word *atonement* appears thirty-six times in the Old Testament, and it remains to be seen what the Revisers will do with it. It occurs in such passages as "Jewels of gold—chains and bracelets, rings, earrings and tablets—to make an atonement" (Numb. xxxi. 50); "And the priests killed them [the he-goats] and they made *reconciliation* with their blood upon the altar, to make atonement for all Israel" (2 Chron. xxix. 24). The word *reconciliation* is similarly employed in three other texts of the Old Testament, and was also in three other texts of the New Testament, but the Revisers have altered it in one of these (Heb. ii. 17), reading "to make *propitiation* for the sins of the people."

<sup>8</sup> The word *atonement* is first found in Sir T. More's "Richard III," written 1513, although Tyndal (died 1536) had "an *atonemaker* between God and Man." He also printed *atonemaker*. The evolution of the expression has, however, been traced back as far as Robert of Gloucester's "Chronicle," about 1298. Erasmus (1553) has "an *onement* with God." In Dryden's time the original meaning, which can be illustrated half-a-score times from Shakespeare, still survived. "If not *atton'd*, yet seemingly at peace" (*Aurungzebe*, act iii.). It may be noted that Skeat's explanation, "Atone: to set at one, to reconcile," is purely antiquarian and etymological, and, being in no way actual, may mislead future scholars.

patristic authority, Dr. Littledale, writes *contra* that "no attempt to state the doctrine philosophically in the terms of scientific theology has proved to be more than a temporary working hypothesis," "and no explanation yet offered has proved satisfactory to the Christian understanding." The Rev. Mr. Mackennal paradoxically caps this by stating that "the difficulty of formulating the doctrine is not matter for regret, but for devout thankfulness." Mr. Hopps holds that it is "nebulous," and a "barren and unprofitable field" of discussion. Canon Farrar declares that it is "after a certain admirable manner, but *how* we know not," and he also dissuades from further attempts at solution. Dr. Gloag is clear that "there are difficulties connected with it which we cannot solve, mysteries which are not revealed. Dr. Olver gives his co-religionists very far-off comfort, when he pronounces that "eternity shall make it plain;" but Dr. Gloag is more cautious, limiting himself by the celebrated *Peut-être*. "Perhaps," he says, "in a future life we shall understand the reason of things which we cannot at present comprehend. And the symposiasts—as we presume they are to be called, although the Rev. E. White modestly alludes to them as "all saints"—go even farther, for while Dr. Littledale speaks of the unsystematic structure of the New Testament writings," Mr. Hopps charges him with mildness, and prefers to call them "inconsistent, inexact, and unscientific." At the same time, he remarks that St. Paul's "feelings were too intensely personal to enable him to be exact." Fifteen centuries ago the Emperor Julian said little more when he asserted that Paul "had always been vacillating in his opinions." All this is, doubtless, somewhat unfortunate for the doctrine discussed, which, we must not forget, "has from the beginning of Christianity been recognized (so writes Dr. Olver) as the key of the whole evangelical position;" but these admissions evince at the same time so much candour that we cannot but admire. And this candour is carried even farther still. Mr. White brackets Dr. Littledale, Canon Farrar, and Mr. Hopps, as making "one-sided statements of the truth;" and he is even harder than that on the Canon alone, whose expressions appear to him "in the highest degree erroneous and unsuitable," and while Dr. Gloag sympathizes with Dr. Olver, and "has not much to dissent" from the views of Bishop Weathers of Amycla, *in partibus infidelium* (who, as may be imagined, permits no doubt to peep through), he accuses Mr. Hopps of propounding "defective truth," and Dr. Littledale of holding a "defective theory which is not the doctrine of Scripture." So that the symposium is not such a "merry feast" after all.

It is manifest, nevertheless, that these excellent clergymen are one and all (if we except Professor Israel Abrahams) trying hard to convince themselves and each other that they believe this doctrine, while they honestly confess they do not understand it, and each of the fourteen differs from all the thirteen others.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> The "Septuagenarian Presbyter" before mentioned, gives us a fifteenth view, to which none of the symposiasts allude, tracing the idea of the Redemp-

The truth is, and we commend it to their notice, that so long as they wilfully confine their minds within the contracted fence of the church's fold and the walled domain of the Jewish and Christian Scriptures, so long will they have but the "homely wits" of the Gentleman of Verona's "home-keeping youth" to help them. Let them, first, however, laying down the distorting spectacles which everywhere paradoxically produce "types" and forecasts of Christian "mysteries," boldly roam—if nowhere else—over the wide area of the Vedas and the Zend-Avesta, now, thanks to Professor Max Müller, brought to the level of even the least scholarly, and we can promise them a good deal that will enlighten the dusk in which they are now fumbling with the atonement question and many others. But let us suppose "atonement," or "redemption," or "reconciliation" accomplished. Well and good. Then in that case we should be very much inclined to go with Canon Farrar and Mr. Hopps, and adopt Lord Melbourne's celebrated phrase, "Can't you let it alone?" There it is, the effect has been produced; whether he knows it or understands it, or not, man is reconciled and safe. But, no; this will not do—and here comes in the *odium theologicum* as hideous and relentless as ever—"he that believeth not the Son shall not see life . . . he chooses for himself the utter estrangement, the outer darkness" (Dr. Olver); "they who reject it must die for ever" (the "Septuagenarian Presbyter"). If those who differ cannot still be burned alive, they can, at all events, be damned to all eternity. We cannot quit this book without quoting from Bishop Weathers a curious view taken of original sin, by what Richter called the sin-apple-cutters of the Roman Church. "In her Office of Holy Saturday the Church breaks forth in a transport of holy joy: O happy fault which merited for us such and so great a Redeemer! O truly necessary sin of Adam which was to be expiated by the death of Christ!" Here, we fancy, and not in the atonement (as Dr. Olver imagines) is "the key of the whole evangelical position;" and once the Frankenstein's monster of theological Sin is rejected, the whole structure crumbles, and the mind is freed from the religious insanity which made poor Cowper exclaim: "God is always formidable to me except when I see him disarmed of his sting by having sheathed it in the body of Jesus Christ."

"Nothing to my mind can be sadder than reading the sacred books of mankind, and yet nothing more encouraging. They are full of rubbish, but among that rubbish there are old stones which the builders of the true temple of humanity will not reject." So wrote Professor Max Müller in a Letter of Catholicity dated 6th of March, 1883,

---

tion to the *gohal*, always the eldest son, who avenged injuries to his family, and ransomed them or rescued them at the cost of his life when captives.

<sup>10</sup> The Rev. W. Palmer, in his "Narrative" just noticed, anticipates that ere long "Romanism will clamour for the burning of heretics" in England (p. 281).

<sup>11</sup> We have verified the quotation. It occurs in the chant beginning, *Verè dignum, &c.*, and runs as follows: *O certè necessarium Admopeccatum quod Christi morte deletum est. O felix culpa quæ talem ac tantum meruit habere redemptorem.*

and prefixed to the Rev. M. K. Schermerhorn's "Sacred Scriptures of the World,"<sup>12</sup> a large book, which is pieced together for "ministers in their pulpits, teachers in day and Sunday schools, parents in their homes, and individuals in their hours of devotion." Instead of literal we have "free renderings, very often filled in with such connecting or explanatory words as would serve the better to bring out the compiler's view of the author's full or evident meaning." This filling-in is in no way distinguished, and it will thus be evident that to the student the book is quite valueless. We note that in the selections from the New Testament all mention of the mythical birth of Jesus, and of his resurrection and ascension, all miracles, and all "fulfilments of prophecy" have been carefully omitted. As to the other sacred scriptures, any references to the originals would, in view of the avowed method of the book have been inconvenient, and consequently none are given. In fact, from beginning to end there is not a note or a reference.

Three more volumes of the Max Muller series of Sacred Books of the East have appeared. The second instalment of the Vinaya texts<sup>13</sup> contains the continuation of the Mahāvagga and three khandakas of the Kullavagga. M. James Darmesteter's valuable translation of the Zend-Avesta<sup>14</sup> is completed, and contains an index to both volumes which we could have wished was less perfunctory, for the notes, being scattered, fragmentary, and not systematic, are practically undiscoverable in consequence of the insufficiency of the index. The second part—the *Sirôzahs*, *Yasts* and *Nyâyis*—is not so valuable as the *Vendîdâd*, but carries us back towards the origin of many religious myths, such as the heavenly spring from which, like the rivers of Eden, all the waters of the earth flow down; Yima, originally the first man, beginning to sin, losing the glory, and overthrown by Zohâk, the fiendish snake; the snake as a creature of Ahriman, the power of evil; Ormazd, the omniscient Lord, giving the Law to Zoroaster on the top of the mountain of holy questions; Sraosha, the priest god, and even holy priests, called the Word incarnate; the Saviour Saoshyant to be miraculously conceived and brought forth by a virgin at the end of time, and his two forerunners to be also miraculously born. We have, too, the probable origin of Roman mithriacism ("Deo invicto Soli mithra" &c.), and the germs of the Spirit of the Earth, of naiads, dryads and river-gods in the *fravashi* who were that inner power in every being which maintains it and makes it grow and subsist.

In the "Fo-Sho-Iling-Tsan-King,"<sup>15</sup> the Rev. S. Beal gives a version of a fifth-century Chinese translation of a Sanscrit poetical life of

<sup>12</sup> "Sacred Scriptures of the World." By Rev. Martin K. Schermerhorn, M.A. New York: Putnam's Sons. London: Trübner.

<sup>13</sup> Vol. xvii. "Vinaya Texts." Translated from the Pâli by T. W. Rhys Davids and Hermann Oldenberg [the sequel to vol. xiii.]. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

<sup>14</sup> Vol. xxiii. The Zend-Avesta. Part II. Translated by James Darmesteter. Oxford: Clarendon Press [Part I. was published as vol. iv., and was noticed in the WESTMINSTER REVIEW for October, 1880, p. 523].

<sup>15</sup> Vol. xix. The "Fo-Sho-Hing-Tsan-King." Translated from the Chinese by Samuel Beal. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Buddha, said to be the most reliable known in China. Mr. Beal honestly confesses that "the result can only be regarded as tentative," the 10,000 lines of Chinese poetry, which it purports to translate, being corrupt, the style abstruse and technical, and the text printed without stops or notes of any kind. We have also received a revised and enlarged edition of Dr. Schaff's "History of Apostolic Christianity,"<sup>16</sup> first published in 1858; a further instalment of the translation of Ewald's "History of Israel"<sup>17</sup>, and a volume by the Rev. C. A. Rowe, intended to demonstrate the simplicity of the Apostolic Gospel, and to develop the position taken up in his Bampton Lectures for 1877. The "*Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*," has lately contained articles on the "Transatlantic Elysium and the Western Eden," by M. E. Beauvois, evincing considerable familiarity with Celtic literature, and a well-illustrated paper by M. Joachim Menant, upon the Beltis goddesses of the Assyrio-Chaldean Pantheon, where we have some striking figures of a very ancient mother and divine child. This useful review<sup>18</sup> aims at being purely historical, and eschews all dogmatism and polemics.

Mr. John S. Hittell has thrown into the form of a catechism<sup>19</sup> the arguments against St. Peter's having ever gone to Rome. The point is still a favourite one with Christian opponents of the Papacy, and Mr. Hittell, discrediting the sole authorities in favour of the Roman theory—Eusebius and Dionysius of Corinth, relies for his chief testimonials on the negative facts that Peter's Epistles were addressed not to the whole Christian community, but to the strangers in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, while his first is actually dated from Babylon—that his non-supremacy is shown in Acts viii. 14, where the Apostles send Peter and John into Samaria, and by Acts xi. 1–18, where he is made to explain his conduct in catering with the uncircumcised at Joppa—that the Acts, while naming Paul's voyages to Ephesus, Athens, Corinth, Thessalonica, Philippi, Malta, Syracuse, Reggio, Pozzuoli, and Rome, never mention Peter as going to Rome, or to Europe, or even to Asia Minor—that at the Council of Jerusalem (circ. 51 A.D.) it was agreed (Gal. ii. 9), that Paul and Barnabas should go to the heathen, and James and Peter to the circumcision, and that the Pauline Epistles sending messages by name to and from more than thirty Christians in Rome, never mention Peter.

<sup>16</sup> "History of the Church." By Philip Schaff, D.D., A.L.D., Professor in Union Theological Seminary, New York. Apostolic Christianity. Two vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

<sup>17</sup> "The History of Israel." By Heinrich Ewald, late Professor of the University of Göttingen. Vol. VI.: "The Life and Times of Christ." Translated by J. F. Smith. London: Longmans.

<sup>18</sup> "*Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*." Tome VII., Nos. 3 and 4. Paris: Leroux. London: Trübner.

<sup>19</sup> "St. Peter's Catechism." By John S. Hittell. Geneva: Georg.

## PHILOSOPHY.

MR. ABBOTT has published a third and enlarged edition of his valuable translation of Kant's principal Ethical works.<sup>1</sup> The present volume contains a translation of 1, the "Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten;" 2, the "Kritik der praktischen Vernunft;" 3, the introduction to the "Metaphysische Anfangsgrunde der Sittenlehre" and the preface and introduction to the "Metaphysische Anfangsgrunde der Tugendlehre;" 4, "Die Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft;" and 5, the Essay "Ueber ein vermeintes Recht aus Menschenliebe zu lügen." Any one who desires to realize how the art of translation has advanced within the last fifty years need only compare this translation with that of the same text by Semple, and with the later rendering of the "Kritischen reinen Vernunft" by Mr. Meiklejohn. Apart from the merits of the translation the book contains in a collected form nearly the whole of Kant's ethical writings. All that is now wanted is a translation of the "Kritik der Urtheilskraft" to make the Kantian system accessible as a whole to English readers. It must always be borne in mind in the study of Kant's system, that it is not possible to study any one of the three "Kritiken" apart from the other two without missing some of what Kant himself regarded as the chief features of his philosophy. The "Kritik of Pure Reason," when it ends by showing that knowledge is limited by experience, would seem to have been in Kant's own eyes an abstract and incomplete fragment of his work. Heine is interpreting the spirit of Kant wrongly when he tells us that Kant, having demolished God, proceeded to build Him up again in the sphere of practical reason simply out of pity. The truth is that the theoretical and the practical reason are for Kant complementary and logically imply one another. What he somewhat pedantically calls the faculty of judgment is a *Deus ex machinâ* called in to bring the two together, and deriving the necessity for its existence from the too abstract and isolated position which Kant has accorded to the other two faculties. Once deny, what he is always insisting on, that knowledge is limited by imagination, and strip the "Kritiken" of the artificial and unnecessary clothing with which a slavish respect for the Aristotelian logic has invested them, and the relation of the three parts as mere divisions of a really indissoluble whole shows itself clearly enough. In such sections of the first Kritik as that which deals with the distinction between phenomena and noumena the point of contact appears distinctly. We make these remarks to emphasize what Mr. Abbott does not in our opinion sufficiently point out—the necessity of studying the theoretical

<sup>1</sup> "Kant's Critique of Practical Reason," and other Works on the Theory of Ethics. Translated by Thomas Kingsmill Abbott. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1882.



part of Kant's system before the practical part. The latter is not really intelligible apart from the former, however much there is to be got from it taken by itself. The study of German philosophy, and especially, the philosophy of Kant, has entered on a new phase. The "philological" period is past, and it is now not the letter but the spirit that we interest ourselves in. And for the understanding of the spirit nothing is more necessary than that we should avoid studying in isolation what cannot be isolated.

Mr. Sidgwick has sought to treat Logic<sup>2</sup> from a somewhat novel point of view. Instead of exhibiting its doctrines as the propositions of a science, he applies them in this volume to the purposes of an art. The result is what any one who is familiar with the present condition of logical controversy would have expected. The attempt to give "practical importance" to logical doctrine has resulted in what amounts to a treatise, from a new point of view, on the scientific side of logic. In saying that the book as it now is before us is not a work of the popular order which its title would indicate, we are far from saying that it is not a successful book. Only it is successful in a direction somewhat different from that which its title suggests. We have long stood in need of systematic discussion of the fallacies of general logic, and Mr. Sidgwick has done much to supply the want. The book opens with an examination of the distinction between Inference and Proof. The former denotes, according to Mr. Sidgwick, the process of reaching a belief or conclusion drawn from its premises; the latter a process of establishing the belief after it is already somehow reached. It is to the latter process and the difficulties attending it that the most salient chapters of the book are directed. Part I. deals with proof in general, under the subdivisions of its meaning and aims, its subject-matter and its process. Part II. treats of the possibilities of error. We think Mr. Sidgwick has demonstrated that there is room for much more research in this particular branch of knowledge than has hitherto been currently supposed. His book is very suggestive, and if we cannot agree that there is much to be gained by treating such a principle as that called by him the law of counter-indication, as though it were something which had nothing to do with the old question of the nature of the hypothetical judgment, we none the less find him here, as elsewhere throughout his book, original. His conclusions as to the utility of logic deserve special notice. Logic for him cannot claim to dictate instructions for belief—to say: This you may consider sufficiently certain, but that you shall not accept. The most that it can do for practice is to help us to know the dangers of uncriticized belief. But it can give us the power of seeing finer shades of difference, and this is on the whole the best and most lasting result of logical training, and affords most help in the rapid detection of fallacy. It is impossible in a brief notice to give any sufficient account of a book like this, which, whether it be wholly a success or not, at

---

<sup>2</sup> "Fallacies: a View of Logic from the Practical Side." By Alfred Sidgwick. (International Scientific Series.) London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1883.

least attempts a new problem, and carries out the attempt in a suggestive way. We hope that Mr. Sidgwick's work will attract the attention it deserves.

This volume contains the second section of the first division of the third part of Professor Zeller's "Philosophi du Griechen," the first section having been already translated by Dr. Reichel. It includes the systems of the later Epicureans, the later Stoics, and the Platonists of the first centuries after Christ, or, to speak more accurately, those systems of Greek thought which were chiefly characterized by these eclectic principles. Professor Zeller's work needs no remark from us. His "History of Greek Philosophy" stands by itself as probably the most accurate of all the reproductions of ancient speculative thinking. All the new light that Hegelianism cast on Greek philosophy is there, and, on the other hand, his book is free from the one-sided tendencies of such works as the first volume of Hegel's own "History of Philosophy," or Lassalle's "Heraclitus of Ephesus." He neither reads Hegelianism into his subjects, nor caricatures it with the best intentions, after the fashion of Mr. Grote. It is much to be desired that the whole of this work were complete in the English translation. English students of philosophy are under obligation to Miss Alleyne for doing so much towards this. Her work is accurate and readable.

To remark that M. Renan is a very brilliant writer is a truism. It is therefore almost unnecessary to state that the "Philosophical Dialogues and Fragments"<sup>4</sup> form a striking volume. This volume has at length been translated, and the translation is very well executed; particularly so, if regard be allowed to the fact that the translator is himself a foreigner. The book is not the less interesting because of the extraordinary audacity of the translator's preface. To recommend M. Renan's book as a popular exposition of the *Hegelian* philosophy (if indeed this can be called recommending it at all), is to draw too freely upon even the credulity of the average English book-reader, not the most sceptical of critics. If there is one form of thought which is more than any other unrepresented in M. Renan's habit of mind, it is that of the later German philosophy. There is in him no more trace of an apprehension of the real meaning of Kant's teaching, than there is in, let us say, the works of Sir W. Hamilton, or of Auguste Comte. We must therefore respectfully decline to accede to the invitation contained in this preface. What M. Renan's metaphysical point of view really is, it is never easy to say. Metaphysic is not less alien to his individual genius than to the genius of the French nation generally. Its successful study would appear to imply a certain ponderosity of disposition, which is quite foreign to such writers as Renan and Sainte-Beuve. And thus it is that while we are unable to look at these dialogues as of any philosophical value, we none the less welcome their

<sup>3</sup> "A History of Eclecticism in Greek Philosophy." By E. Zeller. Translated by S. F. Alleyne. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1883.

<sup>4</sup> "Philosophical Dialogues and Fragments." By Ernest Renan. Translated by Rās Bihārī Mukharjī. London: Trubner & Co. 1883.

appearance in an English form, and regard them as of much general interest. To philosophy there is no royal road. But if the pathway cannot lie through this book, its study may at least conduce to the attainment of other and it may be more important ends.

Within the limits of a necessarily condensed review it is not possible to give any adequate indication of the unusual foolishness of this book,<sup>5</sup> the object of which is accurately indicated by its title. The first page announces that its publication is due to the willingness to purchase copies of one archbishop, one duke, one earl, nine bishops, six deans, nine archdeacons and a long list of minor clergymen and laymen. The last pages announce the discovery by the author of a method of measuring thought by mechanical means, which is to "give scientific precision to those canons which are now at the mercy of each individual critic." The "work setting forth this scientific measurement of thought will not be large; the price probably half-a-crown." It is almost superfluous to say that the present volume is an ignorant misrepresentation of Spencerianism. It is difficult to determine whether it is more markedly characterized by its inaccuracy or by the lack of ingenuity and knowledge which it is no exaggeration to state that every page displays. One of the mysteries of the business of publishing is the fact that such books find readers.

Since Plato and Berkeley, dialogue has been a dangerous form in which to embody philosophical teaching. Nothing of this kind which has been produced by other writers has even approached that perfection of form which is to be found in them alone. To take a late example, even M. Renan has failed conspicuously in this direction. And if it were necessary to point to an instance of complete failure the critic would only have to refer to the metaphysical dialogues of Professor Michelet. In the case of Mr. Percy Greg<sup>6</sup> the shortcoming is not conspicuous. The reason is that what he discusses is not philosophical problems strictly so called, but what are popularly termed the deep things of life, and notably the function of religion in our civilization. Mr. Greg's point of view is that of one who is sceptical as to the grounds on which unbelief in Christianity rests, and as to whether religion will not survive enlightenment, and he is firmly convinced that no true morality can long survive religion. Such subjects can be very pleasantly, and on the whole profitably, discussed in a popular fashion, and Mr. Greg possesses, in common with Mr. Mallock, the faculty of throwing the discussion effectively into dialogue. Each of them writes an excellent style for this kind of thing, and each of them has from a loose point of view contributed something to the subject. Mr. Greg's dialogues are pleasant and interesting reading,

<sup>5</sup> "An Examination of the Structural Principles of Mr. Herbert Spencer's Philosophy, intended as a Proof that Theism is the only Theory of the Universe that can satisfy Reason." By the Rev. W. D. Ground, Curate of Newburn, Newcastle-on-Tyne, Author of "Ecce Christianus: or, Christ's Idea of the Christian Life." Oxford and London: Parker & Co. 1883.

<sup>6</sup> "Without God: Negative Science and Natural Ethics." By Percy Greg. London: Hurst & Blackett. 1883.

and many people will probably be found to say that they have derived benefit from their perusal.

The author of this book<sup>7</sup> is a person of remarkable self-confidence. His desire is "not so much to show that confusion exists in the kindred sciences of grammar and logic, as to indicate what is wanted to get both into a more satisfactory condition." With this laudable object he presents the public with a pithy treatise on the relation of logic to grammar in the particular references of the nature of word-classing, of sentences and of propositions. The bulk of the book consists of brief and unhesitating denunciations of the ignorance both of logic and of grammar of such writers as Mr. Mill, Sir W. Hamilton, Horne Tooke, De Morgan, Latham, Morell, and indeed of every one with whom he does not agree. Of the many sins with which he charges these men, the cardinal one is the misunderstanding the significance in the proposition of the copula, and the consequent degeneration into the vulgar doctrine of the tripartite as distinguished from the bipartite nature of the proposition. The controversy is one with the merits of which we cannot concern ourselves here further than to point out that this question is much more than a philological one, a circumstance of which Mr. Rogers seems to be unaware.

---

#### POLITICS, SOCIOLOGY, VOYAGES, AND TRAVELS.

WE have no work of first-class importance on "Politics" to notice this quarter. In fact, Mr. Goschen's address on "Laissez-faire," lately published in pamphlet form, is the sole representative before us of English political thought. Mr. Goschen's undoubted political capacity and experience, and the peculiar position he has occupied of late years as an independent but, on the whole, sympathetic observer of the policy pursued by his former colleagues, combine to give unusual weight to any words of warning he may utter. His address makes no claim to be exhaustive. It is, however, a very suggestive inquiry into the causes and probable consequences of the change which has come over the public mind towards the doctrine of "Laissez-faire"—a change of which the most striking feature is the growing interference of the State with the relations between classes. Mr. Goschen calls attention to a few amongst the many contributing influences "which stand out clear and prominent." Foremost amongst them he discerns "an awakening of the public conscience as to the moral aspects of many of our industrial arrangements;" doubts "as to their compatibility with the humane requirements of improving civilization." "I hold the

---

<sup>7</sup> "Grammar and Logic in the Nineteenth Century, as seen in a Syntactical Analysis of the English Language." By T. W. F. Rogers, Inspector of Schools, Sydney. London: Trubner & Co. 1883.

<sup>1</sup> "Address by the Rt. Hon. G. J. Goschen to the Members of the Philosophical Institution at Edinburgh on Laissez-faire and Government Interference." London: Macmillan & Co. 1883.

principle of 'Laissez-faire' to have lost favour, chiefly owing to moral considerations, to the assertion of claims other than material interests, and to a growing feeling that it is right deliberately to risk commercial and industrial advantage for the sake of reforming social abuse and securing social benefits." Then again, it is said, that "Laissez-faire," whether or not it succeeds in *producing* wealth, fails in bringing about a just and sound distribution of wealth. Mr. Goschen could not within the limits of his address go into the searching inquiries suggested by this charge, but he plainly intimates his doubts as to the connection between the alleged cause and the alleged effects. A third cause of the change in the public mind is the greater complexity and crowding of society; conflicting interests jostling each other more and more, and causing a cry for more regulation. This, as he points out, suggests an explanation of the fact that in the "Democracies beyond the seas" there is no corresponding call for State control. Fourthly, a more exceptional cause is that in the necessity for some immediate solution of some political or other difficulty the State presents itself as the only *Deus ex machina*. The Irish Land Act he considers an example of this. A fifth cause is found in the democratic changes which have taken place in the organization of the State, without which, trust in the action of the State could never have developed as it has. The people of this country would never have submitted to the parental legislation of a Parliament withdrawn from their control. So long as Parliament was their *master*, they desired only to be let alone by it, but as it becomes more and more their *servant*, they more and more require it to act on their behalf. Such is Mr. Goschen's analysis of the change which has come over the spirit of our legislation, and which is likely to have so profound an influence on its future. All these causes combine to create the present demand for the better housing of the poor; "but what will carry the movement on to an actual experiment . . . will be a wave of deep and strong feeling passing over the public mind." Here we find Mr. Goschen again insisting on the importance of the moral sentiment as a factor in our future legislation. We think he has not over-estimated its importance, and it follows that we consider him to be doing good service in impressing it upon us. No greater service can be rendered by political thinkers than to compel people to recognize the grounds on which such legislation is required, and on which it must be justified if it is to be justified at all. Nothing could be more fatal to the continuity and the stability of our legislation than misconceptions in this respect. On this question (the housing of the poor) Mr. Goschen gives no uncertain sound. Houses unfit for human habitation must not be inhabited, and compensation to their owners must not go beyond their "value for legal use," which value the State must define. As to the ultimate consequences of the new departure, Mr. Goschen gives very weighty reasons for the grave misgivings which all historic experience shows may reasonably be felt. The confidence with which we appear to be entering on it can only be justified by the existence of a much purer atmosphere of public life than other

ages and other countries have ever enjoyed. Admitting, as we do, the reality and magnitude of the dangers Mr. Goschen warns us against, may we not urge in answer to these misgivings, that State control does, on the whole, give fairly satisfactory results in other countries, even though it is of the most "parental" type, and may it not reasonably be expected that when the controlling power is in reality the people themselves, the abuses which discredit foreign systems may be avoided or at least kept within such narrow limits that on the whole the benefits to society shall outweigh the evils. And have we not some reason for believing that the people who have worked out their own salvation in matters political with a moderation and to a degree of perfection unapproached by any other people that history tells of, may be trusted with some confidence to work out also their social regeneration. In the *production* of wealth we have surpassed the wildest dreams of every other age and country. In its *distribution* must we be for ever a reproach among the nations of the earth?

From these speculations on State interference we naturally turn to see what new light M. Yves Guyot,<sup>2</sup> an uncompromising opponent of the principle in all its applications, has to throw upon its actual working in France. Most readers of the WESTMINSTER REVIEW will remember M. Guyot's splendid services to the cause of humanity and individual liberty in the struggle which he has carried on, almost single-handed, against one odious form of State regulation.

Fresh from his victorious campaign against "La Police des Mœurs," M. Guyot now challenges the whole system of police administration in France, and especially in Paris. For some years M. Guyot has boldly and unceasingly attacked the Prefecture and its agents in the columns of *La Lanterne*, as well as in his capacity of Municipal Councillor, and in the year 1879 his devotion to this cause brought upon him a sentence of six months' imprisonment and 3,000 francs fine for libel. Readers will, therefore, bear in mind that while M. Guyot speaks with the fullest possible knowledge of the facts, he is not in a position to speak with judicial impartiality. Fully admitting the seriousness of his charges against the police, and the weight of the evidence with which he supports them, we are bound to adopt an attitude of caution towards an *ex parte* statement. Englishmen, moreover, must especially guard themselves against the error, to which they are very liable, of supposing that things which shock our notions of individual liberty, and of the proper limits of governmental interference, are necessarily shocking to Frenchmen, or out of harmony with their institutions and habits. Having said thus much we readily admit that the police of Paris stand in need of radical reform. The arbitrary spirit of the Empire still animates them from the highest to the lowest, and gives rise to many and grievous abuses. Perhaps, the most striking of these are the recklessness and cruelty with which arbitrary arrests are made by a class of men corresponding presumably

---

<sup>2</sup> "La Police." Par Yves Guyot, Membre du Conseil Municipal de Paris. Paris: 1884.

to our constables, without authorization from any higher power, and the clearly illegal delays which occur in a great majority of cases, before the charges are investigated. Thus in a certain district as many as 18 per cent. of the persons arrested were not brought before the juge d'instruction until the fifth day after their arrest, and 8 per cent. were kept still longer. And this in open violation of the 93rd article of the Code d'Instruction Criminelle, which allows twenty-four hours as the extreme limit. When we find that a very large percentage of charges are dismissed as soon as inquired into, and when we read of the cynical indifference to humanity, rising at times to brutality, with which these capricious arrests are carried out, we see at once there is something terribly rotten in the administration of the police. If further proof be required of the abuse of the powers of arbitrary arrest, we find it in the enormous number (over 11 per cent. of the total arrests) of sentences for "rebellion"—*i.e.*, resistance to arrest; for, as M. Guyot points out, if the accused were really guilty of any original offence they would be punished for that offence, and not merely for "rebellion." We grumble occasionally at our English police; but if any one thinks they manage these things better in France, let him read "La Police," and let him ponder over the "mouchards" and "Agents provocateurs," the arbitrary arrests and illegal detention, the tortures known as "ligoter," and "passer à tabac" and the practical irresponsibility of the police.

From Algeria we have received two small *brochures* from the pen of Dr. Bodichon. The first contains a series of "axiomes" or heads of a foreign policy, having for its aim the partition of the Turkish Empire between Russia, Germany, and France, and the conquest of Sahara by France. The second is an inquiry into the influence of the climate and physical geography of Africa upon its inhabitants. Dr. Bodichon lays down a number of "principes de mal" constituting a tremendous indictment against Algeria and all who come under its influence. The proposed remedies, which he admits are "drastic," amount to little less than the extermination of all native Africans, and a tremendously strict settlement of the country. Since the Cromwellian settlement of Ireland we have seen nothing so thorough in its conception.

Mr. Sheldon Amos, in his new work on the Civil Law,<sup>4</sup> professes to place before his readers "the whole body of Roman Law, both as it presents itself at its most characteristic epoch, the age of Justinian, and as it has been formally developed from the era of the XII. Tables to that of the Code Napoleon and of its numerous family of Codes.'

<sup>3</sup> "Le Vade-Mecum de la Politique Française." Par le Docteur Bodichon. Alger; Typographie et Lithographie A. Bouyer. 1883.

<sup>4</sup> "The History and Principles of the Civil Law of Rome: an Aid to the Study of Scientific and Comparative Jurisprudence." By Sheldon Amos, M.A., Barrister-at-Law, late Professor of Jurisprudence in University College, London, Professor of Jurisprudence and Roman Law in the Inns of Court, and Examiner in the University of London, Author of "The Science of Law," &c. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1883.

This stupendous task, the materials for which would form a respectable library, and which covers a period of some twenty-two centuries, is undertaken within the limits of one not very large octavo volume. It follows of necessity that the greater portion of the work is little more than an outline. Part I., containing the history of the Civil Law up to and including the era of Justinian is comprised in about 100 pages, and much of it is consequently passed over with scant elucidation. The origin of the Roman Institutions, upon which Sir H. S. Maine, M. de Coulanges, and other writers have thrown so much light, is perhaps beyond the scope of Mr. Amos's work, but we might fairly have expected to find a summary of the contents of the XII. Tables so far as they are known. Many interesting points, however, are dealt with in the historical part of the work, in a clear though brief manner, such as that strange anomaly in Roman Constitutional Law, "the existence of three if not four legislative bodies practically independent of each other, and yet each of them possessed of sovereign power." These were the three Comitia and the Senate. The Comitia Curiata, however, early lost all legislative power, and the Senate did not acquire independent legislative authority until towards the close of the Republic. There remain the Comitia Centuriata and the Comitia Tributa. At three different periods in Roman history we find a law passed in almost identical terms to the effect that the resolutions of the Comitia Tributa should be binding on the whole Roman people. It may be that just as in the case of the many confirmations of our own Great Charter, the same law was really in each case re-enacted because it had been again and again disregarded, but there is reason to think that these three laws really represent epochs of advance in the power of the Plebeian Assembly. After the first law (B.C. 449), Plebiscita, in order to bind the *populus*, had still to pass the Comitia Centuriata and to receive the sanction of the Senate. After the second law (B.C. 339) the consent of the Centuries was no longer required. After the third law (B.C. 287) the authorization of the Senate, which by this time was confined to a decision on the constitutional validity of the proposal, had to be given before the voting took place (*in incertum Comitiarum eventum*). Thus, it was not until after the passing of this third law that the Comitia Centuriata, and the Comitia Tributa had independent and co-equal legislative authority. Even with this explanation it is astonishing that legislative conflicts did not often occur. Somehow, the balance of power was preserved by an elaborate system of checks and counter-checks. On the one hand the Plebeian Tribunes might veto a law passed by the Centuries, and on the other, the Senate, by appointing a Dictator, or by investing the Consuls with dictatorial authority, might override the tribunitian power. Into this question, however, Mr. Amos does not go, but he mentions two points which throw light upon it. In Republican times executive action was of far more importance than legislative action, and consequently the appointment of executive officers was the most important business of the legislative assemblies, and the subject of the principal constitu-



tional struggles. Now, in this respect, their separate functions were at any given moment clearly defined. Also at the time when the Centuries and the Tribes were really co-ordinate and co-equal legislative bodies there was not much difference in their composition. The Centuries had been re-organized on a tribal basis and had lost their timocratic character. In short, it was rather a matter of convenience than as the result of a further advance of Democracy, that in the latter years of the Republic *plebiscita* were more common than *leges*. Part II., which forms the bulk of the book, is concerned with the substance of the law in the time of Justinian. In arrangement Mr. Amos follows the German method rather than that usually adopted in English treatises. He prefers the authority of the Digest or Code to that of the Institutes, and indeed gives a good deal of information (*e.g.*, on the subjects of banking, shipping, and marine insurance) not to be found in the Institutes. His statement of the law though usually clear is not always accurate, as, for instance, when he says (p. 163) that "sacred things and *res nullius* generally" are not susceptible of appropriation. This is true of one sense of the phrase *res nullius*, when it means things of a religious character. But the expression had another meaning—namely, unappropriated things, such as wild animals or unoccupied lands, which, contrary to the modern Socialistic idea, were considered by the Romans to be emphatically susceptible of appropriation: *quod enim ante nullius est id naturali ratione occupanti conceditur*. Again, in the notice of Justinian's legislation relating to *donationes ante nuptias* (p. 165) it is apparently implied that the *dos* was a gift from the husband to the wife, whereas it was a contribution made by the wife or her relations towards the expenses of the joint household. The translation of *dos* by dower, too, is very misleading. It had little analogy to what is known as dower in English law. Again, at page 220, there is an inversion of the terms promisor and promisee. In the contract of *stipulatio* it was the promisee who "put the question" and was called the stipulator. The reason why a thief caught in the act was liable to a much severer penalty than one not so caught, described by Mr. Amos (p. 248) as "wholly anomalous, and to modern ideas illogical," probably proceeded from the very rational desire of inducing the party wronged not to take the law into his own hands when he had the opportunity. This was a very important object in primitive society, though no doubt the distinction may have held its ground in part at least, as Mr. Amos suggests, through an habitual distrust of the weight of judicial evidence. The classification of obligations (p. 199) appears to us in many respects more scientific than that usually adopted, but it should be noted that the expressions "one-sided and two-sided engagements," "formal and informal conventions," are by no means continuous with the unilateral and bilateral, formal and formless, contracts of previous commentators. Part III. resumes the history of the Civil Law from Justinian to Napoleon. Its fate in the East is first described, and Mr. Amos traces the unbroken continuity of the history of the civil law in Greek-speaking countries up to the present day. The Mohammedan law, too, is

described as the Roman law of the Eastern Empire in an Arab dress. The Koran is shown to have little to say about law strictly so-called as opposed to religion and ethics. The progress of the Roman law in the West is somewhat more fully dealt with. Its influence was borne along into the coming centuries on two distinct streams, one proceeding from the Theodosian Code and the so-called Barbarian Codes, and the other from the legislation of Justinian as established in Italy in the middle of the sixth century. Even after the disappearance of the last traces of the direct dominion of the Eastern Empire over the West, there remained enough of the old local self-government in the towns to keep alive the old local laws and usages, such as those relating to contracts, sales, marriages, wills and succession. The memory of the Roman law was also continued by the institution, recognized by the barbarian sovereigns, of "personal law," under which Lombard, Goth, Frank, Burgundian, Saxon, and Roman, if casually residing in the same district, to a large extent enjoyed each his separate laws. Mr. Amos gives some account of the revival of the study of Roman law in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries under the Glossators headed by Truerius, to whom succeeded the Humanists, Alciato and Cujas. The influence of the Canon law in perpetuating the Civil law is also discussed. Mr. Amos then traces in some detail the fortunes of the civil law in France, where the country became divided into the Roman law provinces (*pays de droit écrit*) and customary provinces (*pays de droit coutumier*), and in England, where its direct influence has been small indeed. Finally, Mr. Amos shows how far recent codification in Germany, France, Egypt and Louisiana, has proceeded on the lines of Roman law. On the whole, the work though not displaying much originality, is well conceived and judiciously treated, and will form a useful addition to the scanty store of English textbooks on the subject.

"The Land Laws" contributed by Mr. Frederick Pollock to the "English Citizen" Series, is a thoroughly well-done piece of work, by a thoroughly good workman. It is not so easy as some who have not tried it may think, "to make the principles and the leading features of our law of real property intelligible to a reader who is without legal training," even if he is "willing to take some little pains to understand," and perhaps none but lawyers know how difficult it is to speak at the same time exactly enough for lawyers and plainly enough for laymen. In both these aims, Mr. Pollock has succeeded admirably. His book is no mere statement of dry legal rules. It shows how these rules grew up, and brings them into relation with the social forces which at present threaten their existence. It supplies a brief but very clear analysis of the heterogeneous elements out of which our "unique" system has been built up, and shows how some of these elements—

---

<sup>5</sup> "The Land Laws." By Frederick Pollock, Barrister-at-law, M.A., Hon. LL.D. Edin., Corpus Christi Professor of Jurisprudence in the University of Oxford, late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. London: Macmillan & Co. 1883.

rights over common lands, for instance—had their origin in times when private ownership of land was “a struggling novelty” in England. The theory, till quite recently an article of faith with all lawyers, which represented rights over common lands as having grown up out of the bounty of the lord of the manor, is shown to be a mere fiction, the commoners’ rights having existed without interruption for centuries before lord or manor were heard of down to modern times. Most English people will be surprised to learn how very limited are their strict legal rights to the enjoyment of even the elements in their native land. It is doubtful whether there is a single spot in England, excepting places expressly dedicated to the public by their former owners or by Parliament, where the British public have a legal right to be. Roads and rivers are free only for purposes of passing and repassing; commons are free only to the commoners—a definite number of persons in every case. Even the air is not free. “I conceive it is indisputable that to pass over land in a balloon, at whatever height, without the owner’s or occupier’s license is technically a trespass.” After expounding the leading principles of the law as it is, Mr. Pollock touches lightly but suggestively on the evils of limited ownership, the monopoly of urban sites, land nationalization, &c. The book is one of the best of the series to which it belongs, and we earnestly recommend a careful perusal of it to all who desire to be able to form sound independent opinions for themselves on the many-sided “land question.”

A little book by Mr. A. B. Bence-Jones on the Bankruptcy Act of last Session<sup>6</sup> is before us. It is “principally intended for men of business.” So perhaps we ought not to complain that it is of little use to lawyers. The text of the Act is given in full, with such notes as the editor thinks are required for its interpretation.

Mr. Gopināth Sadāshivji Hāte’s pamphlet<sup>7</sup> is a very eloquent address to his “brethren” upon the need and the means of regenerating India. Education and the growth of manufacturing industries appear to be the forces he relies on principally. Caste, and the degraded position of women, are fervently denounced. He thinks that it is above all “to the high education that we must look,” as learning spreads downwards from the few to the many. As to the religion of India in the future the author is sanguine enough to have a “firm conviction that Christians, Mahomedans, Parsis, Buddhists and Jains will all ultimately meet together on the common platform of Universal Brotherhood—with the Bible, the Vedas, the Koran, the Zendavesta and the other sacred books as so many planets revolving round the central sun of Theistic Faith.” There is much virtue in that word *ultimately*! Meanwhile the “articles” of this Faith are given in the appendix, and they

<sup>6</sup> “The New Law of Bankruptcy; containing the ‘Bankruptcy Act, 1883,’ with Introduction, Tables, Notes, and an Index.” By A. B. Bence-Jones, M.A., of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-law. London: Griffith & Farran. 1883.

<sup>7</sup> “Regeneration of India.” By Gopināth Sadāshivji Hāte, Dewan to the State of Palitana, Kathiawar, Pleader, Bombay High Court. Bombay: Printed at the Dnyan Mitra Press, by N. W. Ghumre. 1883.

are not unworthy of the attention of Christians. We select the following as a fair specimen :—

Art. 22. "We believe that religion is progressive; that all the religions of the world represent more or less rude and imperfect attempts to spell out the common religious instincts and spiritual inspirations of mankind; that they have not been *made*, but have grown out of the spiritual life of man, assuming different forms owing to difference of intellectual, moral, social, and political conditions. So there are truths in all and we cheerfully accept them."

Mr. Arthur Smith's "Subjective Political Economy"<sup>8</sup> is a book of which it is impossible to say anything favourable. It is not easy to discover what Mr. Smith means by Subjective Political Economy, but we gather that it is something opposed to Mill's system, which, we are told, is "objective" and "endeavours to prove mind from matter." Subjective economists, we also learn, are necessarily protectionists, just as objective economists are necessarily free-traders. "Objectively the free trade argument is unanswerable, is irresistible. Subjectively it is the greatest imposition, which ever hoaxed mankind. . . . Its subjective atrocity, as an argument, is proof, one might almost say, of its objective truth." As for fair trade "it is a jumble repulsive to true thought." There has been a good deal of discussion during the last few years concerning the proper "method" of Political Economy. Mr. Smith adopts one of his own invention. "Those," he tells us, "which are considered the best works on the subject are synthetic or systematic. They start with an idea—a fixed idea—of what they are going to discuss, and then proceed upon a pre-arranged plan. . . . We, however, prefer to proceed upon the reverse plan. We explain precisely the meaning of the word wealth, and, moreover, explain it in such a way that the majority of readers, though unable to get out of the reasons for the explanation, will at once dissent from the view." A little puzzled by this "plan," and curious to see it in operation, we turn to the chapter on wealth. Here, after wading through many pages of quasi-meta-physical dissertations (to judge of which on their merits the reader must discard all his preconceived notions of grammar) we find at last this "explanation":—"Wealth means the sensation of satisfaction produced in man by a material object." This definition "is entirely subjective, and it is universally objected to for that reason." A few pages further on we are favoured with another explanation:—"Wealth means the having got in consequence of the having been without." Not yet quite satisfied that we have grasped Mr. Smith's "plan" we go on to his explanation of value. We find that "the word value is an estimation of wealth;" and again, "value is the result of an endeavour of the mind to conceive the conjunction of mind and matter upon a separation between them either real or supposed." Now, if our readers will imagine page after page filled with "explanations" as wildly nonsensical as the above, they will see that it is impossible to treat Mr.

---

<sup>8</sup> "A System of Subjective Political Economy." By Arthur M. Smith. London: Williams & Norgate. 1883.

Smith's system seriously. It is true he has the grace to "apologize to the reader for our style of writing, which is generally considered abominable." We do not wish to appear ungracious. Let us therefore accept the apology and say no more about this unhappy "system."

Mr. Carruthers' grammar<sup>9</sup> is better than Mr. Smith's. In other respects we are not sure that his "suggestions" are more valuable than the "system" we have just agreed to say no more about. When he undertakes to show us that a "unit of value" is equal to a "unit of want," of which the measure is "one foot-pound," we must frankly admit we are unable to follow his reasoning. Mr. Carruthers wishes to abolish legal tender, allowing the debtor, in the absence of express stipulation, to pay in any commodity he chooses. He would not even allow the State to interfere between creditor and debtor to force the one to pay the other at all. "Let every trader calculate his losses from bad debts, as a fruit-seller estimates his loss from rotten apples, and charge accordingly." This appears to us to be pushing the doctrine of "Laissez-faire" rather far.

The present quarter is rich in books of travel. The history of the ill-starred but heroic "*Jeannette Expedition*"<sup>10</sup> is very fully told in the two large volumes, edited by Mrs. De Long, the widow of the gallant leader of the expedition. Fortunately the journal which De Long kept faithfully to the last day that his frozen fingers were able to scrawl a few words, was recovered along with the dead bodies of its writer and his companions. The editor tells us she has reproduced this journal "with such omissions and corrections only as its form, never intended for publication, seemed to demand." Mrs. De Long has also supplied a brief and interesting biographical sketch of the commander, and an account of the preparations for and objects of the expedition. We cannot say what scope the journal may have afforded its editor for the exercise of judgment and good taste. There is at least negative evidence that Mrs. De Long possesses these valuable and by no means universal qualifications for her work; for there is nothing in the whole two volumes which could hurt the most sensitive of the promoters or survivors of the expedition, and if the journal contained anything of the kind no hint of it appears. But, indeed, from the generous and considerate tone which breathes from all that we are permitted to see, we feel assured that no unjust or harsh word can be found in the pages of the original, and that there was nothing left for Mrs. De Long to omit on this account. Nor is there much left for the reviewer to do beyond thanking the editor for making audible to all the world

---

<sup>9</sup> "The Units in Exchange, and a Free Currency, being Suggestions for the Employment of a Unit of Value in Political Economy, and the Abolition of Legal Tenders in Currency." By G. T. Carruthers, M.A., Bengal Ecclesiastical Establishment.

<sup>10</sup> "The Voyage of the *Jeannette*. The Ship and Ice Journals of George W. De Long, Lieutenant-Commander, U.S.N., and Commander of the Polar Expedition of 1879-1881." Edited by his wife, Emma De Long. With a Steel Portrait, Maps, and many Illustrations on Wood and Stone. 2 vols. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1883.

these echoes of "a voice that is still," for assuredly the world is the better for knowing how men like George Washington De Long and the crew of the *Jeannette* have lived and died. This tale of noble patience and heroic effort can be read to advantage only in the record kept by the chief actor in it. Yet we cannot resist the temptation to sketch here a brief outline of it. The *Jeannette*, which, under the name of *Pandora*, had already made several Arctic voyages, was purchased in 1878 from Sir Allen Young by Mr. Bennett, of the *New York Herald*, for the purpose of the expedition, which Mr. Bennett, at Licut. De Long's suggestion, had determined to send to the Arctic regions. All expenses connected with the expedition were borne by Mr. Bennett; but in order to arm the commander with the proper powers for maintaining discipline the formal control of this expedition was handed over to the U.S. Navy Department, and the crew were enlisted subject to the articles of war. The *Jeannette*, amid high hopes, started from San Francisco on the 8th of July, 1879. She was to pass through Behring Straits, and it was hoped that, borne by the warm water of the Japan current, she would reach a high latitude on the coast of Wrangel Land, supposed at that time to be a vast continent. Alas for such hopes! Not quite two months from the start the *Jeannette* was beset in the pack within sight of Herald Island—a point far south of where it was hoped she would winter, and her further advance became impossible. "My disappointment is great," writes De Long, "how great no one else will probably know." Still the worst he looked forward to was the loss of the remaining autumn months, during which he had hoped to do something. Happily he did not know that for seventeen weary months to come his ship was to remain imprisoned in the midst of that ice desert, drifting with it backwards and forwards at the mercy of the winds, only to be crushed and sunk by it when at last release seemed at hand. The winter of 1879-80 passed over without catastrophe. But as the summer came and passed away without liberating them, and a second winter in the ice lay before them, it is not to be wondered at that the tone of the journal becomes a shade less hopeful. "Alas! alas! the North Pole, and the North-west Passage are as far from our realization as they were the day the ship left England; and my pleasant hope to add something to the history of Arctic discovery and exploration, has been as ruthlessly shattered, and as thoroughly killed as my greatest enemy could desire." But no trace of this despondency showed itself in action. There the writer's favourite motto—"Hope on, hope ever!"—animated all on board. The second winter slowly passed away, and at last on the 10th of June, 1881, "the ice suddenly opened alongside, and the ship righted to an even keel." Everything was rapidly got ready in the hope of being able at last to steam through the ice now apparently breaking up all round. But in the evening of the next day the treacherous floes closed in again, crushing the poor *Jeannette* so badly that orders were given to remove everything from her to a safe place on the ice, and "at 4 A.M. the *Jeannette* went down." They had plenty of clothes and eighty days' provisions,

besides boats, tents, and sleds, so they were "all bright and cheerful." On the 17th they began their march southwards, over the moving ice-fields, making for the Lena Delta. The labour of dragging the sleds over the rough ice was tremendous. Two miles a day were as much as they could advance with all their efforts. Yet no one suffered seriously in health or spirits. On the 11th of September, they had reached Semenovski Island, and next morning, the sea being now fairly clear of ice, the whole party embarked in three open boats. That same night a heavy gale of wind came on, and in the darkness the boats got separated. One of them was never seen again. De Long's boat with difficulty rode out the gale, and three days' later grounded a mile and a half from the shore of the Lena Delta. Cramped, soaking wet, and half frozen, they waded ashore knee deep through the icy water, carrying their provisions and outfit, and at last ninety-seven days after the crushing of their ship, stood upon the Siberian mainland. But the Delta was a mere swamp already half frozen, more inhospitable if possible than the seas they had left behind them. There was no sign of life, no shelter from the ferocious wind, and provisions were almost exhausted, while the terrible exposure of the last few days in the open boat had done more to pull them down than all their three months' previous hardships. On the 19th of September, De Long and his boat's crew, thirteen in all, started forward in the hope of reaching the nearest settlement, which he believed to be ninety-five miles distant, with only four days' provisions remaining. "Road bad. Breaking through the crust; going in everywhere occasionally up to knees." At almost every step new and unexpected obstacles barred their further progress. It soon became evident that the chart on which De Long had been relying was worthless, and that he had lost his way hopelessly in the frozen swamp. Once or twice their all but exhausted store of provisions were helped out with a deer or gull. At last on October 3, they had to kill their solitary dog. On they struggled with stout hearts but feeble limbs, burdened now with a dying comrade, who, some days later, relieved his messmates of a burden they could so ill support. They buried him in the ice by the river-side, with such naval honours as their slender resources permitted. Solid food was now all gone. For the next fortnight we meet with entries like these: "October 7: for dinner, we had 1 ounce alcohol in a pot of tea" (made from *old* tea-leaves). "October 10: last  $\frac{1}{2}$  ounce alcohol . . . eat deerskin scraps. Yesterday morning eat my deerskin foot nips." Then they had nothing for some days but a spoonful of glycerine. When that was finished, they tried infusion of willow-leaves. The last mention of food is under date October 15: "breakfast, willow tea and two old boots." Still the record is faithfully kept for another fifteen days of agony, though there is little to note beyond the deaths of stout-hearted messmates. The final entry is: "October 30, Sunday. 140th day. Boyd and Görtz died during night. Mr. Collins dying." No word of complaint, no hint of a selfish or ungenerous thought or action on the part of any member of the party is to be found in all this record of long-drawn-

out suffering. Struggling on, as in duty bound, while strength to crawl was left, officers and men devoted to each other, and to their duty, together faced and met their deaths with the silent strength of brave true men. The chronicles of Arctic exploration contain nothing more touching than this "plain unvarnished tale" of the commander of the *Jeannette*. The narrative of the fortunes of the rest of the *Jeannette's* crew is continued by the editor. Two men of Dr. Long's party had been sent forward on the 9th of October to seek relief. After sufferings almost as extreme as those of the men who stayed behind to die, these two did eventually come to a settlement, and were found by Mr. Melville, the officer who commanded the second of the three boats, and who had had the good luck to be driven on shore close to a Siberian settlement. A rapid search was at once undertaken by Mr. Melville, who, at the peril of his life, did all that man could do. But the lost party were not found until returning spring enabled him to renew his search with all the aid that the Russian and American Governments could afford. On the 23rd of March, 1882, the bodies were discovered half-hidden by the snow, and were decently buried on a neighbouring hill-top. Along with the bodies this journal and other papers were recovered. The search for the third boat's crew was carried on for some time longer, but no trace of them has ever been found.

After the prolonged strain upon our feelings which the "Voyage of the *Jeannette*" demands, it is a relief to turn to another expedition, as successful and as unadventurous as its objects were useful though unambitious. In the "Cruise of the *Alert*"<sup>11</sup> Dr. Coppinger has "endeavoured to give a brief account, divested as much as possible of technicalities, of the principal points of interest in natural history which came under observation during the wanderings of a surveying ship." As these wanderings extended over a period of four years (Sept. 1878 to Sept. 1882), and included two prolonged explorations of the little known islands and channels of western Patagonia and the Magellan Straits, besides surveys of the smaller islands and reefs in the neighbourhood of Tahiti, Fiji, and the N.E. coast of Australia, there was abundant opportunity even for an "Amateur," as Dr. Coppinger modestly calls himself, to make very valuable collections and observations. From time to time the specimens collected were sent home to the Admiralty, and handed over to the experts of the British Museum. The book now before us is in great part a record of the times, places, and other circumstances under which the various specimens were obtained, and is thus a valuable commentary on the collection itself. This portion of the book, though of least interest to the general reader, will probably be of most lasting value. However, the general reader has no cause to complain, for he will find all through the book much interesting information about the natural features, climate, and natives

---

<sup>11</sup> "Cruise of the *Alert*. Four Years in Patagonian, Polynesian, and Mascarene Waters (1878-82)." By R. W. Coppinger, M.D. (Staff-Surgeon Royal Navy, C.M.Z.S.). London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1883.



of places rarely visited by scientific observers. From this point of view, the best part of the book is that which relates to Tierra del Fuego. His account of the "Channel tribe" of Fuegians, is of special interest to the anthropologist, for these people he considers, with good reason, "bear away the palm as the most primitive of all the varieties of the human species," not excepting the Australian aborigines. This account is fuller than that given by Darwin, who also described these people in his journal. It is difficult to imagine human beings in a lower stage of social evolution, or more entirely without moral sense, property, government or social organization. Their character, habits, and appearance, are as forbidding as the land in which they live—a region of perpetual rain and gloom—and which no doubt helps largely to make them what they are. The *Alert* quitted Patagonian waters in April 1880, and after visiting a few Chilian ports, made her way very leisurely to Tahiti, thence to Fiji and on to Queensland. There is an interesting account of the natives of Torres Straits, which, however, we cannot stop to notice. From Australia the expedition passed through the Eastern Archipelago to Singapore, afterwards visiting the Seychelles and Amirante group, and returning by way of Mozambique and the Cape. Not only for what he tells us but also for what he omits, are we bound to thank Dr. Copping. While describing very fully places little known, he passes lightly over those which previous travellers have already exhausted. The want of maps is felt especially in trying to follow the Patagonian wanderings. There is not only a good general index but also an index of natural history terms, which will be most valuable to the scientific student. There are eighteen illustrations, mostly reproductions of photographs.

An abridgment in one small volume of "The Voyage of the *Vega*"<sup>12</sup> has now been published. It contains about half the matter of the original edition, and most of the illustrations, but all the old maps of northern Europe are, we regret to find, omitted, and the historical sketch of former expeditions greatly cut down. We notice that Wrangel-land, which in the original edition is indicated as an immense tract extending indefinitely towards the north, shrinks in the new edition to its proper insignificance as ascertained by the *Jeannette* expedition.

Coming back to our own little island after following these great ocean-going ships round the world, we find a charming description of the inland seas of Norfolk<sup>13</sup> and their inhabitants, human and other, from the pen of Mr. Davies. The author describes his yachting adventures with such piquancy and *verve* that we find ourselves mentally resolving to devote our next autumn holidays to sailing the Broads instead of climbing the Alps. Languid as is our interest in

---

<sup>12</sup> "The Voyage of the *Vega* round Asia and Europe." By A. E. Nordenskiöld. Translated by Alex. Leslie. London: Macmillan & Co. 1883.

<sup>13</sup> "Norfolk Broads and Rivers; or, the Water-ways, Lagoons, and Decoys of East Anglia." By G. Christopher Davies, Author of "The *Swan* and her Crew." London and Edinburgh: William Blackwood & Sons. 1883.

"the gentle craft," we feel a quickening of the pulse as we read of pike thirty and even thirty-six pounds weight, to be caught in Jordan, and our impulse to set off at once with rod and can is checked only by reading that "about the exact position of Jordan there is more doubt than there should be, considering the limited area of the district in which the El Dorado of anglers lies." In fact, to tell an inquisitive angler that you are going to fish in "Jordan" is a polite way of saying, "Ask me no questions and I'll tell you no lies." When the *joyd-lust* of the fowler or angler is sated he will have leisure to observe the peculiar dreamy scenery of the Broads, and he will find that "the far-reaching marsh has a beauty of its own—that of changing colour as the wind bows the many-tinted grasses and flowers, and the wind-waves and cloud-shadows sweep along; while everywhere are the snowy sails of yachts and the red-brown canvas of the wherries. Sunrises and sunsets glow with a warmth of colour that gives the placid lagoons an almost unearthly loveliness; while, when the sun is set, the mists often show lakes and islands that vanish with the dawn." The life of the Broadman, as described by the author, is one of idyllic bliss such as rarely falls to the lot of nineteenth-century folk, in England at least. Congenial occupation, the excitement of sport, entire freedom, a healthy and happy life, these are some of the advantages of the lucky Broadman, who moors his house-boat where he chooses amidst the reeds and iris-flowers on the clear lagoon, untroubled by rent or rates or taxes. Mr. Davies has much to say about the habits of eels and eel-catchers. He thinks that eels are viviparous, and that the population question amongst them is solved by emigration to the sea, but admits that doubts still hang over these questions. In winter wild-fowl visit the Broads in great numbers, but not so much as formerly. Decoying forms the subject of a most exciting chapter. A spirited account of a run down the coast brings this pleasant volume to a close. A striking feature of the book is its beautiful photo-gravures, etched by Messrs. Annan's process. They have all the clearness and minute detail of photographs combined with a softness and warmth which the latter lack.

There is probably a large class of English readers who would ask no better guide "Over the Holy Land"<sup>14</sup> than Dr. Wylie. He is not an explorer or a naturalist, or a scientific student of history. He is simply an English clergyman, who, for a half a century, as he tells us, has taken a lively interest in all that has been written upon Palestine, and at last, in the evening of life, has had the happiness for a few weeks or months, to see with his eyes and tread with his feet the land whose varied fortunes he had studied so long and ardently. Dr. Wylie tells us what he saw and did, much as other tourists have done a thousand times, only that he has brought to his task a mind better stored with the results of other men's labours than the ordinary tourist generally possesses. In our opinion, Dr. Wylie would have done

<sup>14</sup> "Over the Holy Land." By the Rev. J. A. Wylie, LL.D. London: J. Nisbet & Co. 1883.

better to content himself with describing what he saw, leaving "philosophy" alone. Unfortunately he undertakes "to expound the rationale or philosophy of the country in its singular adaptation for its great moral and spiritual ends," and he is betrayed into arguing that in the fact of this natural adaptation (the size, position, and boundaries of the country). "We have a proof, of a very broad and conclusive kind, of the divinity of that movement, in other words of the divinity of Christianity." This, of course, is equivalent to saying that the more favourable *natural* circumstances are to a given spiritual phenomenon, the more convinced we should feel that its causes are *supernatural*! We do not share Dr. Wylie's regret that this argument is so seldom urged. It would be easy by means of it to prove the "divinity" of almost every successful spiritual movement—Mahomedanism and Mormonism included. Dr. Wylie is very enthusiastic about the restoration of the Jews to Palestine, and takes pains to prove the practicability of the idea. He assumes, however, that the Jews want to be "restored." Who and where are the Jews who are ready to be thus operated on? The frequency of Dr. Wylie's Bible quotations gives his book the character of what in our younger days we used to call "a Sunday book." It is nevertheless pleasantly written from the author's point of view, and gives a vivid, enough picture of Palestine as he saw it.

"Light in Lands of Darkness"<sup>15</sup> is a historical sketch of modern missionary labour in all parts of the world, old and new, by Mr. R. Young, with an introduction by Lord Shaftesbury. It tells us how the ancient religions of the Persians and Jews have been attacked, as well as the heathen darkness of the Eskimos and Patagonians. Whether Christian missionaries do more good than harm is perhaps a debatable question, notwithstanding Lord Shaftesbury's assertion that "it is difficult to discover any arguments against them." But no one can read Mr. Young's book without a feeling of admiration for the bravery and devotion of the men whose labours he has recorded.

The Statistics of Italian Emigration,<sup>16</sup> for the year 1882, have been collected and most carefully tabulated on a more complete system than heretofore. Lombardy, Liguria, and Venetia furnish by far the greatest number of emigrants, who proceed chiefly to the adjacent countries. The small province of Udine, with a population of five hundred thousand, furnished over twenty thousand emigrants in this year. Marseilles and Lyons absorb a large number of skilled workmen, while Bavaria and Hungary take field labourers. Of those who seek their fortune in America, the greater portion go to La Plata and Brazil, preferring that climate which is most like their own, while few, except organ-grinders, go to the United States. The answers

---

<sup>15</sup> "Light in Lands of Darkness." By Robert Young. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1883.

<sup>16</sup> "Statistica della Emigrazione Italiana nel 1882." Roma: Tipographia Fratelli Centenari. 1883.

to a circular sent to the Prefects, reveal a great unanimity of opinion that it is not so much abject want which forces the people to emigrate as the hope of bettering their fortunes. As to the effect of emigration on wages, all agree that there has been an increase in the amount paid for work, but owing to a corresponding rise in prices, the real wages are perhaps no higher than they were formerly.

A compact table of the causes of death<sup>17</sup> in Italy for the year 1882 reveals some curious facts. Thus, for example, death from apoplexy is most frequent amongst the priesthood, the average rising as high as 16·16 per hundred deaths. Stone-breakers and lime-burners suffer from consumption to the extent of 21·98 per cent. while printers reach the climax, dying from the same disease to the enormous amount of 42·20 per hundred. Fishermen, on the other hand, suffer little from consumption, but very much from inflammation of the lungs. Beggars are by far the most healthy of all whose callings rank as "professions" in these tables.

We have received the Report<sup>18</sup> of the Proceedings of the International Benevolent Congress, which met in Milan in September, 1880. The majority of those taking part in the proceedings were Italian, but there were also present a number of gentlemen representing charitable institutions in France, Holland, Sweden, Spain and Switzerland. They were of opinion that home medical attendance was in every way preferable to the hospital system, as it did not relieve the family of the patient from all the burden of taking care of him. For labourers out of employment "houses of work" (*case di lavoro*) were recommended, so that temporary distress might be tided over without having recourse to charity pure and simple. In the case of women it was thought that the work should be done at home. Those charities which have for their object the giving of small dowries to poor but otherwise marriageable girls were utterly condemned as doing much evil in stimulating the increase of indigent families. Crèches, where the young children of the working-classes would be taken care of during the daytime when the mothers were at work, were advocated, and ladies were earnestly begged to give their attention to this form of charity. Housing the poor, and the reclaiming of liberated prisoners also received a share of the attention of the Congress.

We have received the following Reports, &c., issued by the Ministero di Agricoltura, Industria e Commercio:—"Statistica dell'Istruzione per l'anno scolastico 1880-81. Introduzione;" (Roma Tipographia Elzeviriana, 1883); "Statistica Elettorali Politica, Elezioni Generali Politiche, 29 Ottobre e 5 Novembre, 1882." (Roma: Tipographia Elzeviriana, 1883); "Annali di Statistica. Serie 3a. Vol. IV. Saggio di Bibliographia Statistica Italiana." (Roma: Regia Tipographia D. Ripamonti, 1883); "Annali di Statistica. Atti del Consiglio Superiore

<sup>17</sup> "Statistica della cause di Morte. Morti avvenute nei comuni Capoluoghi di Provincia o di circondario. Anno 1882." Roma: Tipographia dell'Ospizio di San Michele. 1883.

<sup>18</sup> "Atti del Congresso Internazionale di Beneficenza di Milano: sessione del 1880. Milano: Tip. degli operai-soc. co-operativa, 1882.

di Statistica. Serie 3a. Vol. VII." (Roma: Tipographia Eredi Botta, 1883); "Indice Analitico delle Materie contenute negli Annali di Statistica pubblicati nel decennio 1871-81. Serie 1a. e 2a." (Roma: Tipographia Eredi Botta, 1883); "Statistica Guidizzaria degli Affari Penali per l'anno 1880. Confrontata con quelle degli Anni precedenti (Introduzione)" (Roma: Tipographia di Enrico Sinimberghi, 1883). We have also received a pamphlet entitled "The Marriage Laws Considered with the View of Diminishing Prostitution and Infanticide." (Birmingham: Wm. Downing); "Proceedings of the Royal Colonial Institute. Vol. XIV. 1882-3" (London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle, and Rivington, 1883); and "The Colony of Tasmania. Recent Statistics with Map and Appendix. Also Letters from Settlers, containing useful Information for intending Emigrants." By G. Dugald Buckler. (London: 1883).

The Report of the Minister of Education (Ontario)<sup>19</sup> for the year 1882, contains a very interesting special report upon the Kindergarten system and its establishment and working in St. Louis, U.S. In 1873 the committee on teachers in St. Louis recommended, "that one of the schoolrooms be set apart for one year, for the purpose of ascertaining by a faithful experiment what valuable features the Kindergarten may have that can be utilized in our primary schools." Nine years later there were no less than 237 ladies engaged in the public Kindergartens of St. Louis.

In his new volume of comparative statistics of the town of Budapest,<sup>20</sup> Herr Joseph Korösi groups his figures in almost every conceivable combination. Amongst other inquiries he examines the connection between trade and religion, trade and sex, trade and nationality; the relative chances of achieving independence in different occupations, &c. &c.

---

## SCIENCE.

**B** RITISH GUIANA<sup>1</sup> and its Indians, notwithstanding all that has been written about them, offer in many ways a field of varied interest to the traveller. New facts abundantly reward the observer gifted with the power to see, and blest with the leisure of record. For the thoroughness with which his work is done and vividness with which the story is written, high merit must be awarded to Mr. im Thurn's book on Guiana, and the reader will rise from it with a clear conception alike of country, plants, animals and Indians. The first three chapters are a narrative of travel and description of scenery. The author

---

<sup>19</sup> "Report of the Minister of Education (Ontario) for the year 1882, with the statistics of the year 1881." Toronto: C. Blackett Robinson. 1883.

<sup>20</sup> "Die Hauptstadt Budapest im Jahre 1881: Resultati der Volksheschreibung und Volkszählung vom 1 Januar, 1881." Von Joseph Korösi, &c. &c.

<sup>1</sup> "Among the Indians of Guiana, being Sketches chiefly Anthropologic from the Interior of British Guiana." By Everard F. im Thurn, M.A. With 53 illustrations and a Map. London: Kegan Paul & Co. 1883.

ascended the Essequibo to Bartika Grove by steamer, and thence travelled along the stream with Indians, and the story records incidents of hunting, sickness, burning wood, Indian customs, wild cattle, and the characteristic plants. Then the aspects of plant life claim attention; and the writer observes that the forests are mainly composed of trees and shrubs of similar growth and foliage to our own Spanish chestnut, oaks, acacias and laurels, only for the most part on a larger scale, and mixed with many novel forms. At no time is the foliage equal to that of an English wood in spring or autumn, though the colour throughout the year is more varied than in England, except at those seasons. The author records many brilliant coloured masses of blossom in the forests of Guiana. The picture of animal life is not less vivid than the description of the plants. At the sixth chapter begins an account of the Indian tribes, the chief of which are described as to physical characters and habits. Then succeeds an account of their family systems and systems of marriage, especially among the Arawaks, where descent is preserved in the female line; and where an Indian lives in the house of his wife's father-in-law and works for him, becoming a part of his family. The eighth chapter describes the appearance and dress of the Indian and is aided by plates and woodcuts. The Indians never become bald, and their hair only occasionally turns light yellow. Their skins are fine and smooth, consequent on a habit of bathing immediately after every meal, though the whole tribe of Warraus never wash. The female Caribs, when children, have a belt of cotton two inches broad knitted round each ankle, and this is never removed, so that the muscles of the calf attain an abnormal development. Among women the lips become protected by a dangerous-looking row of spikes inserted in holes in the lower lip, though the author is unable to explain the object of this, kissing being unknown among Indians. Painting the body is in general use, the paints being mixed with oils and scented with resins, and put on so as to convey the idea of clothing, and even present the impression of a neat appearance such as we associate with a well-bred civilized gentleman. Among the houses are pile dwellings, in the swamps inhabited by the Warraus, though in forest regions the tribes build houses without walls, while in the cold plains thick clay walls are built as a protection against mountain winds. The social life of the Indians makes us acquainted with details of daily life and many exceptional circumstances, such as the habit of a father taking to his hammock on the birth of a child and remaining there, nursed by the women, and fed on water-gruel for some days. The Indian generally dies of dysentery or consumption brought on by constant exposure. In burial the body is sometimes placed in a sitting position, sometimes in a standing position; fire is made over the grave, the good qualities of the deceased are celebrated with song, dance and drink, and his house is then deserted. Chapters are devoted to hunting and fishing; the form of arrow varies with the kind of game. But few peoples devote more attention to agriculture, for though the cassava is the chief article of food, bananas, pumpkins, yams, water-melons, sweet potatoes, sugar-cane, tobacco and capsicums are planted wherever

there is space. Women do the chief work of cultivation, and cooking. Birds' eggs are rarely eaten, though the eggs of turtles and iguanas are highly valued; and the Caribs are said to eat the eggs of the alligator. Interesting chapters describe the manufacture of pottery, basket work, cotton, hammocks, boats, war-clubs, musical instruments, &c., festivals and feasts, athletic sports, the Kenaima, or evil influence, and the peuman or medicine man. The religion, folk-lore, antiquities and engraved rocks, are all excellently discussed, in language that is always bright. A series of subject indexes facilitates references to anthropology, fauna, flora and the general subject.

The position of a Scotch minister among the Gaelic speaking people of the west coast is eminently favourable for the cultivation of natural history and antiquarian tastes; and thus it happened that the Rev. Alexander Stewart,<sup>2</sup> of Ballachulish, became the centre of inquiries concerning fishes, birds, and beasts, and the recipient of local traditions, legends, and Gaelic poems. This varied knowledge he contributed in a series of papers to the *Inverness Courier*, between 1868 and 1878; and they are now reprinted to the number of sixty-three, under the title "Nether Lochaber." It is almost needless to remark that the materials of the papers are mixed in subject. They succeed each other in the order in which written, and without plan in the arrangement of the matter; conditions which we presume are supposed by the writer to render a table of contents and index unnecessary. The book, however, reflects many aspects of Nature as they are met with on the west coast of Scotland, and while this characteristic local colour will make the volume welcome north of the Tweed, there is a charm in its well-informed gossip that will be grateful to Englishmen who know the district, or who have yet to make acquaintance with its attractions.

In the Elizabethan period literature became coloured by all the wonderful discoveries which travellers and adventurers had made known. But in nothing was this influence more constantly manifested than in natural history. The quaint learning shines in many an old voyage, and its reflection enriches the poetry of the time. So that although there have been several books dealing with the birds, insects, and other natural history matter referred to in Shakspeare, it was an excellent idea to bring together in one volume the animal lore of Shakspeare's time;<sup>4</sup> which besides quoting the references found in the writings of the dramatists, should bring before us the materials from which the old writers gathered ideas. Miss Phipson's work is done excellently, and is a valuable contribution to literature; not that it aspires to any merit beyond bringing together in a systematic way the materials which are here well marshalled. The book begins with an ample list of authors and editions quoted. Next succeeds a short

<sup>2</sup> "Nether Lochaber; the Natural History, Legends, and Folk-Lore of the West Highlands." By the Rev. Alexander Stewart, F.S.A. Scot., Minister of the parish of Ballachulish and Ardgour. Edinburgh: William Paterson. 1883.

<sup>3</sup> "The Animal-Lore of Shakspeare's Time, including Quadrupeds, Birds, Reptiles, Fish and Insects." By Emma Phipson. London: Kegan Paul & Co. 1883.

introduction which indicates how knowledge was obtained from menageries, and how ideas of animals were often coloured by biblical references to them; while hunting, hawking, and field sports systematized observation, and gave an exactness to language which, at the present day, is scarcely so well observed as in the olden time. The bulk of the book which follows is divided into nineteen chapters, arranged according to modern natural history grouping, commencing with the highest mammals, and noticing in succession birds, reptiles, fishes, insects, and lower forms of life. As might be expected, all the quaint metaphysical conceptions which endowed animals with the qualities of men are here set forth, side by side with historical incidents, and superstition. Here, then, may the reader come and revel; whether it be of lions, cats, or dogs, fox, or bear, walrus, or whale, horse, boar, deer, or camel, singing birds, or birds of sport, ample entertainment awaits him. And after the writer has disposed of the lowlier types of life, we are introduced to creations of the Middle Ages, where imagination has elaborated animals out of insufficient materials. The unicorn is always a welcome supporter, but though many curious stories are narrated of unicorns, their habits and modes of fighting, we do not find it recorded that the animal is only a landsman's effort to draw that form of sea-horse of which the northern fishermen spoke, and produced the horn. Dragon, basilisk, griffin, sphinx, harpy, chimera, phoenix, and such like curiosities are treated with the respect due to their remarkable habits or heraldic history. But this portion of the book is of the nature of a supplement, and more brief than necessary; for there are many animals of which we find no record, and the history of which we vain would learn. But although we miss an account of Siegfried's wonderful dragon, which as exhibited on the German stage pours forth the breath from nostrils in his lower jaw, the mythical and immortal animals described are marvellous enough. The frontispiece to the volume represents the mantichora.

Mr. Grant Allen is gifted with so excellent a literary faculty that we cannot but desire its perfect development and devotion to the best work. His later writings, however, hardly realize the promise of earlier work, and he prefers to write for the reading many rather than the learning few. The present volume essentially suggests the literary man whose interest in science is nourished from well-known popular sources, and who finds evolution an inexhaustible aid in spinning the thread of common botanical facts into a literary fabric. "Flowers and their Pedigrees"<sup>4</sup> is an unfortunate title, for it raises hopes which the author is not prepared to satisfy. And the statement in the preface that the book is offered as a first instalment to a functional companion to the "British Flora," would suggest an original contribution to botany. But in no case do we learn anything beyond such matters as the student becomes familiar with early in his work; far

---

<sup>4</sup> "Flowers and their Pedigrees." By Grant Allen. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1883.



less is the story told of the steps which are known in the evolution of the flowers referred to, or of the ways in which the functions of organs have elaborated the structures described. In truth it soon becomes manifest that the book is not written for scientific readers, but only intended for those whose interest in science will lead them no further than its borders; and to such, perhaps, the eight magazine articles here reprinted may be acceptable in their present elegant form. The chapters are termed, "The Daisy's Pedigree," "The Romance of a Wayside Weed," which describes the distribution of the wood spurge, "Strawberries," "Cleavers," "The Origin of Wheat," "A Mountain Tulip," which deals with the distribution of the *Lloydia serotina*. The seventh section, termed "A Family History," discusses the allies of our common English fruits; while the last article is on the Cuckoo pint or *Arum maculatum*. We cannot but remark that the form in which evolution is here presented makes a demand on faith which is not calculated to develop the spirit of investigation, and might, if it were to become general, lead to a species of intellectual serfdom more degrading than the old theological conceptions from which evolution has set us free.

"A Season among the Wild Flowers," is an elegantly printed little volume of popular papers, dealing with the elements of botany. The volume is professedly designed to help readers to recognize and take interest in the more familiar plants, as they are in flower from month to month. The papers commence with some account of catkin-bearing trees, and go through a considerable number of natural orders, illustrating points of structure from time to time with useful woodcuts. The book concludes, as it opens, with a short poem. There is an index of natural orders, of genera, and of English names of plants. As a table-book it strikes us as being more technical than a book should be which appears with gilt edging and an attractive cover, and we are inclined to think that a systematic treatise would help the student better. The volume, however, as far as it goes, is seriously written, and exhibits a large amount of information in clear language.

Hospitalier's "Modern Applications of Electricity,"<sup>5</sup> translated and enlarged by Dr. Maier, is an excellently printed work, not altogether novel in its matter, but containing a large amount of information not generally available, and many illustrations reproduced from *La Lumière Electrique*. The first volume is divided into two parts. Part I. covers 170 pages, and under the heading, Sources of Electricity, includes four chapters on electric batteries, thermo-electric batteries, electric generators, and apparatus for transforming electricity. The second part, also divided into four chapters, treats of electric lighting under the usual headings of arc lamps, electric candles, lighting by incandescence, and applications of electric lighting. The

<sup>5</sup> "A Season among the Wild Flowers." By the Rev. Henry Wood. With Illustrations and Index. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1883.

<sup>6</sup> "The Modern Applications of Electricity." By G. Hospitalier. Translated and Enlarged by Julius Maier, Ph.D., Science Master, Cheltenham College. Second Edition, revised, with many additions. In two volumes. With numerous illustrations. London: Kegan Paul & Co. 1883.

volume concludes with an index and an index of inventors' names, which indicates the nature of their discoveries. The second volume is divided into three parts. Part I. treats of microphones, telephones, and their applications; Part II. devotes chapters to methanometers or apparatus for detecting explosive gas in coal mines, fire alarms, electric water-gauges, the electric log, and other apparatus used in navigation, electro-meteorological instruments, electric sorting, electro-metallurgy, applications of electrolysis, electro-medical appliances, electric etching on glass, and various other matters. Part III. deals with electric motors, and the transmission and the distribution of electric energy, but this portion is more briefly treated, comprising only some sixty pages. This volume also concludes with an index of inventors' names. The work possesses the merit of being thoroughly readable, and is to be commended as an excellent treatise for the general reader. The translator and editor has done his work carefully, though occasionally the descriptions of apparatus are almost too brief to have the clearness which is necessary in a work of this kind.

The Count du Moncel's "Electricity as a Motive Power," necessarily covers to some extent part of the field occupied by Hospitalier's "Applications of Electricity," but the treatment adopted by the two authors is somewhat dissimilar. Du Moncel's work opens with an introductory chapter, setting forth the principles on which electro-motors are constructed, and illustrating the different kinds of magnets in use, and setting out the laws which govern the force thus generated. The book is divided into two parts, termed the first phase and the second phase of electro-motors. The first part commences with a short historical summary, and then describes the historical motors which were produced for the most part in the first half of the present century. The third chapter discusses the principles of the earlier inventions, which are classed as, first, electro-motors founded on the dynamic properties of currents; second, electro-motors founded on the attraction of iron to electro-magnets, and on properties of electro-magnets; third, electro-motors, in which the attraction of gravity is used as a source of power; and, fourth, electro-chemical motors. All the more important forms of apparatus which admit of being thus classed are so far described as to make their distinctive principles clear. The fourth chapter describes many appliances of electro-motors, such as the Edison pen, Lacour's electro-magnetic syren, and the electro-magnetic gyroscope. The last chapter of the first part describes electro-chemical engines. The second part begins by describing reversible magneto-electric machines, of which the chief types are those of Gramme and Siemens. Then follow remarks on the principles of the modern motors, especially with regard to the theory of the action of the electric current. A chapter succeeds on small modern

---

<sup>7</sup> "Electricity as a Motive Power." By Count du Moncel, Membre de l'Institut de France, and Frank Gerald, ingénieur des ponts et chaussées. Translated and edited, with additions, by C. J. Wharton, Assoc. Soc. of Tel. Eng. and Elec. With 113 engravings and diagrams. London: E. & F. N. Spon. 1883.

motors, most of which are illustrated and described, and the following chapter is devoted to applications of small motors, among which are electric boats, pianos worked by Faure accumulators, apparatus for raising water for irrigation, postal railway, &c. Then succeeds an account of the earlier applications of electricity to producing motion at a distance, such as ploughing. The next chapter treats of the application of electricity for locomotion of carriages and for working electric cranes. An account of certain forms of electric apparatus exhibited at the Paris exhibition in 1881, is given with some recent applications of apparatus and experiments in locomotion. The concluding chapters are devoted to the distribution of electricity. Finally there are Notes, which give Du Moncel's views on the electric return, and some other matters referred to in the text. The translator has hardly edited the book so as to present it in the most attractive form, and though the translation appears to be carefully made, the language is sometimes a little wanting in smoothness.

The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge has a small volume of 120 pages, entitled "Optics without Mathematics"<sup>8</sup> which so far fulfils the promise of its title as scarcely to make reference to numbers throughout the little primer. Presumably it is intended for very young children, since the language is more familiar than usual, and the method hardly in accordance with systematic exposition. Still the most elementary facts of optics are intelligibly stated and the beginner may gather some ideas of reflection, refraction, the nature of lenses, the photographic camera, microscope, magic lantern, telescope, the eye, the solar spectrum, rainbow, spectroscope, the polariscope, and double refraction. The treatment is necessarily very brief, and were it not for the demand which no doubt exists for handbooks of this kind, we should have been disposed to doubt the utility of such descriptions without far larger series of diagrams than are introduced.

Mr. Hamblin Smith's experience and success in teaching has naturally led to the publication of textbooks adapted to the wants of Cambridge examinations. His introduction to the study of heat<sup>9</sup> is now in the eighth edition, and is as useful a work of its kind as could be put before the beginner. There is no attempt to popularize in the ordinary sense of the term, but a successful simplification by clear exposition and well-considered selection of the information. Heat lends itself to numerical illustrations, and hence, problems are given calculated to develop the student's knowledge of his subject. An appendix contains some additional matter which is required from candidates for certain other public examinations.

The Annual Report for 1881 on the Meteorology of India<sup>10</sup> follows the

<sup>8</sup> "Optics without Mathematics." By the Rev. Thomas William Webb, M.A., F.R.A.S., Prebendary of Hereford Cathedral. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

<sup>9</sup> "An Introduction to the Study of Heat." By J. Hamblin Smith, M.A., of Gonville and Caius College. Eighth edition, London: Rivingtons, 1883.

<sup>10</sup> "Report on the Meteorology of India for 1881." By Henry F. Blanford, F.R.S., Meteorological Reporter to the Government of India. Seventh Year.

same plan as in previous years. From an interesting series of observations on the temperature of the ground we find that with the air at  $77^{\circ}$  the surface of the ground has a temperature of  $79^{\circ}$  to  $80^{\circ}$ , while at a depth of three feet the temperature is upwards of  $81^{\circ}$ —though there is a slight variation at that depth with the season. The atmospheric temperature was above the average in the Punjab, the Indus region, the Konkan, the Andaman Islands and Nicobar, and below the average on the table land of Central India and Rajputana, in the Central Provinces, Lower Bengal and the Burmese Peninsula, but Mr. Blanford remarks that in Northern and Central India, February, May and December were warmer than usual, while March and November were colder. The atmospheric pressure as usual was least in the S.E. in the Bay of Bengal, so that the gradient to the Andaman Islands was steeper than usual. Both cloud and rain were strikingly absent in Northern India in January and February, and but little snow fell in the mountain region, though in the beginning of March five feet of snow fell at Murree, and in this month the rainfall was above the average in Northern India, though in September, October, November and December the rainfall of this region was small. The report is prepared with the same elaborate care as in former years; and we now look forward to the near approach of a time when these valuable records may be discussed and generalized into a history of the climate of India.

Of late years there has come into existence a new kind of elementary books on science which we may class under the generic name of South Kensington literature. These works are sometimes skilfully written, but they always have an aim which points to South Kensington as the centre of the writers' universe. The book is, of course, to prepare men, women, or children for examination, not so much that they may master any branch of science, as that students may obtain a South Kensington qualification for teaching it, and still more that they may earn money by passing the examination so as to remunerate the teacher who gives them instruction, which is often almost gratuitous. We have lately been impressed by finding that some of the large institutions in London which are engaged in the great work of evening instruction of adults, make compulsory attendance on these examinations determine the fee which the student pays, so that we have reason to believe a large sum of money is spent in this way by the State in subsidizing a low class of instruction which might be better employed in founding professorships for the advancement of education where no fees are paid, as in some of the great continental universities. The knowledge of fact which this system cultivates is not likely to improve the mental condition of students, so much

---

Calcutta: Superintendent of Government Printing. London: Trübner & Co. 1883. "Meteorological Observations recorded at six stations in India in the year 1882." Corrected and reduced. Published by order of the Viceroy and Governor-General of India, under the direction of Henry F. Blanford, F.R.S., Meteorological Reporter to the Government of India. Calcutta: Printed by the Superintendent of Government Printing, India. 1883.

as the enthusiasm for certain aspects of truth which such facts represent which professional teaching endeavours to impart. And therefore we look with no great favour on additions to elementary textbooks, such as this practical chemistry by Mr. Spencer.<sup>11</sup> Yet for the purposes of elementary schools, where it is impossible to aim at high results, such a book will be found useful on account of its practical character. After the few introductory pages which deal with the general properties of the elements, the chapters are divided into a series of experiments, which are briefly and clearly described, so that the student is rendered almost independent of teaching. Hydrogen, oxygen, chlorine, hydrochloric acid, carbon, nitrogen, combinations of nitrogen and oxygen, and sulphur, are described by means of some two hundred experiments. The twelfth chapter, perhaps somewhat too briefly, treats of acids, bases, and salts. Then succeed chapters on chemical calculations, with questions to be worked out in connection with the foregoing experiments. The fifteenth chapter exemplifies the conversion of volume into weight and weight into volume, and is similarly followed by examples which refer to the elements which have been discussed. The seventeenth chapter is to calculate the percentage composition of a compound from its formula, and this follows the same plan of questions which concern the several elements. The next chapter is to obtain the formula of a compound from its percentage composition. The two following chapters are devoted to combinations of gases and qualitative testing for silver, lead, mercury, copper, iron, and calcium. A supplement gives examples of the notes to be made when making experiments. Answers are given to the questions set in connection with the several chapters. The latter part of the book consists of examination questions for the last eight years, set by the Science and Art Department, with various papers from the College of Preceptors, London University, and Cambridge local examinations. Finally, there are instructions to science teachers in chemistry preparing pupils for the elementary stage at South Kensington.

"The Organs of Speech,"<sup>12</sup> by Professor G. H. von Meyer, of Zurich, forms a new volume in the International Scientific Series, and is devoted to the structure and functions of the organs of speech, with special reference to the wants of the philologist. Hence, though a large part of the book is occupied with the discussion of anatomical and physiological questions, the treatment is somewhat different and

---

<sup>11</sup> "Elementary Practical Chemistry and Laboratory Practice. Part I. Adapted to the First Stage of the Revised Syllabus (1882) of Inorganic Chemistry, Theoretical and Practical, of the Science and Art Departments." By J. Spencer, B.Sc. With more than 200 Experiments, 300 Exercises in Chemical Calculations (with Answer) and 250 Examination Questions set at Science Examinations, the London University Matriculations, the Cambridge Local, and the College of Preceptors' Examinations. London: Joseph Boulton & Co.

<sup>12</sup> "The Organs of Speech and their Application in the Formation of Articulate Sounds." By George Hemann von Meyer, Professor in ordinary of Anatomy at the University of Zürich. With forty-seven wood-cuts. London: Kegan Paul & Co. 1883.

on the whole more elaborate than in books especially devoted to anatomy or physiology. Every organ and structure which ministers to the production of vocal sounds is clearly discussed, and sometimes other facial organs which seem to us to have but little if any influence on the ordinary voice. A second chapter discusses the relations between the organs of speech and the formation of sound so as to elucidate the work done by each portion of the respiratory and vocal apparatus. The third and last chapter considers the formation of articulate sounds. The position of the mouth in the utterance of vowels is illustrated by diagrams, and the consonants receive that elaborate treatment which the circumstances of some Continental languages render necessary. The book is the most complete treatise of its kind which we have seen. It is clearly arranged and well written, free from needless technicalities, and only seems deficient in omitting to discuss the physiological influence of climate in relation to the vocal function.

---

### HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

THE universally felt necessity of some reform in the present methods of land tenure, is directing the attention of scholars and students to the origins of the different systems now in vogue, as it does that of economists and politicians to the future. Mr. Ross<sup>1</sup> carries his researches to a point behind that of Mr. Seeböhm's recent book, and discusses the state of our ancestors before they left their continental home and settled in this island. He has not, however, confined his studies to this early period, as several of his remarks apply to the Middle Ages. His method deserves great praise. Not only are copious extracts from the records on which he bases his treatise printed in an appendix, but the author gives in addition a very serviceable, though not, of course, a complete, list of works on the subject. The early life of the Germans was rather pastoral than agricultural, the change to the latter state being effected by means of slaves and dependent freemen, not much better than serfs, who, though politically free, were bound in servitude to their lords as debtors for the land they held, and the stock with which they worked it. Distribution by lot and intermixed holdings were usual, as we know them to have been at a later time in England. In the time of Cæsar and Tacitus, when so little of the primæval forest was reclaimed, the lands of the free lords had no definite boundaries, and were extended as the number of cultivators under them increased. Some writers have affirmed that the land was then held collectively, but Mr. Ross inclines to the view that it was undivided property, not common property. As far as we can make out, this means that unreclaimed land was the property of the tribe in general, but when a settlement was effected, and

---

<sup>1</sup> "The Early History of Landholding among the Germans." By Denman W. Ross, Ph.D. London: Trubner & Co. 1883.

the forest cleared, it was allotted either permanently or in rotation. In the same way, several co-heirs might hold their inheritance in common, but on the demand of any of the number his share was divided off and assigned to him. Communistic holding of land—that is, a landowning corporation, instead of a voluntary association of landholders—did not come into existence, according to Mr. Ross, before the twelfth century, and was due to the usurpation of the rights of individual shareholders. “It is generally true, that wherever the control of undivided property is vested in a majority of the shareholders, rather than in the majority of shares as represented by their owners, the property becomes, sooner or later, the property of the community or corporation. The majority vote may be described as the root of communism. Most of the communism which the world has seen has been an outgrowth from it.” What evidences of communistic enjoyment of forest land are to be found, refer to communistic tenancy under a landlord, not communistic ownership, with which they have sometimes been confounded. Generally, the records collected by Mr. Ross show that individual property preceded communism, that “the German clan was based upon kinship, upon the principle of individual property and upon the principle of inheritance,” till it was broken up by various causes, and gave place to what is known as the feudal system.

The distinguishing mark of the last new life of Christ is the thorough acquaintance possessed by the author with Jewish literature and customs. In this point Mr. Edersheim's book<sup>2</sup> far excels all previous works on the same subject, at least those in English, and this is its chief value, for the author's load of learning has to a certain extent deadened his power of historical insight. He assumes the records of the Evangelists to be true and inspired, and is satisfied with illustrating them fully from other sources, hardly attempting to produce a really critical biography. This, in fact, would be hardly possible to a mind which can “feel that the scantiness of particulars here supplied by the Gospels was intended to prevent the human interest from overshadowing the grand central Fact, to which alone attention was to be directed.” “That silence is itself theopneustic, of Divine breathing and inspiration; it is more eloquent than any eloquence, a guarantee of the truthfulness of what is said.” And again: “It is not only profane but unhistorical to look for calculation and policy in the life of Jesus. Had there been such He would not have died on the Cross.” A preaching tone is kept up throughout, that the Gospels were written for our spiritual edification, not for information, and that the narrative often symbolizes Christ's present work. In the account, for instance, of the walking on the sea. “He would have passed them by, as He so often does in our case,” until “His ready sympathy and comfort, in language which has so often, and in all ages, converted foolish fears of misapprehension into glad, thankful assurance, ‘It is I, be not

---

<sup>2</sup> “The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah.” By Alfred Edersheim, M.A., Warburtonian Lecturer at Lincoln's Inn. Two vols. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1883.

afraid.' " There are people, of course, to whom writing of this kind is comforting, but on them probably the stores of learning will be thrown away. One incident only in the narrative is rejected by Mr. Eidersheim on critical grounds. The scene of the woman taken in adultery is, in his view, contrary to Jewish law and Jewish decency; the punishment for adultery was not stoning, but strangulation; and " that such a scene should have been enacted in the Temple presents a very climax of impossibilities." The explanation of historical difficulties has varying success. He fails to clear up the apparent confusion of St. Luke about the date of Cyrenius's census, remarking that " any historical mistake by St. Luke on this point is extremely difficult to believe." On the other hand, the inconsistency in the Synoptists and the Fourth Gospel as to the use of the word " Passover" in the accounts of the trial and crucifixion, is satisfactorily explained. According to the Fourth Gospel, Christ's accusers would not enter the Judgment Hall lest they should be defiled and be unable to eat the Passover, which, according to the Synoptists, had been eaten by Christ and His disciples the previous night. Dr. Eidersheim shows that as the Paschal Supper was not eaten till after sunset, uncleanness during the day would not have been a disqualification for that ceremony, but that it would be for participation in the sacrifice and feast on the first Paschal day, to which the name Passover was equally applied. The Fourth Gospel is thus defended from a charge of inaccuracy in the knowledge displayed of Jewish customs, for one of Mr. Eidersheim's objects is to disprove the theory of its late Ephesian authorship. His view is supported by numerous arguments, small in themselves, but of some weight when combined, of which one of the most acute is the mention of the Judean institution " friends of the bridegroom," by John, as opposed to the " children of the bride chamber," the Galilean phrase, which Mark puts in Christ's mouth. The author's acquaintance with Jewish manners and customs is very extensive. The picture of the state of society in Jerusalem is most minute and lifelike. Every article of dress, every kind of food, is described at length. The order of the sacrifices, the wearisome observances grafted on to the Mosaic Law by ingenious sophistry, which interfered with every detail of life; the barren discussions of the different schools of Rabbis; in fact, the whole setting of the story is presented with the greatest accuracy and care, and will always be of value even to those who disagree the most completely with the author's views as to the historical aspect of the story itself.

Mr. Gerald Massey<sup>3</sup> is a type of a very different class of opinions concerning Christ. He considers Him as purely mythical, and identifies Him with Horus and other sun gods. " The Christ is a popular lay figure that never lived, and a lay figure of Pagan origin; a lay figure that was once the Ram, and afterwards the Fish; a lay figure that in human form was the portrait and image of a dozen different gods."

<sup>3</sup> "The Natural Genesis." By Gerald Massey. Two vols. London: Williams & Norgate. 1883.



His view of mythology is that Inner Africa was the birthplace of humanity, and that "Egypt was the mouthpiece of the first articulate language, the oldest intelligible witness to the natural genesis of ideas, and the sole adequate interpreter of the primary types of thought;" that "the laws, literature, and mythology of the Egyptians are a complete Kamite fossil formation deposited by the life of the past." "Kamite" means Hamite, doubtless. There is great virtue in a K, especially when it stands at the head of words like "Kronotype" and "Keres" where it has no business. The line of argument is chiefly philological, not such philology as will commend itself to ordinary scholars who know nothing of such languages as Soso, Boko, and Tawghi, and if they find it impossible to accept Mr. Massey's *dicta* in their own province, how can they trust his guidance in a strange country? Here is a sample:—

"Now the ancient British name for Nottingham was *Tyogofury*, the House of the Cave-dwellers, or the men who made holes in the ground. The earlier name of Nottingham is Snotingaham; and *snot* or *sunt* in Egyptian means to found or establish by opening the ground, which perfectly describes the beginnings of the *troglolytes*. Also the *snood* (caul) for the hair of the woman was a sign of this foundation by opening at the time of puberty."

As to *Nottingham*, it is hardly necessary to point out that when there are many words or names of exactly similar formation, no explanation can be satisfactory which will not apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to all. Then the word *snood* is not by any means a *caul*. It is simply a piece of string. Its common use by rope-makers and fishermen is a proof that the word cannot have been first used as an article of feminine attire, or had the meaning which Mr. Massey suggests. Again, it was not *muscles* but *sineus* of which Hermes made his lute strings. So much for the accuracy of Mr. Massey's knowledge of his own language. Now for a specimen of Latin etymology: "The Latin *ex* for *out of* or *from*; and *iste* for *this* or *that*, whence *Existence*, as that which is out of, is expressed by *Enti* or *Nuti* (Eg.) for *Ex-istence*." *Ex pede Herculem*.

The treatment of mythological history is equally dogmatic and unsatisfactory. When it is boldly stated that "the old Sut, Sevekh, Satan, or Satur, the Beast of the Number 666 (Stur)" was canonized by the Romish Church under the name of St. Satur, surely some reference is due to the fact that St. Satur holds his place in the Calendar as a distinct historical personage—Master of the household to Huneric, King of the Vandals.

It is on a foundation of this kind that Mr. Massey builds his edifice. It is by such reasoning that he supports his theory that all mythological and religious doctrines are primarily derived from the earliest perception and recognition of physiological truths: to use his own words, "that the profoundest mysteries were biological, and most sacred because sexual."

The title of Mr. Lillie's new book on Buddhism<sup>4</sup> is a little mislead-

<sup>4</sup> "The Popular Life of Buddha." By Arthur Lillie. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1883.

ing. His object is not so much to give English readers a biography of Sakya Muni, to separate the historical from the legendary, as to answer Dr. Rhys David's allegations that the doctrines he taught were Atheism and the denial of a future existence. Mr. Lillie shows that Buddha's object was, as Christ's was afterwards, to teach a belief in a spiritual God, and a future state of existence depending on the spiritual state of the soul in this life, and to destroy priestcraft. Instead of his disciples denying a God, they honoured him solely because they believed that God spoke through him. Dr. David, he alleges, has confused original Buddhism with the doctrines of the corrupt school, first officially recognized by King Kaniska about 10 A.D., known as the Buddhism of the "Great Vehicle" by its disciples, and by the adherents of the earlier school as the "Vehicle that drives to the Great Nowhere." Like Christianity when it became powerful, it lost its purity and became a religion of processions and pilgrimages. The changes introduced are shown by the interpolations made by the followers of Buddha Ghosa in the rule of observances. The old rule was "Robes made of pieces of rag are a requisite for a priest," to which has been added, "The following exceptions are allowed, robes made of linen, of cotton, of silk, of wool, of hemp, or of these five materials together." "Lodging at the foot of a tree is a requisite for a priest; so lodged it is good for you to strive as long as life shall last." The commentary is: "The following exceptions are allowed: monasteries, large halls, houses of more than one storey, houses surrounded by walls, rock caves." Some of the parables and stories of Sakya Muni are very beautiful, but too long to quote. Here are a few of the maxims: "Religion is nothing but the faculty of love." "There is no satisfying of lusts with a shower of gold pieces." "Few are there amongst men who arrive at the other shore. Many run up and down the shore." "He who has women for slaves, himself is not free." "That which can cause hate to cease in the world is not hate, but the absence of hate."

Out of consideration for the feelings of those people who are afraid of a big book, Mr. McCarthy has produced an abridged edition of his "History of Our Own Times"<sup>5</sup> in one small volume of about 400 pages. As the large work was never dull, cutting it down cannot have been an easy matter. That there are no traces of the process is a sign that it has been done satisfactorily.

Dr. Duke's<sup>6</sup> recollections of the Campaign under Sir Frederick Roberts, which followed the murder of Sir Louis Cavagnari and his companions at Cabul, and finished with the battle of Candahar, are pleasantly and clearly told, without much attempt at fine writing. The general accuracy and trustworthiness are vouched for by a letter from Sir F. Roberts. Rough sketches of the fortifications at Sherpur, and of the scene of some of the engagements, materially assist the reader in under-

---

<sup>5</sup> "A Short History of Our Own Times." By Justin McCarthy, M.P. London: Chatto & Windus. 1882.

<sup>6</sup> "Recollections of the Cabul Campaign, 1879 & 1880." By Joshua Duke; Bengal Medical Service. London: Allen & Co. 1883.

standing the narrative. The author's position as a non-combatant gave him a good opportunity of seeing the progress of a battle, at least until his services and those of his staff were called into requisition. This is his account of the commencement of the action at Takt-i-Shah, a peak of 2,000 feet, which was captured by the 92nd Highlanders and the Guides:—

“The first hill to be stormed, though not more than 200 feet, was exceedingly steep and trying to climb, especially to men carrying 60 rounds or more. The 92nd rapidly began their task. Standing behind the mountain guns, I eagerly watched the hills with my glasses. To the extreme right of the Highlanders an officer with five or six men had gained the summit. Without waiting for breathing time, he and his men ran eagerly along the crest of the hill in the direction of the Takt-i-Shah, and in the skyline I can recall him now, as I saw him then, his drawn sword waving from side to side and keeping time with the swing of his kilt. Two Gordons are on his right and two more on his left, and they advance in open order, each man firmly grasping his rifle which is held ready for the foe. Looking ahead of them a red standard, accompanied, as far as can be seen, by a number of Afghans who are urged on by an old man mounted on a pony, is rapidly coming against them, and the object the Highlanders are after is now clear. The old man boldly urges on his followers, and only fifty yards now intervene when the men with the standard open out and take cover behind the rocks. The Highland officer runs steadily towards them, just a little ahead of his men, and he is evidently determined to capture the standard. Only thirty yards now intervene when, from behind a rock, I can see an Afghan slowly rise on his knee and take deliberate aim with his rifle. The officer appears only to look at the standard, and inwardly I feel inclined to shout to him; a puff of smoke issues from the rock, and he is suddenly struck down. He falls backward, his sword still grasped in his hand, and he makes an effort to rise on his elbow. Poor fellow, a ball has passed through his body above the kilt. My glasses drop, for the Afghans are rushing on him; but another officer, who continues looking on, afterwards told me that an Highlander stood over his fallen body and bravely defended it, shooting one and endeavouring to bayonet another. The Afghan thus attacked seized the Highlander's rifle in his hand and for a few seconds a deadly struggle took place, during which he was cut down from behind and killed, and then the officer he had tried to save. Such was the manner in which Colour-Sergeant Drummond and Lieutenant Forbes, of the 92nd, met their death. With the naked eye the red standard and its little company could be seen advancing in the bravest manner. As the main body of the 92nd neared the summit, so heavy a fire was poured into them from their left that for a few seconds the Gordons hesitated. Lieutenant Dick-Cunyngham, commanding the leading company, now raised his sword and called upon his men to follow, who dashed over the crest, and in another moment the hill was ours, while the Afghans fled in all directions.”

A contribution to the knowledge of an older period of Indian history has been made by Mr. Keene,<sup>7</sup> who has compiled from the official “Narratives,” furnished to the Government of the North Western Provinces by the collectors and commissioners at the time of the Mutiny, an account of how some districts were successfully defended by extemporized leaders, whose ordinary professional duties

<sup>7</sup> “Fifty-Seven: Some Account of the Administration of Indian Districts during the Revolt of the Bengal Army.” By H. G. Keene, C.I.E., M.R.A.S. London: W. H. Allen & Co. 1883.

were of a purely civil character. One thing at least is clear from this record, that however it may be thought advisable to entrust judicial functions to Asiatics, the executive and administrative functions of the District officers must be reserved for Europeans, until at least the native population is gradually educated to govern itself under our rule, and to associate peace and order with our administration. Many civilians had for a time to undertake military duties. At Meerut, Mr. Wallace Dunlop organized a volunteer force, composed of civil servants and soldiers with a few faithful natives, under 150 all told, which not only kept order in the villages round and prevented crime, but for a crowning exploit, defeated the redoubtable Sah Mal, with 3,500 men. At Mainpuri, Mr. John Power, "The Indian Brummell," defended his station with the active help of a few English soldiers and the passive help of the records, which were piled up behind the parapet. Mr. Power had reason to complain of what he thought the pedantic and troublesome rules for the maintenance of records, and revenged himself by stating in his report the use to which they had been put, adding, "That a good stout *Khanajangi mist* (report of an affray case) prepared after the Court's latest rules, and thickened with false evidence, is an excellent article of defence, and has, by experiment, been found to be bullet proof." The civil officers also had considerable influence in stopping the wholesale executions in which military men and some civilians, who had never before acted in a judicial capacity, were far too prone to indulge. "They were the tribunes of the people," said one District officer, who was instrumental in saving from punishment a village which had protected Christian women, "and had to bear the opprobrium of supporting those whom they deemed innocent against their countrymen roused to madness." Two points are insisted upon by Mr. Keene in his preface, one is the danger of keeping any class of the population in ignorance, for the outbreak would never have occurred if the Sepoys had been better educated; and the other is that, "if India is to be made prosperous, it must be by a combination of native merit, with European direction and control."

"In the Company's Service"<sup>8</sup> is a reminiscence of the same period. The scene opens with the Indian College at Addiscombe, once the residence of Lord Liverpool, and now remembered in the neighbourhood by the names of Indian generals, which are given to the roads formed on its site. The pupils to whom we are introduced at "Mother Rose's Cottage," in due time go to the East and meet again at a station, where the Sepoys mutiny and kill one of their officers, but which is saved from further horrors by the prowess of one of the chief characters. For this the author deserves sincere thanks. Nana Sahib and the Well at Cawnpore are not pleasant subjects for a story, and on opening the book we feared we should have them served up again with a new dressing. How far the story is founded on fact does not appear, or whether "Chotapoor" is a real place or not. The

<sup>8</sup> "In the Company's Service. A Reminiscence." London: Allen & Co. 1883.

author has no scruple in exposing the faults of his own countrymen. The want of sympathy for the native soldiers, and ignorance of their customs and language displayed by some of the military men whom he depicts, explain one of the causes of the outbreak.

Our present and future position in India is discussed also by Professor Seeley<sup>9</sup> in a course of lectures on our Colonies—not colonial *possessions*—for he insists over and over again that a colony must not be considered as the property of the State, as something that ought to bring in a profit, but as a part of it; that what is called the English Empire is not properly an empire at all, but a widely dispersed nation.

“As soon as distance is abolished by science, as soon as it is proved by the examples of the United States and Russia that political union over vast areas has begun to be possible, so soon Greater Britain starts up, not only a reality, but a robust reality. It will belong to the stronger class of political unions. If it will not be stronger than the United States, we may say with confidence that it will be far stronger than the great conglomeration of Slavs, Germans, Turcomans, and Armenians, of Greek Christians, Catholics, Protestants, Mussulmans, and Buddhists which we call Russia.”

As to India, the Professor justifies our position there, on the ground that our conquest of the country was not a confiscation or taking possession of the land; that we do not even exact a tribute from the people, as, for instance, the Sultan of Turkey does from Egypt, but merely a tax to meet the expenses of government and defence, as from the subjects of the Queen at home; that the people have been for many centuries accustomed to foreign rule, and ours is better than what preceded it. As to the future, mutinies and partial disaffections will always be put down, like the mutiny of 1857, by that portion of the population which remains loyal. But if the feeling of nationality ever springs up in India, “the moment a mutiny is but threatened, which shall be no mere mutiny, but the expression of a universal feeling of nationality, at that moment all hope is at an end, as all desire ought to be at an end, of preserving our empire.”

The English rule in the East is defended also by Arminius Vambery,<sup>10</sup> in a chapter at the end of his autobiography. He acknowledges the greater power of assimilating barbarous Asiatics possessed by Russia, from similarities in modes of thinking and acting, but sums up by saying that “Russia conquers in order to Russianize and to absorb all the various nationalities in the large body of the Russian people, whilst England conquers in order to civilize, to give the unhappy nations in Asia for a while an education, and to let them afterwards loose, matured in liberal institutions, able to take care of themselves.” But his politics and speculations are not the best part of his book, and quite subordinate to his travels. He must have been a wonderful linguist as a boy. Apprenticed at twelve years old to a dressmaker,

<sup>9</sup> “The Expansion of England.” Two Courses of Lectures. By J. R. Seeley, M.A. London: Macmillan & Co. 1883.

<sup>10</sup> “Arminius Vambery. His Life and Adventures.” Written by Himself. London: Fisher Unwin. 1884.

he left that occupation on his own responsibility, to become tutor to a publican's son, saved up eight florins, and with that sum went off to school at Pressburg. His holidays he spent in walking tours, though he was lame, trusting to his Latin and his politeness to get quarters at the houses of the clergy. After learning most of the European languages by the time he was twenty, he turned his attention to the East and went to Constantinople, where he achieved some success as a tutor. The way in which he made his knowledge of languages serve him was very ingenious. On the steamer going to Constantinople, cold and hungry, in a storm of rain,—

“I longingly looked at the open space close by the deck reserved for the promenading of first-class passengers, where I observed, in the darkness of the night, a man hurrying to and fro. I had at first thoughts of entering into a conversation with him, but my courage to do so failing me, I hit upon another expedient to attract his attention. I commenced declaiming, in the midst of the violent storm, one of the epic poems I knew by heart. My choice fell on Voltaire's ‘Henriade’—

‘Je chante le héros qui régna sur la France  
Et par droit de conquête et par droit de naissance.’

And having roared with a good will into the darkness of the night several verses, I had the satisfaction of seeing the much-envied, first-class passenger stop near a crowd of Turks in a listening attitude, and after a while he joined me and began a conversation with me.”

The stranger turned out to be a Belgian Secretary of Legation, who was of considerable use to the penniless young traveller. The celebrated journey to Khiva and Bokhara and Herat, was accomplished in the disguise of a Dervish. It is almost incredible that he should not have been detected, but his coolness and readiness of resource were extraordinary. One narrow escape he had. At Herat he went to see the reigning prince, Yakub Khan, whom he found in a crowded hall.

“As became my position as a Dervish, I entered with the customary salutation, and exciting no sort of comment by it, I went up straight to the prince, seating myself between him and the Vizier, after having pushed aside the latter, a stout Afghan, to make room for me. There was a general laugh at this intermezzo, but I kept my countenance and immediately raised my hand to recite the customary prayer. The prince looked at me fixedly during the prayer. I observed an expression of surprise and hesitation stealing over his face, and after I had said ‘Amen’ and the whole company, smoothing their beards, responded to it, he jumped from his chair, and pointing at me with his finger, he exclaimed, laughing, and yet half astonished, ‘I swear by God thou art an Englishman.’ A loud burst of laughter followed the original remark of the young prince; but he, in no wise disconcerted, approached; stood up in front of me, and then clapping his hands like a child who had guessed right at something, he added, ‘Let me be thy victim! Confess thou art an Ingiliz in disguise.’ But I now pretended to act as if the joke had been carried too far for my forbearance, and said ‘*Sahib mekum*. Stop this; dost thou not know the proverb—He who even in fun takes a true believer to be an unbeliever becomes one himself? Give me rather something for my *fatiha* that I may continue my journey.’ My grave looks and the citation made by me somewhat perplexed the young prince, and sitting down again, half ashamed of himself, he excused him-

self by saying that he had never seen a Dervish from Bokhara with such features."

And seeing the passport he was satisfied. The privations and hardships of the journey were extreme, to say nothing of the danger, for part of the route lay through the land of the Turcomans, who make a living by capturing slaves. The Shah's Court photographer, for instance, who was taken prisoner in a battle, cost 10,000 ducats to ransom. Some of the incidents he saw there are too horrible to mention. It is amusing to find that in England he was at one time looked upon as a second Psalmanazar, the perfection of his Persian and Turkish conversation causing people to doubt that he was a European at all.

The education question is exercising the minds of the people in the far-off colony of British Guyana,<sup>11</sup> as it is in the home country. The missionaries are asserting the necessity of compulsory and undenominational education, while the governor has passed an ordinance abolishing the former Board of Education, which did not do its work satisfactorily, and vesting in the governor and court of policy the power to make rules for the grant of government aid to the primary schools. There will be given in future a fixed minimum allowance of four dollars a head, with the chance of earning a similar sum according to the success of the teachers in producing results. The population, consisting principally of Creole blacks, Indian coolies, and Chinese coolies, is at a very low stage of morality, and the different religious observances are constantly the source of disorder and riot. The Mohammedan coolies keep the anniversary of the death of Hussan and Hosein by a procession locally called a "tazzia," at which passing Englishmen are frequently assaulted and even sometimes nearly murdered. Among the Hindoo coolies, the practice of infant marriages constantly leads, according to Mr. Bronkhurst, to ill-treatment of the wife, to adultery and murder. The Christian Creoles, though not so prone to crimes of violence, are not much better in morals.

"There was a house-wedding in a village near Mahaica not long ago at which everybody was so drunk before the clergyman arrived, that he had some difficulty in getting the party into anything like order, and in singling out the bride and bridegroom; and after all his trouble, when the ceremony was ended, it turned out that he had married the wrong woman. 'Don't fret, Passon, don't fret; no 'casion for vex,' said the accommodating husband, 'this wan sa do as well.'

"There was a marriage party at Plaisance some time ago, and a very merry marriage party, but of a sudden the bride had to retire, and the bridegroom found, a few minutes later, that he could attend to both the registration matters at the same time."

No wonder it is difficult to get ideas of religion and morality into people's heads, when it is done in this way: "The preacher uttered the sentence in as simple language as possible; a leader repeated it in

---

<sup>11</sup> "The Colony of British Guyana." By Rev. H. V. P. Bronkhurst. London: T. Webster. 1863.

talkee-talkee Dutch; the congregation then repeated it after the leader to show that they caught the idea." Christianity and drink seem to be connected in the minds of the natives as they are in India. Every one has heard of the Indian servant who answered his new master's question as to what religion he belonged to by saying, "Same religion as Sahib. Drink brandy, sar." Here is a parallel case from Guyana:—

"Not very long ago a State-paid clergyman found himself one Sunday afternoon in the house of a planter friend of his, where he met some other friends. Soon a discussion on religious topics was begun, and it became very animated and somewhat scientific, one of the parties to the controversy being a local scientist of some mark. When it became necessary to clinch an argument by a reference to a standard authority, the servant was called and told to go upstairs and fetch the 'Evidences of Christianity'; she would find it lying on the shelf. The girl went, and came back immediately, carrying a double flask of gin. The servant was evidently a reader of missionary literature, and had, with Mr. Russell, come to believe that gin and true religion are closely allied, the presence of the former being inseparable from the latter, and one of its least mistakable evidences."

Our readers will see from these samples that Mr. Bronkhurst's book is decidedly above the average of missionary literature in humour.

"The old order changeth, giving place to new," and the solution of the problem of free education which Jean Baptiste de la Salle<sup>12</sup> found workable in the seventeenth century, will never be practicable again. Holding a stall in the Cathedral at Rheims, he noticed that though there were plenty of schools provided by the Church and by private endowments, there was a great scarcity of masters, especially for primary schools. From receiving schoolmasters in his house to train, he gradually went on from step to step till he founded the institute of the "Frères des Écoles Chrétiennes," resigning first his canonry and then his private fortune, in order to comply the more fully with the rules of his society. These rules embraced vows of poverty, obedience and chastity, for the purpose of giving gratuitous instruction to children, and the founder had the gift of imparting his own enthusiasm and self-denying spirit of work to his followers. The weak point in his rule was that no time appears to have been available for private study, except examination of conscience and the catechism. It is difficult to see how the teachers can have kept themselves at a proper standard of intelligence and elasticity of mind, with so little leisure time. Mrs. Wilson says, however, that their "scholars when allowed to compete with others carry all before them not only in examinations in elementary knowledge, but also in the higher branches of education," exclusive of Latin, which the brothers were not permitted to learn, to make it impossible for them to become priests. The priesthood was besides specifically forbidden. Neither was a priest admitted into the Order, nor was a brother allowed to be ordained. Their teaching was of course Christian, but exclusive of about half an hour occupied by taking the children to church, there was only half an hour a day taken

<sup>12</sup> "The Christian Brothers; their Origin and Work." By Mrs. R. F. Wilson. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co.



for purely religious instruction. This lay character, and the undoubted good they did in France, at first exempted them from the decree of the National Assembly in 1790, by which religious orders were suppressed, but two years later, when some of Voltaire's disciples had learned to look on the education of the poor as an evil, they were included in the edict, and some of the brothers suffered by the guillotine. The superior, who had been in prison eighteen months, was released at Robespierre's death, but the community did not revive until Napoleon was petitioned from all quarters to allow them to resume their work. Subsequently night-schools, commercial schools, industrial schools, and clubs for young men, with lectures and libraries, were started, and in the Franco-German war the society added the care of the wounded to their other duties. All these services to the State have not saved them from persecution by the anti-clerical party, who "have driven them from their schools, have withdrawn from them all public support," but without success, according to Mrs. Wilson, for all classes are contributing to start them again, and the workmen prefer their schools to others.

Major General Porter has brought out a new and revised edition of his "History of the Knights Hospitallers,"<sup>13</sup> moderating a little his "high falutin" style, but still sometimes carried away by enthusiasm (of which the contagion is conveyed to his readers) for the gallant deeds and chivalrous conduct of the members of the Order, to which he himself belongs. The history of the sieges of Rhodes is told with great spirit. The biographical sketches of the English members are of great value, as giving information which explains and supplements scattered notices of occurrences in our English records. The history of the revival of the English *langue* is curious, and shows that the present society has more claim to represent the original Order in England than is popularly supposed—no doubt a much stronger claim than modern Freemasons have to assert their connection with mediæval guilds. In France the Order was not suppressed till 1792, so that when revived by Pius the Seventh's Bull in 1814, there were *bonâ fide* knights to carry on the succession, but the last brethren of the English *langue* had died at Malta in the sixteenth century. The revival was, however, formally accomplished by consent of the French and Spanish *langues*, and the statutes are observed, with the modifications necessary for Anglicanism. Military duties are, of course, in abeyance, and the whole attention of the Order is devoted to the original duties with which the order started at Jerusalem—the care of the sick and poor. Part of the old priory at Clerkenwell, familiar to many as the place whence "Sylvanus Urban" issued the *Gentleman's Magazine*, has been purchased and fitted up as a chancery and domicile for the Order, and they have started a hospital in the oldest of their homes—Jerusalem.

. Professor Church's new book is as interesting as its predecessors,

<sup>13</sup> "A History of the Knights of Malta, of the Order of St. John of Jerusalem." By Whitworth Porter, Major-General Royal Engineers. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1883.

—which is saying a great deal—and even more useful. “Stories from Homer and Herodotus” are, after all, only a substitute for the originals with those children who are not yet learning Greek, and are not much use to those who are. But here is a book which will give quite a new character to the school study of Cicero.<sup>14</sup> Speeches are not a favourite reading for boys. Livy is much more to the taste of most of them. And the historical framework which they get up from Roman history, or which is supplied by their masters, is but a lifeless skeleton. Professor Church clothes it with flesh, and makes it live. The copy now before us was picked up casually by a girl of sixteen, who is just beginning the Catiline speeches at school, and after reading a few pages, she made up her mind that she must have one of her own, in preference to any other new book, though she disapproved of the author’s view of Catiline’s character, having herself just read Professor Beesley’s whitewashing of him. The illustrations are hardly as satisfactory as those in some other volumes of the series. The selection is good, being portrait busts and statues, but the process employed gives a look of roughness to the stone, which is disagreeable and not true, as most of the originals are no doubt marble, and though discoloured, have not quite lost their surface.

The eccentricities of old Scotch law are fearful and wonderful.<sup>15</sup> The technical terms are enough “to make Quintilian stare and gasp.” To “desert the diet” means to dismiss the case. “Taking up dittay” is collecting evidence. “A letter of Slaines” is a document purporting that a murderer has paid compensation to his victim’s relations, in consideration whereof they have abandoned all malice, rancour, grudge, hatred, envy of heart, and all occasions of actions, civil and criminal, and agreed to receive him in such amity, friendship, and hearty kindness as if the crime had never been committed. Then the style of proceeding was worse than the language. Juries, from the time of Charles II. till 1728, could only give a verdict of “proven” or “not proven”—that is, whether the accused had done what he was charged with—but could say nothing as to his guilt or innocence. In cases of murder or theft, this perhaps was of little consequence, but in political trials it was very easy to convict a man of treason or sedition if all the prosecution had to do was to prove that the accused had used certain words or written a certain letter, leaving it to a judge appointed by the Crown to decide whether the act amounted to treason or not. Then there was a process called “a protest for wilful error,” which subjected the jury to a trial before an “Assize of Error.” The jurors, if convicted of giving a wrong verdict, were liable to a year’s imprisonment and the loss of all their personal property. There has been enough bullying of juries in bad times in England, but such an elaborate means of destroying their independence has luckily never been used in the South. The Stuart times of course were the worst.

<sup>14</sup> “Roman Life in the Days of Cicero.” By Rev. A. J. Church, M.A. London: Seeley, Jackson & Halliday. 1884.

<sup>15</sup> “The Lord Advocates of Scotland.” By G. W. T. Omond. Two vols. London: David Douglas. 1883.

When the six ministers were tried in 1606 for holding a general assembly against the King's order, the justice-clerk was actually sent with the jury when they withdrew to consider their verdict, and though a majority had made up their minds to acquit, they were threatened till they did as they were told. The Privy Council, till its abolition in 1708 by the Act of Union, had been the chosen instrument of tyranny and intolerance, and the Lord Advocate too often their instrument. As there was no law (till 1701) to compel the Lord Advocate to proceed with a prosecution within a given time, a person might be kept in prison for an indefinite period on a mere frivolous accusation. Torture, which had never been legal in England as a means of extorting a confession, was only abolished in Scotland in 1709, and had been freely used not more than twenty years before. Coming down to later times, these horrors diminish, but even at the trial of McKinlay for treason in 1816, the means employed for getting evidence were very questionable, though they defeated the object in view. The accused was a Glasgow weaver, member of a Radical Association. The witnesses against him were locked up in the castle and well primed. But at the trial, the one on whose evidence most reliance was placed, when asked, as usual, "Has any one given you a reward or promise of reward for being a witness?" replied in the affirmative, and pointed to the Advocate Depute. Naturally the result was that the Crown gave up the prosecution. Among other legal curiosities, Mr. Omond tells the story of the Douglas case, which excited as much interest as the Tichborne trial in more recent times, the mob sympathizing with the claimant in both cases. In Edinburgh they went so far as to break the windows of the judges who had given their opinion against Mr. Douglas. The biographical part of the work is well put together, but it is the legal and political history which gives the work its value.

In these days of detailed personal biographies, it is something new to come across a monograph taking a wide view of a man's relations to his generation and his country. Herr Brosch<sup>18</sup> leaves personal details entirely on one side and attempts an estimate of Bolingbroke as "a child of his times, a product of the party strife from which he had arisen, and upon which he reacted." He has examined the soil in which his life struck root, and found a luxuriant growth; he has followed through its manifestations the creative or destructive power which Bolingbroke exercised over the history of England and the traces of which still remain. Herr Brosch does not come forward as a whitewasher of Bolingbroke's character; on the contrary, he very emphatically holds the moral obliquity of Bolingbroke's conduct and character to be exceptional and indefensible. Though far from having made any discoveries such as those disclosed in the Berwick Papers, and without adding anything positively new to our knowledge, Herr Brosch has gone to work very conscientiously. He has not only carefully examined secondary authorities, but gone to primary sources

<sup>18</sup> "Lord Bolingbroke und die Whigs und Tories seiner Zeit. Moritz Brosch." One vol. Rütten & Loening. Frankfurt A. M. 1883.

and examined the despatches of the Venetian ambassadors preserved in the archives of Venice and quotes freely from them. He regrets that Herr C. von Noorden's recent "History of Europe in the Eighteenth Century" was not published in time for him to make use of it: we should have expected that he would also have made some reference to Mr. Lecky's "History of England in the Eighteenth Century." His book, however, is an admirable essay, written in a clear, nervous style, and rapidly engages the attention. It is a short book to treat the first half of the eighteenth century in, and it is no advantage to Herr Brosch to have Mr. Lecky in the field. Still the great work of the latter does not entirely overshadow the smaller book. Perhaps it would have been better to leave the Whigs and Tories to the general historian, and to have confined the attention more to Bolingbroke; there is, in fact, much more said about the relations of Whigs and Tories than about Bolingbroke. Most readers, we fear, will turn to the chapter on "Bolingbroke as a writer" and trust to Mr. Lecky for the rest, and this chapter is the best written and most to the point. The book is written for a German public, of course, and these strictures do not apply in their case. It has long ceased to be a subject of wonder that Germans should be writing the history of our country in the accurate and appreciative style of Herr Brosch. It is no small advantage to have a rapid and comprehensive view of a rather bewildering period in which it is not always easy to bear in mind the sequence of events unless they are grouped round some master character like Bolingbroke. He was indeed the typical statesman and philosopher of his times, as Pope was the typical poet. Other statesmen were held back by prudence or keener practical insight, but by no higher motives. We have little but contempt for the moral standpoint of the contemporaries of Bolingbroke and Pope, only in their case we rise to admiration of their exceptional qualities and powers. The "Essay on Man" is still read. It is a pity that Bolingbroke's "Letters on History" are not, at least, equally well known.

Most people are tired by this time of hearing the name of Luther, what with sermons and pamphlets and exhibitions and all the other paraphernalia of a tercentenary. So, as Professor Kostlin's large work, which came out in 1875, is so well known, we will not worry our readers by criticizing or discussing the new English translation of his abridgement of his own work.<sup>17</sup> It is for "popular reading"—that is, it has neither references nor index, but to compensate for this deficiency, the illustrations are fairly well executed—facsimiles of well-known portraits and engravings—and there are plenty of them. The bearded portrait of Luther in the dress of an Austin canon, engraved in Lauterbach's "Historia Monastica," does not find a place among them—in fact it does not seem to be generally known. No copy of it was exhibited in the collection in the King's library at the British Museum, nor has any portrait a beard, except that by Cranach, taken when Luther was at the Wartburg. We see that Dr.

<sup>17</sup> "Life of Luther." By Julius Köstlin. Translated from the German. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1883.

Köstlin adheres to the traditional words used by Luther at the Diet of Worms, "Ilie stehe ich, ich kann nicht anders," against the opinion of Dr. Karl Pearson and other critical historians. They occur in no contemporary account of the Diet except that published by himself, which in other details is not very trustworthy. The book is much pleasanter to read than translations from German very often are.

No one can approach the life of Goethe without emotion.<sup>18</sup> For whatever there may be to admire, or whatever there may be to despise in it, the reader knows that he will find much that is common between himself and Goethe. "Voilà un homme," said Napoleon, when brought face to face with him: every one will endorse the Emperor's estimate. Goethe was a man emphatically, falling into many errors, perhaps, the victim of many illusions in the course of his life no doubt, and often failing, even with the most conscientious efforts, in the attainment of truth; but still a man in his genuineness of character and in his love of truth, as distinguished from Carlyle's *simulacrum*—the seeker after vain shadows, the follower of vain ambitions. Hamlet is in many respects his prototype, and Hamlet is his favourite character. They are both throughout their careers intensely preoccupied with speculation, and to this preoccupation is to be traced behaviour which would otherwise appear inexplicable. To this rather than to any want of delicacy and tact is due Goethe's final letter to Charlotte von Stein, in which he treats the very natural jealousy of a rejected lover as an effect of hypochondria, subinduced by the imbibing of strong coffee. He imagines every one to be as preoccupied with speculation as himself: on any other hypothesis his letter is the most heartless and insulting that ever man wrote to injured woman. The same reason may be assigned for his sending a copy of *Gotz* to Frederike: "it may be some consolation to her to see that the faithless lover gets poisoned!" In his grave and dignified reply to the Countess von Stolberg, who had conjured him on his rising from a sick bed "to turn his heart and his gaze to eternal things, and to make good, ere too late, the harm that his writings had done to the souls of others," it will be seen that this is the keynote of his character. "All my life I have meant honestly towards myself and others; and in all my earthly action I have looked to the highest. . . . You and yours have done the same. In the kingdoms of our Father are many provinces . . . and there will be provision for us both yonder." Guided by this principle of "honesty of purpose," his errors, though bringing in their train their inevitable Nemesis of suffering, he nevertheless learnt to turn to profit, because he was always preoccupied with "the highest." Left without any guidance, at a very early age he schooled himself in the habit of introspection, of testing others, of scrutinizing everything—in a word, in the habit of scepticism, forgetting the fact, or rather disregarding the instinct which tells us that some of our most delicate feelings will not bear scrutiny, and that no attempt at an analysis of them can avail

<sup>18</sup> "Life of Goethe." By Henrich Düntzer. Translated by T. W. Lyster. Two vols. London: Macmillan & Co.

anything. But Goethe learnt this very late: he was sixty before he wrote the "Elective Affinities," and promulgated his doctrine of renunciation and of loyalty to the highest instincts. Before arriving at this noble doctrine, he himself passed through a sad and, in some respects, ignoble experience. He was constantly testing the effect of the charm of one girl after another upon his heart, wondering how intense the feeling would grow and how long it would last. When he first saw a portrait of Charlotte von Stein, he obtained possession of it, and wrote under it, "It would be a glorious spectacle to see how the world mirrors itself in this soul;" and this was the kind of speculation he entered upon with every girl that he met. Hence Herr Duntzer is chiefly engaged with a chronicle of his endless amours; and in his works Goethe himself is chiefly occupied with similar speculations—his works are a reflection of his actual life. All through these "affairs of the heart," Goethe was haunted by the theoretical conviction that they must be made subordinate to his intellectual development—in fact that they were necessary for his intellectual growth and general evolution; and as he grew out of them, and they served the purpose which the nature of things ordained them for, these temporary convictions fell in the background and were forgotten. He never entered upon a flirtation, an amour, or a grand passion without reflecting that it could not be permanent: the nature of the human being is to evolve itself, and no feelings can in their nature persist. At times, however, he suspects that these connections do not result in unalloyed good either to himself or to the other subject of experiment. On the contrary, he frequently discovers, and especially in the case of Frederike Brion, that he has aroused claims and desires which he cannot satisfy and which he never intended to satisfy. Probably the only reason why he only left one broken heart behind him—Frederike's—was that only in her case did he have to do with a perfectly guileless and pure-minded girl. Goethe has been called an experimentalist in love, and with perfect truth. In all his actions towards these various women he "meant honestly to himself and to them"—that is, they helped him on in his mental development: it was a strange injustice in Nature if they did not receive a like benefit! Hence, although at times of deep emotional excitement he distrusted his theory and felt supremely wretched, still, with a horrible perversity, his evil theory in the end obtains the victory over his better instincts; and at the age of twenty-six, after surviving the "renunciation" of Frederike and many other loves which followed, he writes in his calm moments that he finds himself "quite content with the past, and full of hope for the future." And this towards the close of a long affair with Lili Schönemann, who is his "angel" and "sweet love," and everything that Frederike formerly was. Yet, no sooner does he get his wish and is betrothed to Lili, than he "feels the fetters of her love on his genius," and longs for freedom again. He "renounced" the happiness of loving Frederike because her lack of external culture made him fear that she might not be a credit to him in his "dignified Frankfurt home." This time he renounces Lili because, with all her external

accomplishments and warm affection, she lacked that "fire of passion," as Herr Duntzer calls it, "which his soul craved." In short, he grew out of his passion for her. There is no need to say more to prove that, with his honest intentions, Goethe deceived himself, and acted invariably with the most astonishing selfishness. It seems to be the curse of the speculative philosophic temperament that it never loses itself in passion. Where any ordinary man would have lost himself in love for Frederike, and found his life's happiness in her gentle, guileless nature, Goethe was analysing his complex feelings, and speculating on the effect which he supposed her rustic upbringing would have on his circle of friends. In his domestic relations Goethe was no hero, any more than his greatest admirer Carlyle. It is his unswerving loyalty to his highest intellectual aspirations and his high perception of the artistic and beautiful, which commands our esteem. We may admit, too, that in his loves, which were so frequently foolish, there is also a not ignoble side. With the poet's eye, he discovers that great marvel of the meanest natures, which all the Christianity of many lesser minds still leaves them blind to, that there is an immortal soul in every human creature. And with the poet's sensitiveness he vibrates to it wherever and whenever he meets it, and by the power of sympathy brings out all that is best in every one with whom he comes into contact. Only this steadfast loyalty to his highest conscious purposes could enable him at the age of finally settling down into the groove of life, at thirty-one, to write thus with the calmest content—"I have all that a man can desire, a life in which there is daily exercise of my powers, and in which I grow daily; and at this time I am healthy, free from passion, free from entanglement, free from dark ill-understood workings, like one of God's Beloved, half whose life is spent, who hopes from pain that is over many a good in the time to come, while sure also of a heart *tested* to meet the pain to come." These observations would be out of place if they were not to illustrate what we have to say about Herr Duntzer's treatment of his subject. Goethe's works are treated of casually only, everything hangs on his love-affairs, and we have only followed Herr Duntzer in giving prominence to these matters. There is evidence of great care and research in this book as in all the other well-known productions of Herr Duntzer on Goethe and his times. Portraits are given where available, the translator has appended a copious index, and the whole work represents an enormous amount of labour. But there is no literary form, no artistic grouping; everything has been sacrificed for the sake of accuracy and chronological order. And, worst of all, the spirit in which the book has been written is one of indiscriminating hero-worship. The sins of ordinary mortals are no longer offences in his hero: Goethe can do no wrong. Herr Duntzer sympathetically whines whenever Goethe fails to obtain full satisfaction for his soul's cravings in matters of love; and contrariwise grows lightsome and cheery when relating how the "misguidit" Goethe enjoys a little sensual satisfaction in cohabiting with a girl in Rome. "Conforming to the custom of the place" Herr Duntzer puts it.

And when, some months after his return to Weimar, Goethe settles down with Christiane Vulpius "das arme Geschöpf" (as Goethe was not ashamed to call her) the "globulated weibsbild" (of Charlotte von Schiller) the Hausmamsell, or even in a moment of anger the Blutwurst (of Charlotte von Stein, whilom Goethe's soul's idol), Herr Duntzer positively glows at the thought of the ease and comfort and pleasure which his hero derives from the "gutes Mädchen." The result is, that if one can shut one's eyes to the moral blindness of Herr Duntzer and take a cynical pleasure in his ridiculous acceptance of everything that his hero does, the book, in spite of its prevailing dulness, may be made very entertaining. It will not be read, however, except for purposes of reference by Goethe's students, and it will have no chance of displacing Lewes' "Life," which is a work of really artistic merit.

A word on the translation by Mr. Lyster. He says in his preface, "In translating this book I have endeavoured to transmute and fuse the German sentences into English. If I have failed in places, I must ask the indulgence which I should now give to another, knowing as I do the great difficulty of resisting the influence of the foreign style." We cannot extend this indulgence. A translator has no right to ask it. Mr. Lyster felt scarcely competent to the task, and should not have attempted it, for it is not done competently. We fear there are some actual mis-translations, and the general character approaches the Hans Breitmann style. The translator, however, improves as he goes on, and has done good work in quoting the original letters, &c., of Goethe in foot-notes, which Duntzer habitually embodies in indirect narration instead of quoting direct; and finally, as we have observed, the translator adds a good index.

"Memories of Seventy Years"<sup>19</sup> is the title of a pleasant chatty little volume written by "a granddaughter of Dr. Aikin and niece of Mrs. Barbauld." Dr. Priestley, Crabb Robinson, Thomas Campbell, Wedgwood, and Scott, and other celebrated people, appear occasionally at the family house at Stoke Newington, then a pleasant rural village, and even now boasting a few good old houses of the last century. This was, of course, when Abney Park was a park, and not a cemetery. A book of this kind is best judged of by a sample, so here is a new story of Samuel Rogers:—

"Going one night to the gallery of the opera, which he thought the best place for hearing, he noticed a respectable-looking elderly man gazing at him very intently for some time. At last, between the acts, he left his seat, and placing himself in front of Mr. Rogers, said in a solemn tone, 'Pray, sir, is your name Samuel Rogers?' Mr. Rogers, who always cherished the hope that his works were popular with the lower classes, replied most graciously that it was. 'Then, sir,' said the man, 'I should be glad to know why you have changed your poulterer.'"

Another good story, not of Mr. Rogers, but told by him, is

"of a sharp-witted young Genevese, who went, an entire stranger, to the head

<sup>19</sup> "Memories of Seventy Years." Edited by Mrs. Herbert Martin. London: Griffith & Farran. 1883.



of the great merchant firm of 'Hope & Co., Amsterdam,' and coolly asked him to take him into partnership, mentioning as an inducement that he was engaged to marry a daughter of one of the Baring family. He then went to Mr. Baring, and asked for the hand of his daughter, saying that he expected to be taken into partnership by Mr. Hope, and by this ingenious device succeeded in both his objects."

Dr. Heaton, of Leeds, who died about four years ago, and whose memoirs have just been published,<sup>20</sup> was a link between the old and new provincial life of Yorkshire. Born in 1817, the son of the principal bookseller in Leeds, he knew the town as a boy, when the country manufacturers from Gildersome and Morley and Dewsbury, in their corduroy breeches and brass-buttoned coats, came twice a week to the Cloth Hall to sell their goods; when all the corn in the town had to be ground at the King's Mill; when there was no parliamentary representation and no free corporation; when everybody dined at two o'clock, and social invitations were for tea at six. And he left it a place of enormous manufactures, of rather ostentatious hospitality and luxury, and filled with the keenest political and public spirit. Politics—that is, party politics—he kept aloof from all his life, and deplored the provincial temper which makes the election of a man whose duty is to look after police and gas and sanitary affairs dependent upon his opinion on matters of politics with which his office has nothing to do. The fact that everywhere now public men "are forced to the conclusion that it is only by associating municipal questions, from the choice of a parish beadle upwards, with the great questions of imperial policy, that a party organization can be maintained in full efficiency," is strong evidence of "the injurious effect produced upon the public character and temper by these party organizations, which tend to destroy all freedom of thought and independence of action, and, as Dr. Heaton found more than once, to "sacrifice the welfare of the town to that of the contending political armies." Dr. Heaton was a living proof that this abstention from party politics does not always connote want of public spirit, for whether it was in the building of the new Town Hall, in founding the Yorkshire College of Science, in starting the first School-Board, or any other scheme for the benefit and development of the town, he was always one of the foremost in the work. The memoir is pleasantly written but not exciting. There are some characteristic sketches of north-country manners. Here is one:—

"Not many years ago, a very wealthy and prosperous merchant of Leeds, renowned as much for his hospitality as for his riches, found to his annoyance one evening that he had made a slight mistake in the character of the guests whom he was entertaining. Two of them, instead of joining in the usual animated talk over the characteristics of particular vintages of port, the price of iron, or the gossip of the Exchange, positively insisted upon discussing a subject so dull and void of all human interest as books. They were in the midst of a brisk conversation about the treasures of their respective libraries, when their host, whose patience was exhausted by their unseemly conduct,

<sup>20</sup> "A Memoir of John Deakin Heaton, M.D., of Leeds." Edited by T. Wemyss Reid. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1883.

interrupted them. 'Gentlemen,' he said, 'did you ever see my library?' They both confessed ignorance of the fact that he possessed such a thing. 'Come along with me, then, gentlemen, and I'll let you see *my* books! The wonder with which they received this invitation was not lessened by the devious and mysterious way that led to the apartment they were thus invited to inspect. Their host, candlestick in hand, seemed to be taking them down to the very foundation of his handsome house. Suddenly he flung open a door, and ushered them into—a spacious wine-cellar. 'There, gentlemen,' said he, with a flush of pride upon his face, as he pointed to the well-filled bins, in which many rare vintages were nestling snugly side by side; '*that's* my library; and I'd like you to know if that ain't a long sight better than a lot of your fusty books.'"

Dr. Hodgson,<sup>21</sup> of Edinburgh, was a man much of the same type—a public man more than a politician, but of a wider range of mind. He was devoted especially to all schemes which furthered education or freedom. He made the chair of Economic Science at Edinburgh a distinct success, as far as the individual students were concerned, though it did not satisfy his own expectations in the number of hearers he attracted. Dr. Hodgson had to fight the same battle as to the independent status of professor, which Professor De Morgan had won years ago at the University College of London. His connection with the latter institution ceased at the same time as De Morgan's, in consequence of the refusal of the Council to appoint the Rev. James Martineau to the Professorship of Philosophy. Both were actuated by their zeal for the cause of unsectarian education, which Dr. Hodgson's letter to the Council asserts in the strongest terms. He ignored, however, or perhaps did not see, the point which some who were as anxious for religious freedom as he, felt very strongly—that is, that the college was gradually becoming, in the opinion of the public, a Unitarian institution, and, therefore, many who had no *animus* against Unitarianism, thought it unadvisable to appoint the head of a Unitarian theological college to a professorship. He worked hard, too, in the cause of primary education, being one of the commissioners, in 1858, to report upon the existing schools in London. His experiences in this work were curious enough. Among the teachers he found—domestic servants out of place, discharged barmaids, outdoor paupers, and other equally efficient persons, and their answers to the questions were of the vaguest. "One old lady made a most extraordinary reply, after having given her address as 'ghon (John) Street, Southwark,' and 'fower years,' surmounted by the figure 4, to prevent mistake as the 'date of the establishment of the school;' she says under the head of 'terms on which instruction is given,' 'not undersanding the questing, I answer thus with a vew of reading the Bible.'" What she meant is not explained. For the benefit of the "Notes and Queries" type of mind, we may note that the phrase "the three R's" is as old as 1841. There are also a few specimens worth the notice of collectors of educational *facetiæ*. "When the Bishop of

<sup>21</sup> "Life and Letters of W. B. Hodgson, LL.D." Edited by J. M. D. Meiklejohn, M.A. London: David Douglas. 1883.

Chester was examining a school at Haslingdene, he asked one boy, 'Who is your great spiritual enemy?' The boy looked up, and said quite gravely, 'The bushup.'" "In an examination paper, the writer, speaking of sex, said, 'There are two sexes, the male and the female. In the time of the Saxon heptarchy, the word was used to denote counties, as *Essex*, *Sussex*.'" "Who, and what was *Æsop*?" "*Æsop* was a hairy man who wrote fables, and sold his birthright for a mess of pottage." His remarks about the anomaly of appointing young men fresh from the Universities to be school inspectors, are severe, but perfectly just. He says (1876) "it is impossible that teachers can or will long endure the system," but it has not ceased yet.

For female education, Dr. Hodgson was, his biographer tells us, an enthusiast, and he did a great deal for that cause in Liverpool, but, oddly enough, he opposed the foundation of colleges like Girton, on the ground of their necessitating removal from home. Apparently, though he wished to see women educated, he feared, or disliked, their acquiring habits of self-reliance and independence, two qualities, which a collegiate life, as compared with family life, or life at an ordinary boarding-school, is intended to produce. But what are girls to do who have no good education within reach of their homes?\*

The editor deserves high praise for his candour in printing extracts from letters on religious matters, containing opinions from which he completely differs.

Dr. Hodgson suffered from a Calvinistic father, a man in whom "there was no sympathy, no entering into the heart of boyhood. We habitually avoided him, and this vexed him, and increased his severity." The shorter catechism, too, did its work effectually in disgusting him with theology, and in later years he had quite freed himself from the trammels of superstition. This is how he speaks of the Atonement:—

"If anything in the world is essentially personal and untransferable, it is moral character, and yet the popular religion involves a double transfer of guilt to the innocent, and of innocence to the guilty. I say the *popular* religion, but even Canon Melville speaks of every sin that ever has been or will be committed, 'knocking at the heart of Jesus and crying for vengeance,' 'running like molten lead along the fibres that bound men to the Saviour,' 'going in upon the Mediator and swelling His sufferings,' and much more to the like effect. But the whole passage is to me loathsome, and smells of the shambles."

And as to a future life:—

"I am not indifferent to death; it is never long out of my thoughts, and it is a painful and depressing notion; but as I must die I am quite content to let the end be the end; and just as I would not willingly consent to lead my life over again, I have no wish, certainly no habitual strong desire, to live again, and pass through new and unknown phases of existence."

This confession slightly detracts from his position as "*integer homo pro omnibus rebus magis quam pro morte sollicitus*," but at all events he felt that "*vitæ*," not "*mortis, cogitatio est sapientia*."

"Greater London"<sup>22</sup> is the title of a charming book by Mr. Walford,

<sup>22</sup> "Greater London." By E. Walford, M. A. London: Cassell & Co.

telling in a pleasant way the histories and legends of old houses and villages round the metropolis, from Staines in the west, round by Harrow, Stanmore, and Barnet, and so eastward by Waltham Abbey and Epping Forest to Barking and the East and West India Docks. Little out-of-the-way villages, that no one knows but the men who like a Sunday walk, or the votaries of the bicycle, are described as well as the more important places that every one knows and goes to. And this is a good feature. We know quite enough about Hampton Court and Pope's Villa, and are glad to be told what we want to know of such places as Cranford and Harmondsworth and Shenley, and Finchley Manor, without the trouble of turning over bulky county histories. The illustrations are on the whole good, some excellent. The title page is marked Vol. I., so there is probably a second volume to follow, taking Kent and Surrey.

Dr. Brown,<sup>23</sup> the quondam Colonial Botanist at the Cape of Good Hope, is continuing his series of books on Forestry, of which we noticed one or two in our last issue. Finland is his theme this time, a country of lakes and wooded hills, with extensive unenclosed tracts of Crown forest, where the peasants consider wood as being common property like air and water, and therefore waste it. To prevent this evil, a commission appointed to investigate the state of the forests, reported in 1869 in favour of giving proprietary rights to all settlers in Crown Forests, "as the settlement of a population not possessing an absolute right to the soil could not be otherwise than damaging to the wood and detrimental to the land in every way." One method of treating the land had hitherto been to burn down a portion of the forest, get two or three years' crops off the land, and then move on further; or in some cases to cut down the trees and burn them. The re-growth of trees after the land is abandoned is often entirely prevented by the destruction of the seedlings by cattle. The result of this waste is that firewood in St. Petersburg is dearer than English coal. The effect on the climate of Finland of destroying the forest does not seem to be so injurious as in some other places. The first result of the destruction of trees is that the climate becomes drier, and that the rainfall is more partial, both in time and place. In Finland, where the humidity is excessive, this is hardly a disadvantage. There is no danger of the flow of streams and rivulets being diminished and even dried up, as has happened in Italy from the same cause; nor of the land being covered with a useless and injurious plant like the *Rhenoster bosch*, which spreads rapidly over those districts in South Africa where the veldt is burnt and the growth of grass checked. Dr. Brown has had the advantage of the advice of Dr. Blomqvist, Director of the National School of Forestry at Evois, in preparing his treatise, and he gives a short account of the course of study and the management of the school. The method of bringing the two chief products of the forests into the market are described. Timber is floated through the lakes and at sea in the form of a *koshell*. This is a kind of raft invented

<sup>23</sup> "Finland: its Forests and Forest Management." By J. C. Brown, LL.D. London: Oliver & Boyd. 1883.

about twenty years ago, consisting of a head composed of a row of logs, to each end of which is attached a chain of logs, tied together with twigs. Inside this chain the timber to be conveyed is loosely thrown, some rafts containing as many as 10,000 logs. On the lakes, movement is effected by a boat carrying out and fixing an anchor, up to which the raft is brought by means of a windlass. At sea steam tugs are employed. Tar is brought down the river in a "tar boat," built of two broad planks joined boat shape, along which two rows of barrels are laid, and two more at each end. Steering is done with a long oar, and wants great skill, as the rivers are full of rapids. There is, or was, only one man who could steer through the Aiomboika Foss on the Torneo, and this is an English traveller's account of how he did it:—

"The famous steersman, looking placid, chewed a quid, and took his place and the paddle, without taking off his mittens. Behind him, peering over his shoulders, was the youngest of our crew. The old bird was teaching the young idea how to shoot the rapids. At first our progress was much the same as before, the men pulled hard, and the boat went fast; our steerer chewed his quid, and guided his boat with the skill of a London cabman in a crowd. I should have thought twice about steering even there, but it was evident that we were only at the beginning. The banks grew wilder, and rocks here and there replaced the rounded boulders which had hitherto been the principal feature of the riverbed. Presently our friend began to roll his eyes, and grip the spade handle of his steering paddle, and the roar of the water ahead told of something coming. I raised my head to look, and was ordered to lie down and not hide the view; so down I went, but I could still see that we were rushing, end on, at a ridge of black stones that reached half over the river, and that the whole of the stream was dancing and tossing like a mill-race, past the end of the bank. There was broken water, like a heavy surf, right up to a steep broken rock on the Swedish side. We seemed to be rushing to certain destruction; but just as we seemed to be rushing into the race, a turn of the wrist cleared the outermost boulder by a few inches, and we shot round a corner into a splendid pool. It was done with the most perfect neatness and composure; but a few inches the one way or the other would have given us a hard swim. The steerer now seemed to explain to his pupil all about this point, and how to pass it; and then he condescended to take off his mittens."

In the list of *fauna* there are one or two errors, perhaps arising from translating literally Swedish names of birds. *Tetrao Bonasia* is not the woodcock, but the ruffed grouse; and *Capercaillie*, not heathcock, is the common English name for *Tetrao urogallus*.

It is not often that a bookseller's catalogue deserves to be classed among historical literature, but Quaritch's last issue is an exception,<sup>24</sup> for many of the items are of the highest historical interest. Here is the presentation copy to Diana of Poitiers of a book by Ambroise Paré, the great French surgeon; a Dante which once belonged to Katherine de' Medici; an atlas made for Henri Quatre, of the provinces acquired at the treaty of Vervins, and many other books which belonged to French kings and statesmen down to Louis XVIII. and Charles X. Then, for England, there are specimens from the

<sup>24</sup> "Catalogue of Works on the Fine Arts," &c. By Bernard Quaritch. Parts VI. and VII. October, 1883.

libraries of Henry VIII. and Queen Elizabeth, and, rarer still, Hector Boethius's dedication copy of his history to James V. of Scotland. There is a collection of drawings too, among them a set of Botticelli's designs to illustrate the *Trionfi* of Petrarch. By-the-way, are not the tapestries in Henry VIII.'s Presence Chamber at Hampton Court copied from these designs? Five copies of the *Hypnerootomachia Poliphili* are not often seen in one shop, but now there is an unwonted choice for collectors, the prices ranging from £20 to £400. But it is only tantalizing to enumerate dainties of this kind, which are beyond the reach of ordinary mortals, however fond they may be of books.

---

### BELLES LETTRES.

IT is characteristic of the present age to "want all pleasant ends but to use no harsh means." Science is compelled to render herself attractive, religion is nothing if not exciting, and the high-souled muse herself must condescend to the popular taste, and like the German philosopher in the fable, "learn to be gay." Again, it is characteristic of an age which buys its luxuries at a discount to seek to obtain what it covets at something less than the inevitable price. Now in these days a poet, to be a poet, must indulge in a good deal of vague speculation as to the before and the after, he must have something to say about the unimaginable, and must be able to "personally conduct" his readers to Cuckoo-Land-in-the-Clouds. He must also, by way of interlude, supply a quantum of highly spiced realism, and an incident from "the way we live now" will afford an agreeable contrast to an ode on the improbability of our living hereafter. In as much as this speculative poetry involves conclusions which are generally regarded as dangerous, and realistic idylls are apt to be unpleasant and improper, a demand has been felt for verse which is at once speculative and orthodox, and which, while it now and again lifts up the curtain of realism, lets it fall again before any too unpleasant disclosures have been made. Mr. Lewis Morris, who by his former works has won a well-deserved name and something very like fame, seems to us, in his new volume, "*Songs Unsung*,"<sup>1</sup> either consciously or unconsciously to have adapted himself too closely to popular requirements and popular taste. He indulges in a good deal of vague speculation, but he solemnly reproveth speculation when it begins to go wrong, and in "*Clytæmnestra in Paris*" he winds up an extremely repulsive tale with a pious adjuration. The "*New Creed*," which is a passionate and finely worded protest against materialism, is well conceived and carefully executed. It reminds us not a little of Arthur Hugh Clough. "*The Pictures*," detached stanzas intended

---

<sup>1</sup> "*Songs Unsung*." By Lewis Morris, of Penbryn, M.A., Honorary Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., 1, Paternoster Square. 1883.

to embody a single conception, are occasionally striking. But the device is an unworthy one. Here is a fair specimen :

“ A sheer rock-islet, frowning on the sea,  
Where no ship sails, nor ever life may be ;  
Thousands of leagues around, from pole to pole,  
The unbounded lonely ocean-currents roll.”

We notice several instances of defective metre<sup>•</sup> in some of the shorter poems. Here is a couplet from “ The Seasons ” :

“ When the blossoming trees gleam in virginal white,  
And Heaven’s gate opens wide in the lucid night.”

In the stanzas “ In the Strand,” there are many such lines :

“ This green stem burgeons forth year by year.”  
“ New busy crowds pass on with hurrying feet.”  
“ And this poor flower has stronger assurance to give.”

That is how people in the Strand and elsewhere do express themselves, but an accomplished writer pens his lines differently. Mr. Lewis Morris bears a high reputation as a poet. We do not say that he has lessened it by “ Songs Unsung,” but we are convinced that if he wishes to increase his fame, he must not rest content with his previous success.

“ Love’s Offering,”<sup>2</sup> by James Hinton, is a melancholy poem. The revelation of violent passion, when it takes the form of an individual experience related apparently in good faith, must be more or less unpleasing. There are numerous aspects of the passion of love, both in its higher and lower forms, which are insusceptible of artistic treatment. The verse may be stately and sonorous, the mental attitude may be faithfully delineated, and yet we may feel indignant with the author for taking us into his confidence against our will. We must not be understood to imply that the style of Mr. Hinton’s verse is coarse, or the tone markedly sensual. Indeed, the recurrence of sacred names is somewhat monotonous. In one poem of twelve stanzas the word “ God ” occurs twenty times, a vain repetition which is either profane or absurd. “ Flowers are lovely, Love is flower-like,” but the botanist and the anatomist may render the one and the other unfit “ subject ” for a poet’s pen. This is a favourable specimen of the kind of sentiment which, however real, lies outside the domain of art :

“ This is my prayer each day, each night : that God will let me,  
O loved past poet’s speech, before you quite forget me,  
Just see you—once draw nigh.  
And then when we have met, and once again are parted,  
The same cry goes to God from me, half broken-hearted—  
God ! let me see her again before I die ! ”

The “ Deadliest Pang ” is a fine sonnet. There is a certain even merit of style throughout the volume, and no want of metrical skill.

<sup>2</sup> “ Love’s Offering.” By James Hinton. London : Remington & Co., 134, New Bond Street. 1863.

The "Love Poems of Louis Barnaval"<sup>3</sup> are even more extravagant and less reticent than those of Mr. Hinton. They are much less correctly expressed, and to our thinking they are far more original. They form a kind of lovers' diary, and relate the history of an unfortunate and ill-advised passion, which failed when it should have succeeded, and succeeded when it ought to have failed. The author is not ashamed to display himself in those weaker moments when wounded pride and baffled passion get the mastery. Not only does he howl and scream, but he winces and whimpers, without an attempt at self-control. But in spite of eccentricity and imperfect execution these strange verses display genius, and—how rare a quality in modern love poetry!—they are often beautiful. We select the following sonnet:

“ There is a bird, with handsome form, and bright,  
 Quick-darting eyes, who flits all smiles of peace  
 Through copses where the feathered warblers cease  
 Their carols never, save when hawks affright.  
 It is a dainty bird, blue, gray, and white,  
 And seems right glad in life's abundant lease,  
 In its own beauty, and the cradling tree's  
 Low, windy harping to the fair sunlight.  
 Anon it flutters where small twigs are stirred  
 With fluffy balls of down; there twitterers play,  
 Fearing no comer in such gentle guise;  
 'Too long, alas, too confident they stay:  
 A shriek is heard, a scattering in surprise,  
 And one more songster feeds the butcher-bird.”

The editor, Mr. Charles de Kay, in a strange preface, purports to give a short biography of the author, who died young. If, as he hints, these verses were not meant for publication, the author must at any rate be counted blameless.

It is a relief to turn from these displays of passionate egoism to a small but excellent collection of translations from the Greek Anthology—from Pindar, from Horace, and Aristophanes. "Bouquet,"<sup>4</sup> by William Bayley, is a "dainty little volume," printed on the roughest of paper, and it has both fragrance and redolence. The style of the verse, and indeed the beauty of the language, reminds us not a little of Lord Strangford's "Camoens." It is hard to choose where so much is worth quoting, but we were especially charmed by the Cicala and the Cruel Sheep Boys:—

“ Why, shameless shepherds, pluck me  
 From the branches dropt with dew?  
 I am but a poor cicala,  
 And ne'er did harm to you.

<sup>3</sup> "The Love Poems of Louis Barnaval." Edited with an Introduction by Charles de Kay. New York: D. Appleton & Co. London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle & Rivington. 1883.

<sup>4</sup> "Bouquet." By William Bayley. London: Bayley's, 17, Cockspur Street. 1883.



“ The forest-lawns—I love them—  
And I love a lonely nook,  
But the one thing that I love not  
Is a shepherd’s finger-crook.

“ Their nightingale, I comrade  
The wood-nymphs on their way  
In combe and shady dingle,  
Making music at mid-day.

“ There’s the song-thrush and the blackbird,  
And all those starling thieves,  
The plunderers of your ploughlands,  
The sackers of your sheaves ;

“ Your fruit-tree filchers, catch them,  
’Tis right—and kill them too ;  
But why my green leaf grudge me,  
And my tiny drops of dew ?”

“ The Wind and the Whirlwind,”<sup>5</sup> by Wilfrid Scawen Blunt is a metrical indictment of the English Government and People *in re* their Egyptian policy. The verse, if a trifle bombastic, is sonorous and spirited. This is the way in which Mr. Blunt smashes, powders, and pulverizes the author of that historic phrase :—

“ A day of wrath when all Fame shall remember  
Of this year’s work shall be the fall of one  
Who, standing foremost in her paths of virtue,  
Bent a fool’s knee at War’s red altar-stone.

“ And left all virtue beggared in his falling,  
A sign to England of new griefs to come.  
Her priest of peace ; who sold his creed for glory,  
And marched to carnage at the tuck of drum.”

“ Tuck of drum” is good.

“ Phantoms of Life,”<sup>6</sup> by Luther Dana Waterman are duller than the realities. The sentiments are unexceptionable, as Mr. Waterman remarks :—

“ Man’s thoughts are as an angel’s, but his deeds  
Are often of the level of the worm.”

“ The Story of St. Stephen,”<sup>7</sup> by John Collett is an amplification of the brief notice of the life and of the dying speech of the proto-martyr to be found in the Acts of the Apostles. Mr. Collett does not improve that memorable and beautiful narrative by turning it into verse. But if there is little to praise there is nothing whatever to blame in these watery, but well-intentioned rhymes.

“ The Goal of Time”<sup>8</sup> is a kind of rhapsody in which the essential

<sup>5</sup> “ The Wind and the Whirlwind.” By Wilfrid Scawen Blunt. London : Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., 1, Paternoster Square. 1883.

<sup>6</sup> “ Phantoms of Life.” By Luther Dana Waterman. New York : G. P. Putnam’s Sons, 27 & 29 West 23rd Street. 1883.

<sup>7</sup> “ The Story of St. Stephen and other Poems.” By John Collett, formerly of Wadham College, Oxford. London : Longmans, Green & Co. 1883.

<sup>8</sup> “ The Goal of Time. A Poem.” By John Le Gay Brereton-George Robertson. Melbourne, Sydney, and Adelaide. 1883.

unity of the Divine and human is set forth. The language is well-chosen and many of the lines are powerful and striking.

"Poems" by Lara, consist of some feeble but harmless love songs, and of some violent and offensive diatribes against the Royal Family and the doctrines of Christianity. In former days this poor little volume would have been attributed to the Jesuits. It certainly makes the negation of religion less attractive than the lowest form of faith.

We turn with pleasure to "Poems"<sup>10</sup> by Ithuriel. The writer is a Radical, and more or less at war with society, but his complaint is of a noble kind and he utters nothing base. Here and there Ithuriel strikes a new note, and though much of his work is imperfect in execution and a few of the poems do not merit publication at all, the volume, as a whole, is interesting and original. We read with especial pleasure the dedicatory lines to I. R. W., "Into Thy hands I commend my spirit," and "Fou's Pennies." We have only space to quote these charming lines, "In memoriam, J. T.":—

" If I have any scorn for puppet-kings ;  
 If I have any love for noble things ;  
 If I have any loathing for a priest ;  
 If I yearn most for Nature's endless feast ;  
 If I hate slaves, and would see all men free ;  
 Grandsire, each feeling I have learnt of thee !  
 Thou sleepest with thy fathers ! and the fray  
 Of wooden-shoon has worn thy name away  
 From off the stone that covers o'er the tomb  
 Where what of thee was earth, rests in earth's womb."

All true lovers of true poetry owe a debt of gratitude to the Editor of "English Lyrics."<sup>11</sup> This charming book neither supercedes nor is supplementary to the "Golden Treasury of Lyrics." It is the selection of a mind of equal but different refinement and, though of course the same poems are to be found in both collections, some that are inserted in the earlier anthology are omitted in "English Lyrics," whilst many that are unfamiliar and delightful, for the first time find their place in a collection of verse. We may give as examples, a "Pastoral of Phyllis and Corydon," by Nicholas Breton, five charming poems by Thomas Love Peacock, two songs of Blake's and two of Thomas Lovell Beddoe's.

Messrs. Macmillan issue an addition of "Selected Poems of Cowper,"<sup>12</sup> with a critical introduction by Mrs. Oliphant. The selection is a very happy one. Mrs. Oliphant considers that Wordsworth was more indebted to Cowper than either Wordsworth or posterity have acknowledged. Undoubtedly he was indebted to

<sup>9</sup> "Poems, General, Secular, and Satirical." By Lara. London : W. Stewart & Co., The Holborn Viaduct Steps, E.C. Edinburgh : J. Menzies & Co.

<sup>10</sup> "Poems." By Ithuriel. London : John Heywood, 11, Paternoster Buildings. Manchester ; Deansgate & Ridgefield. 1883.

<sup>11</sup> "English Lyrics." London : Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1883.

<sup>12</sup> "Selections from Cowper's Poems." With Introduction by Mrs. Oliphant. London : Macmillan & Co. 1883.

Cowper for his impulse to revolt from what he calls the "gaudiness" and "inane phraseology" of the writers then in vogue. But in criticizing two stanzas of Cowper's "Alexander Selkirk," he says of the second stanza, "that the reader has an exquisite pleasure in seeing such natural language so naturally connected with metre." The only real point of resemblance between the two poets is in their composition of blank verse. Wordsworth often, Cowper rarely, comes within measurable distance of Milton. We beg to call attention to the beauty of the title-page and of the type generally.

The delegates of the Clarendon Press add to their series of English classics Milton's "Samson Agonistes,"<sup>13</sup> with notes and introduction by Mr. John Churton Collins. We question if boys would ever take the same amount of interest in the "Samson Agonistes" which the more intelligent do occasionally take in a Greek play. But the editing is admirable, and there are other students in the world besides schoolboys and candidates for examinations.

Messrs. Macmillan include in their series of school classics the second and third parts of Butler's "Hudibras."<sup>14</sup> Everybody ought to read "Hudibras," and every student of literature ought to know "Hudibras," but it is surely unnecessary and unadvisable that schoolboys should learn "Hudibras." An English writer, whose obscurities cannot always be explained in the notes, and who is frequently coarse in a very fearless old fashion indeed, is not one whom schoolmasters should introduce to the notice of schoolboys.

The republication of the "Life and Miracles of Saint Edith,"<sup>15</sup> as contained in the Wilton Chronicle, will be of interest to philologists and students of early English history. The Wilton Chronicle is by an unknown hand, and was written at the end of the fourteenth or beginning of the fifteenth century. The present edition, which is published at Heilbronn, contains a prefatory note and a transcript of the life of St. Edith from the *Acta Sanctorum*.

"The Myth of Kirké,"<sup>16</sup> by Robert Brown, jun., F.S.A., is a learned and elaborate attempt to trace the influence of the "Non-Aryan East upon Hellas," in what the author is pleased to call the Homeric Poems. In this remarkable brochure Mr. Brown adduces further proofs of the connection of mythology with Nature-worship. The recurrence of the words "Solar" and "Akkadian" will ward off the careless and profane. The use of "Foreword" for Preface will prejudice others.

The well-known Orientalist, Mr. A. H. Sayce, prints the first three

<sup>13</sup> "Milton's Samson Agonistes." Edited with Introduction and Notes. By John Churton Collins. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1883.

<sup>14</sup> "Hudibras." By Samuel Butler. Parts II., III. Edited by Alfred Milnes, M.A. (London), Scholar of Lincoln College, Oxford. London: Macmillan & Co. 1883.

<sup>15</sup> "S. Editha sive Chronicon Vildunense. Im Wiltshire Dialekt, aus MS. Cotton. Faustina, B. III. Herausgegeben von C. Horstmann. Heilbronn: Verlag von Gebr. Henninger. 1883.

<sup>16</sup> "The Myth of Kirké, including the Visit of Odysseus to the Shades. An Homeric Study." By Robert Brown, jun., F.S.A., author of "The Great Dionysiac Myth." London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1883.

books of "Herodotus" as the textbook for a series of essays, in the form of appendices on "The Ancient Empires of the East."<sup>17</sup> In the introduction he gives reasons for upholding the verdict of antiquity that Herodotus was not trustworthy. He maintains that Herodotus never visited Assyria, or Babylonia, or Upper Egypt, and that his facts about Egypt were obtained from "half-caste dragomen, the inferior servants of the temples," and not from the Egyptian priests themselves, who did not speak the language of the Greek barbarian. Mr. Sayce also discusses the propriety of emending the text by the help of inscriptions, and lays down rules under which this may be safely attempted. Dynastic tables of the kings of Egypt, Babylonia, Assyria, Phœnicia, Lydia, Media, and Persia, are attached to the historical essays at the end of the volume. It is needless to state that the work is a marvel of scholarship and erudition.

Messrs. Ginn, Heath & Co., of Boston, issue the second volume of "The Greater Poems of Virgil,"<sup>18</sup> including the second half of the "Æneid and the Georgics." The notes are brief but discriminating. The tint of the paper and the beauty of the type are noticeable.

"The Iphigenia in Tauris of Euripides,"<sup>19</sup> edited, with introduction, by E. B. England, appears in the well-known scarlet binding of Messrs. Macmillan's school class-books, an outward and visible sign of good workmanship within. In the introduction Mr. England discusses the origin of the legend, and suggests that the name Iphigenia, an epithet of the Moon-goddess Artemis, by a freak of legend was substituted for Iphianassa, the name which Homer assigns to the daughter of Agamemnon. A Tauric goddess, identical with the maiden Artemis-Iphigeneia-Tauropolos conveys Agamemnon's daughter into the Tauric Chersonese. The introduction also contains an admirable division of the play into acts and scenes. The various readings are given below the text, and the critical notes are in English. The explanatory notes at the end of the volume are adapted for younger students, and are both clear and interesting. There are English and Greek indices. To the same excellent series belongs "The Hieron of Xenophon,"<sup>20</sup> edited by the Rev. Hubert A. Holden. This striking but little known classic, which has been wisely proposed as the Greek subject for the Intermediate Examination for the B.A. degree for the University of London for next year, is for the first time brought out as a schoolbook. Mr. Holden's introduction contains a short account

<sup>17</sup> "The Ancient Empires of the East, Herodotus I.-III., with Notes, Introductions and Appendices." By A. H. Sayce, Deputy-Professor of Comparative Philology, Oxford; Hon. LL.D. Dublin. London: Macmillan & Co. 1883.

<sup>18</sup> "The Greater Poems of Virgil." Vol. II., containing the last Six books of the Æneid, and the Georgics. Edited by J. B. Greenough. Boston: Ginn, Heath & Co. 1884. London: Trübner & Co.

<sup>19</sup> "The Iphigenia among the Tauri of Euripides. With Introduction and Critical and Explanatory Notes." By E. B. England, M.A. London: Macmillan & Co. 1883.

<sup>20</sup> "The Hieron of Xenophon. With Introduction, Notes, and Critical Appendix." By Rev. Hubert Holden, M.A., LL.D., sometime Fellow and Assistant Tutor of Trinity College, Cambridge. London: Macmillan & Co. 1883.

of Hieron and of the other interlocutor in the dialogue the poet Simonides. He appends some general remarks on tyranny in the Greek sense of the word. There is an elaborate chronological table of the principal events in the life of Xenophon, and in addition to ample notes suitable to fairly advanced students, there is an appendix on the text. There are Greek and English indices. Is it not a mistake, a generous mistake, to print an important work of scholarship in the form of a schoolbook? We long to see it in a more dignified garb.

To their series of elementary classics Messrs. Macmillan add "Selections from Virgil,"<sup>21</sup> by E. J. Shuckburgh. "Scenes from the Andria of Terence,"<sup>22</sup> by F. W. Cornish, and "Eutropius,"<sup>23</sup> by W. Welch and C. G. Duffield. Schoolmasters are always glad of a change, and will doubtless welcome Terence in an easy form. The "Eutropius" contains some admirable exercises and exhaustive vocabulary and plain notes. The directions for translation and parsing are the best which have ever come under our notice.

Messrs. J. C. Nimmo and Bain have published a splendid quarto edition of the "Fables of La Fontaine."<sup>24</sup> The work is illustrated by twenty-five original etchings by M. A. Delierre. Of these we cannot speak too highly, and select for special commendation the portrait of La Fontaine, the Heron, the Peacock, and the Ducks and Tortoise. The text of the English translation is based upon that of Robert Thomson, published in 1806.

The same firm issue in large octavo, "Types from Spanish Story,"<sup>25</sup> by James Mew, with thirty-six proof etchings by R. De Los Rios. The stories are taken from Guzman D'Alfarache, Cervantes, Le Diable Boiteux, Gil Blas, and other sources. The etchings, which are beautifully designed, have a somewhat faint and blurred appearance. The binding is extremely rich, and is a masterpiece of modern skill—we will not say modern art.

Messrs. Nimmo and Bain have also issued a choice English edition of M. Octave Uzanne's "L'éventail,"<sup>26</sup> the most graceful and elegant monograph on "The Fan" which has perhaps ever appeared. By

<sup>21</sup> "Selections from Virgil." Edited, with Notes and Vocabulary, for the use of Schools, by Evelyn S. Shuckburg, M.A., Assistant-Master at Eton. London: Macmillan & Co. 1883.

<sup>22</sup> "Scenes from the Andria of Terence." Edited, for the use of Schools, by F. W. Cornish, M.A., Assistant-Master at Eton College. London: Macmillan & Co. 1883.

<sup>23</sup> "Eutropius, adapted for the Use of Beginners, with Notes, Exercise, and Vocabulary." By W. Welch, M.A., and C. G. Duffield, M.A., Assistant-Master of Cranleigh School. London: Macmillan & Co. 1883.

<sup>24</sup> "The Fables of La Fontaine." Translated from the French, with Twenty-five Original Etchings. By A. Delierre. London: J. C. Nimmo & Bain, 14, King William Street, Strand, W.C. 1884.

<sup>25</sup> "Types from Spanish Story, or the Old Manners and Customs of Castile." By James Mew. With Thirty-six Proof Etchings, by R. De Los Rios. London: J. C. Nimmo & Bain, 14, King William Street, Strand, W.C. 1884.

<sup>26</sup> "The Fan." By Octave Uzanne. Illustrated by Paul Avril. London: J. C. Nimmo & Bain, 14, King William Street, Strand, W.C. 1884.

whom the English version has been executed we are not told, but though some of the exquisite aroma of M. Uzanne's airy gaiety necessarily evaporates in the process, the translation is skilful and close. Fortunately M. Paul Avril's illustrations need no translator. They are exactly reproduced in all their artistic loveliness and luxuriant whimsical variety. "The Fan," under all its aspects, is a vast subject. The standpoint chosen by M. Uzanne is, he tells us, the *centre gauche*, midway between the ponderous domain of archæological erudition or dry technical detail, and the seductive realms of *la haute fantaisie*. The result is a "literary and anecdotic history of The Fan" which, while charmingly light and fanciful, abounds in curious scraps of erudition, brought together by research so wide and varied that the list of authorities fills several pages of the appendix. But perhaps the most striking merit of the book is the entire appropriateness, both of the letterpress and illustrations, to the subject treated. M. Uzanne's style has all the airy grace and sparkling brilliancy of the *petit instrument* whose praise he celebrates; and M. Avril's drawings seem to conduct us into an enchanted world where everything but fans is forgotten. He sets before our eyes every conceivable phase of feminine life where fans have played a part, and his designs, while vastly superior in artistic merit and, above all, in correct drawing of the nude, to any but a few exceptions in fan-painting, still are all modelled upon the paintings on fans. Sometimes they are in the style of Chinese or Japanese fans, but oftener in that of the great fan painters of the *grand siècle* or of the regency who loved to depict "*fêtes galantes* (we quote M. Uzanne) scenes from Olympus of a nudity a little too free, azure apotheoses, in which the Graces are multiplied, and Love distributes his kisses."

"The Green Ray"<sup>27</sup> is not in M. Jules Verne's best manner: it contains none of the *impossibilités raisonnées* which are at once his distinguishing characteristic and the secret of his world-wide popularity. The marvels or impossibilities in "The Green Ray" are to be found in the picture there presented to us of Scottish names, manners, and costumes. It will hardly be denied that such a Scotch family name as "Ursiclos," and such clans as the clan "McDouglas" and the clan "Melville," are sufficiently impossible; nor can it be counted as anything less than a marvel for a lowland gentleman's butler to wait at dinner and perform all his other duties clad in the "garb of old Gaul!" But these and innumerable errors of the same kind are all due, apparently, to a fixed idea on the part of M. Verne that all Scotchmen are Highlanders. The story is so slight as to be little more than a setting for the admirable descriptions of Scotch scenery which are the best feature in the book. The illustrations, too, are unusually good, and, together with the beautiful type and delicately toned paper, greatly enhance the charms of the little volume.

---

<sup>27</sup> "The Green Ray." By Jules Verne. Translated from the French by Mary de Hauteville. London: Sampson Low & Co., Crown Buildings, Fleet Street. 1883.

Doctor O. W. Holmes's "Autocrat of the Breakfast Table,"<sup>28</sup> and its companion, "The Professor at the Breakfast Table,"<sup>29</sup> are too well known to need commendation or criticism. Revised by the author, and many valuable notes added, they now form four volumes of Mr. Douglas's charming "Rudder Grange" series.

From the same series we have "Mr. Washington Adams in England,"<sup>30</sup> by Mr. R. G. White. It is the history of a practical joke played by an American, travelling in England, upon an English nobleman whose acquaintance he makes in the train. The story is told by another American—a friend of the practical joker—who happened to be in the same compartment and to be again present at the *dénouement*. The *casus belli* on the part of the too susceptible Yankee is the unaffected astonishment—most courteously manifested, be it said—of the Englishman on discovering that the two well-bred and well-spoken gentlemen in whose company he finds himself are Americans. He gives no other ground of offence, except it be his ignorance of the constitution and boundaries of the United States. On the contrary, after listening with extraordinary meekness and deference to a long lecture, the tendency of which is to show that the Americans are not Americans at all, but in reality more thoroughly English than the English themselves, as well as being better bred and possessing a purer English accent, the Earl of Toppingham takes a most cordial leave of his American instructors and invites them to visit him at his house if they should find themselves in his neighbourhood. Hence arises the idea of the hoax or practical joke which gives its name to the book. Mr. Humphreys (the susceptible lecturer) determines to give the benighted Earl a severe lesson. Lord Toppingham had had the *outrévidence* to take his ideal of the typical Yankee from, let us say, Asa Trenchard in the "American Cousin;" Mr. Humphreys resolves that he shall see his ideal realized: so, having been in his youth an eminently successful amateur actor, he makes up as the typical Yankee, and armed with a letter of introduction from himself under his real name of Humphreys, presents himself at Lord Toppingham's country house as the Hon. Washington J. Adams, Member of Congress. There he whittles, chews, spits, cleans his nails and picks his teeth with a bowie-knife, and is with difficulty prevented from making targets for his "six-shooter" of the trees in the park. Finally, at luncheon, to which he invites himself, he reads some *soi-disant* new verses by Walt Whitman, which are in reality an excellent parody on that author, and much the cleverest thing in Mr. White's book. After this he retires, the last view of him being his legs, carelessly dangling out of the window of the cab which bears him away. Such is in *résumé* the story of Mr. Washington Adams in England. Were it worth while, it might not be altogether impossible to show that the

<sup>28</sup> "The Autocrat of the Breakfast Table." Two vols.

<sup>29</sup> "The Professor at the Breakfast Table." Two vols. With the Story of Iris. By Oliver Wendell Holmes.

<sup>30</sup> "Mr. Washington Adams in England." By Richard Grant White. One vol. Edinburgh: David Douglas. 1883.

English notion of the typical Yankee is not quite so unfounded as Mr. White maintains it to be. But it is not so much the argument of the book as the book itself with which we are here concerned, and of that we will merely say that, though to a certain extent clever and amusing, it is not altogether well done. To begin with, a practical joke, which, under the circumstances described, must be regarded as an unprovoked and unwarrantable liberty, does not seem the best means of vindicating American good-breeding and refinement. Then, again, in the discussions between the two "high-toned" Yankees and their English acquaintances, Mr. White falls into the common error of making his opponents too silly and ignorant, and the champions of his own ideas too super-humanly well-informed and clever. Finally, it is absurd for Americans to criticize English pronunciation, spelling, &c. Every nation is and must be the supreme judge of the spelling and pronunciation of its own language. If English, as spoken and written in America, is to be regarded as another language—the American language, the standpoint assumed by Mark Twain—we in England have nothing more to say about eccentricities of orthography or pronunciation, present or to come. But if, as Mr. White maintains, the language of the United States is *English*, it must inevitably be judged by the English standard.

Another volume of Mr. David Douglas's "Pocket Editions of American Authors" is "Prue and I,"<sup>31</sup> by Mr. George W. Curtis. It is clever and fanciful, but, to our thinking, too unsubstantial. Its tone throughout is a sort of pensive, dreamy moralizing; the qualities it seems to lack are *verve* and *entrain*. Occasionally it recalls vague, shadowy bits of Hawthorne, but one misses the romantic glamour which Hawthorne threw over his dreams. There is a certain sadness in "Prue and I," not the passionate sadness which exhales from such stories as "The Bride of Lammermoor," or from such music as Verdi's "Traviata," but the sort of sadness inspired by distant music and still more by distant bells.

Mr. Howells is, beyond question, one of the most charming romance writers in the English language, on either side of the Atlantic, and "A Woman's Reason"<sup>32</sup> deserves to rank with the best of his productions. The plot, simple, but sufficiently romantic, is well-developed, the characters are all consistent creations, each one thinking, acting and speaking as such people would in real life. The dissection of the human mind and heart is performed with extraordinary skill and fineness of touch. In truth *fineness* is Mr. Howells' distinguishing characteristic, and, as we have already had occasion to remark, his tendency is to carry it to a fault. Sometimes it is shown in the moral tone of some of his personages in whom a sort of morbid and fantastic scrupulousness takes the place of simple, straightforward, uprightness; oftener it appears in a certain sensitive

<sup>31</sup> "Prue and I." By George William Curtis. Edinburgh: David Douglas. 1884.

<sup>32</sup> "A Woman's Reason." A Novel. By William D. Howells. Two vols. Edinburgh: David Douglas. 1883.



self-consciousness, which causes some of his most charming presentments of American young ladyhood to appear captious, unamiable and almost ill-bred, in their intercourse with Englishmēn. The adventurous parts of the story are shortly and simply told, but with considerable power. The descriptions of the Atolls in the Pacific are good samples of the power of words to convey scenic effects.

"A Righteous Apostate"<sup>33</sup> is an unusual novel. The plot, especially, is quite a new departure. Many of the situations, too, are striking, and many of the scenes powerfully and dramatically wrought out. Some of the characters are finely conceived and well sustained, but others again are entirely unnatural. The philosophical reflections and generalizations, of which, short as the book is, there are too many, are neither so deep nor so novel as they probably seem to the author to be. In the production of the incidents, probability is too constantly and too glaringly violated. Still, with all these defects, which, together with an occasional awkwardness of style, seem to indicate a comparatively unpractised writer, "A Righteous Apostate" has the great and redeeming quality of being not only readable, but extremely interesting. This, after all, is what in works of fiction distinguishes the sheep from the goats. The work bears few marks of transatlantic origin, except in the printing, where the hiccupping division of words (*e.g.* rec-ollection) is rather repulsive to a European reader.

Another curious American book, from the same publishers, is "The Diothas."<sup>34</sup> The writer, "Ismar Thiuseu," (no doubt a *nom d'occasion*, assumed for the exigences of the story) is, in the opening scene, which serves as prologue or introduction, about to be mesmerized by a friend, to test some theories recently discussed between them. "I am willing to try the experiment," says Ismar Thiuseu. "Remember the conditions," replies his friend. "Your mind is imaginative and poetical; mine, logical and fairly stored with science and history. It is necessary to the success of our experiment that your mind submit entirely to the guidance of mine." These words are the key to the peculiar character of the mesmeric vision which follows, fantastically imaginative in substance, yet highly matter-of-fact and realistic in detail. To its narration the rest of the volume is devoted. After an interval of deep and dreamless slumber, Ismar Thiuseu wakes, as it seems to him, but in an unknown world. Put to sleep in the nineteenth century, he wakes in the ninety-sixth! The scene is still New York, but not the New York he knew; that, says his friend, who is still with him in his dream, "crumbled into dust almost eighty centuries ago. Its fragments form only the lowermost layer of the five fathoms of detritus on which the present city stands, the accumulated remains of a succession of cities each more magnificent than its predecessor." Here is a description of the future New York, or rather "Nuiork," as it has by that time come to be called:—

<sup>33</sup> "A Righteous Apostate." By Clara Lanza. One vol. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1883.

<sup>34</sup> "The Diothas; or, a Far Look Ahead." By Ismar Thiuseu. One vol. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1883.

“Imagine the present sidewalk covered by an arcade supported on arches and pillars of polished granite. The architecture was of a style to me utterly unknown, but combined in a remarkable degree the characteristics of lightness and solidity. Above the lower arcade rose others, one for each story, each slightly receding within the other, and of correspondingly lighter construction. The material of the lower arcade was stone; that of the upper one was a metal, incrustated with a peculiar oxide of stone colour. So similar was it, indeed, to stone that it was only by accident I discovered the real material of the delicate carved work, surpassing in airy grace and exuberant variety of detail the far-famed wonders of the Alhambra.”

These arcades were joined to each other by bridges, placed at convenient distances so that foot passengers could traverse the whole town without descending into the carriage road. The costume of the men in this wondrous town “consisted of a short tunic, reaching not quite to the knees, and sandals.” It seems to argue rather a poverty of imagination on the part of the author to dress his men of the ninety-sixth century in a sort of kilt, robbed of all its picturesque adjuncts, and, as it were, reduced to its simplest expression. The Nuiork “gentlemen of the period” must have had somewhat the air of walking about with dressing jackets and slippers for sole habiliments. The costume of the women, or rather ladies, for, though there is but one class, all are ladies in the highest sense of the word, differs but slightly from that of the men. They, too, wear the tunic, only rather longer, and the sandals, with the addition of a mantle and Turkish trousers. Neither sex wears either hat or gloves, except occasionally as a defence from the inclemency of the weather. Their modes of locomotion are minutely described, but we can only afford space to say that electricity is the only motive power employed, steam being abolished, and horses, as indeed all other domestic animals save dogs and cats, extinct. This brings us to the food of the future; it consists entirely of chemical preparations extracted from vegetable bases, and is cooked in central depôts, and thence delivered at each house in electric waggons specially adapted for the purpose. They have *consommé*, beefsteaks, and, in short, everything we now eat, but all are chemical imitations of the real thing, After each meal the family wash the plates and dishes and pack them to be returned to the depôt, *for they have no servants*. This, at least, is surely a blessed change, if it were but possible. After breakfast—a midday meal, as in France—the telephone is set to work, and each family enjoys a concert produced by artists, no matter where, often at the other side of the globe. For a more full and detailed account of the customs, manners, opinions, laws, and religion (for they have a religion) of our supposed descendants, we must refer the reader to the book itself, as likewise for the love story of Ismar Thiussen with his fair descendant in the three hundred and thirty-first degree, Reva Diotha, whom, notwithstanding her consanguinity, he was on the eve of espousing when the catastrophe comes which ends the story by waking him. The book evinces some thought. Many of the changes imagined are probable, some, especially those in the laws for the repression of crime are laudable; one alone is absolutely impossible, that, namely, which

represents the human race as having ceased to increase in number, and consequently to have found rest from the enforced struggle for existence. Such a state of things would make an anomaly in the world of organisms, among which surplus reproduction, with its necessary consequence of internecine struggle, is the universal law. There can be no rest but in the extinction of organic life, the Nirvana of the Buddhists.

"The Laird's Secret,"<sup>35</sup> by J. H. Jamieson is a semi-religious novel, and were it not that the scene is laid in Scotland instead of America, and the people devout upholders of the "Solemn League and Covenant," we should constantly be reminded of the "Wide, Wide World," "The Old Helmet," and others of Mrs. Wetherell's works. The story of the lives and loves of the minister's three daughters is pleasantly and graphically given, and the details of the family life and occupations are too well narrated to be ever for a moment dull. One of the chief objects of the book seems to be to denounce Ritualism. The ancient chapel of Dalmany, which has hitherto been a hallowed ruin, is decked out by the new incumbent of the parish, supported by the Laird, his patron, in all the flaunting glories of the latest fashion of the Ritualists. Crosses and candlesticks, flowers and vestments, genuflexions and prostrations shock and trouble the minds of the simple Covenanters in no small degree. To them it is "a mad idolatry to make the service greater than the God." We will not reveal "the Laird's Secret." It would spoil the enjoyment of a very pleasant tale. We will only add that the two volumes before us may be very sincerely recommended to the novel-reading world.

"Eugenia, an Episode"<sup>36</sup> by William Money Hardinge, is one long tirade of "sound and fury signifying nothing." The author has, apparently, a very hyperbolic turn of mind, which leads him to create splendid heroes and angelic heroines out of very poor materials. The story is neither worth dissection nor elaborate comment.

"The Land Leaguers,"<sup>37</sup> Mr. Trollope's latest work, cut short before its completion by his last illness, is worthy of his best days, and it is impossible to read it without feeling keenly the loss which every lover of English fiction has sustained in his death. The story is not primarily, like many by the same author, a study of character, though the characters are fresh, natural and well-drawn; nor is it mainly a tale of adventure, though adventures and stirring incidents abound. The purpose of the book is to depict the actual life of dwellers in Ireland during the tragic and shameful years of 1880-1882, and this purpose it fulfils completely. Any one who has read "The Land Leaguers" will have a more lively and vivid idea of how life, especially that of middle-class landowners and their families, was disturbed and

<sup>35</sup> "The Laird's Secret." By J. H. Jamieson. Two vols. London and Edinburgh: William Blackwood & Sons. 1882.

<sup>36</sup> "Eugenia: an Episode." By William Money Hardinge. Three vols. London: Smith, Elder & Co., Waterloo Place. 1883.

<sup>37</sup> "The Land-Leaguers." By Anthony Trollope. Three vols. London: Chatto & Windus, Piccadilly. 1883.

distorted by that hideous reign of terror, than could be obtained from all the newspaper reports of the time. And this effect is obtained without interrupting the narrative either with statistics, declamation, or irrelevant talk of any kind; only once does the author, putting aside his *dramatis personæ*, come before the curtain himself, when (see the chapter headed "The State of Ireland") in a few weighty and dispassionate pages, marked by a complete knowledge of his subject, he expresses and explains his dissent from the Liberal policy of conciliation, notwithstanding that he himself was, all his life, a consistent supporter of the great Liberal Party. But, apart from its politics, the story is in itself full of interest, and, though the final chapters are wanting, the *dénouement* is clearly foreshadowed.

As to "The Story of my Heart,"<sup>38</sup> by Mr. R. Jefferies, we humbly confess that we are incompetent to deal with it. Such lofty and vague imaginings are beyond us. We hope and believe that it is all it should be, but our mental attitude with respect to such rhapsodical utterance is exactly that of the Northern Farmer with regard to the sermon.

"I 'cerd un a bummin' awaäy loike a buzzard clock over my yeid,  
An' I niver knaw'd whot a meaned, but I thowt a 'ad summat to saäy,  
An' I thowt a said whot a owt to a' said, an' I coom'd awaäy."

Still there is a familiar ring about Mr. Jefferies's "wood-notes wild." They recall something; but whether that something is Walt Whitman's "Leaves of Grass" or the *communiqués* "from our Colwell Hatchney correspondent" in *Punch*, we cannot undertake to determine. Perhaps the style is borrowed from the one, and the thought from the other.

Mr. Vernon Lee's "Ottilie"<sup>39</sup> is a graceful little work, set, as it were, in a minor key, but we hardly see wherein it merits the name of an idyll. The story is by no means pastoral or poetic, nor even, in any marked degree, ideal. It is simply the "o'er true tale" of unlimited devotion and self-sacrifice, lavished on a weak, vain and emotional nature, and inevitably producing unbridled selfishness and disregard for the happiness of others. The treatment is eminently realistic, and the book reads more like an actual autobiography than an idyll. The *couleur locale*, both as to time and place, is skilfully woven in.

A book like the "Crusoes of Guiana"<sup>40</sup> will always find plenty of readers, for the love of wild adventure is inherent in most minds. Here we have it in full measure. It is the story of a political prisoner who manages to escape from the wretched convict prison of French Guiana, and after many "hair-breadth 'scapes" makes his way to the coast of Dutch Guiana, where he is joined by his wife and children. Their life in the wild forests is very vividly described. Certainly they have most extraordinary luck in the midst of their misfortunes.

<sup>38</sup> "The Story of my Heart: my Autobiography." By Richard Jefferies. London: Messrs. Longmans & Co. 1883.

<sup>39</sup> "Ottilie: an Eighteenth Century Idyll." By Vernon Lee. One vol. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1883.

<sup>40</sup> "The Crusoes of Guiana; or, the White Tiger." By Louis Bousсенard. London: Sampson Low & Co.

A tree or plant is found for every need, insomuch that we are forcibly reminded of the "Bootjack tree" in Mr. Burnand's "Chicken Hazard." The book is by Mr. Louis Boussenard, and is, we suppose, a translation. The illustrations are not good, but the tale is very brightly written, and never for a moment flags. It will, no doubt, captivate many a boy reader, and at the same time is a good wholesome story inculcating humanity, unselfishness, and cheerful contentment under the most trying circumstances.

In translating the cycle of tales called "Pilgrim Sorrow,"<sup>41</sup> by Carmen Sylva, Miss Helen Zimmeru has had a thankless task, for they can neither be truly described as allegorics nor fairy lore, though they partake of the nature of both. They are, in fact, the outpouring of a heart bowed down by grief and suffering, and are so intensely lugubrious that it would be cruel to put them into the hands of children. "Carmen Sylva" is the *nom de plume* of the beautiful Queen of Roumania, whose sorrowful life and good deeds are well known throughout Europe. The adventures of Pilgrim Sorrow are, no doubt, meant for the chief incidents of her own life.

"Mr. Bumpkin's Lawsuit,"<sup>42</sup> is not so much a novel as a protest against the abuses incident to the present system of legal procedure in civil actions. The protest is thrown into a narrative form to bring it home with greater force to the minds of "laymen." The artifice adopted by Mr. Harris, of presenting his story as the result of a succession of dreams, is clumsy, and keeps up in the reader's mind a constant sense of unreality which mars the effect he desires to produce. Indeed, as a work of art, the tale has all sorts of faults; it is too flimsy and unsubstantial a vehicle for the moral which is the final cause of its existence; and, again, it is for the most part unnecessarily farcical, though, here and there, not without a dreary pathos. The farm, with all its adjuncts, from the pig which was the innocent cause of the lawsuit, to the bull which followed the farmer's wife "like a Christian," is happily depicted, and the blight, which the silly and ruinous lawsuit spreads over the peaceful scene, is powerfully and touchingly described.

"Hannah Tarne,"<sup>43</sup> though ostensibly a story for children, is nevertheless full of interest for grown up-people. Quite without pretension, it enlists our sympathies from first to last, and we know of no book of fiction which we would sooner recommend to youthful readers. The name of the author is not given, but whoever he (or perhaps she) may be, the work is well done, and breathes a healthy, loving spirit worthy of all praise.

<sup>41</sup> "Pilgrim Sorrow. A Cycle of Tales." By Carmen Sylva (Queen Elizabeth of Roumania). Translated by Helen Zimmeru. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1884.

<sup>42</sup> "Mr. Bumpkin's Lawsuit; or, How to Win your Opponent's Case." By Richard Harris, Barrister-at-law, &c. Stevens & Sons, Law Publishers, 119, Chancery Lane. 1883.

<sup>43</sup> "Hannah Tarne. A Story for Children." One vol. London: Macmillan & Co. 1883.

Nothing can be fairer nor more rational than the preface to Mr. Bartram's "Heroes of Israel."<sup>44</sup> "I have not hesitated" (he says) "where it seemed to me called for, to apply the same kind of moral criticism to these old-time narratives, that most of us would to similar occurrences in the present day." Yet the first story he presents to his child readers is the story of the Israelitish spies harboured in the house of Rahab, who smuggles them out of the city, and compounds for the safety of herself and her relatives, regardless of the massacre of all her fellow-townsmen. And this "old-time narrative" does not seem to Mr. Bartram to call for any "moral criticism." How, he might have asked himself, should we regard a Parisian Rahab who should, in 1870, have betrayed Paris to Prussian spies?

What can we say of Mr. Shorthouse's "Little Schoolmaster Mark?"<sup>45</sup> It claims to be "a spiritual romance," which, whatever it may be, is certainly not the same thing as *un roman spirituel*. Perhaps, to do justice to a work of the kind disembodied reviewers would be required. In any case, to poor mundane critics like ourselves it has the effect of being "some such thing to no such purpose." We discern clearly enough in it the influence of German mysticism on the one hand, and on the other, of Mr. Vernon Lee's pleasant dissertations on the Italian drama; we see also that the paper and type are both *de luxe*, but of the teaching or moral of the book, if, indeed, it contains a moral, or teaches anything, we know no more than if we had never read it.

Thackeray's "Essay on the Genius of George Cruikshank,"<sup>46</sup> reprinted from THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW, is a piece of work well calculated to drive a critic of these days to despair. How inimitable is its touch! At once familiar and elegant, serious and humorous, enthusiastically appreciative, and yet just and clear-sighted; but, above all, what the French call *personnel*. It is not the impersonal reviewer who is going through his paces, delivering a more or less well-qualified opinion, in good set terms, adroitly set off with technical phrases; it is Thackeray talking to us, as few can talk—talking with apparent carelessness—even ramblingly, but never losing the thread of his discourse or saying a word too much, nor ever missing a point which may help to elucidate his subject, or enhance the charm of his essay. We may not all take so exalted a view of the merit of Cruikshank, as an illustrator, as that so eloquently set forth in the essay before us; to us it seems that though we may in the illustrations of our own time have lost something as to intensity—we might almost say, violence—of expression, whether of humour, pathos, or horror, we have undoubtedly gained vastly in correct drawing. Cruikshank's figures, as it seems to us, are not so much men and women as the

<sup>44</sup> "Heroes of Israel." By Richard Bartram. London School Association, Norfolk Street, Strand. 1883.

<sup>45</sup> "The Little Schoolmaster Mark. A Spiritual Romance." By J. H. Shorthouse, Author of "John Inglesant." One vol. London: Macmillan & Co. 1883.

<sup>46</sup> "An Essay on the Genius of George Cruikshank." By William Makepeace Thackeray. With all the original Woodcuts. London: George Redway, York Street, Covent Garden. 1884.

incarnation of the sentiment he desired to express. Perhaps no true delineation of humanity could so powerfully (may it not be exaggeratedly?) express those emotions as did Cruikshank's embodiments of them. Still we must confess that to us correct anatomical drawing is a *sine qua non* even in a caricature. Mr. W. E. Church's prefatory note on "Thackeray as an Art Critic," is interesting and carefully compiled.

Few literary matters have been discussed more repeatedly or at greater length, or with more acrimony than the poets and poetry of the first quarter of this century. Mr. T. H. Caine now adds to the mass of critical literature on this well-worn topic, his "Cobwebs of Criticism,"<sup>47</sup> in which he entangles not only the poets themselves, but their reviewers. He divides his subject into the Lake School, consisting of Wordsworth, Coleridge and Southey; the Satanic School, where Byron figures alone; and finally, the Cockney School, which contains Leigh Hunt, Keats, and Shelley. To each poet a chapter is devoted, wherein are set forth the contemporary criticisms of his works, taken from *The Edinburgh Review*, *The Examiner*, *The Quarterly Review*, *The New Monthly Magazine*, *Blackwood*. The violence and shortsightedness which too often characterized the critiques are discussed, and variously accounted for. Where the attack is less on the works than on the private life of the author, Mr. Caine carefully sifts the charges advanced, and endeavours to do justice without fear or favour. Still, as might be expected, little new light is brought to bear. Nothing is adduced that can substantially alter the opinion which most men interested in literature have already arrived at with regard to each of the great names which form the subject of Mr. Caine's volume. Of it we will say no word of criticism. To criticize critics may be salutary, but is surely going far enough; to criticize the critic of critics would be the proverbial "last straw," and, if it did not in this case "break the camel's back" it would assuredly exhaust the patience of the public.

Dr. Craik's "Manual of English Literature and Language"<sup>48</sup> has the unusual merit of being at once an admirable textbook for the use of students and a very agreeable contribution to English belles lettres. It is needless to enter into any detailed criticism of a work which in its present form has already reached its ninth edition, whilst Dr. Craik's larger work, from which the present manual has been compiled, has long enjoyed the high reputation it so well deserves. To the present edition of the manual are appended a list of questions, the answers to which are all to be found by careful study of the text; perhaps it would have still further increased the usefulness of the work,

<sup>47</sup> "Cobwebs of Criticism. A Review of the First Reviewers of the 'Lake,' 'Satanic,' and 'Cockney' Schools." By T. Hall Caine. London: Elliot Stock, 62, Paternoster Row. 1883.

<sup>48</sup> "A Manual of English Literature, and of the History of the English Language." With numerous Specimens. By George L. Craik, LL.D. With an additional Chapter on Recent Literature. By Henry Craik, M.A. Griffin & Co., Exeter Street, Strand.

as a manual, if the text had been cast into numbered paragraphs, with corresponding numbers affixed to the questions; but, as they stand, the questions will be found invaluable by both students and teachers. The synoptical tables at the beginning of the book are another very useful arrangement. They mark each successive stage in the process of evolution which has transformed, without loss of identity, the simple and inflexional speech of the Jutes and Angles into modern English, the most composite and least inflexional of all the Indo-European languages. Nothing can be more interesting than the history of this evolution of our language as given by Dr. Craik. He treats the subject scientifically and fully, yet with extraordinary conciseness. There is not a word too much, yet there is none of the curt baldness of exposition which one is apt to expect in a manual. His review of our literature from the age of Chaucer down to the first quarter of the present century belongs to the highest order of criticism. In the space of some 400 pages he passes in review five centuries of English literature, and everywhere he touches it with a master hand. Rarely has it been our lot to read criticisms so diversified in their subjects, and at the same time so just and so appreciative. The concluding chapter, which deals with the literature of our own time, is from the pen of Mr. H. Craik, author of the "Life of Swift." The value of the book as a book of reference is greatly enhanced by a full and well-arranged index.

Passing from Dr. Craik's manual to Mr. Gosse's "Seventeenth Century Studies"<sup>40</sup> is like turning from the map of England in an ordinary-sized atlas to the inch-scale Ordnance plan of a county. In the one the whole subject is sketched out, and the relative size and importance of its component parts can be compared and estimated; in the other, the minute delineation of one small corner fills the entire page; its proportion to the whole is thus momentarily lost sight of, but the interest is enhanced by the largeness and distinctness of the details. Mr. Gosse has chosen for the subjects of his essays, Thomas Lodge, John Webster, Samuel Rowlands, Captain Dover's Cotswold Games, Robert Herrick, Richard Crashaw, Abraham Cowley, Catherine Phillips—better known as "the matchless Orinda"—Sir George Etherege, and Thomas Otway. Each essay is a finished specimen of that careful and accurate analytic treatment which the modern scientific spirit has introduced into literary criticism and biography. Did our space permit we would gladly follow Mr. Gosse through all the brilliant, charming series; but we must content ourselves with singling out for especial commendation the study on Etherege; it is even more lively and entertaining than its fellows, and has the additional merit of bringing to our knowledge many new and interesting facts:—

"That Sir George Etherege" (says Mr. Gosse) "wrote three plays which are now even less read than the rank and file of Restoration drama, and that

<sup>40</sup> "Seventeenth Century Studies. A Contribution to the History of English Poetry." By Edmund W. Gosse. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., Paternoster Square. 1883.



he died at Ratisbon, at an uncertain date, by falling downstairs at his own house and breaking his neck after a banquet, these are the only particulars which can be said to be known, even to students of literature, concerning the career of a very remarkable writer. I shall endeavour to show in the following pages that the entire neglect of the three plays is an unworthy return for the singular part they enjoyed in the creation of modern English comedy; and I shall be able to prove that the one current anecdote of Etheredge's life has no foundation in fact whatever. At the same time I shall have the satisfaction of printing, mainly for the first time, and from manuscript sources, a mass of biographical material which makes this dramatist, hitherto the shadowiest figure of his time, perhaps the poet of the Restoration, of whose life and character we know the most."

We may add, that the promise held out in the above lines is fully kept in the essay to which they serve as introduction.

Another study on a seventeenth-century author is Mr. Macaulay's "Francis Beaumont;"<sup>50</sup> it is, as the preface informs us, "the first systematic attempt to separate Beaumont and Fletcher on broad grounds of criticism." In pursuance of this object, analysis is strained to the uttermost. We cannot say that, in our judgment, the desired result is absolutely reached. No certainty is attained, or is probably attainable, but, without doubt, a fair probability is set up. After all, why separate Beaumont and Fletcher? Should we more enjoy the works signed Ereckmann-Chatrian if we could accurately assign to each collaborateur his share in the joint work? We are well aware that such questions as these are "flat blasphemy," or, worse still, pure Philistinism; still the thought will intrude that "*le jeu ne vaut pas la chandelle.*" Nevertheless, as the attempted separation of Beaumont from Fletcher gives occasion to much acute comparative criticism, and to much instructive discussion of our greatest English poets, we are quite ready to admit that "*la chandelle vaut bien le jeu.*"

Before taking leave of the seventeenth century, we must notice Mr. J. Ashton's curious volume, entitled "Humour, Wit, and Satire of the Seventeenth Century."<sup>51</sup> As its name imports, it is a collection of comic pieces in verse and prose, illustrated with many curious contemporary woodcuts, and enriched by many interesting and instructive notes by the editor. Both the notes and illustrations are, in our opinion, infinitely more amusing than are the ancient jokes themselves, in which we can find little fun. In fact, the real merit of the *recueil* is the light it throws upon the manners of the period when such jokes were thought funny. At the end of the volume, the tunes of many of the ballads are given: some of them are tunes still extant, though set to other words.

The purpose which prompts Mr. Gould to give to the world his "Shakesperian Corrigenda"<sup>52</sup> is worthy of all commendation. It would be difficult to exaggerate the importance of obtaining the text of

<sup>50</sup> "Francis Beaumont. A Critical Study." By G. C. Macaulay, M.A. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., Paternoster Square. 1883.

<sup>51</sup> "Humour, Wit, and Satire of the Seventeenth Century." Collected and Illustrated. By John Ashton. Chatto & Windus, Piccadilly. 1883.

<sup>52</sup> "Corrigenda and Explanations of the Text of Shakespeare." By George Gould. J. S. Virtue & Co., Limited, 26, Ivy Lane, Paternoster Row. 1884.

Shakespeare as free from corruptions, errors, and obscurity as the difficulties of the case permit ; and it must be admitted the mass of errors of all sorts which Mr. Gould announces as the result of his patient and skilled examination of Mr. Halliwell Phillipps's photograph edition of the folio of 1623 throws sad discredit on the established text. But, to render the suggested "edition of the future" in any degree satisfactory, we think the most important of all the rules laid down by Mr. Gould is the first—viz., "that the editing be undertaken by a syndicate of competent persons." It would clearly be impossible for us to find space to discuss in detail even a small proportion of the emendations proposed, but we have met with many which we cannot approve. One specimen must suffice: in "the Two Gentlemen of Verona," act ii. scene 1. Mr. Gould unhesitatingly affirms that "To fast like one that *takes* diet," ought to read "that *hates* diet." Here he is clearly mistaken. The word "diet" in the text does not mean *food*, as in modern English, but *abstinence* from food on account of health. Compare the French expression "Faire diète."

It would be difficult to say what Mr. Lancelot Cross's "Hesperides"<sup>53</sup> is about—what it treats of; but it would be still more difficult to tell certainly what it does not treat of. It is a large volume of rambling dissertation upon all sorts of subjects, but principally on literature. We would gladly, were it in our power, give a *résumé*, or at least, some general notion of its contents, and so leave it without further criticism; but such "disjointed chat" (we do not round the quotation with "bald," for it is anything but bald) defies *résumé* or analysis, nor does the volume contain anything sufficiently striking to be quoted. We will therefore confine ourselves to saying that those who enjoy listening to prolonged discourse, varied enough as to its subjects, and often more or less clever and eloquent in their treatment, will probably find the "Hesperides" pleasant reading.

Mr. Francis Hueffer's "Italian and other Studies"<sup>54</sup> is a collection of articles which have from time to time appeared in some of the leading Reviews and Journals. Their republication in the more abiding form of a volume is amply justified by their intrinsic excellence as essays, and also for the valuable information which they so agreeably convey on subjects of lasting interest.

We have before us the first and second numbers of the library edition now being issued of "A Dictionary of the English Language"<sup>55</sup> by the Rev. James Stormonth, so well-known for his admirable English Dictionary for the use of schools. The present enlarged edition promises to be a most useful and complete work. The explanations of scientific terms are brief, but clear and sufficient; the etymologies are a valuable feature, and well-treated. The pronunciation, which has

<sup>53</sup> "Hesperides." By Lancelot Cross. London: Trübner & Co. 1883.

<sup>54</sup> "Italian and other Studies." By Francis Hueffer. London: Elliot Stock, Paternoster Row. 1883.

<sup>55</sup> "A Dictionary of the English Language." By the Rev. James Stormonth. London and Edinburgh: Blackwood & Sons.

been revised by the Rev. P. H. Phelps, is thoroughly satisfactory, so far as we have been able to test it.

We have also received Vol. XVI. (Men—Mos) of the “*Encyclopædia Britannica*,”<sup>56</sup> ninth edition. To single out any one article for special mention or quotation would not only be invidious but would give no adequate conception of a work whose most striking characteristic is the evenness and regularity with which a high degree of excellence is maintained throughout the vast range of subjects dealt with. In the present volume we have articles on Mendelssohn, Meteorology, Methodism, Mexico, Michael Angelo, Milk, James Mill, and J. S. Mill, Miniature, Mineralogy, Mirabeau, Mirrors, Missions, Molière, Mohammedanism, Molluscs, Monarchism, &c. &c. And on each topic we have the latest and most authentic information, the last corrected opinions and ideas, in short, the *dernier mot* of all that modern accuracy and research have attained to.

To all who aspire to speak French correctly Madame Duperré de Lisle’s “*Etude sur la Prononciation Française*”<sup>57</sup> will be invaluable. Within its 156 pages are to be found not only the broad principles of French Pronunciation, but most of those minor niceties which are in general only to be acquired by long and careful study under a competent professor. All the difficulties which beset a foreigner are foreseen and cleared up. For instance, the so-called *e muet* is tracked through all its Protean transformations with an accuracy and minuteness which will win the gratitude of all earnest students of *vivâ voce* French. But, indeed, each letter of the alphabet is separately treated of, and all its various sounds in combination with other letters carefully tabulated. Another table and some pages of lucid exposition are devoted to the length, or prosodical value, of the several vowels. This is a subject of the highest importance, both for correct speech, and for anything like intelligent appreciation of French poetry. The *liaison*, too, that stumbling-block of foreigners, is carefully explained, and its difficulties much lessened by clear and simple rules. Even more important than the *liaison* is the *accent tonique*, about which we English err so strangely both in theory and practice; some of us maintaining that there are no emphasized syllables in French, while others, and by far the larger number, painstakingly emphasize the first syllable of each word. On this point the words of our author are decisive. At page twenty-five we read: “*En Français il (l’accent tonique) porte toujours sur la dernière syllabe du mot, quand elle est sonore, et sur la pénultième quand la dernière est muette.*” The pronunciation inculcated by Madame de Lisle, which is sanctioned by the approval of such high authorities as MM. Legouvé and Got, is in all respects that of

<sup>56</sup> “*The Encyclopædia Britannica: A Dictionary of Arts, Sciences, and General Literature.*” Ninth Edition. Vol. XVI. Edinburgh: Adam & Charles Black. 1883.

<sup>57</sup> “*Etude sur la Prononciation Française.*” Par Madame F. Duperré de Lisle, Institutrice Diplômée, Membre de la Société des Gens de Lettres, et de celles des Auteurs Dramatiques, avec deux lettres de M. Legouvé de l’Académie Française, M. Got, Doyen de la Comédie Française. Paris: Librairie Ch. Delagrave. 15, Rue Soufflot. 1883.

well-bred and well-educated French people, free alike from pedantic preciseness, and from that clipping glibness which in England is too often mistaken for the perfection of Parisian accent. The arrangement of the book is excellent, and an ample table of contents gives every facility for reference.

The idea of printing selections from the *Gentleman's Magazine*<sup>58</sup> is not new. The suggestion was, it seems, made by Gibbon in 1792, though not acted on till 1809. But the present series (of which the first volume, treating of Manner and Customs, is before us) justly claims to be more than a mere selection. It is a collection, inasmuch as the articles bearing on each particular subject are classified and arranged under appropriate headings. So that instead of searching through the 224 volumes of the original magazine for the scattered information they may (or may not) contain, it will now be possible to find at once all that bears upon the subject of our inquiry, and to store it in a handy form on our bookshelves. The idea is an excellent one, and it really seems strange that so useful a work should have so long remained unattempted. It is true, as Mr. Gomme says, that "the old writers were hopelessly unscientific," and that the theories advanced in the *Gentleman's Magazine* are generally erroneous, and therefore it is necessary to caution the unwary "general reader" against accepting them. Yet even these erroneous theories have a value of their own, as showing us what our grandfathers believed, and the kind of evidence they were satisfied with. It is, however, as a record of contemporary facts and observations that the *Gentleman's Magazine* possesses most value. descriptions of manners and customs which have since completely disappeared form a considerable portion of its treasures. These and all kindred articles Mr. Gomme has collected and classified in the present volume. Amongst the most valuable of its contents are the whole series of Mr. Nichol's articles on "Pageants." There are a few judicious explanatory foot-notes, and some useful bibliographical references collected at the end of the volume. Its rough, thick, warm-tinted paper with irregular edges give it an appropriate flavour of antiquity.

We have already called the attention of our readers to M. Lussy's "Traité de l'Expression Musicale," and we have now the pleasure of directing their attention to a new work by the same author—viz., a "Treatise on Musical Rhythm."<sup>59</sup> It is chiefly in the world of thought that the "Treatise on Musical Expression" obtained the recognition which it deserves, and this is also likely to be the case in respect to the "Treatise on Musical Rhythm." In the domain of art, M. Lussy's positive theories are regarded as audaciously dogmatic, while, on the contrary, the examples he adduces are looked upon as surprisingly elementary. But his new volume is scarcely likely to encounter the same obstacles, although it is, in fact, due to the same

<sup>58</sup> "The *Gentleman's Magazine* Library. Being a Classified Collection of the chief Contents of the *Gentleman's Magazine* from 1731 to 1868." Edited by George Lawrence Gomme, F.S.A. London: Elliot Stock. 1883.

<sup>59</sup> "Traité du Rythme Musicale." Par Mathias Lussy. Paris. 1883.

inspiration as that which animated his former work. Public curiosity has already been excited by M. Lussy's theories in England, Germany, Russia, and Sweden, as well as in France. Notwithstanding differences on points of detail or of secondary importance in respect to the "Treatise on Musical Rhythm," the European Press which concerns itself with matters musical, has exhibited a remarkable consensus of opinion that the work is nothing less than a scientific revelation—the result of its author's long and laborious observation of musical phenomena. Moreover, his arguments are distinguished by that indestructible solidity which the positive method can alone confer; hence they have encountered no opponents worthy of the name, although they have wounded many existing prejudices. Up to the present time, what musician could affirm that he possessed a clear and precise conception of rhythmical phenomena? Who had a truly enlightened view of the origin of rhythms? M. Lussy's volume has met with an enthusiastic reception from the chiefs of the science of music, and we are glad to learn that it is about to be, as the "Traité de l'Expression" is already, translated into English.

## INDIA AND OUR COLONIAL EMPIRE.

---

*INDIA.*—The second volume of the Indian Census Return of 1881 contains some interesting statistics as to the nationality and occupations of the people. The total population of the country is 253,891,821, and out of this enormous number only 85,444 persons, of whom 73,456 are males, and 12,088 females, are British-born subjects. Of these 85,544 moreover, 56,646 are soldiers, so that outside the ranks of the army there are fewer than 20,000 British-born males in India. In addition to the persons born in Britain there are, of course, a number of persons of other European nationalities, and also a number born in India of European parents; but, including all these, the number returned under the comprehensive head of "British-born and other Europeans" is only 142,612! Turning next to the occupations of the people, we find that 134,930,000 are returned as of no occupation, and including labourers, whose branch of labour is undefined, persons of indefinite occupation, and females returned simply as wives, we have a total of 151,263,000 who have no stated or defined occupation. There thus remain about 102,629,000 persons whose occupations are defined, and the great preponderance of the agricultural industry over all others in India is shown by the fact that out of this number 71,199,000 are returned as persons working on the land or engaged about animals. Industrial occupations engage 21,041,000 persons, of whom 12,859,000 are males, and 8,182,000 females. In the work of government, either national, local, or municipal, 1,843,000 persons are engaged, of whom 313,000 are classed as belonging to the army, while what may be called the professional classes number upwards of 1,451,000 persons.

It is satisfactory to learn from the provincial administration reports for the year 1881-82, that the condition of the people, of whose numbers and occupations some slight idea has been given above, has been satisfactory in almost every respect. The exceptions are few and unimportant. In the first place the food supply has been abundant in almost every district, and the natural result of this blessing has been seen in the lowness of prices and the development of manufactures and the increase of material wealth generally. In past years, India has too often been known as the land of famines, and the chief problem has been how to feed the immense masses of its population, who so largely depend upon the natural products of the soil, and who are so disastrously affected by unfavourable seasons. The fact that the amount of food raised in India has been in excess of the wants of her people has, therefore, a significance as welcome as it is unusual. With plenty comes prosperity, and the records, to which we refer, show that good seasons and improved methods of cultivation have benefited India, in the same manner in which free importation of

foreign products has benefited the United Kingdom. The area under cultivation has been increased, the ryots have been less dependent upon the money-lenders, the land revenue has been well and readily paid. The abundant supply of food has stimulated the growth of manufactures, and an additional number of people are thus induced to follow manufacturing pursuits, thus lessening the millions dependent on the chances of the harvest.

As we anticipated, so far from the removal of the cotton duties injuriously affecting the Bombay millowners, fresh mills have been built and opened, and the home and foreign trade of Bombay has improved in a remarkable manner. The cultivation of the tea-plant has been carried on over a more extended area than ever, and Indian tea more than maintains its place in the home and other markets. Cinchona is being produced more largely, both for export and for home consumption. Growers of tobacco have been instructed in the most approved methods of preparing the leaf for use, and, with the introduction of seeds of a better quality, it is hoped that the cultivation of tobacco may shortly show marked signs of improvement.

The year just closed has been one of almost unbroken peace in India. With peace and material prosperity, it is but natural to expect a further improvement in the condition of all classes. But the cloud that has arisen in connection with the Ilbert Bill sufficiently darkens the present to render a forecast, even of the near future, a task too uncertain to be attempted. Since the terrible days of 1857, nothing has so stirred up race-feeling in India as the proposed amendment of the Indian Code of Criminal Procedure. It has been accepted by the great mass of Europeans and Eurasians in India as a change that will work to their serious detriment should they ever become amenable to the jurisdiction of the Criminal Courts. But, as a matter of fact, the proposed legislation will only alter the status of *European British subjects*. As the law stands at present, no American, German, Frenchman, Italian, Russian—in a word, no continental European has a *right* to be tried only by a European British subject. One and all, they are liable to be tried on precisely the same terms, and by precisely the same judges and magistrates, as the natives themselves. The effect of the Bill, if passed, will be to place European British subjects on a common footing with all other Europeans and Americans; and, if a right of appeal to a British tribunal be reserved, we confess that we fail to perceive on what reasonable grounds so tremendous an outcry has been raised by the opponents of the measure. Few opinions have been advanced against its justice; almost all the objections raised have been founded on the alleged inexpediency of making the concession to the native Civil Service at the present time; and it is contended that the very pitch to which race prejudices have been stirred should be taken as a convincing proof of how ill-advised the Viceroy has shown himself to be in prosecuting the Bill. But at the time when the suggested amendment of the law was first made known to the public there was, by universal admission, a state of tranquillity and apparent goodwill throughout India. If, then, the agitation that

has since arisen has altered for the worse the relations between the races, at least let it be recognized that such evil change has been wrought by the ill-considered action and indiscreet utterances of the more noisy amongst those who decry the measure. So difficult is it to discover within the four corners of the Bill sufficient cause for the opposition it has met with, that we are almost led to believe that it is due to the unpopularity of the Viceroy himself, and that had the Ilbert Bill never seen the light, some other measure would have served equally well the purpose of branding the Governor-General with the odious accusation of preferring the interests of the native millions of India to those of the thousands of his fellow-countrymen living in the Imperial Dependency. Be this as it may, it is impossible to ignore the fact of the reprobation of the Bill by the great bulk of official opinion throughout India, and had there not been such unseemly exhibitions of disloyalty to the Viceroy, we should have welcomed the withdrawal of the measure on the ground of expediency alone, as the most fitting termination to a most regrettable episode, and the course most conducive to the best interests of the Empire. Such a line of action now, however, would approach perilously near to a concession to irresponsible people of the government of the country, and, leaving out of the question the manner in which native feeling might display its disappointment, the unconditional surrender on the part of the Viceroy would serve as a precedent the gravity of which it would be impossible to over-estimate. In answer to the query, "Is any compromise possible?" the *Calcutta Statesman*—a journal which in the earlier stages of the controversy strongly supported the Bill—has suggested that while a native magistrate might be empowered to try a European prisoner who did not object to that course, the latter should be entitled to claim a trial before a magistrate of his own race, and the suggestion is strongly recommended to the consideration of the Government, on the ground that while the European community would prefer to see the Bill dropped altogether, still, in the event of Lord Ripon declining to adopt that course, it is probable they would so far meet him as to accept a measure which would found the jurisdiction of a native magistrate on the defendant's consent!

Fortunately, other matters of public interest have diverted the minds of the Calcutta natives from dwelling on such incidents as the Scotch dinner on St. Andrew's Day, and the public hooting of Lord Ripon on his return from Simla. The arrival of the Duke and Duchess of Connaught at Bombay on November 21, elicited a splendid outburst of loyalty on the part of the immense concourse that assembled to welcome the soldier-prince and his consort. It was quickly pointed out that the Duchess was the first wife of an English prince to visit India, and the welcome was, if possible, warmer on that account. The reception given to their Royal Highnesses by Calcutta was equally enthusiastic. Having proceeded to Meerut and taken over the command of the Meerut Division, the Duke of Connaught returned to Calcutta, and was present with the Duchess at the opening of the Calcutta Exhibition, by the Viceroy, on December 4.



The strained relations subsisting between the Government and the Anglo-Indian community, were evident in the absence of non-officials from the ceremony. The proceedings commenced by the choir singing an Italian *cantata*, composed for the occasion. The Bishop of Calcutta then offered prayers, after which Colonel Trevor, Vice-President of the Executive Committee, read an account of the rise and progress of the scheme, and, in the absence of the Lieutenant-Governor requested the Viceroy to declare the Exhibition open. In his reply, Lord Ripon deplored the absence of the Lieutenant-Governor, who had originated the scheme and displayed a lively interest in it from the first. He went on to express his gratification at the presence of the Duke and Duchess of Connaught, and read a telegram from the Queen conveying Her Majesty's best wishes for the success of the Exhibition. Finally, he said, he hoped the Exhibition would prove a source of lasting benefit to India, especially in promoting trade with the Australasian colonies, a trade which, he believed, had a great future before it, and then the Exhibition was declared open. In the report read by Colonel Trevor, certain statistics were given, from which it appears that the floor space of the Exhibition amounts to 300,000 square feet, on which are gathered 100,000 articles, sent by 2,800 exhibitors. The main interest of the Exhibition centres in the Indian Courts, which contain the most complete collection of Indian products and industries ever presented to the public. Much attention has been attracted to the display of jewellery, contributed by various princes and chiefs. Some idea of the richness of this part of the show may be gathered from the fact that one contributor alone, the Maharajah of Burdwan, has lent jewels to the value of over £300,000. Amongst other departments of the public service, the Calcutta mint is represented by a collection of old coins, both of gold and silver, of about 200 different kinds, belonging to the ancient Hindoo and Mohammedan dynasties in India, such as the Pandobee, the Akbarce, and other coins. Up to the date of our going to press, the average attendance of visitors each day has been about ten thousand, though the Exhibition is still in an incomplete state.

The report of the Great Indian Peninsular Railway for the half-year, ending June 30 last, states the receipts at £2,053,683, against £2,009,147, an increase of £44,536. The expenditure has increased by £16,420, from £843,521 to £959,941. The net revenue has increased by £28,116, from £1,165,626 to 1,193,742. The directors regard these results as satisfactory and encouraging, the more so as it will be found on examination that there is an increase in receipts under both of the chief divisions of traffic—namely, coaching £12,285, and goods £32,720. The steady manner in which the passenger traffic continues to increase is satisfactory. With the object of stimulating this traffic still further, lower rates were introduced on August 1 last for the two higher classes, and other arrangements were adopted calculated to afford, especially to the third-class passengers, greater comfort and facilities. It is fully expected that though the reductions may at first occasion lower receipts, an expansion of traffic will soon be

secured and will produce an increased revenue. With reference to the projected formation of a company to construct a railway from Bhopal to Gwalior and Cawnpore, under an arrangement with the Government, the directors regretfully report that the matter remains in abeyance, the Secretary of State having informed the promoters that Her Majesty's Government, having decided to move that the subject of provision for the extension of railways in India shall be referred to a Select Committee of the House of Commons next Session, he does not deem it expedient, pending the result of that inquiry, to enter into an arrangement with them on the basis proposed in their negotiations.

The *Official Gazette* is responsible for the following figures relating to the total number of persons killed by wild animals and snakes last year in India. The number of human beings was 22,125 against 21,427 killed in the previous year, and the number of cattle was 16,707 against 11,669. Wild animals destroyed 2,606, and snakes 19,519 of the people who thus perished. Of the deaths occasioned by wild animals, 895 were caused by tigers, 359 by jackals, 278 by wolves, 207 by leopards, and 202 by alligators. On the other hand, 18,591 wild animals, and 322,421 snakes were destroyed, for which the Government paid rewards amounting to 141,653 rupees. It would be interesting to know whether this enormous slaughter of snakes has a very perceptible effect in diminishing their number; it certainly has not checked the number of deaths caused by snakes, as witness the above figures.

According to the report of a correspondent writing to the *Times* in November last, who had been visiting Darjeeling, the prosperity of the station and district has made great advances since they were brought into connection with the Indian railway system two years ago. The advance already made seems, however, but an earnest of a still more prosperous future, not so much as a health resort but as the centre, at no distant date, of an important trans-frontier trade. Within a few days' march of the terminus of the mountain railway lines is the richest and most populous part of Thibet, inhabited, not by a race of throat-cutting robbers like those of the trans-frontier districts of the Punjab, but by a peaceable and trade-loving people. At present the bulk of the trade between India and Thibet is obliged to follow a most circuitous route, through Nepal, and it is charged duty on entering and leaving that country. Notwithstanding these difficulties, the trade continues to increase. The direct route lies unquestionably through Darjeeling, and already goods can be conveyed by rail to within a week's journey from the frontier. The removal of the existing restrictions would open new and enormous markets for tea, tobacco, indigo, and other Indian products, as well as for hardware and Manchester cotton goods. These markets in return would supply us with the finest wool in inexhaustible quantities. At present an occasional Thibetan trader finds his way to Darjeeling. The Llama at Shigatze is now a child; but his Prime Minister is said to be very intelligent, a great admirer of the English, and very anxious to establish friendly relations with us. A short time back he sent to

Darjeeling for a supply of English books (we presume he can read English, and we should like to know what books he asked for, and whether he got them, and if not what books were sent him, if any), photographic and other scientific instruments. He may therefore be reckoned on as willing to remove the restrictions to an improved intercourse. Once more we are told that it is to the supineness of the English Government that these difficulties are not removed. Under the Chefoo Convention, we are reminded, we acquired the right of sending residents to Thibet. Such residents, we are assured, would be received as hospitably by the Thibetans as were the emissaries sent by Warren Hastings a century ago. Possibly such might be the case, but we are inclined to think that Lord Kimberley would model his reply on that recently delivered by Lord Derby to the deputation that pressed him to send a resident to Coomassie. We are of opinion that to British pluck and enterprise it may safely be left to furnish us with some further and more definite information as to the markets likely to be met with in Thibet, and the best means to obtaining so desirable an object as the opening up to British commerce a country which has been a sealed book to Europeans for over 100 years.

The exploring party sent to the Takht-i-Suleiman has returned, having ascertained that the Takht is not one mountain, but consists of two parallel ridges, distant about four miles from each other, and joined by a plateau of about one mile in breadth, which runs from the northern peak of the western range to the southern peak of the eastern range. The southern peak, on which is "Solomon's throne," is very steep and almost inaccessible, while the northern, which is higher, is well wooded. The Sheorani tribesmen opposed the expedition under the belief that it was intended to carry the hill away, and plant it in British territory. Their attack was repulsed at a loss to them of about a dozen men, and two or three wounded amongst the expedition.

Sir Robert Sandeman's mission to Southern Beloochistan is said to be progressing favourably. Since leaving Sibi on November 20, he has been everywhere well received. He has an escort of 400 troops of all arms.

According to news letters from Cabul, the Ameer has been very communicative to the British Agent. As a matter of fact he acquainted the agent with the proposals of the Persian Envoy, in order that Colonel Afzul Khan might refer them to India. The Envoy left Cabul on November 20, returning by way of Candahar and Herat. Nothing certain is known respecting the Persian mission to Cabul. The Shah is bound by treaty to abstain from diplomatic intercourse with Afghanistan, save with the assent of England. The Ameer, on his accession, was explicitly informed that we should insist on being cognizant of whatever intercourse he might hold with any foreign power. We doubt much that the influence of the British subsidy has as yet grown to pall upon the Ameer, and we fully expect that there is very little after all to be told of the mission that has come and gone.

## THE CANADIAN DOMINION.

IN entering upon his duties as Governor-General of *Canada*, Lord Lansdowne has carried with him to the fullest extent the best wishes of his countrymen. Whilst the position is one of the most splendid and dignified to which a British subject can aspire, it is as certainly one of the most difficult to successfully occupy. Mr. Gladstone's choice of a successor to the Marquis of Lorne has received the universal approbation of all parties loyal to the empire. When the appointment was made public the only note of ill-natured criticism came from the disaffected Irish Press, which even went so far as to promise that the new Governor-General would meet with the hostility of the Irish race throughout the Dominion. The best answer to such vapouring was afforded by the indignant protest elicited from the Quebec branch of the Irish League, upon having its attention drawn to the telegrams that appeared in the American and English newspapers, regarding the supposed discovery of a dynamite plot to murder Lord Lansdowne on his arrival at Quebec. The reception accorded by the citizens of Quebec, Ottawa, and Montreal was of the most enthusiastic description, and the fact that his mother was a Frenchwoman, which he announced in his reply in the French language to an address presented to him by the French inhabitants of Quebec, opened to him the warm hearts of the Lower Canadians, and secured his immediate popularity with them.

Whilst such favourable auspices have attended the arrival of his successor, the Marquis of Lorne and the Princess have returned to England amidst the most friendly regrets of the Canadians. The late Governor-General's administration has been entirely successful, and we should hail with the utmost satisfaction the announcement of his appointment to succeed Lord Ripon. His departure from the Dominion has by no means put an end to Lord Lorne's efforts towards furthering the welfare of Canada. Both at Bingley Hall, Birmingham, and at Prince's Hall, London, before the Fellows of the Royal Colonial Institute, he has lectured on Canada and its people in such pleasing and instructive fashion that the newspaper reports of his lectures have been read with interest throughout the length and breadth of the United Kingdom. As a manufacturing country Canada is making astonishing progress. Official statistics show that her production of cotton fabrics has trebled since 1879, and, incredible as it may seem, a large quantity of cotton goods has been exported from Kingston to England. At St. John's, Quebec, operatives have to work overtime to fill orders. The woollen trade also has nearly doubled since 1879; and, whereas in 1878 most of the sugar consumed in the Dominion was refined elsewhere, Canada now refines more than is sufficient for her own needs. A steadily increasing quantity of coal is produced, and although the Nova Scotian output last year was considerably greater than ever before, the supplies failed to satisfy the enormous additional demand, and the import of coal was actually

more than it had been during any previous twelve months. But perhaps the best test of the prosperity of a State is the condition of her railway traffic. There are now in Canada nearly 9,000 miles of railway in operation, and the mileage run has increased from 17,680,168 in 1875 to 27,846,411; the earnings have risen from 19,470,539 dols. to 29,027,789 dols.; and the weight of freight carried from 5,670,836 tons to 18,575,787 tons. Moreover, there is every probability that the Canada Pacific Railway which has now reached the foot of the Rocky Mountains, will be completed within the next two years, when there will be a direct railway communication between Halifax and Victoria. If any further proof of the great prosperity of the Dominion is needed, it will be found in the official returns recently issued which show that the balance to the credit of depositors in the Post-Office Savings Banks amounted to 12,303,000 dols., while the statement of the Government Savings Banks shows a balance of 14,374,000 dols., giving a total of 26,677,000 as the aggregate deposits of the Canadian people in the Savings Banks of the country. At both institutions during the last year or two the deposits have shown a remarkable increase, which is still steadily maintained.

The progress of the Colonization Companies that have taken up lands in the *North-West Territories* of Canada is being watched with much interest. It is stated that eleven of those that started are actively engaged in the work, and that the results achieved so far have been very satisfactory. They have each placed one hundred settlers on their lands, and many more were expected before the winter set in. The operations of the Companies have necessitated a large outlay. Stores, sawmills, and blacksmith's shops, and the other necessary adjuncts to colonization have been provided; and in many cases money has been advanced to settlers, who are necessarily picked men. Those on the Primitive Methodist reserve are chiefly farmers from England. The crops this year have been wonderfully good, and the prospects seem to be favourable to the success of the movement. In the re-organization of the North-Western Mounted Police, it has been determined to make the first offer of service to non-commissioned officers of the Royal Marines who have completed their time in the service. They will be required to serve for five years, and their homes will be in the western prairies from the borders of Manitoba to the Rocky Mountains.

The citizens of Toronto, who now number over a hundred thousand, and will celebrate the fiftieth year of the incorporation of their city in March next, have secured for themselves the credit of being the first to adopt the principle of the Free Libraries Act of the country. It has been decided to make an annual grant of £3,200 for the first three years, and a subsequent annual grant of £6,000, this being a larger subsidy than that made by any American city with the exception of Boston. As much as £5,000 is being spent to form the nucleus of the library, and representatives of the city council have been engaged in England in making the necessary purchases. A

movement with a similar end in view is now on foot in Brandon, a rising town in Manitoba. We have further to congratulate the city councils of Toronto and of Ottawa on having decided by a majority of three-fourths to petition the Legislature in favour of granting the municipal and parliamentary franchise to women. Another sign of the times is the projected illumination of Quebec by the electric light, a company being already actively engaged in pushing on the work. The great success that has attended the establishment of the Beaconsfield Vineries at Pointe Clare, Quebec, has placed it beyond doubt that a large number of the more hardy species of grapes can be cultivated out of doors in Canada, and made to bear an abundant crop of excellent fruit. One acre will yield, on an average, from ten thousand to fourteen thousand pounds, realizing at  $2\frac{1}{2}$  cents. ( $1\frac{1}{4}d.$ ) per pound, £52 to £70, or £10 per ton. The cost of production is said not to amount to more than one-fourth of the value of the crops produced. Equally good reports are given of the Canadian silk industry, and the principal drawback that the Montreal factories have to contend with is the low grade of goods desired.

During November an important change was effected in the standard railway time of the United States and Canada. Up to that date there had been no less than fifty standards of time, and to remove the inconvenience arising from such a state of things, the whole of North America has been divided for time purposes into five broad belts, running north and south, each extending over fifteen degrees of longitude. In each belt only one standard of time will be maintained, one hour's difference existing between each standard. The principal cities in Eastern Canada will in all probability follow the example of the chief cities of the United States in making civic time uniform with railway time. Useful work has also been done by the Meteorological Service in extending its operations to the North-West Territories. Fourteen new stations are about to be opened, and arrangements have been made for observations at stations about twenty miles apart on the line of the Canada Pacific Railway, as well as for the opening of new stations in the north part of the Territories. It is hoped that the perfection of the system of storm warnings will result from these extensions, and that the climate of the fertile belt will be ascertained with much greater definiteness than hitherto. The latest news from *British Columbia* is to the effect that the Legislative Assembly has passed a resolution instructing the Government to introduce a Bill restricting Chinese immigration. The Provincial Secretary stated that there were 3,000 destitute Chinese on the mainland, and that certain murderous outrages had been committed by them. Agricultural disaffection in *Manitoba* is said to be assuming considerable proportions, and a mass meeting, composed of delegates from all the principal places in the province, is reported to have been held protesting against the high tariff and the railway. Without further details we are not prepared to comment on this news, but, on the face of it, it appears to have a healthy ring in it. If the ill-tidings lately cabled be correct, in reporting a loss of nearly 700 persons through

the foundering of fishing vessels in the gales on the coasts of New England, Nova Scotia and Newfoundland, during November last, we cannot imagine a more worthy object of a Mansion House Relief Fund, than the succouring of the widows and orphans of those of our fellow-subjects who have perished in such untimely fashion.

*The West Indies.*—During the closing months of the year the popular mind of *Jamaica* has been perplexed with the consideration of two subjects of almost equal moment. The appointment of General Sir Henry Norman as Governor has excited much comment from the dissatisfied persons who are clamouring for a representative government, and who pretend to see, in the fact of Sir Henry Norman being a soldier, an intention on the part of the Home Government to sternly suppress any attempt on the part of the disaffected to enforce their claim to “every right that is dear to the hearts of free men.” The organ of these people, the *Weekly Gleaner*, asks them, “How long do they propose to be told they shall submit to taxation without representation?” Is it worth while to remind these oppressed ones of the result of the last census of their island, and to ask them in what fashion, save as a Crown Colony and under the direction and protection of the Imperial Government, can they hope that their 15,000 white citizens should control and govern the destinies of the remaining 580,000 inhabitants? If *Natal*, with its population of 30,000 whites, has felt itself too-heavily weighted by the presence of 300,000 Zulus within the borders of the Colony to venture to accept the burden of responsible government, we fail to see how *Jamaica* with half the white population of *Natal*, and double the number of its black and coloured people, can have the slightest claim to a consideration of their fanciful grievance. Nevertheless we are glad to learn that the new Governor has been commissioned, amongst other things, to contrive that a reduction in taxation, to the amount of £60,000 a year, shall be at once effected. If, in addition to the alleviation thus secured to the tax-payers, some satisfactory arrangement can be arrived at, by which the continued exodus of labourers from the island, in search of employment in the construction of the Panama Canal, may be checked without injury to the material interests of these would-be emigrants, we have little doubt that we shall soon cease to hear anything more of this planter’s plaint.

Passing from one extremity of the West Indian Islands to the other, we find the same complaint of a dearth of labour in *Tobago*. Sugar is the staple production of this island which, with a population of under twenty thousand, and an area of 120 square miles (of which about two-thirds are still covered with primitive forests), yet boasts of an import and export trade of about £120,000 a year. Owing to the price of sugar being so low, the only chance of making estates pay is by planting and reaping large crops. But this is to a considerable extent rendered impossible by the complete uncertainty of labour. In an ordinarily good year, many acres of canes are usually left uncut, as the labourers abandon the estates when the first rains come down in May, in order

to till and plant their own provision grounds. Most of the sugar-estates have powerful steam machinery, capable of doing three times the work they ever get to do. Their usefulness is limited by the absence of steady and reliable labour. In *Barbados* the land is not one whit more fertile than in *Tobago*; but in that island cultivation is only limited by the land available. The reason is that the labouring population of *Barbados* is so large that there is no land for them to squat on; they are therefore compelled to work regularly. So far as personal comforts are in question, the negroes of *Tobago* are a great deal better off than the labouring classes in Great Britain. They catch large quantities of fresh fish; the woods teem with game, which any one is free to shoot; and the negroes largely avail themselves of the privilege. Roedeer abound, and also a species of pheasant called cocrico, besides innumerable pigeons, partridges and doves. The negroes own horses, cows, sheep, and goats, besides fowls in abundance. A great variety of vegetables and fruit is grown by them with little trouble. Both males and females dress in a style that would astonish their friends in this country, who only think of them as oppressed and down-trodden. Some of the most prosperous merchants are negroes; some own sugar estates; others are tenants of estates, and the majority own the houses in which they live, with land attached. One negro planter has attained the dignity of a Justice of the Peace. Physically they would compare favourably with our own stalwart Scotch peasantry; and yet with all this great amount of material prosperity and well-being it appears that all classes outside the official circle are on a dead level as regards political power. The Administrator and his Privy Council rule unrestrainedly.

Turning to *British Guiana*, we find some interesting statistics ready to hand in the Annual Report of the Immigration Agent-General for last year. According to this report, the majority of coolies who come to *British Guiana* keep up a constant correspondence with their friends and relatives left behind in India. During 1882, nearly 600 letters were sent by the coolies of this colony to the agent in Calcutta, for delivery to their friends, and these letters, which were carried post-free through the Immigration Office, contained 137 remittances aggregating £474, in sums varying from 10s. to £25. Moreover, the Indian immigrant community own 13,074 cattle, and large flocks of goats, and 200 carts and cabs. The Portuguese, who have long monopolized the business of shopkeeping, and now own 1,644 shops, have discovered keen competitors among the Indian and Chinese immigrants, who own 1,174 shops for the sale of rum, wine, malt liquors, opium and gange, dry goods, meat, cooked food, and drugs. Government Savings Banks have already been established in the three counties, at George Town, New Amsterdam, and Suddie, and were the number considerably increased, and offices opened at each police station and branch post-office (as recommended by the Postmaster-General), a large portion of the immigrants' earnings, which is now squandered in drink and narcotics, would find its way into these institutions. These



facts and figures fully prove that *British Guiana* is well adapted to meet the requirements and desires of the Indians, Chinese, Portuguese, and others, and that they can get on and prosper better in this "land of mud" than in their own native homes. It would be well for the Government of India to take special means of circulating information amongst the natives of the more congested districts, relating to the condition of *British Guiana*, and the facilities of making money there, and, in fact, throughout the *West Indies* generally. There are many Indian coolies who have left the colony for their native homes, and it is agreeable to learn that very many of them return to labour on the sugar estates. But the advertisement effected by their good report amongst their friends is at the best but a tardy means to rely upon, and seeing how widely felt throughout the *West Indies* is the want of efficient labourers, we commend to our readers the question of the transference of coolie labour from the *East Indies* to the *West Indies* as a subject that well merits their attention, and one that will largely benefit the interests of the Empire in being satisfactorily solved. We await with interest the Report of the Royal Commissioners, which will be almost immediately published, and we hope to find that the labour question has been well threshed out.

The affairs of *South Africa* during the past three months are as thorny a subject to discuss as they ever have been. The Colony of *Natal*, indeed, needs scanty comment save in so far as it is at the present moment interested with the question of how Cetewayo is to be disposed of, and the manner in which *Zululand* is to be pacified. No doubt the future of *Natal*, as indeed of the whole of *South Africa*, will be largely affected by the decision to which the Crown Government may come in its dealings with the Boer delegates. Cetewayo has been tried, and found wanting; whether the cause of his failure to maintain himself against his foes is to be found in his own loss of prestige, or in the circumstances in which he found himself, and which were due to the policy of the Home Government, the result is indubitable. We sincerely hope no further attempt to impose him upon an unwilling *Zululand* will be attempted. All our efforts should be concentrated on reducing the present state of anarchy to at least a condition of internal quiet. Already we hear of raids into *Zululand* by the Boers; and this again brings us to the great South African question, "How to deal with the Boers?" They are a sturdy, stubborn race, but they are ignorant, and inflated with an exaggerated belief in their own prowess. The Boer delegates now in London represent a State which is always hostile to British interest, which treats the natives both within and without its borders as a class of beings unworthy the name of man, and which only a short time back, being confronted by an army of overwhelming strength, signed an agreement acknowledging subjection, promising to pay an outstanding debt, and agreeing not to cross its own borders for warlike purposes. Now this State clamours to be relieved from all these bonds of humiliation. Well, let them be relieved from the yoke of suzerainty.

A treaty concluded with the South African Republic (as they wish to style their State), in which Great Britain promised war in the event of the Republic making any treaty with a foreign State without British consent, would give us all the practical rights we now enjoy. In any case we should have to resort to arms to enforce our will, and war would be easier and more tolerable against foreigners than against rebellious subjects. The native races will have a far better chance of withstanding the inroads of the Boer freebooters when the *Transvaal* in no sense is under the protection of the British flag. As for the £250,000 debt from which the Boers ask to be relieved, the wisest course appears to be to decline to forgive them the debt, but to agree not to press it. The third demand is a preposterous one: no less, in fact, than the cession of *Bechuanaland*, and of certain rights in *Swaziland*. This right of extension beyond their borders at their own discretion would enable them to harass the natives all round them, and might probably lead to a general uprising of black against white. But even a more serious power would be allowed them, in granting them the right to bar the way of the Cape Colonists from their northern trade route; and already we are told that the most northerly line of railway from *Cape Colony* has advanced to within 70 miles of *Bechuanaland*. Moreover, the Boers are manifesting signs of impatience at the prospect of the Imperial Government resuming the control of affairs in *Basutoland*, and they have called upon "all the white communities of South Africa to issue a strong protest against the ceding of *Basutoland* to the Imperial Government." As, however, the *Basutos*, with the exception of *Masupha*, have shown themselves unanimous in agreeing to the requirements of the Imperial Government—viz., a hut tax of ten shillings, and obedience to the Resident (who will be the popular Colonel Clarke)—the retrocession has been decided upon, and is now an accomplished fact.

The demand of the Government of the *Cape Colony* for a new loan of £4,837,500 was favourably commented on by the London financial papers, notwithstanding the fact that every year since 1875 has found the Cape Government a fresh borrower in the London market. The present loan is raised to a considerable extent for railway purposes, and it is calculated that by the end of 1884, there will be 1,500 miles of Government line in operation, costing £13,000,000. In their present undeveloped state, these lines are returning about 2½ per cent. upon their capital outlay. Though the trade of the Colony has been a good deal depressed during the last twelve months, yet the financial development of the Cape in the past seven years has been very remarkable. The revenue has risen from £1,319,062 in 1876-77 to £3,300,006. The expenditure has risen from £1,495,833 in the former year to £3,700,000 in the latter, and though there was a deficit last year, it is confidently expected that an equilibrium would be obtained for the current year. The following table shows all in favour of the finances of the Colony:—

	Imports.	Exports.	Vessels entered.		Vessels cleared.	
			Number.	Tonnage.	Number.	Tonnage
1880 ...	£7,662,858	£7,710,191	2114	2,256,406	2103	2,220,913
1881 ...	9,227,171	8,396,908	2312	2,540,910	2260	2,526,591
1882 ...	9,372,019	8,506,600	2328	3,058,876	2331	3,034,015

The total public debt of the Colony on December 31, 1882, was £15,302,758 sterling, or £10 3s. 10d. per head of the population, and the taxation during the past financial year was at the rate of £1 3s. 6d. per head. It is not, however, the financial element which is regarded as the main weakness of *South Africa*, it is the political. Even with her rapid borrowing of recent years, *Cape Colony* compares favourably with the *Australias* as being lightly burdened with debt. But it is the uncertainty as to the relative strength of the British, Boer, and native elements, and the fact that the Dutch are a power in the land and averse to British progress, that constitute the real hindrance to South African advancement. We would fain hope that the presence of Mr. Scanlen in London, and his frequent intercourse with our leading statesmen, merchants, and financiers may lead to some mitigation of this three-cornered difficulty.

AUSTRALASIA.—The newly-constituted Agricultural Department of the Privy Council have issued, within the last few weeks, the Agricultural Returns for the year 1883. The Returns comprise Tables, showing the agricultural resources of the various British possessions, compiled from the Official Returns of such as publish agricultural statistics. The most complete and regular Returns are those of the several *Australasian Colonies*, for which the Tables show the progressive increase in cultivation from 1867. The quantity of land under Wheat in the year 1882-3 in each of the following Colonies, was:—in *South Australia* 1,746,500 acres; in *Victoria*, 969,300 acres; in *New Zealand*, 390,800 acres; in *New South Wales*, 247,300 acres; in *Queensland*, 10,500 acres; in *Tasmania*, 46,700 acres; and in *Western Australia*, 22,700 acres. The total area under Barley in those Colonies amounted to 99,000 acres only. Oats covered 170,000 acres in *Victoria* and 320,000 acres in *New Zealand*. Returns for the same year, as to the area under Maize in *New South Wales* and *Queensland*, where this kind of corn is chiefly grown, show an acreage of 118,000 acres for the former and 53,000 acres for the latter colony. The produce of the wheat crop in six of these colonies (omitting *Western Australia*, for which it is not stated) amounted in the aggregate to 31,513,000 bushels, or an average of about 9½ bushels to the acre. Of this quantity *South Australia* produced 7,356,100 bushels, or only about 4½ bushels per acre; *Victoria*, 8,751,400 bushels, or 9 bushels per acre; *New Zealand*, 10,270,600 bushels, or 26 bushels per acre; *New South Wales*, 4,042,400 bushels, or 16 bushels per acre; *Queensland*, 145,700 bushels, or nearly 14 bushels per acre; and *Tasmania*, 946,000 bushels, or 20 bushels per acre. The yield of Oats in the same year was 4,446,000 bushels in *Victoria* and 10,520,400 in *New Zealand*, or an average of 26 and 33 bushels

respectively per acre. The produce of Maize in *New South Wales* and *Queensland* together amounted to 5,480,300 bushels, or an average of 32 bushels per acre. Potatoes were grown on 89,000 acres in the six Colonies, producing nearly 4 tons to the acre, the highest average yield, that of *New Zealand*, being 5 tons. The total acreage of land under the Vine in *New South Wales*, *Victoria*, *South Australia*, and *Queensland* is returned at nearly 16,000 acres, producing about 1,500,000 gallons of wine. As regards Live Stock, in which especial interest is felt by the people of the United Kingdom, in view of the possible further supply of meat to this country, should success attend the experimental processes now being tried for the transport of dead meat, the Tables show an increase in the numbers of Horned Cattle, and of Sheep, but a considerable decline in the number of Pigs. Comparing the figures of 1872 with those of 1882, we observe that the number of Horses in the seven *Australasian Colonies* had risen from 820,000 to 1,220,000. Horned Cattle had increased in the same period from 5,038,000 to 8,430,000, and the number of Sheep, in which the wealth of these Colonies is more marked than in any other kind of live stock, had risen from 51,500,000 to 76,000,000. It is also satisfactory to observe that, in *Victoria* and *Queensland*, the losses in Sheep occasioned by drought in 1878 had been repaired in 1882. The imports of wool from *Australia* had increased from 173,201,712lbs. in 1872 to 345,784,446lbs. in 1882. There is no mention of Hop-growing, but it is within our recollection that only last summer a consignment of 5 tons of hops from *New Zealand* was received at a high price by a London firm of brewers. Contrasting the above figures in the aggregate with those for the United Kingdom the comparison is very flattering to the Colonies. Taking the acreage under Corn crops, we find that the Colonies of *Australasia* have a far larger acreage under Wheat than has the United Kingdom; the figures being 2,713,282 acres for the Kingdom and 3,434,005 acres for the Colonies. Taking the total acreages under Barley, Oats, Maize, and Potatoes, the figures are, for the Kingdom 8,215,939 acres, and for the Colonies 914,879 acres. The United Kingdom has 1,898,745 Horses, and the Colonies have 1,219,342; the Kingdom has 10,097,943 Horned Cattle, the Colonies have 8,429,448; the Kingdom possesses 28,347,560 Sheep, and the Colonies boast the enormous number of 76,008,662; and finally the figures give 3,986,427 Pigs to the Kingdom, and 807,711 to the Colonies. When we remember that there are thirty-five million inhabitants in the United Kingdom, compared with the three millions of *Australasia*, the fact of the overwhelming preponderance of agricultural wealth on the side of the Colonies is fully borne home to our minds. To a people boasting such resources as these in the early years of their history, it is supremely important that no settlement should be effected by a State that either is, or in the future may be, hostile to its interests, within striking distance of its shores. Recognizing the fact that they are not yet equal to the task of holding the Southern Pacific against all comers, the Australasian statesmen attending the Conference at Sydney

refrained, in their second resolution, from suggesting any action by which effect could best be given to their first resolution: "That the further acquisition of dominion in the Pacific, south of the Equator by any foreign power, would be highly detrimental to the safety and well-being of the British possessions in Australasia, and injurious to the interests of the Empire." But it is in the third and fifth resolutions that we find the unanimous feeling of the Australian colonists explicitly set forth on the question of annexation and the means thereto. These resolutions justify reproduction *in extenso*; they are as follows:—

"3. That, having regard to the geographical position of the island of New Guinea, which presents an opportunity for the extension of British trade and enterprise, as well as to the certainty that the island will shortly be the resort of many adventurous subjects of Great Britain and other nations, and to the absence or inadequacy of any existing laws for regulating their relations with the native tribes, this Convention, while fully recognizing that the responsibility of extending the boundaries of the Empire belongs to the Imperial Government, is emphatically of opinion that such steps should be taken as will most conveniently and effectively secure the incorporation of so much of New Guinea and the small islands adjacent thereto as is not claimed by the Government of the Netherlands."

"5. That the Governments represented at this Convention undertake to submit and recommend to their respective Legislatures measures of permanent appropriation for defraying, in proportion to the population, such share of the cost incurred in giving effect to the foregoing resolutions as Her Majesty's Government, having regard to the relative importance of Imperial and Australasian interests, may deem reasonable."

The Inter-Colonial Conference met on December 4; on December 5 the resolutions relating to the annexation were unanimously agreed to, and received the signatures of the fifteen delegates representing the six Australasian Colonies and the Crown Colony of West Australia. The Governor of the Fiji Islands, who also attended the Convention, expressed his general concurrence with the resolutions, but considered himself precluded from signing from his position as a Governor of a Crown Colony. This scruple of etiquette does not seem to have weighed with the Governor of West Australia, whose signature was attached. On December 8, the Conference terminated its labours and adjourned *sine die*, having adopted five further resolutions, recognizing that the time had arrived at which a complete federal union of the Australasian Colonies could be attained, and pledging themselves to invite the Legislatures of their respective Colonies to pass addresses to her Majesty the Queen praying that she may be pleased to cause a measure to be submitted to the Imperial Parliament for the purpose of constituting a Federal Council on the basis of the draft Bill adopted by the Convention. This Bill, as drawn up by the Inter-Colonial Conference, provides that each colony shall be represented by two members, and the Crown Colonies by one member. There will be yearly sessions, and any three of the colonies will be competent to summon an extra Session. The first Session will be held at Hobart, and be convened by the Governor of Tasmania. The summoning of

subsequent Sessions will be determined by the Council. The Council will be invested with legislative authority in regard to the relations of the Colonies with the Pacific Islanders, the prevention of the influx of criminals, marriage, divorce, fisheries, naturalization, enforcement of criminal process, extradition, Colonial defences, quarantine, patents, copyright, bills of exchange, and other matters. The royal assent will be necessary to give effect to any decision arrived at by the Council, and will be given through the Governor of the Colony where the Council may be in Session. This Act will only be operative in the Colonies which assent to its provisions, and will not have force until four of the Colonies have signified their adhesion. It remains to be seen with what welcome the expressed will of the Australian Colonists will be received by the Colonial Office. We have no doubt of the hearty sympathy accorded to the Colonists by the vast majority of Britons, and the sooner other corporations of the United Kingdom follow the example of the Glasgow Chamber of Commerce, and pass resolutions supporting the Colonies on the question of annexation, the sooner shall we hear that the Imperial Government has resolved to take action in conformity with the legitimate desires, to which so earnest and eloquent a voice has been given by the memorable meeting of the Sydney Convention.

Turning "from grave to gay," or at any rate, from matters of Imperial moment to affairs of local importance, we have cause to congratulate the trustees of the Sydney Free Public Library, who at the beginning of 1883 set on foot an excellent plan for the higher education of their settlers in "up country" villages. The plan was delightful in its simplicity, and consisted in ordering a dozen or so of remarkably strong oaken boxes, of a size capable of containing about sixty volumes. The contents of each box was to be selected from the most sterling works relating to biography, history, travels, science, art, &c. Books of the highest merit have been chosen in each class, and so far the movement has been so successful, that as many as fifteen of these veritable "circulating libraries" are *knocking about* the roads and tracks of the Colony, in transit to one or another of the villages where as yet there is no opportunity or means of establishing a local library. The boxes and their contents belong to the Sydney Library, and the public-spirited librarian of that institution has the care of directing that the boxes shall be duly circulated from station to station. The tedium incident to a life spent far from the capital city must be immensely relieved by this plan, and we hope it will be adopted by other Colonies.

A scientific expedition to New Guinea has been sanctioned by the Geographical Society, and will shortly leave England under the command of Mr. Wilfrid Powell. The funds are to be provided from private sources, but the Colonial Secretary is to be asked to lend his official countenance to the enterprise.

In view of the dissatisfaction with which the Maoris regard the Native Land Courts, we are promised a visit by Tawhaio, the head of the Maori race, for the purpose of petitioning the Queen to direct

the transference of the powers of these Courts to an elective body of natives. The matter is now under the consideration of the Governor of New Zealand.

As we are about to go to press, we are informed of the arrival of the New Zealand Shipping Company's steamer *Tongariro*, at Port Chalmers on Tuesday evening, December 11, on her maiden voyage, after a run of forty days nine hours' actual steaming. This is the fastest passage ever made to the Colony. The quickest previously made was by the company's chartered White Star steamer *Ionic*, in forty-three days six hours. At least another day and night will be taken from the length of the voyage when the widening of the present Suez Canal, or the completion of a second canal, has been effected.



THE  
WESTMINSTER  
AND  
FOREIGN QUARTERLY  
REVIEW.

---

APRIL, 1884.

---

ART. I.—THE SAMSON-SAGA AND THE MYTH  
OF HERAKLES.

1. *Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie und Sprachwissenschaft* herausgegeben. Von Dr. H. STEINTHAL und M. LAZARUS. Berlin. 1865.
2. *Geschichte der Poetischen National Literatur der Hebräer.* Von Dr. ERNST MEIER. Leipzig. 1856.
3. *Die Simsonssage nach ihrer Entstehung Form und Bedeutung und der Heraklesmythus.* Von Dr. GUSTAVE ROSKOFF. Leipzig. 1860.

WHEN Goethe was told that Madame de Staël objected to the introduction of Mephistophiles into the presence of the Lord and the angelic host in his immortal tragedy, the poet with playful wisdom retorted, "What if the good lady should some day meet the devil in heaven itself?" The mythical theory which orthodoxy not unnaturally suspects of ulterior purposes, anticipating the action of the subtle and pervasive entity in "Faust," has already intruded into celestial circles. The traditional and popular interpretation of the Biblical writings having retreated before a more rational and often more interesting exegesis, a mythical or legendary element discovers itself in the inspired records of the Hebrew race, no less than in the secular literature of Greece and Rome, or the sacred books of the East. Amid innumerable divergences we recognize the identity of the human

[Vol. CXXI. No. CCXLII.]—NEW SERIES Vol. LXV. No. II. U



mind, "the features of the same face, the blossoms upon one tree." Similar phenomena suggest similar explanations. The same tendency to assimilate natural objects to beings like ourselves; to assume that as we have life, intelligence and will, all existing things, evidencing force or motion or apparent purpose, have also life, intelligence and will, is traceable everywhere. The moving stars, the flying clouds, the waving trees, and the falling waters have been endowed with a kindred vitality. We give, as Shelley has beautifully and truly said, "a human heart to what we cannot know" and worship our "likeness in the world's vast mirror shown." This same personifying or deifying impulse testifies by its omnipresence to the activity of the true "Oversoul." Everywhere we see the spirit of man conceiving, imagining, abstracting, generalizing.

If it be true of the numerous subdivisions of mankind, with perhaps some insignificant exceptions, that they people the world with the creatures of their own fancy, surely that the law should be suspended in the case of *one* nation, would be a singular and startling anomaly. The Hebrew people is not an ethnological enigma; it is not a psychological curiosity; it is a part of the same generic whole as the Greek, Roman and English people; and it seems an obvious philosophical duty to attempt to bring it into the daylight of common thought and customary life, to rescue it from its own isolating misrepresentation, as well as from every foreign system of thought that disguises or perverts its real character, by imposing on it a preternatural exclusiveness.

A riper theological criticism than that which our fathers knew has shown that the old Hebrews, like other nations, were, in an early stage of their development, polytheists. We now substitute for the unedifying notion of a preposterous idolatry, the idea of a worship of many gods presiding over different departments of the universe. This worship, which began with attributing supernatural power to imaginary beings, standing in some close relation to material objects, gradually advanced to a more rational conception of the world, as experience corrected the suggestions of instinctive inference, or reduced multifarious and seemingly heterogeneous phenomena to comparative unity and order. Thus, in the Hebrew mythology, the great primitive powers—the Elohim as they were called—were subordinated to one supreme power, as the gods of classical antiquity were subordinated in the Stoic and even in the Platonic reform to Zeus, their father and king, or in the Roman period to Jupiter, the best and greatest. The Hebrew cosmologist, obeying the same law, exalted one of these powers to the throne of the skies, honoured him as the maker of heaven and earth, and, adopting a fancy suggested by a familiar institution of his country, chanted his glorious achievements, as the power

that created the world in the six days of the Hebrew week devoted to work, and, with a childlike logic, imaged his deity solacing himself after his labours with the necessary rest of the seventh day. The traces of the old polytheistic faith are still discernible in the accommodated narrative of the Hebrew rhapsodist. It is scarcely possible, for instance, satisfactorily to explain away the address in Genesis iii. 22, *Behold the man is become as one of us*. No rational being ever accosted himself as a divisible plurality. *One of us* implies an aggregate having some community of Nature. A divine supremacy once conferred on the chief of the celestial powers, the inferior Elohim were reduced to the grade of angels or sons of God. According to the Book of Enoch, according to some of the old fathers and, as it would seem, to the writer of the Epistle which bears the name of the Apostle Jude, the sons of God became the impassioned lovers of the daughters of men.\* As such they are represented in primeval Hebrew history. Fascinated by the beauty of the fair, frail children of Adam, they "deserted heaven for their sweet sake," wooing them as the gods of Greece or Rome wooed their Semele or Creusa or Rhœa Silvia. Of these seraphic princes and their mortal paramours the appropriate offspring were the giants of Hebrew story, the mythical equivalents of the Titans of Greek song, the rebel sons of heaven and earth, who defied and battled with the gods, and were overthrown and imprisoned in Tartarus. The Hebrew mythologists in their fabled garden eastward in Eden, with its wonderful river scenery, its first man and first woman, its talking serpent, its tree of knowledge, its tree of life, its cherubim with flashing sword, present us with parallels to Ormuzd's garden of delight, to the four streams issuing from one source in the holy mountain of Merou; with counterparts to the parents of the human race in Meshia and Meshyana, mysterious beings who lived originally in purity and innocence; with a substitute for Ahriman who appeared in the form of a serpent; with a rival to the king of trees—the white, salubrious and fruitful Hôm—which confers immortality on those who taste of its sap; and with cherubs to match the griffins who guard the treasure in the land of gold, or the bulls whose images were stationed before the palaces of Assyrian kings.

The cherubim and their angelical colleagues, the seraphim, are conspicuous products of the Hebrew mythopœic imagination. We will see what is said of them by their latest historiographers. "The seraphim," says Mr. Cheyne,† "in their original mythic

---

\* See Genesis vi. 4; Judith xvi. 7; Baruch iii. 26; Enoch ix. 18. Also De Wette's "Kürze Erklärung: Jude." Kalisch; "Genesis." Josephus. Philo.  
† "Isaiah," p. 273.

interpretation meant the serpent-like lightning; just as the cherubim were in the same acceptation the clouds of the storm or of the sunset," or "the storm-clouds or cloud-masses which seem to guard the portals of the sky, and on which the sun appears to issue forth at break of day." According to the same authority "the cherub was either an eagle or a quadruped with eagle's wings." A parallel to the Hebrew cherubs is found in the winged *Grupes*, who not only watched over treasures, but were the bearers of the gods: at least if Plutarch and Eustathius are right in identifying the quadruped bird of Æschylus with the griffin. In discussing this question the Rev. T. W. Cheyne, whose scholarly work on the "Prophecies of Isaiah" witnesses to the critical and enlightened spirit of the author, quotes with approval the opinion of the German theologian, Delitzsch, who, commenting on one of the Psalms, in which Jehovah is said to ride upon a cherub, recognizes in the description the presence of a mythic element. The subject derives additional illustration from a statement in the recent essay by the well-known philologist, the Rev. A. H. Sayce.\* "The ox," he writes, "the sun's usual symbol, denoting his strength, was originally derived from Babylon, where the image of the winged bull called the Kirubu, or Cherub, guarded the house from the entrance of evil spirits." The griffins in Herodotus who protected the golden Arimaspean hoards, the cherubs with the coruscating sword that kept the way of the Tree of Life, and the winged quadrupeds of Babylon who guarded the palaces of the Assyrian kings, are evidently near relations.

"All," says the Greek historian just cited, "all that is beautiful and rare seems to come from the North." The human mind is enamoured of the Remote. The Indian had his sacred mount—Merou. In Asiatic mythology the holy mountain of the gods is a permanent object of belief. Echoes of some primeval tradition of this kind appear to have reached the old Hebrew world. In one of our sacred books we read of the Mount of the Congregation, of the recesses of the North. Thus the tyrant of Babylon exclaims "I will exalt my throne above the stars of God. I will sit also upon the Mount of the Congregation, on the sides of the North" (Isaiah xiv. 13). We read, too, of the stars, of the High Ones on high, and their preappointed punishment (Isaiah xxiv. 21); of the stars that are not pure in the sight of God (Job xxv. 5), and of the morning stars and the sons of God that sang and shouted at the birthday of creation (Job xxxviii. 7). In the phrase 'Jehovah-Sabaoth' lies, as Mr. Cheyne points out, a probable reference to the stars conceived of as animated beings, thus

---

\* See "Variorum Teachers' Bible."

implying a primitive worship; a representation which harmonizes with the fancies of Plato, of Aristotle, and of Origen, who all alike endowed the stars with life and consciousness. The traditions of the Flood, the fable of the Phœnix,\* the visits of Jahveh and the angels to the patriarchs and their descendants in the Bible recall similar tales in secular story and song. Lilith, the wandering spectre-woman of the night, mistranslated screech-owl in our Authorized Version, Azazel, the mysterious evil genius of the desert, are the Hebrew correspondents of the Empusa of Greece and the Typhon of Egypt. We need not now apologize for any ungentle intrusion into the sanctuary of cherished convictions, when an Arnold has acknowledged the unhistorical character of old Hebrew narratives; when a Milman has noted the legendary matter in patriarchal history; when a Colenso has attenuated Moses into a mythical hero, comparable to our own King Arthur; when a Bampton lecturer detects in the antediluvian heroes "numerical incarnations of periods rather than men;" and when, finally, an orthodox commentator on the gospel of St. John rejects the forced interpretation which degrades the "sons of God" into righteous men, and boldly declares that they were "angels, enamoured like men of the beautiful daughters of Adam."

But while mythical allusions abound in sacred literature, there is one book in the Bible which claims particular attention as a repertory of Hebrew myth and legendary history. This book, which records the exploits of those heroic rulers whom their countrymen designated *Shophetim*, the name, as the classical reader will remember, of the elective magistrates of Carthage and Tyre,† is one with which we are all familiar—the Book of Judges. Of this book De Wette observes that "although distinguished by miraculous and mythological features, the narrative not only bears the marks of a genuine unartificial popular legend, but is part of a true historical tradition, and gives a lively picture of the conditions and morals of the people of that time." The introduction and the appendix, it should be said, must be carefully separated from the original work. The true Book of Judges—the "Heldenbuch" of the Hebrew nation—comprises the narrative of adventurous exploits of the pre-regal rulers of Israel, terminating with the history of Samson. It excludes the preliminary account of the conquest of Canaan and of the angel's visit to Bochim (i.-ii.), as well as the appendix (xvii.-xxi.), inserted after the institution of regal government, and when Shiloh had ceased to

---

\* Job xxix. 18, should be translated, "I shall die in my nest, and multiply my days as the phœnix." See also Isaiah xxxiv. 14.

† Suffetes.

be a religious centre. The somewhat obscure intimation in xviii. 30, "the captivity of the land," is plausibly referred to the Assyrian captivity B.C. 721. The Parenthesis (c. 11, v. 16-19), with its doctrine of religious pragmatism, of a Theodicea which alternates the punishment of idolatry by subjection to foreign despotism with the deliverance from oppression in consideration of a practical repentance, not only evinces a studied unity of design, but betrays "a moralizing reflectiveness" which obliges us, with Dr. Davidson, to place the composer of the whole book in the time of the later kings; though the materials at his disposal were some of them extremely old. The date assigned by Ewald for the final arrangement of the book carries it beyond the year of Jehoiachim's captivity, B.C. 562.

Adapted, modified, and interpolated as the original documents which form the "Heldenbuch" have been, satisfactory evidence of the antiquity of these compositions, in their primitive shape, is adducible. The Song of Deborah, a magnificent outburst of patriotic exultation, if not composed by that heroine herself, must be regarded as extremely old, furnishing, as it does, not only material for Psalm lxviii., but supplying the initial verses of that psalm, which are identical with a passage in the Song. Another indication of the remote date of the constituent parts of this compilation, is found in the story of Jephthah and the sacrifice of his daughter, the Eastern Iphigenia, to the national god, Jahveh. The recorded celebration of a solemn commemorative festival by the daughters of Israel in her honour, repeated during a long term of years; the absence of all allusions to the Mosaic law or Levitical priesthood; the uncensured erection of altars in contravention of the very letter of that law; the unrestricted polygamy\* practically illustrated in Gideon, Ibzan, and Abdon, the official representatives of the nation; the existence of topical myths suggested by such local appellations† as the "Place of the Invoker," the "Face of God,"—a well-known encampment on the hills—the "Spring of Trembling," the "House of the Acacia," the "Meadow of the Dance," the "House of Passage," the "Magicians' Oak," the "Hill of Moreh;" the memorial altar raised by Gideon to Jahveh-Shalom, and said to be still visible in Ophra when the record was penned: all these names of localities, all these consecrated usages, illegal practices, or barbaric habits, refer us to a dim background of time, a world of myth and legend. The stories of the heroes in Judges, overlaid with the inevitable embellishments of the popular imagination, transmitted from generation to generation, were in their original

---

\* Judges viii. 30; xii. 9, 14.

† Literal renderings of the original names, for which see the Hebrew text.

form first committed to writing, probably in an early period of the Hebrew monarchy. The reference to the survival of an ancient custom in Israel (xi. 39, 40) precludes a prior date, while the implied knowledge of the termination of Philistine rule (xiii. 5) carries us down to the reign of David; for that king (1 Sam. iii. 8) is declared to have completed the deliverance which Samson<sup>s</sup> is said to have commenced.

Among the stories of this old heroic foretime none is more entertaining, more picturesque, or more rich in mythical incidents than that of the mighty Nazarite, whose happy fortune it has been to serve as a theme of song to the great English poet who has left us that drama of noble strength and exquisite finish which bears the name of the champion of the tribe of Dan—"Samson Agonistes." In depicting Samson as the devoted champion of his people, Milton has shown him to us "dark, dark amid the blaze of noon," yet with his "puissant hair, the golden beams of law and right," heroically finishing a life heroic, and achieving with tranquil grandeur that crowning adventure of which the wonder-stricken messenger made the breathless report, "Gaza yet stands, but all her sons are fallen."

Milton, in the splendid prose lyric from which we have cited some musical fragments, as well as in the majestic drama which bears the name of the Hebrew deliverer, has unintentionally suggested a possibly true interpretation of an incident in the story of Samson. The puissant locks of the hero are for him "beams of light and law." The tale has pointed the moral; the moral may explain the tale. Do not these illustrious and sunny locks remind us of other beams than those of law, of beams of light which is not a figurative lustre but a material splendour? Have not attributes or accidents of the Sun-god, of the Tyrian Herakles, been appropriated to Samson? Has not some vagrant tradition of the Phœnician Melkarth, of Baal-Samim, the Lord of the Heavens, whose worship so seduced the heart of Israel, been obscured, and has not a real or supposititious local hero attracted to himself some rays from the splendour of an old Oriental god?

To answer these questions let us look more closely into this strange legend of the ancient Hebrew world.

At the period of Samson's birth the Philistines, who occupied the south-western border of the Israelite settlement, had succeeded to the tyrannical supremacy previously exercised by the great northern powers of Canaan. It has been usual to regard Cappadocia or Crete as the immediate home of this alien people. But Caphtor, it is now affirmed, on the authority of certain Egyptian inscriptions, is not Crete or Cappadocia, but *Keft Ur*, which, as Mr. Sayce instructs us, means the Greater Phœnicia—a Phœnician settlement in the Delta of the Nile. From Egypt

these restless adventurers emigrated to Palestine, in the reign of Ramses III., about B.C. 1280. The land which they occupied was conterminous to that of Dan. The tribe of Judah had been conquered; the tribe of Simeon dispersed; Gaza and Ashkelon were in the possession of the new colonists. Five fortified cities were held by as many Philistine princes. A sea of waving corn-fields gave ocular evidence that these emigrants from the Egyptian Phœnicia understood the art of husbandry.

To inaugurate the rescue of his countrymen from the new tyranny, Samson, according to the story, was miraculously raised up. His birth was announced by an angel, who "from his father's field rode up in flames." The child was to be consecrated to the service of Jahveh, no razor was to touch his "illustrious locks." The spirit of Jahveh, the spirit of enterprise and enthusiastic energy, first descended on him, in the camp of Dan, the resting-place of the patriot band of Israel and the burial-ground of his family. In his ripe manhood the young Nazarite appears before us, like some hero of romance. Joyous, light-hearted, frolicsome, he plays perilous pranks with his enemies. He jests, he feasts, he sings, he makes riddles. In his great Brobdingnagian humour he sports sometimes very grimly with those who do him an ill turn. Far from being ascetic and respectable, he makes love to all the women he has a fancy for, now marrying a Philistine maiden, now flirting with a fair light-of-love, and now dallying with the faithless Delilah, who sends him to his doom. Although to touch a dead body was pollution to a Nazarite, he did not hesitate to eat of the honey so marvellously deposited in the carcase of a lion which, like our Richard of Crusading memory, he had encountered and slain. Like Richard, too, Samson could string verses together, and this prodigy of the honeycomb set him riddling and even rhyming, for there is a sort of assonance here and there:—

" Out of the eater  
Came forth meat;  
Out of the bitter  
Came forth sweet."

At his marriage-feast, when, Nazarite though he was, we can hardly believe that he abstained from the wine-cup, since he and his friends kept up their revelry for seven days, he proposed this riddle to his boon companions, and when, after long and vainly guessing, they extorted the right answer from the false Philistine wife, who had coaxed it out of the soft-hearted giant, they capped his jingling question with a counter-jingle:—

" What is sweeter  
Than honey-cell ?

What more bitter  
Than lion, tell?"

The merry riddler replied, keeping up the joke—

“Had my heifer not drawn your plough  
You wouldn't have guessed my riddle now.”

On another occasion he celebrates in a kind of rough Border minstrelsy a notorious exploit of his own :—

“With the jaw-bone of an ass  
Have I slain men, mass on mass,  
One score, two score,  
A thousand or more,  
With the jaw-bone of an ass.”\*

Some of these incidents recall the Herakles of Greek mythology; the strong, the heroic Herakles, but also the jovial, jesting eating and drinking Herakles. The general superficial resemblance, indeed, of the Hebrew to the Greek hero is so obvious that Mulman admits it; while Stanley unconsciously recognizes in Samson “the wayward likeness of the great luminary”—the reality of the Tyrian Herakles. The Bishop of Bath and Wells goes even further, for he suggests the possibility of a connection between the Samson-Saga and Phœnician tradition; and assuming the literal truth of the Biblical story, supposes that the Hebrew worthy was the historical prototype of the Greek hero. Dr. H. Steinthal, in the “*Zeitschrift*,” edited by himself and M. Lazarus, has worked out the mythical explanation of the story in a widely different sense. Kuenen, who refers to his solution in the “*History of the Religion of Israel*,” adopts it, and E. Meier, in his “*Poetical Literature of the Hebrews*,” while minutely reviewing the old Saga, exaggerates the coincidences between the exploits of Samson and those of Herakles, reversing Lord A. Hervey's order of derivation, and regarding Samson's career as a direct parody of that of Herakles; an extravagance which we cannot but regret.

The Heraklean story, as we now have it, is a great composite picture to whose elaboration foreign countries contributed, however true it may be that its fundamental outlines were derived from Hellas itself. But it does not follow that the idea and even the name of Herakles may not, in their primeval form, be susceptible of an interpretation connecting them with the East. The Greek hero is said, by an old writer, to have been originally named Palæmon, or the Wrestler, and to have been called Herakles because he was destined to receive immortal glory from

---

\* See Ewald's critical remark.



Here. This derivation, though in itself unexceptionable, may be only an adaptation of the Oriental name, just as Cadmus, which C. O. Müller refers to  $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$ , may with far greater probability be referred to Kedem—the *East*. The name Ar occurs as the name of an Asiatic God. It is preserved, perhaps, in that of the old founder of Gadara, Archaleus, as Hellenized in the Phœnician history of Claudius Julius.\* The Rev. George Rawlinson admits that Herakles may be related to the Semitic *Har*, *heat*, or *burning*. The worship of Herakles, it is intimated by Herodotus, had long been familiar in Egypt and Tyre. The historian certainly identified the demigod of Greece with the Baal, or Melkarth, of Tyre, and was convinced that there was an ancient god Herakles, to whom a temple was built, long prior to the birth of the son of Alcmena. The city of Tyre, we are told, had an antiquity of 2,300 years before Herodotus. Gades, or Gadeira, so famous in the Heraklean myth, was founded about B.C. 1100. Cyprus was subject to the Tyrians in the time of Solomon; and the Phœnicians had found their way to Sicily before the middle of the eighth century. In fact, as Mr. Grote observes, we trace the wealth and industry of Tyre and the distant navigation of her vessels through the Red Sea and along the coasts of Arabia, back to the days of David and Solomon.

It was in the reign of the magnificent monarch, who made silver to be in Jerusalem as stones, that the intercourse between the Tyrians and the Israelites became prominent. Tyrian industry and Tyrian art contributed to the great national work, the construction of the Temple, and the Sidonian artisans of the Homeric poems lent invaluable aid to the royal founder. The Temple of Solomon has been held indeed to be an exact reproduction of the Temple of Melkarth; the objectionable stone-cylinders or obelisks of the Phœnician structure being replaced by two columns, called Jachin and Boaz, to efface all vestiges of a symbolism contrary to the worship of Jahveh. It must have been about this date that King Hiram (if Movers rightly interprets the historian Menander) pulled down the old sanctuaries in Tyre and built the Temple of Herakles and Astarte; celebrating there for the first time the feast of the awakening of the solar hero or god, Melkarth, the Tyrian Herakles, now identified with Baal-Samim or Sol-Belus, being, as Mr. Sayce tells us, the sun with *long hair* or rays.

The splendid sarcasm of the prophet Elijah (1 Kings xviii. 27) when mocking the priests of Baal, will readily recur to all who have heard Mendelssohn's musical rendering of that magnificent outburst. Referring to this scene, Movers detects in it allusions

---

\* See Movers, p. 431-2; also Rawlinson's "Herodotus," ii. 43, note.

to incidents marking the popular story of the Tyrian Sun-god, in the scoffing suggestion that that Deity is meditating, or has retired, or is journeying, or sleeping—but sleeping with the intent that he may awaken\*—acts all having a characteristic reference to the Phœnician Herakles as philosopher, adventurer, or traveller, or finally as symbolical of the declining and reviving power of the sun. Is it unreasonable, then, to infer that the mythical conception of the Eastern Herakles, which was generally accepted in later days in Greece, was early known to the Israelites? Samson, we may remember, was of the tribe of Dan. Beth-Shemesh—the house of the sun—was the name of the town situated on the border-line between the tribes of Dan and Judah. This town was already in existence when the Jewish conquest in Canaan was accomplished. The worship of the sun, which was practised there, would naturally be introduced among the people of Dan. The Israelites, says Mr. Sayce, like their Phœnician kindred, were inclined towards sun-worship: a tendency which accounts, as he thinks, for the worship on the high-places exposed to the rays of the sun. Jonathan, the grandson of *Moses*, according to the true reading (Judges xviii. 30), was priest to the tribe of Dan, and the graven image which they set up seems, says the same learned authority, to have been a Baal. The immoral institutions, he adds, connected with the Phœnician religion were common in Judah as early as the reign of Rehoboam, and in both the northern and southern kingdoms children were burnt or made to pass through the fire in honour of the Sun-god. Under Ahab, and through the influence of his Tyrian wife, the worship of Baal and Ashera, was formally established in Judah. Ashtoreth or Astarte had been recognized by Solomon himself. His successor burnt incense to Baal, to the sun, and to the planets, and to all the hosts of heaven, dedicated chariots to the sun, and placed horses in his honour at the entrance of the Temple of Jahveh (2 Kings xxiii. 11).

The worship of the sun was not limited to Phœnicia. It was universal or all but universal. Almost every nation, says Mr. Robert Mackay, will be found to have had a mythical being, whose strength or weakness, victories or defeats, more or less nearly describe the sun's career through the seasons. Thus there was a Scythian and Etruscan Herakles. The Assyrians and Lydians worshipped a sun-god named Sandan or Sardanapal. The worship of this equivocal deity appears to have penetrated at an early period into Phœnicia. The oldest trace of the ceremony of the interchange of attire by the sexes in the cultus of Baal or Herakles is found in the Biblical record, 2 Kings x. 22.

---

\* See the Hebrew text. The received translation is inaccurate.

This usage associates the Lydian God Sandan with the Tyrian Melkarth and the Grecian Herakles, the slave of Omphale. For Sandan is described as clothed in woman's attire, while his inseparable companion Tanais, whose name was known to the Phœnicians, is represented on the coins of Cappadocian kings with the club and the lion's skin, the symbols of Herakles.\* Sandan himself is portrayed in the character of a lion-hunter, and is figured in old monuments struggling with a lion. In Greece there were several distinct varieties of this heroic character. Of these the Theban son of Zeus was the great central figure in whom all converged. It is acknowledged by the learned historian of Greece, Dr. Thirlwall, to be at least a remarkable coincidence that the birth of Herakles is assigned to the city of Cadmus, that is, to an eastern or Phœnician origin; and he expresses the opinion that the great works ascribed to him, so far as they were really accomplished by human labour, may seem to correspond better with the art and industry of the Phœnicians than with the skill and power of a less civilized race. There is no doubt a class of legends in which Herakles, like Samson, appears simply as a local hero. We are convinced, however, that the fabulous adventures called "The Labours of Herakles" belong in part at least to the Phœnician world and the wandering Tyrian God. It was in honour of this deity that colonists from the East erected temples when they founded their principal settlements along the shores of the Mediterranean. And far from being of a recent date, this European immigration, with its fanciful recital of Phœnician prodigies, must be referred to a remote period, a period long prior to the date of the composition of the poems of Homer and Hesiod. The oldest form of the popular story, however happily conceived as a poetical or religious fiction, is surrendered by Dr. Thirlwall, as an inadequate historical statement. The adventures attributed to Herakles are allowed to be prodigious and supernatural, and his endless expeditions are only accidentally connected, in the historian's opinion, with his traditional labours. For the really oldest information accessible to us respecting this ubiquitous hero we must turn to the pages of the poets already named—to Homer and Hesiod.

"The old story," then, is supplemented in the "Iliad," by details from the "great Heraklean picture" which are possibly of coeval origin. The poet does not specify the Twelve Labours of Herakles, but he ascribes to him achievements which are purely mythical. He tells us how the son of Amphitryon on coming to Troy in quest of the horses of Laomedon, with his little fleet of six ships, took the famous city of Priam; how he

---

\* *Movers*, p. 461.

warred with the Gods, piercing the bosom of the Queen of Heaven and transfixing Hades, the colossal God of the Underworld; how he was pursued by the Master of the Deep over the plain where Athene and the Trojans raised a lofty mound which bore his name long ages after; how he was cast ashore on the Isle of Cos and mysteriously transported to Argos; how he destroyed the family of Neleus, carried off Astyoche from Ephyre, and killed his friend Iphitus. If the poet of the "Iliad" does not enumerate the labours of Herakles, he at least testifies to the severe tasks imposed on him by Eurystheus, and perhaps to the most formidable of all his enterprises—his journey to the Unseen World to bring from Erebus the Dog of Hades.

Hesiod, the contemporary, or rather the successor, of Homer, recounts many of the hero's labours. He slew Cerberus, the fifty-headed offspring of the Serpent-Woman and the violent Typhon, and the dragon Hydra, and Orthros the herd-dog, and sister and brother of Typhon, and the triple-headed Geryon, the owner of the herds in Erytheia and the master of Orthros, and the keeper of the herds, Eurytion. The first exploit of Herakles is related in detail by Hesiod: the slaughter of the lion of Nemea, the offspring of the impossible Chimæra and of the watch-dog of Geryon. The rescue of Prometheus, the death of the devouring eagle at the hands of "Theban Herakles," and the final triumph, after the completion of his agonizing labours, of the son of Alcmena, when, in Pindar's phrase, he becomes "lord of the golden house," wedding, on Mount Olympus, Hebe, the daughter of mighty Zeus and of golden sandalled Here.

The Heraklean legend, as recognized in Homer and Hesiod, was evidently not invented but accepted by them as a part of the contemporary popular faith. If the Homeric poems existed about nine hundred years before Christ (and Mommsen would date them still further back), the legend itself must have existed some generations previously. Herakles, in the "Iliad," and in the "Theogony," is already a mythological being; the captor of Troy, the opponent of gods, the subduer of portentous monsters, the conqueror of Hades, and a wanderer not only to Gadara but to Erebus itself. Orthros and Cerberus, the hounds whom he destroys, are the gloom of the morning and evening, conceived as hostile and demoniacal powers.\* Cerberus, says Max Müller, is the darkness of night, to be fought by Herakles, the night herself being called *Sarvara* in Sanskrit. Prometheus, released by the Greek hero, is a symbolical personage; Typhon, the brother of Orthros, is a poetical incarnation of the whirlwind;

---

\* "Lectures on the Science of Language," p. 478, by Max Müller.

and the legend of the struggle of Herakles with Geryon already formed part of the great Gisdhubar epic of ancient Chaldea, and along with the other adventures of Gisdhubar or Herakles passed first to the Phœnicians, and then through them to the Greeks.\*

In the myth, says M. Lenormant, incontestibly of Phœnician origin, in which Hercules slays the serpent guardian of the Hesperidean trees, and acquires possession of the golden apples, we see the revenge taken by the god of light and of the sun, winning back the tree of life from the powers of darkness, jealousy and enmity, personified by the serpent who got possession of it in the beginning of the world. Preller, he adds, has justly remarked, that the god returning from the country of the Hesperides with the golden apples, is the sun in the East reappearing with the beams of light, of which the darkness of night had despoiled the earth.†

The hero, whose bride is Hebe or immortal youth, who vanquishes the giant of the West in his gloomy lair, and fights with the dusky hours of night and morning, bears even in the age assigned by Herodotus to Hesiod and Homer a conspicuous resemblance to the solar deity. In a later day Pisander, and after him Stesichorus, as usually interpreted, sing how Herakles in a golden cup given him by the Sun, passed over the ocean to the Isle of Geryon, adjoining which were the islands of the Hesperides, the daughters of Evening. Pindar celebrates the arrival of Herakles at Gadara and the Pillars which marked the limit of his enterprise; he knows of his conquest of Antæus on Libya's harvest-waving shore, and of the olive which the men that dwelt beyond the North wind gave at his desire, and of the mighty games which he instituted on the hallowed banks of Alpheius, and of his quest of the hind with horns of gold. Later still Sophocles records the legend of his death, and Euripides celebrates his numerous enterprises. "The event," says Dr. Thirlwall, "which closes the career of the Greek hero, who rises to immortality from the flames of the pile on which he lays himself down, is a prominent feature in the Eastern Phœnician mythology, and may therefore be safely considered as borrowed from it."

Phœnicians, Assyrians and Lydians alike attributed suicide to their god, for they could only interpret the sun's mitigation of his

\* Rev. A. H. Sayce, *Academy*, July 3, 1880.

† Quoted, in part from memory, from M. Lenormant's "Beginnings of History," a work published very long after this article was written, or it would have been more frequently cited, as it often confirms or illustrates our general conclusions. While professing to believe firmly in the inspiration of our sacred books, M. Lenormant is yet of opinion that the narratives in the early chapters of Genesis, are merely the Hebrew version of very old traditions common to some of the nations of Western Asia.

own heat as suicide. Standing in summertime upon "the peak of heaven" the god kills himself, yet does not die. Rather he renews his youth in the character of the Phoenix, reappearing as a gentler autumn sun. Contradictions, says Dr. Steintal—to whom we are indebted for these remarks—are inherent in Pagan mythology; symbols become independent attributes or modes of operation; symbol fights with symbol, god with god, and god with symbol. Accordingly the lion exhibits a hostile attribute, symbolizing with the Semites summer heat. When it is said that Sandan or Herakles or Samson kills the lion the meaning is that the beneficent power which they symbolize protects the earth when the sun is in Leo, the period of her greatest fertility, the period, too, when honey is most abundant: the period, finally, when the sun-god kills the lion lest he should be killed himself; when the solar power extinguishes the sun's heat by embracing the sun, by strangling or rending the lion.

It is evident that the Legend of Herakles originated in pre-Homeric times. It is possible that the incidents, known to the later Greek poets, may have been known to Homer and Hesiod, though not immortalized in their verses. The dependence of the Greek myth on the Phœnician has been affirmed by Movers. The battles of the Tyrian sun-god with Typhon and his children, Cerberus, Orthros and Hydra, are imitated in the Greek versions. The gigantic monsters with whom the son of Alcmena contends are the constellations which from their extreme heat exercise a baneful influence. The pivot of the myth is the war with Typhon. Not originally a sun-god, but the supreme Phœnician deity—the principle which governs and preserves the universe—Arkal, as mythical hero, contends with Typhon, who personifies the powers and elements antagonistic to the order of Nature. Later as Baal he assumes the character of a solar deity. He is not, however, so much the sun-god himself or even the solar energy, as a sort of vicegerent who journeys with the sun, expires with the sun's light in the winter solstice, and revives once more to resume the old victorious career. As Melkarth he is the tutelary deity of Tyre; the king of the city whose worship was carried over great part of the ancient world. "Under the slightly altered form of Melicertes," says Mr. Kenrick, "he appears in the Greek mythology with the attributes of a maritime divinity and the synonym of Palæmon, or 'The Wrestler,' an epithet of Herakles." In old Phœnician inscriptions Baal is rendered Herakles, and Baal of Tyre is constantly Hellenized into the Tyrian Herakles: evidence which does not indeed prove their original identity, but which enables us to trace back the belief in that identity to a tolerably remote period.

The historian, whom we have just quoted, seems to admit that

the original conception of "Herakles" was that of a divinity, though the poetical imagination of the Greeks adorned it with so many fables, bearing the character of human adventures, that the god was ultimately transformed into a man. "Nor is it unlikely," he adds, "that some of the labours of Herakles in Greece, in clearing the country and exterminating wild beasts, may represent the influence of Phœnician civilization; or that his descent into Hades was suggested by the establishment of his worship in the extreme West and on the verge of the Unseen World. The local hero, if such there were, early appropriated a portion of the legendary splendour of the god. The very name of Herakles may refer to the sun, as the 'glory of the heavens,' and the names of some of the persons in the Heraklean cycle—Electryon, Augeas, Auge—are suggestive of a solar origin."\*

We have shown, then, that the original conception of Herakles was in part derived by the Greeks from a Phœnician prototype; that lineaments in the portrait of the demigod were borrowed from Baal, the lord of heaven, the Tyrian sun-god. We have shown, too, that there was a constant intercourse between the Israelites and people of a Phœnician origin; that Gades or Gadeira, the chief Phœnician colony outside the Pillars of Hercules, was founded prior to the commencement of classical history; while the heroic tales of the Hebrew nation could hardly have assumed their present form much before the seventh century B.C. It is, therefore, quite possible that the adventurous life of the Greek Herakles may have been, in some of its details, reflected back in the mirror of Phœnician sensuousness, and Greek communicativeness may have transmitted to the East, though in fragmentary fashion, incidents in the imaginary career of the Theban demigod. In this way, through the sun-worshippers of Gades, of Tyre, of Bethshemesh, the peculiar exotic traits which may be detected in the story of the Hebrew Samson may be satisfactorily accounted for. The hypothesis, however, is not absolutely necessary. Old Semitic myths—descriptive of the journeys, the adventures, the battles, the sufferings and the revival of the solar deity—could not fail to become known to the idolatrous Jews, and we may well suppose that the mythological folk-lore of the East dealt in religious wonders analogous to those in which the capricious fancy of Greece delighted. The legend of Gisdhubar was, as we have seen, carried to Phœnicia.

---

\* "A fetid scum was occasionally thrown up on the shores of Sicily, which was explained as the consequence of the Sun's stabling his horses in those Western regions. . . . Transferred to the Peloponnesus, Augeas (αὐγή), the Son of the Sun, was substituted for the Sun himself, and the cleansing of the stable was deemed a labour worthy of Herakles."—Kenrick's "Primeval History," p. 77.

If we could accept the testimony of Josephus, *Samson*—by him interpreted the *Strong*—would be the nominal counterpart of Alcides, whose name has a similar significance. Josephus, however, was a poor etymologist, and there is no warrant for this interpretation. Hebrew scholars are pretty generally agreed that Samson, or rather Shimson, is a diminutive of *Shemesh*, the sun. In the Biblical narrative no attempt is made to explain or justify the name. The otherwise inexplicable nomenclature is an initial presumption that there is some affinity between the adventurous champion of Dan and that of the wandering Tyrian god. It is remarkable that the actual career of Samson is but little in correspondence with his professional or presumed career. Though included among the rulers or judges of Israel, the actions ascribed to him are scarcely accordant with his supposed official position. There is no indication that his habitual life was that of a Nazarite, though he was avowedly consecrated to the service of God from his birth. It is observable that no stress is laid on his religious obligations in general. On the contrary, his violation of duty passes uncensured, and the preservation of the hair alone is made the subject of emphatic comment; though in the Nazarite ritual (Numbers vi.) there is no connection asserted between the length of the hair and the extraordinary physical prowess of the wearer. Neither is the strength of Samson ever represented as dependent on the observance of his Nazarite vow. His hair is simply regarded as a talisman which preserves him from harm. Stories of the sacred character or magical efficacy of hair are common in Greek legend. Iolaus, the companion or mystical second-self of Herakles, was held in such veneration in Agyrium, that all the inhabitants of that city were accustomed to dedicate their hair from the moment of birth, and to allow it to grow till the day arrived on which it was to be formally presented to the hero.\* The children who failed to make this customary offering in the temple erected to him, were punished with the loss of their voice and youthful bloom, but, on a pledge being given for the celebration of this holy rite, the sufferers recovered their health and their vocal powers returned. Another legend records how Comætho, the daughter of the Taphian King Pterelaus, shore from her father's head the golden lock to which Poseidon had attached the gift of immortality. A similar story is told of Nisus, the King of Megara. His hair now white from age, sings Ovid, was brilliant with one purple lock. On this lock depended the security of his kingdom and his life. Scylla, the daughter of this enchanted prince, saw and fell in love with Minos, the King of Crete, who was then besieging and was soon to capture Megara.

---

\* Diodorus Siculus, lib. iv. 24.



Persuading herself that the cause of Minos was the rightful cause, the false daughter, in the silence of night, crept to her father's couch, and as he slept shore off the magical purple lock and "slit the thin-spun life," bearing to Minos the visible proof of her love and the welcome instrument of his victory. In this tale we have not only the semblance of a solar deity in Nisus with the glistening lock, but we are placed in the very midst of the Phœnician mythical cycle. The plain, says Mr. Kenrick,\* which extends from the foot of Ida to the southern coast, was the scene of the mythic history of Europa, the Astarte of the Sidonians, in whose union with Jupiter we see the blending of the Phœnician with the Greek mythology. It was at Phæstos, in the same part of Crete, that the Tyrian Herakles was the special object of adoration. It was in this island that the hero was reported to have raised a large army for his expedition to Libya, Egypt, Iberia, and Gaul. A mythopœic relation, too, may be presumed to exist between the purple dye of Phœnicia and the sun, since the Tyrian solar god is said to have discovered that colour. A trace of this superstition of the hair reappears in the case of Herakles himself. A late Greek author reports that the son of Alcmena was three nights in the inside of a sea monster, and at the end of that time was released, but *with the loss of his hair*.

From the number of the labours of Herakles we can derive no argument in favour of his solar character. The Zodiac was not known to the Greeks before the seventh, perhaps not before the fifth, century B.C. The Chaldeans, however, are said by Diodorus Siculus to have divided the Zodiacal circle into equal parts, corresponding to the twelve months of the year, and the figures on the Chaldæo-Assyrian monuments, with the exception of the Virgin and the Balance are, according to M. Lenormant, recognizable as the familiar figures of the Zodiacal signs.

It is a singular coincidence that the number of the achievements of Samson exactly equals that of the Greek Herakles. Kaiser, an orthodox interpreter, is so convinced of the influence of the Greek myth, in the formation of the Hebrew tale, that he ascribes the resemblance to an intentional imitation designed in derision of the Philistine or Phœnician Herakles, who possibly brought the story from Crete. This extravagance, however, we are compelled to discountenance.

The Hebrew champion, like the Greek, though in a more contracted sphere and less romantic fashion, is brought into hostile relation with the animal world in two instances at least: the adventure with the lion and that with the foxes, or, as some

---

\* "Primeval History," Kenrick.

translate the Hebrew word, jackals. It is difficult to accept the narrative in Judges xv. as a report of a real transaction. This story of the foxes with the firebrand flaming between their tails, as they rushed through the cornfields and vineyards of the Philistines, is only explicable as a resetting of some Semitic myth, similar to that which we find in the "Metamorphoses" of Ovid. Ovid's tale, indeed, is, as Dr. Steinthal remarks, a mere invention to account for the ceremonial fox-hunt at the festival of Ceres in Rome. At this festival, burning torches were fastened to the foxes' tails, and the animals were chased through the circus. This singular rite was a symbolical reminder of the damage done to the fields by the "red fox," called Robigo, which was exorcized with various rites about the time of the Dogstar. If, at that time, says Steinthal, a great solar heat follows too close upon the hoar-frost or dew of the cold nights, the mischief rages like a burning fox through the cornfields. On April 20 were celebrated the *Robigalia*, on which occasion prayers were addressed to Mars for protection against devastation. In the grove of Robigo, the Mildew-god, young dogs of red colour were offered in expiation on the same day. In the Roman ceremonial in the circus and the grove, in the story of Ovid, and in that of Samson, we detect the same mythic conception of the red fox that burns up the corn.

Four of Samson's prodigious achievements are intended to exemplify the preternatural strength inherent in his long hair. Thongs or cords which were new and had never been used, bonds of extraordinary tenacity and unusual complexity, were broken by him like burning tow or flaxen thread. It would be rash, however, to suppose, with E. Meier, that the knotted ropes of Samson were plagiarized from the so-called "knot of Hercules."

Neither can we see in the adventure at Gaza an exact imitation of the story of the Tyrian deity in its Greek dress. Samson is reported to have carried away the great gate of the city of Gaza, with its two posts, and to have placed them on a mountain opposite Hebron, a distance of more than forty miles. If we cannot, with Meier, regard this narrative as an intentional reproduction of the story of Herakles and the pillars erected by him on each side of the Straits of Gibraltar, and immortalized by Pindar as the "Gate of Gadeira," we may be permitted to recognize in it that general family resemblance which stamps it as of mythical or legendary origin.

The prayer of Samson for water, when suffering from thirst, like that of Herakles for protection against the Cicadæ, was immediately answered (Judges xv.). The host of insect ravagers which molested the Greek vanished never to return. To quench the thirst of the Hebrew a miraculous stream flowed

from a hollow in the jawbone of an ass, reminding us of the wonderful well which the mythical ram dug in the sand to refresh the fainting Herakles. To commemorate the event in Samson's case the spot was named the *Invoker's Fountain*. The tale is evidently an etymological myth. The existence of a natural spring in a jagged rock, which to fanciful minds bore some resemblance to a jawbone sufficiently explains its origin.

We have traced the features common to the Samson-Saga and the myth of Herakles. We are not warranted in affirming that the story of the Hebrew worthy was borrowed directly from that of the Greek, because in some instances foreign fancies may have intruded themselves into the legend of the son of Manoah. Admitting the general resemblance of the stories of Samson and Herakles, Lord Arthur Herveý observes: "The combination of great strength with submission to the power of women, the slaying of the Nemæan lion, the coming by his death at the hands of his wife, and especially the story as told by Herodotus of the captivity of Hercules in Egypt, are certainly remarkable coincidences." We shall recur to the Nemæan lion and the Egyptian captivity presently. The loves of Herakles—his passion for Astyoche, Auge, Iole, Dejanira—are parallels to the amours of Samson, and his amorous preferences for the Philistine wife, the frail woman of Timnath and the faithless Delilah, doubly commemorated in her country's legends and in the great poem of our English Milton.

There are certain incidents in the narrative of Samson's love for Delilah which curiously recall incidents in the career of the son of Alcmena. The treatment of Samson by Delilah has its parallel in the degrading servitude of Herakles, when he carded wool, wore the garments of a woman, and led an effeminate life as the slave of Omphale. The sleeping and awaking of Samson are described with emphatic iteration in the narrative, and the sleeping and awaking of the Tyrian god are recorded by the historian Menander in words which connect the feast held in his honour with the birthday of the sun, or the renewal of solar power after its decline at the winter solstice. To suppose any intentional parody is impossible, but similarity of phenomena suggests the action of a kindred mythopæic fancy. The death of Samson, like that of Herakles, arose out of his relation to women. Herakles, who, like Melkarth, as described by Sanchoniathon, was lax in his morality, had become enamoured of his fair captive Iole, after he had taken the town of Achaia and slain her father Eurytus and his sons. Dejanira, to retain her husband's love, sent him the magical white garment steeped in the envenomed blood of Nessus, and thus became the unwitting instrument of his destruction. The deliberate crime of the perfidious Delilah contrasts tragically

with the loving though fatal artifice of the wife of Herakles. The cry of the fair traitress, "The Philistines be upon thee, Samson!" made the strong man rouse himself from a sleep that ended in weakness, blindness, captivity, and death, and was designed to do so. Again, we say, direct imitation is out of the question, but there is a sufficient generic resemblance in the two stories to indicate that we are dealing with mythical and not historical personages.

"Eyeless at Gaza at the mill with slaves," the Hebrew hero when with his growing hair his strength returned, crowned his marvellous career with a voluntary death. On a solemn festival day he destroyed the temple of Dagon, by grasping and violently pulling the two massive columns which supported its roof, copies perhaps of the pillars of the Tyrian Melkarth. His victory in defeat and death, when he slew more than he had slain in his life, have a startling correspondence with the Greek legend in Herodotus (ii. 21), to which Lord Arthur Hervey refers:—"On the arrival of Herakles in Egypt, the natives, putting a chaplet on his head, led him out in procession, as intending to sacrifice him to Zeus. For a while he kept perfectly still, but when, standing close to the altar, they set about the initiatory rite with him, he began forcibly to resist, and slew them all."

This, says C. O. Müller, is the oft-told legend of Busiris, the savage son of Poseidon, who caused all strangers to be put to death. A generation before Herodotus, the poet Panyasis referred to it, and his contemporary Pherecydes even gave the name of the king. In "Apollodorus" Busiris figures as the son of Egyptus. Busiris is introduced into one of the Hesiodic poems, in the seventh century before our era, where he not only stands in no relation to Herakles, but is assumed to have lived eleven generations before the time of that hero. It is evident, therefore, that the legend is no recast of the story of Samson any more than the story of Samson is a recast of the legend. This consideration does not affect the position that there is a common fund of mythical imagery which supplies the requisite matter for the ever-varying narratives of heroic achievement.

Among the remarkable coincidences between the career of Samson and that of Herakles, acknowledged by Lord Arthur Hervey, is the slaying of the lion in the vineyards of Timnath and the slaying of the lion in the Valley of Nemæa. As it was the first feat of Samson, so it was the first achievement of Herakles. As Herakles is said to have strangled the animal with his own hands, so Samson is said to have had nothing in his hand when he rent his forest foe as if he had been a kid. There is a further circumstance connected with this adventure, which Kuenen very naturally regards as additional evidence in favour

of a mythical interpretation of Samson's story. The riddle of Samson, he observes, remains a riddle as long as we think of an ordinary lion. The most elementary book on natural history testifies to the fastidious personal and domestic delicacy of the bee. In order to prevent noisome and unwholesome effluvia from the decomposing remains of intrusive snails, bees even take the trouble to embalm them with propolis, a kind of resin principally derived from coniferous trees. From this fact alone we may estimate the probability of the incident in Judges xiv. 9. Bees are assuredly not accustomed to deposit honey in the dead body of an ordinary lion.\* But if instead of an ordinary lion we assume that the lion of Samson was a mythological animal, the riddle, otherwise so perplexing, is readily explicable. The zodiacal lion was probably known to the Greeks before the time of Pindar, who appears to have connected it with the Giant of the Stars, Orion, in his celestial chase. Still earlier it may have been known, free from the drapery of Greek fable, in some old Semitic myth which had wandered into Canaan from Lydia or Chaldæa, and had perhaps won its way to Beth-Shemesh, the House of the Sun.

The recent researches at the site of the ancient city of the Chaldæan Heliopolis justify the conjecture that "Sippar of the Sun" may have been one of the centres from which such mythical ideas radiated. In the inscribed memorial tablet of Nabu-Validdma, King of Babylon about B.C. 850, the sun-god is represented seated on his throne beneath a canopied shrine, as a man with thick curly hair and a long beard. In Assyrian and Babylonian art, says Mr. Boscawen, in his interesting letter in the *Athenæum* of Sept. 8, 1881, Isdubar, the great solar hero, the giant king, whose labours, like those of the Greek Herakles, are of a solar character, is represented as having thick curly locks and a long beard, and by his profusion of hair he is distinguished from the other characters in the legend. Like the Greek hero he is covered with a garment of disease, which deprives him of the hair of his head and the hairy covering of his limbs, and until these are restored by the immortal Khasisadra or Xisuthrus, the giant-king is powerless. It was so, comments Mr. Boscawen, with the Hebrew solar hero Samson in his strength, and until shorn of it by Delilah he remained unconquered. There is no symbolical lion in this sculpture from the great Chaldæan centre of sun-worship, but we have already seen that the Assyrians and Lydians worshipped a sun-god named Sandan, who is figured on old monuments struggling with a lion, the emblem of summer-heat. Recognizing the astronomical

\* See, however, the story of Onesilus, Herodotus, v. 114.

character of the lion we can answer the enigma proposed by Samson, without the surreptitious aid of the languishing and traitorous Delilah. The solution lies in the idea that the sun produces honey when he is in the constellation Leo.

Though we have entered with some minuteness into the various characteristics of the Greek and Hebrew legend, we are far from affirming that all the coincidences are designed. Our delineation of the features of the two stories must not be confounded with the hypothesis of an absolutely and exclusively common derivation. Yet some community of thought there was. The mind that conceived the Heraklean picture was generically the same mind that conceived the portrait of the Danite hero, appropriating similar materials and elaborating them in a similar spirit. The traits in the Samson-Saga, which appear to us almost demonstrably derivative, are the significant name of the hero Samson, the "Little Sun;" the magical efficacy of the hair when unshorn and the loss of that efficacy when shorn, the slaying of the lion, the prodigy of the bees, the honey enigma, the adventure of the foxes and firebrands, illustrated by the Roman Robigalia, and the self-destruction or quenching of the "Light of Israel," immediately caused through the loss of his hair, and mediately through the fatal fascination of womanly beauty. It is, we think, an admissible hypothesis that some of the incidents in his story were derived from the cultus of the Tyrian god, but we are little inclined to refer them to any determinate source or to any deliberate imitation. We rather conceive that there was in the intellectual atmosphere a floating capital of mythical parasitic dust, and that the story of Samson grew up like other stories, by spontaneous accretions, the nucleus being the shadowy conception of a Canaanitish sun-god, adored, perhaps, at Beth-Shemesh. Herakles, too, may have been in part of Tyrian or Semitic descent, but the Danite hero was not the model of the Greek worthy, nor the Greek worthy of the Danite hero. In both cases we have not history but mythology.

A consideration of the essential coincidences in the two stories led Kuenen to the conclusion that "the Israelites in later times had reached a point of religious development at which the old myths had lost their meaning and, for example, the strong, brave man had to take the place of the warlike sun-hero." And if Kuenen has somewhat overstated the case, some such hypothesis is required, if only to render intelligible the otherwise inexplicable name of Samson. That name, it should be remembered, occurs only in the Book of Judges; it is borne only by the hero of Dan. The word Shimson, to use the Hebrew form of the name, does not signify *strong*, but *little sun*. The proximity of the tribe of Dan to the polytheists of Canaan was favourable to

the circulation of tales of which the Tyrian Herakles was the hero, and the apparently factitious representation of Samson's official life inclines us to suspect that it was not his real life, but was purposely invented for him, so ill does he play his part as a Nazarite of God. For he has, as Kuenen remarks, nothing in common with the Nazarites but his long hair, originally the symbol of the rays of the sun, as our orthodox friends may learn from Mr. Sayce. We are disposed then to agree with Kuenen, with but little modification, that as many of the features of the originally Grecian Herakles are borrowed from the Semitic sun-myths, so it is but natural that he should resemble Samson, if the latter be derived from the Canaanitish sun-worship, which is scarcely to be distinguished from that of the Phœnician. If in remote pre-Homeric times Herakles was a purely Grecian hero, he very early appropriated some of the attributes of the Tyrian Melkarth. In many parts of Greece there may have been a pre-eminently strong man, but there never existed an historical Herakles. In Dan there may have been a local deliverer, but there never was a Samson, just as there may have been in Switzerland more than one William Tell, but never the William Tell of song and of romance. And as the picturesque incident of the apple, borrowed from the prior mythology of the North, repeated itself in the story of the Swiss deliverer, so some rays from the native splendour of the Phœnician sun-god may have fallen on the henceforth "illustrious locks" of Samson; and some possible *Shamên*, the Strong,\* in his legendary transformation, have appropriated the glorifying name of *Shimshon*, or the Little Sun.



## ART. II.—THE CENSORSHIP OF THE STAGE.

*Parliamentary Papers*, 1832, vol. vii. ; 1866, vol. xvi.

FOR our present censorship of plays we have to thank all three estates of the realm. It was created by the Crown in the sixteenth century, and new life was breathed into it by the Houses of Parliament in the eighteenth. To understand its true nature, it is necessary that we should shortly trace its development.

In the reign of Henry VIII. the drama began to be secu-

---

\* Rather fat, robust. In Judges iii. 29, translated lusty in our Authorized Version.

larized. The monks were no longer the sole impresarios. The moralities, fecundated by germs from the Latin comedy, gave birth to plays in which real life was imitated, however rudely, no longer under the veil of symbolism. At the same time the renaissance love of pageantry penetrated to England, along with the material prosperity which it presupposed. The nobles, enriched by the spoils of the monasteries, took under their protection the arts which the monasteries had fostered. In 1544, and probably earlier, the amusements of the Court were placed under the control of a "Magister jocorum, revellorum et mascorum." In 1549 the representation of all plays and interludes was prohibited throughout the realm for a space of three months, on account of their seditious tendencies. Three years later a special license of the Privy Council was declared necessary for any dramatic performance in the English tongue. From this time forward both players and playwrights were harrassed intermittently by different dominions and powers; the players, as rogues and vagabonds, by the civic authorities; the playwrights, on political or religious grounds, by the Star Chamber and the Privy Council. In 1581 we find a commission issued by Elizabeth to "Edmunde Tilney, Maister of our Revells," empowering him to call before him all "plaiers with their playmakers," and to make them present or recite all "Comedies, Trajedies, Enterludes, or what other Showes soever . . . as they shall have in readines, or meane to sett forth;" whereupon he is to "order and reforme, auctoris and put down, as shalbe thought meete or unmeete unto himselfe," and in case of disobedience is to "comnytt" the offenders "to Warde," there to remain until such time as the said Edmund Tilney shall think their expiation sufficient. An attempt of the playwrights, eight years later, to enter into the Marprelate controversy (of course on the side of Prelates), was promptly suppressed. Throughout the reigns of Elizabeth and her successors censorship seems to have been intermittently and capriciously exercised, with no set forms or fixed principles.\* The theatre, with all its popularity, existed, in theory at least, upon sufferance. A general right of interference and suppression seems to have been held so entirely a matter of course, that there was no difficulty in applying it to individual cases in the most offhand and informal fashion. The Crown, while it sometimes protected the players against the assaults of bumbledom,

---

\* There is a short Act of 3 James I. (c. 21), by which it is provided that any one who in a stage play, interlude, show, Maygame, or pageant, shall jestingly or prolanely speak or use the holy name of God, or of Christ Jesus, or of the Holy Ghost, or of the Trinity, shall forfeit the sum of ten pounds, half to the king, half to the informer.



and the more justifiable hostility of puritanism, took their religion and politics under the wing of its own prerogative. Court historians can tell us when the Master of the Revels merged in the Lord Chamberlain;\* it is enough for us to note that the latter's jurisdiction over the drama is a survival from the good old times of Tudor absolutism.

Chance has preserved to us the private note-book of Sir Henry Herbert, Master of the Revels under Charles I., which throws a curious light upon the mysteries of his art. In August, 1623, he allows "an olde play called *Winter's Tale* . . . on Mr. Hemmings his word that there was nothing profane added or reformed." This he does without fee. In April, 1627, he receives £5 from Mr. Hemmings for forbidding the Red Bull Company to play Shakespeare's plays. A play of Massinger's, apparently lost, is prohibited in January, 1630, because it contained such dangerous matter as the deposing of a King of Portugal. "I had my fee, notwithstandinge," adds Sir Henry, "which belongs to me for reading itt over, and ought to be brought always with the booke." Shirley's play of "*The Ball*" comes near being prohibited in November, 1632, because in it "there were divers personated so naturally, both of lords and others of the Court, that I took it ill." The offensive matter was promptly altered, but Sir Henry still thinks it necessary to excuse his leniency by noting "the first that offends in this kind, of poets or players, shall be sure of publique punishment." Next year, however, Shirley regains favour with his play of "*The Young Admiral*." It "may serve," says the censor, "for a patterne to other poetts" who will be encouraged by the favour bestowed on it, "to pursue this beneficial and cleanly way of poetry." In May, 1633, the part of Vitruvius Hoop is wholly struck out of "*The Tale of the Tubb*," as being a libel upon Inigo Jones. In the same year Sir Henry receives from Christopher Beeston, manager of the Queen's Players, £3 for the license of "an ould play called *Hymens Holliday*," and £1 for some alterations in it; whereon he adds, "Meetinge with him at the ould Exchange, he gave my wife a payre of gloves, that cost him at least twenty shillings." Master Christopher Beeston was evidently wise in his generation; more so, at any rate, than his brother William, who in

---

\* Probably not until the passing of the Act of 1737. The first recorded instance of interference by the Lord Chamberlain is in 1624, when he was ordered by the king to remit a penalty inflicted by the Privy Council on the players who had produced Middleton's "*Game of Chess*." After this the two offices seem to have exercised concurrent jurisdiction, though the Master of the Revels was no doubt theoretically subordinate to the Lord Chamberlain. In some instances we even find the Lord Chamberlain prohibiting the publication of plays.—J. P. Collier, "*Parliamentary Report*," 1832, vii.

1640 is committed to the Marshalsey for playing a play without a license. "The play I cald for, and forbiddinge the playinge of it, keepe the booke, because it had relation to the passages of the K.'s journey to the Northe, and was complaynd of by his M.tye to mee, with commande to punish the offenders."

The paternal interest taken by Charles I. in the drama is curiously exemplified in this note-book. It is well known that he suggested to Shirley the plot of "The Gamester;" but it appears that if he was ready with doctrine he was at least as diligent in reproof and correction:—

"This morning (says Sir Henry Herbert) being the 9th of January, 1633, the kinge was pleasd to call me into his withdrawinge chamber to the windowe, wher he went over all that I had croste in Davenants play-booke, and allowing of *faith* and *slight* to bee asseverations only, and no oathes, markt them to stande. . . . The kinge is pleased to take *faith*, *death*, *slight*, for asseverations, and no oaths, to which I doe humbly submit as my master's judgment; but under favour conceive them to be oathis, and enter them here, to declare my opinion and submission."\*

This entry is almost as pathetic as George Colman's scruples about the use of the word "Angel," to be hereafter alluded to. On another occasion, however, when Charles I. deigned to take the censor's blue pencil in his own august hand, Sir Henry's sensitive conscience went entirely with his master's judgment. The play was "The King and the Subject," by Massinger, and contained the following lines spoken by Don Pedro, King of Spain, to his subjects:—

"Monys? Wee'le rayse supplies what ways we please,  
And force you to subscribe to blanks, in which  
We'le mulct you as wee shall thinke fitt. The Cæsars  
In Rome were wise, acknowledginge no lawes  
But what their swords did ratifye, the wives  
And daughters of the senators bowinge to  
Their wills, as deities," &c.

In the year 1638, this passage had indeed an unpleasant relevance to certain measures of finance and government nearer home than Spain. Sir Henry accordingly transcribes them at length in his note-book, "for ever to bee remembered by my son and those that cast their eyes on it, in honour of Kinge Charles, my master, who, readinge over the play at Newmarket, set his marke upon the place with his owne hande, and in thes words: *This is too insolent, and to bee chinged.*"

---

\* Charles II., being reproved by a courtier for swearing, replied, "Your martyr swore twice more than ever I did."—Malone, "Prolegomena," iii. 235.

So much for our excellent Sir Henry. We shall only transcribe two more entries, the one characteristic, the other pathetic. The first is this:—" [1642, June] Received of Mr. Kirke, for a new play which I burnt for the ribaldry and offense that was in it, 2*l.* 0. 0." There is a promptitude and decision about this course of action, eminently characteristic of irresponsible criticism. The second entry, only two months later, runs thus mournfully:—" Here ended my allowance of plaies, for the war began in Aug. 1642."

The Parliament and the Protectorate dispensed with a censorship by dispensing with plays. At the Restoration, matters were placed on a new footing. In the patents\* both of Killigrew and Davenant we read that "forasmuch as manie playes formerly acted doe containe severll prophane, obscene and scurrulous passages, and the women's part therein have byn acted by men in the habit of woemen," therefore the masters and governors of the respective companies are to expunge any passages "offensive to pietie or good manners," and to see that women's parts are henceforth acted by women—a regulation to which the attention of our purveyors of burlesque might with advantage be directed. The patentees being looked upon as officers of the Court, and the players as His Majesty's or the Duke of York's servants, this ordinance again places the drama under the tutelage of the dignitary who presided over the royal amusements. It would be interesting to know how this censorship worked, and what passages, in the age of Sedley and Rochester were objected to as "prophane, obscene and scurrulous." The information, however, would be more curious than edifying or important, and as we are not writing a history of the censorship, we shall not attempt to collect it. The object of the theatre, as stated in both patents, is to provide "not only harmless delight, but useful and instructive representations of human life, to such of our good subjects as shall resort to the same." How far the Court censorship secured this nobly stated end, is known to all who have even glanced into the dramatic literature of the period.

In 1698 Jeremy Collier published his "Short View of the Immorality and Profaneness of the English Stage," and succeeded in arousing, or perhaps merely in expressing, the indignation of the awakening middle classes. The censorship, whose nature it is to come in "a bad second" at the tail of public opinion, once became moral and vigilant. In his new-born ardour the Master of the Revels even went the length of finding political tendency

---

\* Against which the Master of the Revels (Sir H. Herbert) ineffectually protested. Prolegomena to Malone's "Shakespeare," iii. 246.

in Shakespeare. When Colley Cibber sent in his adaptation of "Richard III." for license, it was returned with the first act deleted at one blow!\* The reason stated was that the murder of Henry VI. by Richard, which Cibber had interpolated from the earlier play, might possibly awaken sympathy with the banished King James, then living at St. Germain's. In vain did Cibber protest. The censor had no leisure to weigh particular scenes and phrases, or sift what was inoffensive from what was dangerous. "Off with his head!—so much for Buckingham," he cried; and for several years the play had to stagger along as best it might in this truncated condition. Cibber, however, had his revenge. In 1718 George I. granted to Sir Richard Steele a patent exempting him and his assigns from the authority of the Master of the Revels. Cibber was one of these assigns; and on the censor claiming his fee of forty shillings for every play produced, whether it passed through his hands or not, the patentees contested his right with complete success.

Ten years later occurred the events to which the censorship in its modern form may trace its rise. No one who now reads Gay's "Beggar's Opera" will find in it any violently seditious tendency. It is a satiric extravaganza, reminding us now of Gulliver, now of Mr. Gilbert, gross enough, indeed, but not more so than the taste of the time permitted.† Nor was it the coarseness of the dialogue which made it offensive in high places; it was the repeated and really witty onslaughts on the venality of politicians and the general corruption of the parliamentary world. The town seized upon these allusions with a delight which sent them home barbed to their mark, and the success of the Newgate pastoral at Covent Garden was such as to make "Gay rich and Rich gay." The mischief was done before Walpole and his henchmen could interfere to prevent it, but they determined that the attack should not be repeated. Consequently, when Gay wrote a sequel under the title of "Polly," equally pungent in its satire, though inferior in other respects, the licenser, on a hint from the Ministry, insisted on its absolute suppression. The public, whose appetite had been whetted by "The Beggar's Opera," was very indignant, and the sale of the printed play put £1,100 into Gay's pocket. Public indignation, however, was not so loud-voiced then as now. The time for effectual invective against

---

\* Cibber's "Apology for his Life," chap. viii.

† In 1772, Sir John Fielding wrote to Colman, then manager of Covent Garden, advising him not to perform "The Beggar's Opera," as it tended to increase the number of thieves. The answer was as follows: "Mr. Colman's compts to Sir J. F., he does not think *his* only house in *Bow Street*, where thieves are hardened and encouraged, and will persist in continuing the representation of that admirable satire 'The Beggar's Opera.'" Genest, iii. 223.

political venality was not yet come, by many a year. The disease had to reach its height under another King and another Minister, when an office was opened at Whitehall for the barefaced bribery of the "King's friends." One almost wonders that Walpole, in his cynical security, did not let Gay and his admirers have their laugh out in peace.

For the moment the fate of "Polly" rather encouraged than depressed the dramatic satirists of the day. At their head was one Henry Fielding, the youngest but most brilliant graduate of Grub Street. In many plays, but especially in "Pasquin: a Dramatick Satire on the Times," he had favoured the town with unmistakable variations on the theme which had made "The Beggar's Opera" so popular. At last, in a satiric medley called "The Historical Register for the Year 1736," he placed on the stage a personage who, under the name of "Quidam," was clearly intended for Walpole himself, and represented him distributing purses to patriotic legislators. This was not to be borne. It was even whispered that worse remained behind, and that it was the intention of Foote to apply his powers of mimicry to a caricature of the Minister's august person. The authority of the censorship must clearly be reasserted and defined, and scribblers taught to bridle their "licentious" pens. At this moment a providential incident occurred. An anonymous farce, called "The Golden Rump," was sent to Giffard, the manager of Goodman's Fields, who found it so grossly treasonable and profane that he took it straight to Sir Robert Walpole. There were not wanting those who roundly asserted that the Prime Minister did not then see it for the first time, it having been written at his instigation for the purpose of stirring up the temporary scare in St. Stephen's to which he trusted for carrying the measure he designed. Be this as it may, he compensated Giffard for the possible loss incurred through his loyalty, and nothing more was ever heard of the farce, except within the walls of Parliament, where members were treated to an alarming anthology of its seditious and profane passages. On the wave of indignation thus excited, he easily carried through the Act (10 Geo. II. c. 19), which established our censorship practically in its present form. It was ostensibly intended to "explain and amend" an Act of Anne relating to "rogues, vagabonds, and sturdy beggars," with which it had in fact nothing whatever to do. At least fourteen days before the production of any theatrical entertainment or part of one, a copy was to be forwarded to the Lord Chamberlain, in whom was vested absolute and final power to suppress the whole or any part of it, while a penalty of £50 was imposed for any breach of his orders. So far as we know, the only voice raised against this

measure was that of Lord Chesterfield, in a speech which, Mr. Austin Dobson suggests, may possibly have been inspired by Fielding. His lordship protested against the hurrying through of such a questionable measure at the very end of a session, asserted that the common law of the land supplied an ample check upon any undue freedom of the stage, dwelt upon the injustice and impolicy of gagging the most effective public censor of folly and vice, and then went straight to the heart of the whole matter in the following admirable words :—

“But granting it necessary, my lords, which I am far from thinking, to make a new law for restraining the licentiousness of the stage; yet I shall never be for establishing such a power as is proposed by this Bill. If poets and players are to be restrained, let them be restrained as other subjects are, by the known laws of their country; if they offend, let them be tried, as every Englishman ought to be, by God and their country. Let us not subject them to the arbitrary will and pleasure of any one man. A power lodged in the hands of a single man, to judge and determine without limitation, control, or appeal, is a sort of power unknown to our laws, and inconsistent with our constitution; it is a higher and more absolute power than we trust even to the king himself; I must therefore think we ought not to vest any such power in his majesty’s lord chamberlain.”

Eloquent, logical, irrefutable as it was, this protest produced no effect. The Bill became law on June 21, 1737, and “with its passing,” says Mr. Dobson, “Fielding’s career as a dramatic author practically closed.”

It is useless to speculate whether English literature lost or gained by the gagging of Fielding’s Aristophanic muse. The loss, at any rate, cannot have been great. The time had not come for a new blossoming of the drama, but for an efflorescence of fiction. We may as well state at once our belief that during the eighteenth century, and, indeed, until our own day, the censorship did not seriously impede the development of the English drama. It was, as we shall see, vexatious and futile. It interfered indefensibly with freedom of speech and rights of literary property. It did no good and, in individual instances, it inflicted grave injustice. On the whole, however, it can scarcely be argued that the drama suffered greatly from its restraint. The conditions of the times were not favourable to the development of a great and serious national drama. Had there been sufficient vitality and power of growth in the organism, it would long ago have burst the bonds imposed upon it. Until quite recently, we believe, the censorship was vexatious rather than noxious. It annoyed individuals without seriously injuring the

drama as a whole. Now, on the other hand, the repressive tendency which was once merely potential is becoming actual, and will grow more galling with every year that passes. There are indications, faint but surely not fallacious, that the rising flood of modern thought will one day sweep the English drama out of the eddy in which it has so long been whirling, to carry it forward on the broad current of the age. It will, then need quite other pilotage than that of a Court censor, whose dominant desire must necessarily be to get it safely anchored in the placid pool of prejudice and convention.

The new censor did not let his powers lie dormant. He determined to show at once that he was no house-dog in mosaic, but a real live Cerberus,\* ready to scent sedition afar off. Already in 1739, Brooke's "Gustavus Vasa" was prohibited while it was actually in rehearsal, because, as Genest says, "there was a good deal in it about liberty," which, in a free country, was not to be endured. The play, with a preface, was printed by subscription at five shillings a copy, and brought in over £1,000 to the author. This was the occasion of Dr. Johnson's ironical "Vindication of the Licensor of the Stage from the malicious and scandalous aspersions of Mr. Brooke," a masterly political tract, directed, however, against the Government in general rather than against the licensor in particular. James Thomson, surely as inoffensive a playwright as ever lived, was the next victim. He was known to be on friendly terms with the Prince of Wales, and certain passages in "Edward and Eleanora," a mediæval version of Admetus and Alkestis, were supposed to allude to the estrangement between Frederic and his father. The suspected lines were eight in number, but they apparently leavened the mass, for it was absolutely prohibited after it had been placed in rehearsal and advertised for production. This was in 1739, and the unhappy drama did not see the stage until 1775. So evil was poor Thomson's reputation in the Lord Chamberlain's office, that a friend of his who had copied "Edward and Eleanora," was surprised to find a tragedy of his own prohibited, for no better reason than that it was in the same handwriting as that incendiary production. This, at least, is the account of Thomson's biographer,† but as the hero of the play was Arminius

---

\* Literally three-headed, for a suspected play is referred by the reader to the head of the department, and by him to the Lord Chamberlain himself, who finally accepts or rejects it. See evidence of N. Macdonald before Commission of 1852-53, and of Hon. Spencer Brabazon Ponsonby before Commission of 1866.

† "Life of Thomson," p. xxvi., by Rev. Patrick Murdoch, prefixed to his "Poetical Works." London. 1849.

(Hermann), it, too, probably contained "a good deal about liberty."

It would be tedious to follow the censorship through its eccentric course down to the end of last century. Among its best known vagaries are the maltreatment of Reed's "Register Office,"\* from which two of the best characters were summarily cut out, and the objection† to Macklin's "Man of the World," which had to be sent up for license three times before it found its way to the stage. By the beginning of the present century, propriety had become the ruling consideration of the licenser, though he still kept a watchful eye on politics. Nor did he allow the sanctity of private life to be invaded, for we find he recorded of the licenser who preceded George Colman, that he objected to the word "gammon" in a farce by T. Morton, because he had a friend in Hampshire of that name, whose feelings might be hurt if it were taken in vain on the stage.

George Colman the younger was a model censor, and we have, fortunately, an instructive record of his proceedings in his own evidence, and that of his contemporaries, before the Parliamentary Committee of 1832. He was probably appointed on the principle of "set a thief to catch a thief," the validity of which he amply proved. The expression "damne" was carefully erased, as "immoral and improper" from every play which came before him. On its being pointed out to him that the same expression occurred in many of his own works, he explained that when he wrote them, "he was a careless and immoral author," adding, "I did my business as an author at that time, and I do my business as an examiner now." "Hang me," on the other hand, he considered quite as expressive and entirely proper. The phrase, "He had no more idea of it than Eve had of pin-money," occurring in his own "John Bull," he admitted to be one which he would have struck out in another man's work. He even boasted of having "erased an angel or two," holding angels to be "celestial bodies," by no means fitted for the air of a playhouse. Among the lines thus suppressed was the famous testimony to William's character in Douglas Jerrold's "Black-Eyed Susan":—"He plays the fiddle like a hangel." This speech has since been restored without any strikingly deleterious effect upon the thousand audiences who have applauded it. Nor did he neglect public decency in his care for public piety. He cut out the word "thighs" from a farce named "The Bashful Man," which, indeed, he would have been justified in entirely suppress-

---

\* Genest, iv. 612.

† Again on account of satire upon political venality. Kirkman's "Life of Macklin," ii. 277.



ing, as its title must surely have been a personal allusion to himself

During the madness of George III. the performance of "King Lear" had been officially forbidden. This was before Colman came to office ; but he, too, kept a strict eye upon politics. In a play, by Douglas Jerrold, called "The Bride of Ludgate," Charles II. was to appear disguised as a priest, and perform a mock marriage, but by the licenser's orders, "owing to the present situation of the bishops," the priest was changed into a proctor. A more vigorous act of authority, however, was the total suppression, in 1825, of Miss Mitford's "Charles I." on the ground that it "took liberties" with the character, at a time when, as Mr. Collier suggests, "there was a disposition to think lightly of the authority of kings." The tragedy was produced nine years later, at a theatre beyond the Lord Chamberlain's jurisdiction, and does not seem to have brought about a revolution.

Strangely enough, scarcely an allusion was made before the Committee of 1832 to a work which throws a vivid light upon the methods and principles of official censorship. In the year 1821, when the delights of irresponsible power were yet new to Mr. Colman, a tragedy named "Alasco," by Mr (afterwards Sir) Martin Archer Shee, was submitted to him. Dealing with a Polish subject, it was full of commonplaces about liberty and tyranny, through every one of which the licenser drew his pen "in a rage of red ink." Though the play was already in rehearsal, Mr. Shee refused to let it appear in its mutilated condition, preferring to print it with the excised passages in italics, and with sarcastic foot-notes appended. The sarcasms were quite unnecessary. No comment could make the publication more damaging than it was in itself. A more turgidly moral and rhetorically respectable work it would be hard to conceive. Its most inflammatory portions are mere vague generalities of Whig patriotism. Among the phrases erased by Mr. Colman are the following:—

"No, no, whate'er the colour of his creed  
The man of honour's orthodox."

"Our common wrongs—our country's wrongs, unite us."

"Some sland'rous tool of State,  
Some taunting, dull, unmanu'd deputy."

"But shall I reverence pride, and lust, and rapine?  
No!"

"Am I so lightly held—so low in estimate,  
To brook dishonour from a knave in place?"

The value of the author's comments on this line may be imagined. Another curiosity of this most curious document in the history of the censorship is the reply of the Lord Chamberlain to a remonstrance addressed to him by Mr. Shee. In a letter, whose composition shows that a knowledge of the English language is not a necessary qualification for autocratic power over the English drama, the Duke of Montrose writes:—"Whilst I am persuaded that your intentions are upright, I conceive that it is precisely for this reason—though it may not strike authors—that it has been the wisdom of the Legislature to have an Examiner appointed, and power given to the Chamberlain of the Household to judge whether certain plays should be acted at all, or not acted at particular times." This defence of the censorship from its own august mouth is extremely valuable and instructive.

The main object of the Committee of 1832 (Mr. E. L. Bulwer, afterwards Lord Lytton, being one of its most active members) was to consider the licensing, not of plays, but of theatres. It resulted, several years later, in the abolition of the privileges of the patent theatres, and the establishment of practical free trade in theatrical speculation. By the Act of 1843 (6 & 7 Victoria, cap. 68), which is still in force, the power of granting licenses to all theatres in London and Westminster, Finsbury, Marylebone, Tower Hamlets, Lambeth, and Southwark is conferred on the Lord Chamberlain, while beyond these boundaries it vests in the Justices of the Peace. With the merits of this system we have nothing to do. It must be pointed out, however, that in these provisions the censor finds his sole weapon of offence. But for them, his prohibitions might be disregarded with impunity. The department has neither machinery nor funds for the prosecution of offenders and exaction of the statutory penalty. But, as the power of granting and withdrawing licenses rests absolutely with the Lord Chamberlain, or with magistrates who are extremely unlikely to countenance any opposition to his authority, his secret tribunal, when it so wills, "can strike, and firmly, and one stroke." The Lord Chamberlain has, indeed, the power to order the closing of any theatre on any day or days he pleases. Christmas Day, Good Friday, and Ash Wednesday\* are the only "holy days" upon which he now insists; but, up to 1832, and perhaps later, the theatres were closed every Wednesday and Friday during Lent, and on the anniversary of the "martyrdom" of King Charles I.!

As regards the censorship proper, this Act practically reenacts the provisions of Walpole's Act of 1737. The function of

---

\* Mr. Wilson Barrett calculates that the loss caused to employés of metropolitan theatres every Ash Wednesday amounts to £10,000. This does not include the loss to managers and authors.

the office is stated to be "the preservation of good manners, decorum, and of the public peace," and plays are required to be sent in seven days before production, instead of fourteen days, as under the former Act.

In 1853\* a Select Committee upon Public Houses devoted passing attention to the question of the censorship, and reported that it did not seem to have been vexatiously exercised. In 1850 the number of plays submitted was 230 and none were rejected; 228 were submitted in 1851 and five rejected; 225 in 1852, out of which three were rejected. Of these one was grossly immoral; two contained offensive allusions to Roman Catholics at a time of political excitement; and two others were "La Dame aux Camélias" and "La Tour de Nesle" (both in French) which "it was not thought very desirable to produce here." Thus two world-famous works, one at least of which has since been licensed both in French and English, were suppressed because an official at St. James's considered them "not very desirable."†

The most important document in the recent history of the censorship is the report of the Select Committee of 1866. This, too, is largely occupied with questions of theatre-licensing, and of the respective rights and duties of theatres and music-halls; but the censorship also receives a full measure of attention.

The first witness examined was the Hon. Spencer Brabazon Ponsonby, Comptroller of the Lord Chamberlain's Department. This gentleman was of opinion that the modern French drama is almost entirely immoral; that, but for the censorship, ours would be the same; that a large number of plays are suppressed by the indirect influence of the censorship; that authors most willingly consent to alterations; and that "La Traviata" which had been licensed in Italian but not in English, should by rights have been altogether suppressed. Questioned as to whether his license was withdrawn from a manager sending in an immoral play, he replied "No; that play is merely banished, and there is an end of it"—an admirably concise statement of the working of the censorship.

Mr. W. Bodham Donne, then Examiner of Plays, was the next witness of importance, and revealed some of the secrets of

\* At this date, according to Mr. Norman Macdonald, Superintendent of the Lord Chamberlain's Department, fees were paid, not for reading, but for licensing. They were £1 for anything under three acts, £2 for three or more acts. George Colman in 1832 distinctly stated that in his time the principle was no license, no fee. (See *ante*, p. 330.) Since 1853 this has been altered, and the fee, in terms of the Act of 1843, made payable on delivery of the MS.

† In the course of his evidence Mr. Macdonald stated that it was theoretically the duty of the licenser to attend rehearsals, and he seems sometimes actually to have done so.

his craft in a manner which testified at once his conscientiousness and his naïveté. Early in his expurgatory career he was impressed with the futility of straining at words and letting actions pass unnoticed. In pantomime especially, he was aware that there was a great deal of "business," not even suggested in the text, into which the most dangerous political, moral or religious meanings could be introduced. The clown was notoriously a person of lax morals, on which the cautious conservatism of the pantaloon could place little or no restraint. Under the harlequin's mask, itself a suspicious object, the most incendiary principles might be concealed; while the policeman, the only representative of law and order, was too often treated with disrespect, not to say contumely, and held up to public ridicule and contempt. Mr. Doune accordingly decreed that all pantomimic "business" should be written down and submitted to him along with the words to be spoken. Everything was to be put in black and white—"when harlequin dances with columbine, when he makes a change," &c.\* His demand was entirely logical and in perfect harmony with the spirit of his office; but the full grandeur of his devotion to duty can be appreciated only when we know that every December he had four or five plays and nearly thirty pantomimes and burlesques to examine, most of them in the three or four days before Boxing Night. What more than Herculean toil! To read the books of two dozen pantomimes must of itself tax the most powerful intellect, but to examine their comic business and purify it of all profanity, impropriety and sedition, would demand a whole college of inquisitors. Yet we find this devoted functionary, instead of claiming any special recognition of his services, modestly regretting that he cannot be in several places at once to see that his directions are carried out. When informed of any disobedience, however, he has still energy left to "execute justice at once;" that is, he "tells the manager that he must either withdraw the play or mind what is said to him." Nor must it be supposed that his surveillance is nominal or even lax. He "draws his pen through anything in the shape of an oath, anything which turns religion into ridicule, and any political joke." So exact, on one occasion at least, was his attention to the first of these duties, that in one of Mr. Gilbert's plays the expression "lodgings fit for a lord" was altered by the censorial blue-pencil into "lodgings fit for a heaven." As to "political jokes" he was not so punctilious. In the season 1871-72, as we find from a correspondence in the *Daily News*, he gave managers to understand that "he had struck Lowe's name and the matches out of every pantomime;" yet Mr.

---

\* See "Parliamentary Reports," 1866, vol. xvi. p. 78, Questions 2124-2127.

Millward, the author of several of that season's pantomimes, writes to say that all his jokes on the forbidden topic had been left untouched. On the other hand the line "May Gladstone keep his temper" was ruthlessly expunged from a topical song. About the same time he stopped a farce at the Strand Theatre on the ground that "insanity was a much too painful affliction to be treated humorously," and three months later sanctioned another farce bearing the title "He's a Lunatic." Had Mr. Donne been censor in Shakespeare's time would he or would he not have expunged from "Twelfth Night" the scenes of Malvolio's madness?

In order fully to illustrate Mr. Donne's censorial activity, we have wandered away from the Report of 1866. Let us now return to it, and note one or two more points in the same gentleman's evidence. Having stated that "Oliver Twist" and "Jack Sheppard" had been suppressed after production,\* on account of their tendency to incite to crime, he admitted that the latter was sometimes allowed to be acted for benefits, but did not explain why benefit audiences should be incited to crime while the morals of the general public were so carefully protected. "Oliver Twist," it may be remarked, has had at least one considerable run under the sanction of Mr. Donne's successor, without seriously swelling the Newgate Calendar. The most remarkable of Mr. Donne's utterances we have kept to the last—namely, his opinion that "*double entendre* is a species of wit which is very nearly extinct!" It has always seemed to us that the censorial mind must be subject to fits of abnormal obtuseness to this "species of wit," but it is somewhat startling to find its divine innocence thus formulated in so many words.

Messrs. Benjamin Webster and J. B. Buckstone followed Mr. Donne on the roll of witnesses. Both declared themselves perfectly satisfied with the working of the censorship; but the weight of this testimony may be estimated from the fact that both lamented bitterly the abolition of the privileges of the patent theatres, attributing to it the "decline" of the British drama. The fact that Mr. Buckstone, both as playwright and as actor, found himself entirely unhampered by the censorship, is of itself a cutting comment upon its utility, and upon Mr. Donne's theory of the obsolescence of *double entendre*. The only instance of official interference mentioned by Mr. Buckstone, occurred in 1846, when the House of Commons was to have been put upon the Haymarket stage, Mr. Buckstone him-

---

\* The only plays so treated during his recollection, said Mr. Donne. Mr. J. Stirling Coyne, however, stated before the same Committee, that a play of his named "Lola Montes" was stopped after it had run two nights, but was allowed to be reproduced four nights afterwards, without a single change except the substitution of "Pas de Fascination" for its original title.

self playing Lord John Russell. The drama was, of course, promptly suppressed. The elder Mathews, however, was allowed to impersonate Daniel O'Connell on the stage, "because it was so very funny," Mr. Buckstone suggests, but more probably because O'Connell's influence in the Lord Chamberlain's office was naturally small.

Mr. E. T. Smith, a prolific playwright and experienced manager, was among the next witnesses. He had not found the censorship work inconveniently. His plays were sent in with the fee, read, and returned immediately; "and if there is anything put in by the author about our Saviour or God it is cut out." As an instance of justifiable interference, he mentioned the suppression of a drama at the Surrey, in which the case of Thurtell and Weir was dealt with, the famous gig being drawn nightly across the stage. This play, Mr. Moy Thomas states, was produced before the trial, when such flagrant contempt of court could surely have been stopped without the Lord Chamberlain's intervention; after the trial, the taste of the exhibition would no doubt have been execrable, but scores of similar dramas have been licensed before and since.

Among the remaining witnesses were Mr. Dion Boucicault, Mr. Charles Reade, Mr. John Hollingshead, and Mr. Tom Taylor. The first two expressed no objection to the existence of a censorship, if only it were accompanied with a right of appeal, probably to the Home Secretary. Mr. Hollingshead and Mr. Tom Taylor, on the other hand, maintained in unqualified terms the futility of the office. Mr. Boucicault, whose experience is certainly wide enough to entitle his opinion to respect, expressed his conviction that the English public, like that of the United States, is perfectly fitted to be its own censor. In America, he said, the police regulations for safety and decency are found amply sufficient, and the moral tone of the stage is on the whole higher than here.

One of the most interesting pieces of evidence given before the Committee was Mr. Shirley Brooks' description of his encounter with the censorship, on the subject of an adaptation of "Coningsby." He had undertaken it in 1844 at the request of the Keeleys, then managers of the Lyceum. The piece was rehearsed, an elaborate scene representing the Eton Montem was prepared, and everything was in order, when, to the astonishment of all concerned, an intimation arrived that it would not be licensed. Mr. Brooks at once went to St. James's, and was received with great courtesy by the Lord Chamberlain in person. They went over the play together, and point after point, which to the author appeared perfectly harmless, was declared inadmissible. The main objection to the whole play was its "quasi-political"

character. It "exhibited a sort of contrast" between the higher and the lower classes. In vain Mr. Brooks pointed out that in almost every piece at the transpontine theatres, some titled villain, with a Star and Garter, or at the very least a wicked baronet, was maltreating his poor tenants or corrupting their female relatives, amid the execrations of the pit and gallery. In vain he argued that in his "Coningsby" the aristocracy were exhibited in a much more favourable light. Everything suggestive of class antagonism was sternly deleted. "Then this was not to be in and that was not to be in; something might be construed as an allusion to some family in Shropshire; Mr. Holloway's ointment was not to be put in as Mr. Highgate's ointment, because really Mr. Holloway was an industrious tradesman and employed a good many people, and so on." "Of course," Mr. Brooks says mildly, "a series of things of that kind places a dramatic author in a very unfavourable position." He adds, however, that he never had any further difficulty with the Lord Chamberlain, because "he soon learnt his lesson and made his satire out of milder materials."

We come now to our own times, and to events which are with in the memory of every one. The suppression of allusions to Mr. Lowe and the match-tax in the pantomimes of 1871, led to a correspondence in the *Daily News*, which culminated in the publication of a long and able article on the subject by Mr. Moy Thomas (January 9, 1872). The case could not have been more concisely and convincingly stated, but no effect was produced, though rumours were for a time current that a curtailment of the powers of the censorship was contemplated in high places.

In 1873 Messrs. W. S. Gilbert and Gilbert A'Beckett produced at the Court Theatre a burlesque of Mr. Gilbert's "Wicked World," entitled "The Happy Land." In it three of the leading characters were "made up" in imitation of Messrs. Gladstone, Lowe and Ayrton, while the dialogue contained some really clever political persiflage. The censor saw that he had been trifled with. It was too late to suppress the dialogue, but he promptly insisted upon the alteration of the actors' make-up, and his fiat had to be obeyed. It is not stated that the political prejudices of the audience were so aroused as to endanger the public peace, which would surely be the only rational excuse for such an act of authority. Moreover, the objectionable masks were retained when the burlesque went the round of the provinces, where political feeling certainly runs quite as high as in London.\*

---

\* In a pantomime produced last season in Edinburgh, an actor made up in imitation of Mr. Gladstone, and sent the Premier a photograph of himself in the part. So far from calling on the Lord Chamberlain to repress such insolence, Mr. Gladstone acknowledged the photograph with the remark that it seemed an excellent likeness.

It would be tedious to follow the censorship through all the inconsistencies into which the French drama, that troublesome factor in modern civilization, has entrapped it. The visits of French companies to London, so common of late years, must have been the bane of the censor's existence. Several comparatively innocent plays have been placed in his Index Expurgatorius, while many others of more than questionable tendency have been licensed. The censor may, of course, deny this assertion, reminding us that one man's meat is another man's poison, and that he can decide upon a play's morality or immorality only by its effect upon himself. This is quite true. We are far from wondering at or blaming his inconsistency. A consistent censor is almost a contradiction in terms. The mistake is simply this: one man's meat being another man's poison, one man, provided with no heaven-sent test, is set to determine authoritatively what shall be meat and what poison for all other men. To say that he errs, frequently and ludicrously, is merely to say that he is mortal; and if he has erred ludicrously in the past, may he not err destructively in the future?

In the year 1878, Messrs. Sydney Grundy and Joseph Mackay made an adaptation of "La Petite Marquise" of MM. Meilhac and Halévy, under the title of "A Novel Reader." It was refused a license. The authors wrote to the licenser requesting to know what passages had given offence, and were informed that that functionary could hold no communication with dramatists except through a manager. The manager of the theatre where the play was to have been produced accordingly called at St. James's. He was courteously received, and the offensive passages were pointed out to him, but *under the seal of the strictest confidence*. A correspondence ensued in the newspapers, in which Mr. Grundy hurled invectives, more just than judicious, at the censorship. His point, however, was generally mistaken. He did not complain of the rejection of "A Novel Reader," but of the secrecy of a tribunal by which, in the words of Mr. Brabazon Ponsonby, a play was "merely banished and there was an end of it." The case was, indeed, a strange one. The licenser is certainly not bound by the constitution of his office to give reasons for his decision, but there is nothing either in the theory of his position or in the practice of his predecessors to prevent his doing so. As it was, the authors, working in the dark, attempted to modify whatever features in their work might be thought questionable. This, as it turned out, was to be regretted, for their chance of "placing" it was past; and when at last it was played at a private performance, for which no license was required, its original form



could not be restored, so that the merits of the licenser's decision remained untested. We are not inclined to think that, even in this case, the censor robbed the British drama of a masterpiece. Immoral the play cannot have been. On the contrary, its satire was levelled at the evils of the febrile school of feminine fiction, a subject which cries out for serious treatment. Unfortunately the authors of "A Novel Reader" did not treat it seriously. They attempted to graft a sober moral upon a piece of French flippancy, and the result was not happy. Serious errors must be seriously satirized. We look for flippancy in Horace, but not in Juvenal; and the vulgar immorality of a certain school of fiction is a subject for Juvenal rather than Horace. "A Novel Reader," therefore, can scarcely have been a work of good art, though its earlier form was probably much better than its later. The censor's æsthetic sensibilities may have been justly offended; but then his business is not with taste, but with morals.

A similar case, though of yet more flagrant injustice, was the suppression of the late Mr. Arthur Matthison's drama, "A False Step." This was a translation of Augier's tragedy, "Les Lionnes Pauvres." A tragedy it indeed deserves to be called, for it "arouses and refines both pity and terror," and that by the simplest and noblest methods. A more moral play was probably never written. "Le vice individuel," says Augier in his preface, "n'est pas à supprimer, mais on peut en supprimer la contagion;" and a more potent antiseptic than this play it would be hard to conceive. Even the censor could not but see that it was "profoundly moral in its ultimate purpose," but, conceiving that "if presented to a mixed English audience it would give much offence," he absolutely vetoed it. Truly he was wiser when, in dealing with "A Novel-Reader," he refused to give his reasons, for the worst enemy of his office could not have satirized it more bitterly. As the censor's duty in 1737 was to shield venality in St. Stephen's, so it seems to have been his function in 1878 to shield immorality in Mayfair. Let us be just, however, and admit that his position was not quite so absurd as might be supposed from the above unfortunate phrase. He meant that if the piece were placed on the stage, the public and the critics would protest against it as painful and un-English; and here, we think, he was right. An eloquent letter by Mr. Clement Scott, prefixed to the published edition of the play, shows that one critic at least would not have joined in this cry; but there is little doubt that the cry would have been raised. We do not for a moment believe that Mr. Matthison's not very skilful translation would have succeeded. Its tone is far too serious and its matter far too "unpleasant," for the British public. The change of the scene from Paris to London, too, is unfortunate, for the picture of manners is in its details

decidedly French, and would thus have given colour to an accusation of untruth. The play, in short, was far too good to succeed, but was it the censor's duty to deprive it of its chance? He acted for the nonce on a new theory of his functions, and held himself bound to save a manager from making a bad investment. It might have been hissed on the first night, and taken off after a week; but even then a certain section of the public would have made acquaintance, in the theatre or through the papers, with a masterpiece of French literature, whose "ultimate purpose," on the censor's own showing, is "profoundly moral." Only on the theory that hissing a play is a breach of the "public peace," to be prevented at all hazards, can his action in this case be for a moment defended.

The tale we have just told carries its own moral. It may be summed up as follows:—The censorship was established as an offshoot of the Royal prerogative, when it was, so to speak, at its royalet. It was confirmed under the would-be paternal rule of the Stuarts, whose theory of government necessarily fostered every form of irresponsible meddling. At the end of the seventeenth century and beginning of the eighteenth, it had fallen almost into abeyance.\* Then came a period when a great Minister—great with all his faults—ruled the country by means of an unrepresentative and venal House of Commons. The stage ventured to give humorous expression to the people's growing contempt for their legislators, and at the lightest touch of satire the galled jades winced. Such insolence was clearly intolerable. An old weapon was rummaged out of the lumber-room of royal prerogative, provided with a statutory handle, and delivered to a Court official, who was to stand sentinel at the gates of stage-land and give no quarter to any one who should venture an incursion into the sacred domain of politics. Let it be thoroughly understood by those who believe in the censorship as a bulwark of public morality, that it was established in its present form as a shield for political immorality. Combining the qualities of King Stork and King Log, it has been alternately tyrannical and futile, odious and ridiculous. By its own confession it is inconsistent, and has admitted to-day what it prohibited yesterday, with no change in the circumstances to justify the change of front. By its own confession it is futile, having no power to enforce some of its most important directions. It can suppress a play which touches upon an ethical problem, but it cannot prevent an indecent "gag" or an immoral double-meaning conveyed by the actor's look or gesture. It is anomalous, since it is the one

---

\* Lord Chesterfield refers to the time of Charles II., "when the stage was under a license," as to a bygone state of affairs.

irresponsible and secret tribunal in the land. It is unjust, since like the Jedburgh judges of border history, it first hangs the prisoner and then tries him, or rather lets him do what he can to obtain a trial elsewhere. It is destructive, since it takes out of the people's hands a power which they alone can rightly wield, and thus deadens their feeling of responsibility for the morals of the stage. The first result of its abolition would be a quickening of the moral sense of theatrical audiences. Prudery rather than license would probably be the order of the day.

"Good manners, decorum, and the public peace" are placed by the statute under the censor's ægis. Religion, morals, and politics—these are, in fact, the subjects of his tutelage. He is a watchman to warn off the drama from the serious interests of life, swinging his fiery sword in blinding circles around the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Let us see what terrible results would ensue if our autocratic and invulnerable angel-guardian were relieved from duty.

Would religion suffer? Would the tenets of Mr. Bradlaugh, or even of Mr. Matthew Arnold, find exponents on the stage? We think not. It is possible, on the contrary, that one or two attempts might be made to hold up these doctrines to ridicule, which would at once and signally fail. The public is as determined as any censor can possibly be that such burning questions shall not be brought upon the stage. In France, where the censure is practically confined to politics, Sardou's "Daniel Rochat" is the only piece in which an attempt has been made to weigh faith against unfaith, and the public would not listen to it. In America, where there is no censorship,\* the religious question has been entirely avoided, except in the case of the said "Daniel Rochat," which was played with some success, the balance being made to decline on the side of faith. In Germany, where the censorship would probably not interfere with the discussion of religion on the stage, and where the public mind might be supposed to be ripe for it, there has been

---

\* "Public opinion," says the distinguished American critic, Mr. Brander Matthews "compels decency. Now and again a low concert-saloon or very cheap theatre, making a special appeal to the lewd fellows of the baser sort, descends to overt acts of indecency, broad and flagrant—and then the police interfere. But this interference is only with plays wholly without literary pretence, and in theatres but little better than a 'penny gaff.' I know of no interference with any regular theatre." The writer then goes on to say that indecent or immoral plays, if by any chance attempted at theatres of the better class, are almost certain to fail. French plays are condensed and translated, not adapted and mutilated. With politics and religion the American stage has no relations whatever. A political satire is now and then produced, but never excites any feeling. "I think our audiences are less prudish and less prurient than yours," Mr. Matthews concludes; "they have a firmer moral tone."

equally little tendency to make the attempt. In Scandinavia, one great poet has recently ventured a play in which the established religion of the land is attacked with mordant sarcasm ; and, though there is no censorship, even his enormous reputation could scarcely tempt a manager to produce it. England, the favoured land where religion and the public peace are guarded by official omnipotence, is the only country where a play has been produced of recent years in which the religious question was crudely and rashly handled, and which threatened to lead to a breach of the public peace. To do the censor justice, it must be admitted that, if "The Promise of May" had been the work of an unknown and struggling playwright, whose career, perhaps, depended upon its chance of success, he would never have thought of licensing it. As it was by a great poet, whose name appears next to his own in the list of Her Majesty's Household, he thought, perhaps, of the fate predicted for a household divided against itself, and determined to stretch a point in favour of the Laureate. The result was a stormy first night, and, at a subsequent performance, a scene of indignant protest. This experience will probably teach managers, for some time to come, to let Agnosticism alone ; but, even if it does not, even if another "Promise of May" were to be produced to-morrow with the same result, would there be any great harm done, any such evil as to justify the maintenance of an irresponsible official who should, but does not, prevent it? The great body of the theatre-going public is conventionally religious—witness the watery piety which found favour in "The Silver King"—and is much less likely than the censor to tolerate anything which endangers their religion. Mr. Boucicault tells us how, in "Old Heads and Young Hearts," when Charles Mathews knelt to a lady and remarked, "I came to scoff, but I remain to pray," the audience mistook Goldsmith's line for a quotation from the Bible, and promptly hissed what they considered its flippant desecration. The same spirit of reverence is alive to this day, and the censor's function with regard to religion can, at best, be merely to deprive certain pieces or speeches of an opportunity of being hissed, which, as before remarked, he in practice fails to do.

Let us take politics next, leaving to the last the more important subject of morals. What has been said of religion applies in a less degree to politics—namely, that pieces of strong political tendency would very rarely be produced, because they would be almost certain to fail. But supposing such a play to be produced, is England a country in which it is likely to lead to revolution, serious disturbance, or even the much-dreaded "breach of the peace?" We are accustomed to strong political argument and invective in the press ; but that, say the defenders of the censure,

is not to the point, since an invective delivered in print to a thousand people, at their thousand breakfast-tables, does not produce the same effect as it would if delivered by a skilled actor to the same thousand people assembled in the electric atmosphere of a theatre. Perhaps not; but a public meeting possesses this electricity of numbers, and a great orator is a skilled actor, using in deadly earnest the same weapons of satire and denunciation which are held so perilous in the mimic warfare of the stage. A public meeting, it may be objected, is sometimes—very rarely—riotous. True; but why should the excitement, which, in a public hall is considered a healthy sign of political life, be held dangerous and destructive in a theatre? Would not the same means by which the excitement is kept within bounds in the one case apply equally well in the other? And, is it worth while to maintain an irresponsible official on the chance that he may, once in ten years, avert from the theatre an outburst of excitement such as occurs every night in some political assembly without doing the smallest harm to any one or anything?

As for political persiflage after the manner of "The Happy Land," it is hard to see why it should be given extreme license in the comic papers, and should be utterly repressed on the stage. Speaking of the play in which Mr. Buckstone was to have represented Lord John Russell, Mr. Shirley Brooks said, "I do not feel sure that the Aristophanic drama would be such a very bad thing to restore." It would surely be an excellent thing if we had but an Aristophanes. The only possible plea for repressing it is the old bugbear of the public peace, which was not in the least endangered by "The Happy Land," or on the numerous other occasions when would-be Aristophanisms have eluded the censor's ken. John Bull's traditional phlegm is not so easily disturbed. On the music-hall stage, as we all know, songs of violent political tendency are nightly sung with no fatal results. One of these, at a crisis in our history, took such hold on the public mind that it added a word to the English language. Had Mr. Macdermott been a playwright, instead of a poet, he would have been informed that a drama of such strong tendency was calculated to arouse the angry passions of the peace-party and consequently could not be "recommended for license."

We come lastly to the great question of morals. Here there is a distinction to be drawn between the different senses in which the word "immorality" is commonly used. It is applied on the one hand to indecency, obscenity, pruriency, and on the other to any form of thought or action, however conscientious, earnest, and high-principled, which transgresses the conventional rules of social decorum, or even touches upon matters which society has

tacitly determined to wink at and let alone. Vulgar sensualism, and devotion to ideals more advanced than those of the crowd, are in popular parlance alike immoral. Now the policy of good government, if good government had in reality anything to do with the matter, would clearly be to repress the former and to give the latter as much currency as popular prejudice would allow. What, then, is the action of the censorship? Precisely the reverse. Vulgar sensualism it fails to repress, while it deadens the feeling of responsibility in that better portion of the public which otherwise should, and would, take the censorship into its own hands. Advanced ideals, nay the mere handling of any problem of delicacy and importance, it most effectually represses, and will work more and more harm in this way as the stage becomes more serious, more cultured, better qualified to grapple with ethical questions. The public mind has room for strange contradictions. On the one hand, it hankers after coarse frivolity, hovering ever on the verge of the indecent, and none the less acceptable if it take an occasional flight over the frontier; on the other hand it is prudish, squeamish, disinclined to judge actions to which conventional standards do not apply, and afraid to have the veil torn from the plague-spots of society. The prurient craving is openly pandered to with small check from the censorship, which utterly crushes any attempt to overcome the cowardly shrinking. Criterion comedies and opera-bouffes are licensed in shoals, vulgar and meaningless to outward appearance, but full of the most piquant meaning to those who can read between the lines; "Les Lionnes Pauvres" and "Le Supplice d'une Femme" are consigned to the limbo of still-born immoralities—

"Vuolsi così colà dove si puote  
Ciò che si vuole."

Let us illustrate our conception of the true morality which the censorship tends to repress, and the false morality which it encourages. In Mr. Pinero's much discussed play of "The Squire," the heroine, supposed to be a noble and high-minded woman, is privately married to a man who believes himself to be a widower, but whose first wife afterwards turns out to be alive, just as the second finds herself about to become a mother. The situation is a painful one, and may give rise to various emotions in all concerned, while it opens many questions as to the best way out of the difficulty. The very last emotion which the heroine should experience is shame. That the discovery should diminish her self-respect, is a concession to a false ideal of conduct which may be justly described as immoral. If she had a spark of independence of character, she would see that the moral quality of

an act committed in unavoidable ignorance of certain circumstances affecting it, is not in the least changed by the fact of these circumstances becoming known. Had this been clearly shown, the play would have been moral in the best, indeed in the only true, sense of the word—but it would probably never have been played. As it was, Mr. Pinero never even suggested this view of the case. The heroine suffered agonies of shame, and was at last restored to self-respect and the esteem of the world, by the death of the first wife—a convenient circumstance, no doubt, but one which did not alter by a jot or tittle the moral quality of her conduct. The fact that this end was accepted by the public shows how omnipotent is thoughtless conventionality in the judgment of conduct; and it is precisely this stolid conventionality which the censorship inevitably fosters. Had Mr. Pinero possessed the courage and insight to make his play a protest against the illogical moral standards of society, the censor would probably have refused his license; at least, had he not done so, he would have acted against the spirit of his office. The theatre should, by rights, be a little in advance of public opinion. “*Sa force consiste,*” says M. Augier, “*à formuler le sentiment général encore vague.*” The effect of the censorship is to keep it a little behind public opinion. The general feeling has to be distinctly formulated before the censor will allow its utterance on the stage. He is necessarily timid; for it is the weaker intellects among the public who are the first to take offence and exclaim against anything that seems like laxity. “*Ces pauvres juges perplexes,*” says Augier again, “*me font l’effet de sentinelles dans le brouillard; dès qu’une question un peu délicate les approche, ils crient au large, et il n’est amis ni ennemis qui tiennent; ils tirent dessus avec l’intrepidité de la peur.*”

Mr. Boucicault has compared the influence of the censorship to that of a lady at a dinner-party, in “controlling in a delicate way the subjects spoken of.” Any one who has seen “*Confusion*,” which has now been running for several hundred nights at the Vaudeville, can tell how extremely delicately this influence is exerted. On the other hand, it succeeds, directly or indirectly, in silencing the discussion of many themes which, if unfitted for a dinner-party, are eminently suited for the serious stage. “*Wherever it has been deemed advisable,*” says A. W. Schlegel, “*to submit every piece before its appearance on the stage to a previous censorship, it has been generally found to fail in the very point which is of the greatest importance—namely, the spirit and general impression of the play.*”

In nothing that we have said do we intend any reflection upon the present Examiner of Plays. He has shown at least as much

tact and judgment as any of his predecessors, and at least as much as can reasonably be expected of any who may succeed him. He does not pretend to be infallible, and yet he is placed in an office which demands infallibility to balance its omnipotence. That is the *tragi-comedy* of his position. He is one of the two personages in the British Empire who can do no wrong, and in these irreverent days such a constitutional fiction is apt to excite ridicule rather than awe. Unfortunately, it is much less of a fiction in the case of the censor than in that of the Queen.

In this lies the final argument against the censorship, an argument which should be the strongest of all, but to the ordinary English mind is perhaps the weakest. It is an anomaly and an anachronism. The reader may think that we have harped too much upon its irresponsibility; but that is the first and last word of the whole matter. Its good or evil action in any one instance or any number of instances is of no real moment; it is irresponsible, therefore it is unwise, unsafe, unjust, un-English. So said Lord Chesterfield a century and a half ago, and we, today, can but repeat his words. So said Samuel Johnson, not, surely, a friend of undue license. So said Sainte-Beuve, though the traditions of the French and the spirit of their institutions are much less opposed to such an office:—

“ Il y avait quelque chose (he writes) qu'on appelait autrefois la censure pour les théâtres; vilain nom, nom odieux, et qu'il faut dans tous les cas supprimer. Est-ce à dire qu'il faille supprimer toute surveillance? . . . Ce qui se passerait dans un bureau du ministère de l'intérieur serait de nature si nette et si franche, qu'à toute heure, à la première interpellation, il en pourrait être rendu bon compte au public du haut de la tribune, aux applaudissements des honnêtes gens.”

If we could even secure this publicity which Sainte-Beuve declares indispensable, it would always be a point gained. The suggested appeal to the Home Secretary would be cumbrous and not a little absurd; but even that would save a play from the silent annihilation to which it is now exposed. The late Mr. Shirley Brooks made a curious suggestion that a sort of theatrical Public Prosecutor should be appointed, whose duty it should be to hear and examine into any complaints of the public after the production of a play, and to apply the ordinary machinery of the law to the restraint of licence. If we still shrink from the perils of liberty, some such compromise might possibly be adopted. Meanwhile the fact remains—a fact which, but for the deadening force of custom, would seem to every one incredible and monstrous—that the property, and to a certain extent the reputation, of an industrious class of literary workmen, is



absolutely at the mercy of a secret tribunal, consisting of from one to three Court officials, who at one stroke of the pen can annul the labour of months or years, giving no reason and allowing no appeal. The burglar is tried by a jury of his countrymen; the merest pickpocket, whose offence is so trifling as to be treated summarily, has justice administered to him before the public eye. The dramatist, who demands nothing more than to be tried by his peers, appeals in vain to the immemorial traditions of English freedom. There is not even a Habeas Corpus Act for the drama, but rather a Bastille or an Inquisition dungeon, whereto, in the memorable words of the Hon. Spencer Brabazon Ponsonby, "a play is merely banished, and there is an end of it." When will the nation's care for this great branch of literature be so aroused and enlightened that we may be able to retort this phrase upon its inventors, and say of the censorship, "It is banished, and there is an end of it?"

---

### ART. III.—LORD LYNDHURST.

*A Life of Lord Lyndhurst, from Letters and Papers in possession of his Family.* By Sir THEODORE MARTIN, K.C.B. London: John Murray. 1883.

THE question whether Lord Lyndhurst is entitled to a place in the first rank of our statesmen and judges, often before disputed, is now by the publication of this volume raised again. Among the officials of the Papacy, as every reader of "Redgauntlet" will remember, is the *avvocato del diavolo*, whose duty it is, on every proposal for the canonization of a saint, to combat the pretensions of the candidate for sanctity. In Lyndhurst's case the functions of this *avvocato* have been discharged by Lord Campbell \* with all the power and skill and with even more than the zeal which distinguished his efforts at the bar. Sir Theodore Martin now tardily essays on behalf of Lyndhurst to reply to the Devil's Advocate. In fact, his book is more a reply to Campbell than a Life of Lyndhurst. The advocates on both sides having been heard, we propose to assume the office of judge, and to discharge its functions with so much impartiality as we can.

---

\* "Lives of the Chancellors," vol. viii. Edition 1869.

With regard to Campbell's Lives of Lyndhurst and Brougham\* we remain of the opinion we have already expressed:—"It would have been good for Lord Campbell's reputation if his literary executrix had not published this volume. It was not completed, and we may therefore hope that had he lived to finish it there would have been a softening of the malevolent tone which runs through it and disfigures it." † In this opinion we are glad to find great authorities agreeing with us. These lives have been called the narratives of the impressions made on a self-conscious, ambitious, remarkably coarse and not over-scrupulous rival. ‡

"Campbell's 'Life of Lyndhurst,'" wrote the late Chief Baron Pollock to a friend, "is in my opinion a most disgraceful production. It is written with the utmost possible malice and ill-will. It rakes together all the scandal and falsehood that was ever invented or written about Lord Lyndhurst, dishonestly publishing as true what is notoriously false, and insinuating by a sneer matter for which he knew there was no pretence whatever. It is a biography written for the express purpose of degrading and vilifying a great man whom he hated, chiefly because he was aware he was largely the object of that man's contempt." §

Brougham thought Lyndhurst was much too hard on Campbell, yet, he adds, "the judgment he formed of men was generally as accurate as it was sagacious; so perhaps he was right and I was wrong." || When it was rumoured that Campbell was writing "The Lives of the Chancellors," Lyndhurst uttered this prophecy to Brougham: "Campbell will take his revenge on you by describing you with all the gall of his nature. He will write of you, *and perhaps of me too*, with envy, hatred, malice, and all uncharitableness, for such is his nature." ¶

Mrs. Hardcastle, Campbell's daughter, literary executrix and editor of his "Life," says that Brougham wrote his "Memoirs" when in his "dotage." \*\* This is not accurate, though Brougham himself regretted that he did not earlier begin to put down many

\* These Lives form the eighth volume of the "Lives of the Chancellors."

† *Vide WESTMINSTER REVIEW*, New Series, No. CIII., July, 1877, Art. "Successful Lawyers," p. 182; the same subject is further pursued in *WESTMINSTER REVIEW*, New Series, No. CXII., October, 1879, Art. "Lord Brougham," pp. 482, 3.

‡ The late Bishop Wilberforce, in his Essays, contributed to the *Quarterly Review*, vol. ii. p. 230.

§ "Life of Lyndhurst," p. 520.

|| Quoted by Martin, "Life of Lyndhurst," p. 519.

¶ "Memoirs of Lord Brougham," vol. iii. pp. 434, 5, quoted in Martin's "Life of Lyndhurst," p. 518.

\*\* In her letter to the *Times*, December 19, 1883.

details which when he wrote he found it difficult to recall with accuracy.\* He is wrong as to the date he assigns to Lyndhurst's prophecy, but we have no doubt it was uttered.†

The reader of Campbell's "Life of Lyndhurst" and Martin's reply to it should be always on his guard against Campbell's animus, but he should equally bear in mind that on matters of fact, as distinguished from insinuations, opinions and inferences, Campbell speaks with far greater authority than Martin. That Campbell was, as he says, Lyndhurst's intimate friend, is, on the authority of Lyndhurst's family, denied by Martin. But the following facts cannot be denied—that Martin, as he admits, "had not the happiness nor the honour to know Lord Lyndhurst,"‡ while on the other hand Campbell became acquainted with Lyndhurst in Mr. Tidd's chambers in 1803; that their acquaintance continued all the time they were both at the bar; that so far back as 1835 Lyndhurst owned Campbell as an old friend;§ that Campbell had frequent opportunities of observing Lyndhurst on the bench and in Parliament between 1827 and 1835; that from 1835 to 1841 Campbell, then the Whig Attorney-General, not only had to watch Lyndhurst's proceedings as leader of the Tory Opposition in the Lords, but was repeatedly in communication with him,|| and that during the twenty years which passed between Campbell's taking his seat in the Lords in August, 1841, and his death in June, 1861, they were both members of the Upper House, and had much intercourse both public and private. We learn nothing therefore of Lyndhurst from any personal knowledge his biographer had of him. We cannot better describe this book than by accommodating to it Macaulay's description of another biography.

"It seems to have been manufactured in pursuance of a contract by which the representatives of Lyndhurst on the one part bound themselves to furnish papers, and Martin on the other part bound himself to furnish praise. It is but just to say that the covenants on both sides have been most faithfully kept, and the result is before us in this volume of undiscerning panegyric."¶

A contemporary truly remarks of Martin's work that "it is

\* "Memoirs," vol. i. p. 1.

† See our view of this question stated at length in WESTMINSTER REVIEW, New Series, No. CXII., p. 482.

‡ "Life," p. 522.

§ "Life of Campbell," vol. ii. p. 48; confer "Lives of the Chancellors," vol. viii. p. 95.

|| Vide Campbell's "Lives of the Chancellors," vol. viii., *passim*. Conf. "Life of Lord Campbell," vol. ii. pp. 48, 67, 85, 86, 93, 192.

¶ Vide "The Essay on Warren Hastings," in the earlier editions of Macaulay's "Essays and Trevelyan's Macaulay," vol. ii. pp. 99, 100.

thoroughly unercritical, and that from one end of it to the other the author does not make a single serious criticism on his hero—he represents him simply as an angel of light. One gets tired of the perpetual attitude of hands held up in pious horror that any human being can be found so base as to malign Lyndhurst. The writer is so blinded by admiration of Lyndhurst, and possessed by such an intense dislike of his opponents, that he makes no effort to hold the balance or to be just. His criterion of the truth and falsehood of stories is a simple one, disbelieve whatever makes against Lord Lyndhurst.\* Any statement to Lyndhurst's disadvantage, whether made by Campbell or by Denman, by Abinger or by Sir Henry Holland, or by any other authority, our biographer thinks is sufficiently met by "a flat and entirely unsupported contradiction," or by an arguementative denial—such as "This is incredible," or, "Is it likely that."† Martin is very angry with Mrs. Hardcastle for insinuating that he has been employed "to blacken the character of a distinguished man" [Lord Campbell] personally unknown to him. "I think I may safely say (he replies) that all who know me know also how impossible it would be for any one to venture to approach me with a proposal to blacken any one's character."‡ Mrs. Hardcastle would have been on safer ground had she insinuated that Sir Theodore was employed not to blacken the character of Campbell, but to whitewash the character of Lyndhurst. With regard to whitewashing Lyndhurst it is amusing to read the disclaimer by the *Times*, in its review of this book,§ of any prejudice in favour of Lyndhurst, or "of any object in whitewashing him," and to compare its present indiscriminating praise of Lyndhurst's "majestic personality" with the more judicial estimate of him which appeared in the *Times* immediately after his death, and again at the close of the year in which he died.||

Lyndhurst is said by Brougham to "have held all men very cheap." He certainly did not overrate himself.¶ He was, he said, only "a successful lawyer," and he thought there "was nothing in that to make the world desire to know anything about him hereafter."\*\* He was therefore, if not opposed, wholly in-

\* The *Guardian*, December 19, 1883, p. 1920.

† *Vide* Mrs. Hardcastle's letter in the *Times*, *ubi supra*.

‡ *Vide* Mrs. Hardcastle's letter, *ubi supra*, and Sir T. Martin's reply in the *Times*, December 22, 1883.

§ In the *Times*, December 3 and 6, 1883.

|| *Vide* the Memoir in the *Times*, October 13, 1863, reprinted in "Mornings of the Recess," vol. ii. p. 1; and the Annual Summaries of the *Times* for a quarter of a century, p. 199.

¶ "Life of Brougham," vol. iii. p. 436.

\*\* "Life," Preface, p. iii.

different to any life of him being published, but his family felt that the publication of Campbell's book made it absolutely necessary that an authentic life of him should, under their auspices, be given to the world. "Circumstances, which it is unnecessary to mention, we are told, hitherto prevented this being done."\* This is to be regretted. Twenty years have passed since Lyndhurst's death, and fourteen since the publication of Campbell's book. In that time the interest attaching to Lyndhurst's memory and fame has necessarily decreased, and the number of contemporaries who had the means of judging between the two biographers, and correcting the errors in fact and judgment of each is greatly reduced. "The Lives of the Chancellors" are probably not now widely read, and those who first become acquainted with Campbell's "Life of Lyndhurst" by reading Martin's reply, will be tempted to refer to Campbell's book, and the scandals, sneers and malicious insinuations it contains will be revived and will find readers who but for the too tardy publication of Martin's work, would have remained ignorant of them.

Martin, which is very rarely the case, accepts without doubt or cavil Campbell's statement that when he applied to Lyndhurst for materials for his "Life," Lyndhurst replied, "Materials! you shall have none from me; I have already burnt every letter and paper which would be useful to my biographer; therefore he is at liberty to follow his own inclination."† And we are told that he took care that "no diaries of his should survive to gratify curiosity, and upon principle destroyed almost every letter or paper of a confidential nature which could have thrown light upon his official life, or his relations with the leaders in society or politics with whom he was intimately associated." Lyndhurst therefore did not agree with his colleague, Sir Robert Peel, who once said to one of his followers, "No public man who values his character ever destroys a paper."‡ All Lyndhurst's papers, however, were not destroyed; some had been kept by his friends, some of the letters which passed between him and his eldest sister and brother and between him and his father and mother have been recovered, and throw, our biographer says, "valuable light upon Lyndhurst's character and early career."§

We differ from Martin as to the value of these letters and papers even as to Lyndhurst's early career. As to his public life, this bulky volume tells us nothing not previously told by

\* "Life," p. 522.

† "Life," Preface, p. iv.; "Lives of the Chancellors," vol. viii. p. 2, and note. Lyndhurst offered to correct the proof sheets of Campbell's Life of him. Campbell, who knew what he had written, of course did not accept the offer.

‡ Morley's "Life of Cobden," vol. i. p. 391, note.

§ Preface, p. iv.

Campbell, and from that and other sources well known to our readers.\* For this reason we shall not dwell at any length on the details of Lyndhurst's career, preferring rather to devote our space to an examination of the opposing theories of the rival biographers, Martin affirming him to be an angel of light whom Campbell represents as a "Mephistopheles."

One fact in Lyndhurst's career is unexampled. He said he had been "three times Lord Chancellor;"† in fact, he four times held the office. He first became Chancellor, April 12, 1827, and held office until the death of George IV. in July, 1830, when according to the then custom he and all other Ministers resigned their offices. The Great Seal was at once redelivered to him by William IV., and he retained it until the fall of the Wellington Ministry in November, 1830. He received it for the third time in November, 1834, and held it during "the hundred days" of Peel's first Ministry, which came to an end in April, 1835. In September, 1841, the "clavis regni" was delivered to him by the Queen when he was in his seventieth year, for his fourth and last which was also his longest term of office. It lasted until July 6, 1846, when, with Sir Robert Peel, he finally descended from power. "No chancellor," as Campbell truly says, "has received the Great Seal so often from different Sovereigns since the Plantagenet reigns."‡

Campbell sneeringly says that "the peerages merely record the date of Lyndhurst's birth, as if he had then sprung from the earth, without even telling us what region of the earth witnessed this wonderful vegetation;" and he insinuates that Lyndhurst was "unreasonably ashamed of his family."§

With glaring inconsistency, in the same volume, Campbell elaborately sneers at Brougham for claiming to be of antient lineage;|| and in his own "Autobiography" he is careful to tell us that he can truly say of himself—

"Of gentle blood, part shed in honour's cause,  
Each parent sprung."¶

Lyndhurst himself, however, had no such weakness as Campbell insinuates. Indeed, his declaration to his peers savours of the "pride which apes humility": "I cannot boast an illustrious

\* *Vide* "Lives of the Chancellors," vol. viii., and our articles, "Successful Lawyers," and "Lord Brougham," *ubi supra*, and the WESTMINSTER REVIEW, New Series, No. CXXIV., October, 1882, p. 425, Art. VI., "The Jubilee of the First Reform Act."

† Preface, p. ii.

‡ "Lives of the Chancellors," vol. viii. p. 134.

§ *Ibid.* p. 2.

|| *Ibid.* p. 214, *et seq.* Conf. "Life of Campbell," vol. ii. p. 244.

¶ "Life of Campbell," vol. i. p. 5.

descent, I have sprung from the people.”\* That he was an American born is well known. He used to express himself “in terms of affection for his native land, and speak proudly of distinguished Americans as his countrymen.”† He met Charles Sumner at Brougham’s, and learned that Sumner was one of Boston. “Then, said Lyndhurst, with a most emphatic knock on the table and something like an oath, we are fellow-townsmen.”‡ The civil war between the Northern and Southern States was raging during the last two years of his life. A Northerner born, his sympathies were all with the North.§ It is not so well known that he who stigmatized the Irish as “aliens,” was himself of Irish descent—not in the sense of being descended from Irish aborigines, but from English settlers in Ireland. His grandfather was a native of Limerick county, who married and then emigrated to America, and there died, leaving one son, John Singleton Copley. He married, and his eldest son, named after him, was born in Boston, U.S.A., May 21, 1772. The elder Copley, as is well known, was an artist, who in 1776 settled with his family in England.|| Lyndhurst—to give him by anticipation the name by which he is best known and will be remembered—was sent to a school at Chiswick, kept by a Dr. Horne, whose son was a member of the Equity Bar, and in after days practised before Lyndhurst. He may be remembered by some few of our older readers as Sir William Horne, the Solicitor-General to Earl Grey’s Government. Lyndhurst, when in his ninety-first year, related that “the doctor was a good classical scholar, and infused into his scholars a fair proportion of Latin and Greek.”¶ For his scholars’ sake we trust he was free from the irritability and irascibility which were the chief characteristics of his son.

Campbell, on the authority of a book entitled “Literary Lawyers,” relates that Lyndhurst before going to Dr. Horne’s, was at a school at Clapham, where, at the early age of fourteen, when attending dancing lessons, he fell in love with a beautiful girl into whose hand he slipped a locket and some verses which Campbell suspects “were copied from a scrap book, for the professed lover had never since been known to versify,”\*\* but Martin takes no notice of this story. From Chiswick Lyndhurst, pro-

\* “Speech on Second Reading of the Reform Bill, October, 1831; “Lives of the Chancellors,” vol. viii. p. 77; “Life of Lyndhurst,” p. 295.

† “Lives of the Chancellors,” vol. viii. p. 7, note.

‡ “Memoirs of Charles Sumner,” vol. ii. p. 66.

§ “Life,” p. 499.

|| Martin, p. 12, fixes the date of the Copleys’ settlement in England in 1774, but the context shows 1776 is the right date.

¶ “Life,” p. 18.

\*\* “Lives of the Chancellors,” vol. viii. pp. 8, 9.

nounced by Dr. Horne to be then "a prodigiously improved young man," went to Cambridge. His father, who already had fixed on the bar as his son's profession, intended to enter him at Trinity Hall but "the powers which erring man calls fate and chance" decreed that the Copleys, father and son, should travel to Cambridge in company with Dr. Gretton, a former fellow of Trinity College who, after an informal examination of the future Chancellor, declared to the father "If you do not let your son, with his manifest powers, go to Trinity, he will be utterly thrown away." Accordingly the younger Copley went to Trinity College and not Trinity Hall. "Early," says our biographer, "he acquired the habit, so conspicuous in after-life, of thoroughly mastering and fixing with precision in his memory whatever engaged his attention, whether in science or literature;" and elsewhere he says "The quickness of his perception and the rare precision and tenacity of his memory made it comparatively easy for him to cover a large area of literary study in those early days. And what he learned then remained with him, and was ready to be turned to account in after years when the claims of his profession of political life, and of society, left him little leisure for such studies."\* Campbell accurately remarks that "Lyndhurst was fond in his speeches of introducing quotations, but they were supplied by his early reading, and some favourite ones (as Burke's on 'American Taxation' touching the happy effects of a conciliatory policy) had often received the meed of Parliamentary approbation."†

Martin becomes hysterical at the suggestion that Lyndhurst at any time of his life was indolent or idle, but although at the University he showed "that power of labour when he chose," which Brougham attributed to him, and which distinguished him through life, it is equally true that then as ever—as Brougham also said of him—"he generally hated work."‡ Even his eulogist is forced to admit—"He put off too long his preparation for the struggle for honours, and gave to his boat and his fishing-rod the hours which should have been devoted to study." He was driven to one of those gigantic efforts which Anthony Trollope condemns.§ "He made up for the lost hours by working late into the night under the stimulus of strong tea and wet bandages on his head."|| The result was that in January, 1794, he came out Second Wrangler only and with

\* "Life," pp. 18, 21, 23.

† "Lives of the Chancellors," vol. viii. p. 209. The concluding words are taken from Lord Beaconsfield's description of Peel's speeches.

‡ "Life of Brougham," vol. iii. p. 436.

§ A. Trollope's "Autobiography," vol. ii. p. 224.

|| "Life," p. 29.



damaged health. A letter from his tutor to his father mentions that his pupil "had of late been very studious," implying of course that up to that time he had been the reverse. Immediately after the examination for honours he came out First Smith's prizeman, and in the Michaelmas term of that year competed successfully, as did Macaulay\* twenty-seven years later, for the King William prize.†

In September, 1795, Lyndhurst obtained a Trinity Fellowship, his success being the more honourable because it was obtained the first time of his appearing as a candidate.‡ Before this time it had been decided that he should visit America, and in August, 1795, he obtained from Trinity "the appointment of travelling bachelor, with a grant of £100 for three years."§ He left for America at the end of the October following. The only noteworthy facts in his American experiences were, that for a part of his time he had as travelling companion Volney, of "Ruins of Empires" fame,|| and that he visited Washington at Mount Vernon. "We found," he says, "the President courteous, hospitable, and of a pleasant humour. He talked freely upon many subjects—his house, his gardens, and the country round it. There is no trace of luxury about the house. It is by his homely worth that Washington is conspicuous."¶ The rule of the University prescribed that "travelling bachelors should write an account of their travels to the Vice-Chancellor. Lyndhurst accordingly wrote from the States to the Vice-Chancellor three Latin letters with a trivial account of his journey. These letters escaped the researches of Campbell, but are given in full in this volume; they are in no wise remarkable. Copley's Latin, we are told, is scholarly and good, and contains abundant evidence of his familiarity with the great classical writers.\*\* The *Times* biography of Lyndhurst mentions a tradition that in these letters he "expressed somewhat liberally" his sympathy with American institutions, and adds: "But against this story there is the counter-tradition that the essay in question was written by Legh Richmond,†† who accommodated himself at his friend's request to that friend's idleness or indifference."‡‡ Both the tradition and the counter-tradition seem to us equally groundless. The letters do not in any way allude to American politics, except when the writer remarks:—

\* *Vide* Trevelyan's "Life of Macaulay," vol. i. pp. 83 *et seq.*

† "Life," pp. 30, 31, 33.

‡ "Letter of his Tutor Life," p. 32.

§ *Ibid.*, p. 34.

|| *Ibid.*, p. 55.

¶ *Ibid.*, p. 60.

\*\* *Ibid.*, p. 54.

†† We presume the late Rev. Legh Richmond, the well-known Evangelical clergyman and writer.

‡‡ "Mornings of the Recess," vol. ii. p. 8.

"Trade and political topics which have any bearing on commerce are of the first concern here; neither literature nor philosophy are the themes of conversation, and nowhere here would you find a *learned man* in the European sense of the word. Those who apply themselves to mercantile pursuits are generally the richest and most esteemed throughout America."\*

Neither of Lyndhurst's biographers mention that he was ever acquainted with Legh Richmond; † between them there was no likeness, and could be no sympathy. ‡ Nor, if our memory be to be trusted, does Legh Richmond's biographer mention that he ever visited America. Lyndhurst's letters to the Vice-Chancellor were undoubtedly written in America, and they bear one mark of being his own composition—viz., they are undated. § It was one of his weaknesses throughout his life not to date his letters.

One incident of Lyndhurst's undergraduate days deserves a passing notice because it bears on the question on which we shall presently have something to say. Did he ever hold ultra-Liberal opinions? Henry Crabb Robinson relates that he was told by Sergeant Rough, a contemporary of Lyndhurst, that Lyndhurst and a future Bishop were chased by the Proctors for chalking on the walls "Friend for ever." ¶ The future Bishop was caught, the more wily future Chancellor escaped. Friend was a clergyman, if we recollect rightly, Fellow and Tutor of his college, who taught what were then considered very advanced liberal opinions on theology, and for that was deprived of his offices. But much has happened since then. Probably he would now hold high office both in the university and the church.

Lyndhurst was admitted a member of Lincoln's Inn, May 19, 1794; he took his M.A. degree July 5, 1797, and soon afterwards entered the chambers of Mr. Tidd "where the unjoyous science of special pleading was taught to the future aspirants to the dignity of the coif." ¶ On leaving Mr. Tidd he took chambers in the Temple, "the loved abode of the demon of strife," as he called it; and, after practising for a short time as a special pleader, he was called to the bar in June, 1804, and joined the Midland Circuit. He certainly possessed what has been described "as the one thing needful for success at the bar—intrepid assurance,

\* "Life," p. 60.

† He is mentioned by Martin, p. 121, but we do not understand him to affirm the two men were friends.

‡ We shall see, however, that Lyndhurst had at one time friendly relations with the Evangelical party.

§ "Life," p. 54.

¶ H. Crabb Robinson's "Diaries," vol. iii. p. 402.

¶ This description is attributed by Sir James Stephen to Isaac Taylor, author of "The Natural History of Enthusiasm," vide "Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography," p. 594, edition 1876.

animated by constitutional vivacity;”\* but his progress was extremely slow.† At one time he entertained the idea which Bishop Thirlwall carried out of abandoning the bar for the Church. After nine years of very moderate success he took the rank of Sergeant-at-Law. At this time he was so little known, that on Scarlett‡ recommending him to a solicitor “as a gentleman of considerable talent” to conduct a cause to which Scarlett himself was unable to attend, the solicitor took a day or two to consider of it, and then told Scarlett that, as the case was one of great importance to his client, he could not think himself justified in placing his interests “in the hands of a gentleman so little known to the profession as Sergeant Copley.”§ The reason for his want of success leads us to one of the questions on which we uphold the authority of Campbell against that of Martin. Besides the primary qualification for success at the bar which we have mentioned, Lyndhurst had others not less necessary. He was in all respects “a finished intellectual athlete.” He had an admirable power of clear condensed statement,

“ ‘ Far exceeding,’ says Brougham, ‘ that of any man I ever saw. His great excellence was in the statement of a case, which, however obscure or complicated, was thereby made clear to the dullest capacity; so perfect was it that it rendered argument almost unnecessary, and he convinced and carried along with him his hearers in a way I never saw equalled.’”||

Of his speeches an accomplished critic says :

“ Their art, we might almost say their merit, is of the highest kind, for it is concealed. The words seem the simplest, clearest, and most natural that a man could use. It is only the instructed man who knows that he could not himself have used them, and that few men could.”¶

“ His eloquence,” says another of his critics, “ was high-reaching and sustained; but it was lucid rather than brilliant, and though searching it was not electrical. It was the eloquence rather of a great pleader than of a great orator, who carries away violently the sympathies of his audience.”\*\* This criticism is well illustrated by a very accurate observer, Henry Crabb Robinson, who remembered Erskine at the bar, and was present at the trial of

\* Sir James Stephen, *ubi supra*.

† “ Life,” p. 113, 116.

‡ Then leader of the bar, afterwards Lord Abinger, who succeeded Lyndhurst as Chief Baron of the Exchequer.

§ “ Life of Lord Abinger,” p. 70.

|| “ Life of Brougham,” vol. iii. pp. 436, 7.

¶ Bagehot’s “ Biographical Studies,” p. 329.

\*\* “ Mornings of the Recess,” vol. ii. p. 34.

Watson, Lyndhurst's defence of whom first attracted to the then Sergeant public and ministerial attention.

"After fifty-four years," writes Robinson, "I retain a perfect recollection of the figure and voice of Erskine. There was a charm in his voice and fascination in his eye; and so completely had he won my affections that I am sure, had the verdict been given against him, I should have burst out crying. The sentence that weighed on my spirits was a pathetic exclamation: 'If, gentlemen, you should by your verdict annihilate an instrument so solemnly framed,\* *I should retire, a troubled man, from this court;*' and, as he uttered the word *court*, he beat his breast, and I had a difficulty in not crying out. When in bed the following night I awoke several times in a state of excitement approaching fever; the words *troubled man from this court* rung in my ears."†

Of Lyndhurst's defence of Watson the same observer relates:—

"Copley spoke with great effect, but with very little eloquence. He spoke for about two and a half hours, and sat down with universal approbation. He said nothing that was not to the purpose. There were no idle or superfluous passages in his speech. He dwelt little on the law, and that was not very good; but his analysis of the evidence of Castle against Watson was quite masterly."‡

What then was the reason that, with all these qualifications, Lyndhurst had not a "lucrative practice?"§ It is to be found in "that hatred of work" which, according to Brougham, distinguished him through life. As another writer remarks, "his disinclination to labour was such as not unfrequently to endanger his success;"|| but he had powers which went far to make up for his want of industry.

"His mind," says his eulogist, for once not exaggerating, "was of that bright and subtle order which penetrates through the tangle of unimportant details to ruling principles. He would learn more in an hour than other men in days. His memory served him so well that he could dispense with the note-books and memoranda on which men less happily gifted find it necessary to depend."¶

In several respects Lyndhurst and the late Sir Alexander Cockburn resembled each other. What Campbell truly said of Cockburn, when he was raised to the bench, is equally true of Lyndhurst. "He was a man of great intellectual ability, capable of keen though not of continuous application."\*\* Each of

\* The question in the cause was as to the validity of a will.

† H. C. Robinson, "Diaries," vol. i. pp. 17, 18. ‡ *Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 55.

§ Notice in the *Times*, Dec. 6, 1883.

|| The *Edinburgh Review*, quoted by Martin at p. 134.

¶ P. 122.

\*\* "Life of Campbell," vol. ii. p. 348.

these distinguished men had the same nervous and lucid eloquence. For each, Parliament and society had greater attractions than the routine work of the bar. Each, in order to make him do justice to his clients, required the stimulus of a great case, or one the subject of which interested him. In cases like that of *McNaghten*, the murderer of Mr. Drummond, where the question was as to the prisoner's insanity; the libel case of *Achilli v. Newman*, or "the great modern oyer of poisoning," Palmer's case, no one could surpass or even equal Cockburn; but in ordinary cases, "we speak that which we do know and testify that which we have seen," when we say he was an unsatisfactory counsel. Lyndhurst also, when interested in a case, could take great pains with it. His life-long interest in practical chemistry and mechanics is well known. In "*Bovill v. Moore and others*," an action for the infringement of a patent for a spinning jenny for the manufacture of lace, Lyndhurst was engaged for the defendants, lace manufacturers at Nottingham. Finding he could not, from the description of the machines in his brief, fully understand the points on which the case turned, he went to Nottingham to see the machines at work.

"Delighted to find his counsel animated by so great an interest in the case, Mr. Moore took pains to explain the principle of his machine, possibly with an amplitude of detail superfluous to a practical student in mechanics like Copley. Copley listened patiently but with a seeming air of listlessness and without saying a word. Mr. Moore went on with further illustrations. Still Copley listened and made no sign. At length, exasperated at what he thought to be either stupidity or indifference in his hearer, Mr. Moore stopped, with the exclamation: 'What is the use of talking to you? I have been trying this half-hour to make you understand, and you pay no heed.' 'Now listen to me,' replied Copley, who meantime had been thinking out the points of resemblance and difference between the machine before him and that from which it was alleged to have been borrowed, and then, going into the whole question, he showed such a mastery of technical detail that Mr. Moore confessed himself fairly astonished. He was still more astonished when he found that Copley, bent on making himself master of the working of the machine by actual experiment, took his seat at the frame, and, before he left it, turned out an unexceptionable specimen of bobbin net lace. His description of the intricate and delicate details of Heathcoat's machine, and of the points of difference between it and Bovill's, was a marvel of lucid exposition. . . . His legal argument, as a piece of ingenious closely knit reasoning, was upon a par with the exquisite skill of his practical exposition." \*

Martin is at some pains to disprove a story told in the *Edin-*

---

\* "*Life of Campbell*," vol. ii. pp. 123-5.

*burgh Review* of Lyndhurst's want of preparation in Watson's case, and we think is successful, but he fails to disprove a matter of fact asserted by Campbell. Campbell says that Lyndhurst was

"More solicitous about the effect he might produce while speaking than about the ultimate result of the trial," and he continues, "Therefore he was unscrupulous in his statement of facts when opening his case to the jury, more particularly when he knew that he was to leave the court at the conclusion of his address, on a plea of attending to public business elsewhere. I was often his junior, and on one of these occasions, when he was stating a triumphant defence, which we had no evidence to prove, I several times plucked him by the gown and tried to check him. Having told the jury they were bound to find a verdict in his favour, he was leaving the court, but I said, "No Mr. Attorney, you must stay and examine the witnesses. I cannot afford to bear the discredit of losing the verdict from my seeming incompetence; if you go, I go." He then dexterously offered a reference, to which the other side, taken in by his bold opening, very readily assented."\*

Now what reply has Martin to offer to Campbell's positive statement as to transactions in which he was an actor? Nothing but this series of inferential denials:

"No one who is conversant with legal practice can possibly attach credit to this story, despite its apparent circumstantiality of detail—a barrister capable of such conduct would very soon be found out. He would be a marked man among his brethren, on the bench as well as at the bar, and would be dropped by every respectable attorney. No more damning accusation, indeed, can be brought against a counsel than that of being unscrupulous in his statement of facts, and of indifference about the ultimate result of the trial." †

Martin must have forgotten, if ever he knew, what used to be common in Westminster Hall and Lincoln's Inn. "Brougham, chiefly solicitous about himself, having made a brilliant speech, was rather apathetic as to the event of the trial," and in consequence—as we have heard from older members of the profession—"he did not get into regular employment in the ordinary routine of the courts."‡ The late Sir Fitzroy Kelly when at the bar was notorious for his "strong openings" and for closing his case without an attempt to prove them. In fact, what was said of another great Tory lawyer, the now almost forgotten Sir William Webb Follett, might have been said of all the great lawyers of that time. His eulogist admits that Follett "in his excessive eagerness to accomplish his object, was hurried

\* "Lives of the Chancellors," vol. viii. p. 39, quoted by Martin, p. 202.

† "Life," p. 202.

‡ "Lives of the Chancellors," vol. viii. p. 324.

into an occasional forgetfulness of that nice and high sense of moral principle which ought to regulate every one's conduct, especially those in eminent positions."\* Martin's inferential vindication of Lyndhurst illustrates what has been said of the utterly "uncritical" nature of this book. On the point here in dispute between Campbell and Martin, our decision is unhesitatingly in favour of Campbell.

Our biographer does not tell us anything on a subject about which there have been various statements†—viz., the reason which induced Lord Liverpool to bring Lyndhurst into Parliament; anyhow, in March, 1818, he was by Treasury influence brought in for the borough of Yarmouth.‡ This event in his life raises the question whether—as Campbell affirms and, with many outbreaks of hysterical wrath, Martin denies—Lyndhurst then suddenly suspiciously and completely, changed his political opinions. We think the evidence shows Campbell to be right. "My excellent friend Lyndhurst," says Brougham, "was not gifted with very great tenacity of political opinion."§ Lyndhurst always showed himself extremely sensitive on this subject, and "his sensitiveness, rather than the unusual gravity of the impeachment, was always an inducement for its renewal in the rivalries of party warfare.|| Certainly the change was not more complete than one we have seen in our time, by which "the rising hope of those stern and unbending Tories"¶ who followed while they distrusted Peel, was transformed into the chief of the Liberal party. Campbell affirms that Lyndhurst "in after-life asserted that he had never been a Whig, which, he says, 'I can testify to be true.' He was a Whig *and something more* or, in one word a Jacobin. He would refuse to be present at a dinner given on the return of Mr. Fox for Westminster, but he delighted to dine with 'The Corresponding Society,' or to celebrate the anniversary of the trial of Horne Tooke."\*\* Campbell's letters to his family show, to say the least, that at the time when the alleged change in Lyndhurst's opinions took place he

\* "Miscellanies," by the late Samuel Warren, D.C.L., &c. p. 47. Sir W. W. Follett died June 28, 1845, being then Attorney-General and M.P. for Exeter.

† See "Mornings of the Recess," vol. ii. pp. 12, 13. See Lyndhurst's own version, "Life," p. 338.

‡ Yarmouth, Isle of Wight, not Yarmouth in Norfolk; both these boroughs are now disfranchised.

§ "Life of Brougham," vol. iii. p. 435.

|| "Mornings of the Recess," vol. ii. p. 11.

¶ Macaulay's description of Gladstone in 1839, *vide* "Essays," p. 464, edition 1874.

\*\* "Lives of the Chancellors," vol. viii. p. 11.

believed what he afterwards stated in his "Life of Lyndhurst." For example, in April, 1818, he writes:—

"Copley is come into the House of Commons for a Treasury borough. It is expected he will be Solicitor-General on the next vacancy. He and I used to attend seditious meetings together, perhaps we may sit together on the Treasury Bench; but he was more a Jacobin than me. I have always been too moderate to be received into favour."\*

And again shortly afterwards:—

"I would not be the subject of all the jokes and sarcasms circulated against Copley for all his prospects. He told me to-day he wished the offer had never been made to him. I comforted him by saying, 'I defend you always, Copley, as strenuously as I can.' I am obliged to admit that it is a melancholy defection, and a dreadful fall; but, say I, think of his temptation; if he has sold himself it is for a good price."†

This is certainly the language of "the candid friend." After Lyndhurst had, as anticipated, been made Solicitor-General, Campbell writes:—"I rallied him about his conduct with former freedom, and he retains his former good humour."‡ Writing on March 10, 1821, he relates this dialogue:—

"Copley was yesterday laughing at the Whigs for being shy of the Radicals, and trying by their moderation to preserve the good opinion of the King, observing that their only chance was to force themselves in on the shoulders of the people.

"Campbell.—Had you come into the House on the popular side, what a firebrand you would have been!

"Scarlett.§—He would have retained his name of Jacobin Copley.

"Solicitor-General.||—That is a calumny lately invented.

"Scarlett.—It is the name I well remember your being called by before you went over."¶

"Letters and despatches (according to a well-known canon of historical evidence), like journals entered day by day, have this advantage over memoirs that they exhibit faithfully the impressions of the moment, and are written without knowledge of the ultimate result. They are therefore more trustworthy than any narrative composed after the whole series of events has been worked out."\*\*\*

Campbell's letters were written to his own family without the remotest idea of their ever being seen beyond the family circle; but the allusions to and the remarks on Lyndhurst, as Mrs. Hard-

\* "Life of Campbell," vol. i. p. 350.

† *Ibid.*

‡ *Ibid.*, vol. i. p. 365, and see p. 437. Conf. "Lives of the Chancellors," vol. viii. p. 24.

§ Lord Abinger.

|| Lyndhurst.

¶ "Life of Campbell," vol. i. p. 396.

\*\*\* Sir G. C. Lewis, "Historical Essays," p. 158.



castle points out, "agree exactly with the account written with a view to publication many years afterwards."\* Lyndhurst, in his Anti-Reform Speech of October, 1831, indignantly repudiated the charge of changing his opinions on Reform—

"Adding emphatically, with a loud voice, says Sir Denis Le Marchant, who was present: 'I never was a Whig.' The Attorney-General (Denman) (continues Sir Denis), who stood next to me, pressed my arm tightly, saying—'Villain! No, he was a Democrat, when I was a young man, he took me to a dinner of the Friends of the People.' The violence of the speeches startled me, and I could not help observing that I thought his friends went too far, for there must be some honest Tories. 'No,' he (Lord Lyndhurst) answered, 'it is impossible, an honest Tory is a contradiction in terms.'"<sup>†</sup>

It was said by one who was himself a member of the Bar, "that the life of the Bar is a life of rude familiarity, of bitter jealousy and of ceaseless gossip,"<sup>‡</sup> from which neither judges nor leading counsel escape. The imputations of Campbell, Scarlett and Denman on Lyndhurst's consistency might therefore have been attributed to their jealousy of him as a successful rival, but the belief in Lyndhurst's apostasy was not confined to the legal or to the political world. It prevailed also at Cambridge. In 1822 one of the members for the University died. Lord Teignmouth, who was personally interested in the election that followed, records that "Sir J. Copley§ (Lord Lyndhurst) entered the lists, but at once retired. To his success, notwithstanding his University and subsequent distinction, the imputation of *rattling* would have at this time proved an insuperable obstacle."|| Strangely enough for so acute a logician, Lyndhurst, in defending himself against this oft-repeated charge, forgot Erskine's rule, "when a convincing answer cannot be found to an objection those who understand controversy never give strength to it by a weak one,"¶ and his own maxim, "that a man attacked should not defend himself, but attack his accusers."\*\* When taunted by the Marquis of Tavistock and Scarlett with his sudden and suspicious change of opinion, he answered them to the same

\* Letter in the *Times* of Dec. 19, 1883.

† "Memoir of Earl Spencer," p. 350. Conf. "Lives of the Chancellors," vol. viii. p. 78.

‡ Sir James Stephen's "Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography," p. 595, edition 1875. The remark is attributed to Isaac Taylor. Sir James was called to the Bar in 1813.

§ He was then Solicitor-General.

|| "Reminiscences of Many Years," vol. i. p. 302. Lyndhurst was afterwards elected for Cambridge University, viz., in 1826.

¶ Erskine's "Speech on the Rights of Jurics."

\*\* Campbell's "Life," vol. i. p. 437.

effect\* as he did Lord Lansdowne when—so far forth as we know—he was for the last time in Parliament taunted on the subject: “I never belonged to any political party till I came into Parliament. I never belonged to any political society. I have been in Parliament sixteen years, and I wish the noble marquis to point out any speech or act of mine which can justify my being described as a Whig or something more than a Whig.”† And afterwards he added, “It is a base calumny, and I give it the most unqualified contradiction.”‡

We assent to Campbell’s dictum that “this is a very lame defence of Lyndhurst’s political consistency.”§ No one ever said that he had spoken or voted in Parliament as a Whig or something more. The allegation was that before he entered Parliament he held opinions more than Whig—*i.e.*, Jacobin or democratic. That he never belonged “to any party or political society whatever” may be true, but it is possible to desert an opinion as well as a party.

In the same debate Denman, with whom Lyndhurst had claimed to be on terms of intimacy for a long period, asserted that Lyndhurst had held such opinions and in such terms that notwithstanding the abundance *duræ frontis perbita audacia*,|| which Melbourne truly attributed to him must have made him wince.

“I feel somewhat astonished,” said Denman, “that my noble and learned friend should plead forgetfulness as to the opinions which he entertained, twenty years ago undoubtedly, but when he had reached mature years. If these opinions are forgotten by himself, they are not forgotten and cannot be forgotten by others. They were not uttered merely in the presence of those who were on close terms of intimacy with him, or in the course of private conversation, but they were openly avowed rather, as if my noble and learned friend felt a pride in entertaining and avowing them.”¶

An acute observer, Sir Henry Holland, who knew Lyndhurst more than forty years, remarks that “Lyndhurst’s intellect would have been more fruitful had he been less subtle and sceptical.”\*\* “He was wanting,” says another biographer, “in the enthusiasm which indicates deep convictions.”††

How does Martin deal with the evidence as to the change in Lyndhurst’s opinions? He complains of Campbell garbling quotations and suppressing passages unfavourable to his views. Martin

\* “Lives of the Chancellors,” vol. viii. p. 30. Martin’s “Life,” p. 166.  
 † “Mornings of the Recess,” vol. ii. p. 11.

‡ “Lives of the Chancellors,” vol. viii. p. 105.

§ Martin’s “Life,” p. 334. § *Ubi supra*, p. 368.

|| *Ibid.* p. 115.

¶ *Ibid.* p. 107. \*\* “Life,” p. 499.

†† *Times Annual Summaries*, p. 199.

had before him Brougham's unbiassed judgment of Lyndhurst, and quotes so much as is entirely in favour of Lyndhurst; but he passes over Brougham's remark on Lyndhurst's "want of tenacity of political opinion."\* Martin relies much on a passage in one of Lyndhurst's letters, written to his mother when he was in America, and therefore before the time when, according to Campbell, Scarlett and Denman, he held Jacobin opinions. "I have become," he wrote, "a fierce Aristocrat. This is the country to cure your Jacobins. Send them over, and they will return quite converted. The Opposition here are a set of villains. Their object is to overset the Government, and all good men are apprehensive lest they should on the present occasion be successful."† This letter shows, as Martin contends, that Lyndhurst had then "ranged himself with the Aristocratic party upon conviction,"‡ by which he means the Aristocratic or Tory party in England; but Lyndhurst, it is plain, only refers to America, where the villainous Opposition were endeavouring to overset the then young Republican Government.

Lyndhurst, writing to his sister, then in America, denounces as an instrument of much mischief Cobbett, then a Tory. He describes the prospectus, then just issued, of Cobbett's "Porcupine" as "filled with the most virulent and intemperate invectives against the United States."§ Cobbett, in his "Porcupine," "scoffed in unmeasured terms at the independence of the United States. He ridiculed the constitution of the Union. . . . He held up to contempt the doctrine on which the Americans prided themselves—the democratic equality of all men."|| That Lyndhurst denounced the writer of these sentences shows he was then no adherent of the English Tory party or of their new allies, the rabid anti-revolutionary Whigs—such as Wyndham—who aided and abetted Cobbett.¶

Martin tries to dispose of the conversation between Lyndhurst, Campbell and Scarlett by a brief reference in a note, where he says "that in no other quarter has he been able to trace the use of the epithet 'Jacobin;'"\*\* as if this were any answer to the facts stated by Campbell. Denman's evidence is thus attempted to be disposed of:—

"Either Sir Denis Le Marchant or Lord Campbell must be wrong in their story. Le Marchant says Denman *whispered the remark*†† to

\* P. 507. Conf. Brougham's "Life," vol. iii, pp. 435-6-7.

† Pp. 45, 46.

‡ P. 45.

§ P. 77. The letter is dated Oct. 22, 1800.

|| "Historical Gleanings," by Professor Thorold Rogers, 1st series, p. 165. Title "William Cobbett."

¶ *Ibid.* p. 169.

\*\* Martin, p. 161, note.

†† *i.e.*, the words, "Villain! No, he was a Democrat."

him. Campbell says, *Denman was then standing by me shaking his fist in a manner which made me afraid he would draw upon himself the notice of the House; he exclaimed, 'Villain—lying villain!' Which of these versions of the story are we to accept?\**

We see no important difference in the two versions. Martin garbles his quotation from Le Marchant, who says, "Denman, who stood next to me, pressed my arm tightly, *saying*"—not, be it observed, *whispering*—"Villain! No, he was a Democrat."

Campbell, Le Marchant, and Denman were all three standing in front of the throne, and there is no reason why Campbell should not hear what Denman said. The adjective and the menacing gesture used by Denman may have been noticed by Campbell and not noticed or probably forgotten by Le Marchant. Martin passes over, and wisely, without notice the story which Denman told Le Marchant as to the dinner of the Friends of the People,† and he thinks he disposes of this matter by saying: "In a matter of this sort, the testimony of a bitter Whig partisan, based upon the loose, irresponsible talk of a barrister's circle, is surely entitled to little weight as against the evidence of Lyndhurst's own early recorded opinions and his unqualified contradiction to the imputation on all occasions, whether public or private."‡

Denman was a Whig and a partisan. Lyndhurst was also a partisan, though not so sincere a partisan as Denman. There was no bitterness in Denman's character, his statements were not "based upon the loose, irresponsible talk of a barrister's circle," but on his own knowledge of the man who himself said that "he had been on terms of intimacy with Denman for a long period."§ Martin, we have seen, misrepresents, or at least misunderstands, the effect of Lyndhurst's own early recorded opinions, and his unqualified contradictions were, we have seen, mere evasions. Martin attempts to deprive of its force Denman's free and clear statement about Lyndhurst's former opinions by introducing a subsequent wrangle between Lyndhurst and Denman, which followed in the same debate. Denman exaggeratedly attributed Copley's rise at the Bar to the patronage of those who held advanced Liberal opinions. Lyndhurst refuted that exaggerated statement, but he does not attempt to deny Denman's assertion as to the democratic opinions formerly held and avowed by Lyndhurst,|| as to which he in old legal phraseology suffered judgment by "*nil dicit*."

\* P. 297, note.

† Conf. Martin, p. 297, and note; "Memoirs of Earl Spencer," p. 350; "Lives of the Chancellors," vol. viii. p. 78.

‡ P. 297.

§ *Ubi supra*.

|| Pp. 336-7-S.

We observe that Martin complains loudly of Campbell for garbling his quotations from Lyndhurst's speeches, and his extracts from "Hansard" show instances both of omission and addition in Campbell's version. We agree with Mrs. Hardcastle that "the variations, such as they are, can hardly be said seriously to affect the sense." She makes the not very probable suggestion that her father "may very well have had separate sources of information;" and she adds, "it is the editor of the posthumous volume [*i.e.*, herself] who must take the blame to herself if the copies are inexact, and the foot-notes misleading."\* It is no part of our duty to decide between Martin and Mrs. Hardcastle; we would, however, suggest to the disputants that Campbell may have taken his quotations from the defunct "Mirror of Parliament,"† which was in existence during a large part of the careers of Campbell and Lyndhurst. Its reports often vary from those of "Hansard." We will not charge Martin with garbling so freely as he charges others, but in his book there are frequent instances of inaccuracy and ignorance—*e.g.*, when Lyndhurst bantered Brougham on his fiery speech against the repeal of the Navigation Laws, he asked, "Why does Lord Brougham know so much about the navigation laws?" "Answer—Because he has been so long engaged in the *seal fishery*."‡ Martin makes Lyndhurst ask Brougham, "Why does Campbell know so much about the navigation laws?"§ Campbell took no active part on the question. Again, Martin (referring to 1829) describes Lord King "as one of those who had formerly resisted Catholic emancipation."|| Those who know the parliamentary history of George III.'s reign know that Lord King was always associated with Grey, Lansdowne and Holland in promoting emancipation—that he was remarkable for his deeply rooted conviction of the sinfulness as well as the folly of intolerance, and for his hostility to ecclesiastical establishments.¶

To return to Lyndhurst: he was, of course, a faithful supporter of the Ministry which brought him into the House. He was rewarded in 1819 with the office of Solicitor-General. In office it was his duty to support and vindicate the policy of "Castlereagh's six Acts." Of these acts Campbell accurately describes the effect:—

"While they were upon the Statute-book the constitution was suspended, oral discussion was interfered with, not only at county

\* Letter in *Times* of Dec. 19, 1883.

† As to the "Mirror of Parliament," see "The Canning Episode" in "The Life of Lord George Bentinck," pp. 269–277.

‡ "Lives of the Chancellors," vol. viii. p. 561.

§ P. 481, note.

|| P. 259.

¶ Brougham's "Statesmen:" title "Lord King."

meetings but in debating clubs and philosophical societies, and no man could venture to write upon political or theological subjects, except at the peril of being transplanted beyond the seas as a felon.\*

And again :

“ For a time we could not be said to live in a free country.”†

In Martin’s opinion this is simply absurd. Wherein lies the absurdity? No one will dare to deny that Campbell was a good lawyer. Does Martin venture to affirm that Campbell’s opinion of the effect of the acts is absurd? or does the absurdity lie in saying that while the acts were in force England was not “ a free country?” Martin’s remark is noteworthy. He is no common literary hack. He is the Court scribe; the eulogist of Prince Albert, the lukewarm admirer of parliamentary government, and of Stockmar, the prince’s secret and irresponsible adviser, who hated and despised it. It is a fair inference that it is in high quarters that Martin has learned to condemn as absurd the opinion that the Six Acts were incompatible with free institutions. Lyndhurst took so prominent and effective a part in the miserable business of the Queen’s trial as to gain the favour and regard of George IV. He became Attorney-General in 1824, and Master of the Rolls in 1826. To undertake that office required much, if not of audacity, at least of self-confidence. He had never been counsel in an Equity Court, and at that time the great proportion of business at the Rolls was of a formal kind which made technical knowledge and experience, rather than a powerful intellect, the qualifications for its judge.

“ I think,” wrote Eldon to Peel, “ he has acted very prudently. He goes to school in the lower form (the Rolls) to qualify him to remove into the higher if he takes the Chancellorship.”‡ He was Master of the Rolls only eight months. Martin says that during that period he verified “ the anticipations of his legal brethren that he had every quality to make him a distinguished judge.”§ Of his judicial performances as Master of the Rolls hardly a vestige remains; according to the gossip of the profession, “ he sat as seldom as possible, and rose as early as possible, and did as little as possible.”|| Such indeed was his practice during the whole of his judicial life.

In February, 1827, Lord Liverpool was seized with apoplexy, and on the 27th of that month the Master of the Rolls made a great speech against Roman Catholic emancipation taken from

\* “Lives of the Chancellors,” vol. viii. pp. 28-9.

‡ *Ibid.* pp. 42-43.

|| “Lives of the Chancellors,” vol. viii. p. 47.

† *Ibid.* p. 31.

§ P. 212.

a celebrated pamphlet by Philpotts, afterwards Bishop of Exeter—for which he was severely lashed by Canning.\*

In April Canning was called on to form a Ministry. According to Martin, he wished Eldon to remain as Chancellor. This we doubt, but we know that Canning much regretted that it was not in his power to offer the Great Seal to Scarlett;† but the King, who remembered the services of the Master of the Rolls in the Queen's case, and was delighted with his anti-Catholic speech, insisted that Lyndhurst should be Chancellor.‡ This Lyndhurst declared to his peers: "My Lords (he said), I owe the situation I have the honour to hold in this House to the generous kindness of my late Sovereign;" and with much *duræ frontis perditæ audaciæ* he added—"A monarch largely endowed with great and princely qualities."§ Lyndhurst himself looked upon his acceptance of the Great Seal as a speculation; and in talking of it to Greville, "political opinions and political consistency never seemed to occur to him, and he considered the whole matter in a light so business-like and professional as to be quite amusing."|| The effect of his elevation on his position in Parliament and before the country is described in words which we cannot hope to improve, and therefore transcribe:—

"His transfer to the House of Lords opened a path to that great parliamentary position which he afterwards attained. Before entering the House of Lords he was, comparatively speaking, nowhere. A clever and serviceable official, with a clear head and fluent tongue, though he had been nearly ten years in the House of Commons, he had not succeeded in acquiring what is as definite a privilege in that assembly as a coat or silk gown elsewhere—viz., the ear of the House. His calm and dignified elucidation of a subject in debate was better fitted to the serene temper of the other House; and though he did not at once obtain the reputation as Chancellor which he acquired subsequently, he very soon made himself known to the Lords as a political notability."¶

After the death of Canning it was Lyndhurst who brought about the resignation of, to use the Duke of Wellington's description, "the weak and contemptible Goderich."\*\* Campbell gives a detailed account of the interview between the King and Lords Goderich and Lyndhurst, when Goderich resigned. It

\* Martin, p. 214; "Lives of the Chancellors," vol. viii. p. 45; Greville's "Journal," vol. i. p. 91.

† P. 217.

‡ "Memoir of Lord Abinger," p. 106; Lord Colchester's "Diary," vol. iii. p. 469.

§ "Speech on the Reform Bill," Oct. 1831; Martin, p. 295.

|| Greville's "Diary," vol. i. p. 135.

¶ "Mornings of the Recess," vol. ii. p. 19.

\*\* Fitzgerald's "George the Fourth," vol. ii. 390, note.

appears to us to contain much that is fanciful, and to be too highly coloured. He says that Lyndhurst in relating the particulars of this conference avers that His Majesty added, "But remember, whoever is to be Minister, you, my Lord, must remain my Chancellor." Martin, who seems to have for the old Duke of Wellington the *révérence idiote* in which he was held by our grandmothers, says this is "incredible. On a matter of this sort the Duke would have brooked no interference, and Lord Lyndhurst was not the man to report to others such an act of unconstitutional interference with the privileges of his First Minister."\* There is nothing incredible in this statement; we know that the King insisted with Canning that Lyndhurst should be Chancellor, though Canning would have chosen another man; and there can, we think, be no doubt that the King insisted with Wellington that Lyndhurst should remain Chancellor, as he did until the fall of the Wellington Ministry.† Mr. Fitzgerald publishes some letters from the King to Wellington, which tend to show that he relied on his Chancellor as his adviser fully as much, if not more than on his Prime Minister.‡ At the fall of the Wellington Ministry, the Chancellor's secretary said to Campbell, "As we did not come in with the Duke, I do not see why we should go out with him."§

Lyndhurst figured both as a judge and as a statesman. We will first consider his judicial character. Everybody admits—and no one more fully and frankly than Campbell—that Lyndhurst possessed in the highest degree every qualification which makes a great judge; but Brougham truly says of his "excellent friend:" "Great as Lyndhurst was as a judge, the common impression was *that on the bench he was not in earnest*, and I am bound to say that this verdict of the public was a just one"|| Lyndhurst himself told Lady Cranworth "that the Chancellor's work may be divided into three classes. First, the business which is worth the labour done; second, that which

\* Martin, p. 235; "Memoir of J. E. Herries," vol. ii. p. 75; "Lives of the Chancellors," vol. viii. p. 57; "Mornings of the Recess," vol. ii. p. 20; Greville's "Diary," vol. i. p. 120. Greville corroborates Campbell's statement.

† Martin, p. 235, in a note on Campbell's "incredible story," remarks: "Lord Campbell himself says that from 1827 down to the time of his becoming, in 1841, a member of the House of Peers, personal intercourse between Lyndhurst and himself almost entirely ceased." How, asks Martin, could he have learned what was known only to Lyndhurst, Goderich and the King? The answer is plain—Lyndhurst told him after friendly intercourse between them was renewed.

‡ "Life of George IV.," vol. ii. pp. 391-399.

§ "Life of Campbell," vol. i. p. 488.

|| "Life of Brougham," vol. iii. pp. 435-6.



does itself; third, the work which is not done at all.”\* *Pace* Martin, the third was, we think, the largest class of Lyndhurst’s work. Sir Denis Le Marchant,† who had abundant opportunities of observing Lyndhurst, and of learning the estimation in which he was held by the Bar, tells us that

“Lyndhurst was always a complete master of his argument, his premises being so skilfully laid that his conclusions were almost irresistible; nothing could be more clear, distinct and logical than his handling of a subject—at least according to his own view of it; but he grappled with no difficulties which he could not overcome. Hence his decisions (as I am assured by the most eminent advocates at the Chancery Bar) are of little use as precedents, and certainly inferior to Lord Brougham’s, who boldly, and often successfully, unravelled the web of sophistry and technicality that surrounds so many questions of law.”‡

Complaints of him soon began to circulate. “My friend Copley,” writes Campbell in November, 1827, “I am sorry to say, performs rather indifferently; he is said to be very idle and remorseless.”§ And in 1829 he writes of him: “He is as careless of his judicial as of his political reputation.” And again: “He is frightened lest he should give offence to Sugden. Being too indolent to learn his trade, he considers the man at the head of the Chancery Bar his master.”¶ Here again Campbell’s statements at the time agree exactly with those he afterwards wrote for publication. One of Lyndhurst’s judicial habits is accurately described by his biographer:—

“Confident in the tenacity of his memory, Lord Lyndhurst’s practice, both on the bench and when sitting as Chancellor, was to take very brief notes during the progress of the case. That he was justified in a course which could not generally be safely followed was shown by the uniform accuracy with which, after a long argument, he would cite dates or figures or facts. His habitual courtesy and self-control were shown by the patience with which he always listened to the speeches of the counsel.”¶¶

During his first three Chancellorships\*\* no case of the first importance came before him. His greatest judicial performance occurred not when he was Chancellor but when, as Chief Baron of the Exchequer, he presided on the Equity side of that Court.

\* H. C. Robinson’s “Diary,” vol. iii. p. 454.

† He was private secretary to Brougham when Chancellor.

‡ “Memoir of Earl Spencer,” p. 351, note.

§ Campbell’s “Life,” vol. i. p. 449. The word is “remorseless” in the original, but we suspect a misprint.

¶ *Ibid.* pp. 464, 482.

¶¶ Pp. 255–6.

\*\* *i.e.*, from May, 1827, to November, 1830, and from November, 1834, to April, 1835.

We refer to his judgment in *Small v. Attwood*,\* a case of no public importance, but of great moment to the parties. Campbell ungrudgingly admits that—

“by all accounts it was the most wonderful ever heard in Westminster Hall. It was entirely oral, without even referring to any notes; he employed a long day in stating complicated facts, in entering into complex calculations, and correcting the misrepresentations of the counsel on both sides. Never once did he falter or hesitate, and never was he mistaken in a name, a figure, or a date.”†

Martin approbates this testimony of Campbell because it is favourable to Lyndhurst; but on the same page he utterly reprobates Campbell's testimony that Lyndhurst was “reckless as to the fate of suitors,” and “only while he was in Court cared for or thought of the causes he had to dispose of.”‡ Campbell was speaking of Lyndhurst's general habits. On the bench, as at the Bar, he required the excitement of a great case to make him exert his great powers. Such a case was the one referred to. It was one of fraudulent representation in the sense in which the word fraud is—perhaps we ought to say was—used in Courts of Equity. Lyndhurst had never practised in Equity nor, so far forth as appears, studied Equity jurisprudence. It is, therefore, a question he was particularly unfitted to decide. His judgment was reversed by the House of Lords—a fact which excites the indignation of a writer who, under the signature “E. B.,” intervened in the controversy between Martin and the Hardcastles, against whom he is evidently animated by ill-feeling and spite.

“Martin,” he says, “has made a mistake against himself in leaving Lyndhurst to appear alone in *Small v. Attwood*, where his judgment was actually reversed by a majority of one, and that one was an ex-Master in Chancery who had got a dormant peerage. Fancy the three times Lord Chancellor and the great Common-Law Chief of the century being reversed by one of his own Masters.”§

In passing we remark that, spite of his great judicial qualities, Lyndhurst, as a Common-Law Chief, ranks below Ellenborough, Tenterden, or Campbell. Lyndhurst defended his judgment in a speech which Campbell describes, with Martin's approbation, as “again astounding all who heard it by the unexampled power of memory and lucidness of arrangement by which it was dis-

\* It is said that the hearing of this case from first to last occupied a greater number of hours than the trial of Warren Hastings.—“Lives of the Chancellors,” vol. viii. p. 72.

† *Ibid.* pp. 71-2-3.

‡ Martin, p. 284.

§ Letter in the *Times*, January 2, 1854. We suspect the writer is a relation of Mr. Francis Barlow, a friend of Lyndhurst's, and at one time his secretary.

tinguished.\* He stood however alone, the three other Lords who heard the case being unanimous for reversal. Those three were Lord Cottenham, then Chancellor, the most consummate Equity lawyer who ever sat as Chancellor; Lord Brougham, and the then Earl of Devon—at whom “E. B.” ignorantly sneers—but who was an eminent practitioner at the Equity Bar before he became a Master in Chancery, and who sat at the table of the House of Lords as Clerk of the Parliament before he took his seat on the Earl’s bench. We have heard Lord Westbury, a very competent judge, say that the judgments of Lords Devon and Cottenham† are “a perfect digest of Equity jurisprudence on the subject of fraudulent representation.”

Six years passed between Lyndhurst’s third and his last Chancellorship, all which time he had been, according to Campbell, “absorbed in political intrigue.”‡ This assertion is condemned by Martin as “unfounded.” Had Campbell said “pursuits” instead of “intrigue,” Martin would hardly have ventured to contradict him. Equally “unfounded,” says Martin, is Campbell’s assertion that “Lyndhurst hardly ever attended to the judicial business of the House of Lords; with one exception, he never sat in the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and he did not trouble himself with reading the periodical reports of decisions of the Equity Judges.”§ We are able so far to corroborate Campbell, that during the years 1837–40 we often attended the judicial sittings of the House of Lords, and we never saw Lyndhurst there but on one occasion—the hearing of the appeal from his own judgment in the Lady Hewley Charity case. His attention to the legislative business of the House was not very close. A member of the bar describing the discussion of the Ecclesiastical Duties and Revenues Bill (1840), says: “Lyndhurst was there for some time, but he, I believe, allows nothing to interfere with his dinner, and would go away though an archangel were speaking.”|| As to his attendance at the Privy Council, Martin quotes an Edinburgh Reviewer whom he describes as speaking “with authority,” and if that be so, Campbell is in this matter inaccurate. “For many years Lyndhurst,” says this Reviewer, “sat at the Privy Council on all the patent matters which were heard there;” and he

\* “Lives of the Chancellors,” vol. viii. p. 73. Conf. Martin, p. 285.

† It is to be regretted there is no memoir of this distinguished judge. There is a brief but excellent sketch of him by Sir Denis Le Marchant in his “Memoir of Earl Spencer,” pp. 60 to 68, and another by Campbell *more suo*.—Vide “Life of Campbell,” vol. ii. p. 207.

‡ “Lives of the Chancellors,” vol. viii. p. 134.

§ *Ibid.* vol. viii. p. 134; imperfectly quoted by Martin at p. 394.

|| “Memoir of J. R. Hope Scott,” vol. i. p. 202.

gives the reason for this attendance: "From his love of mechanical invention he took great interest in these matters."\* Lyndhurst was an admirable judge when he was interested, but he was not interested in ordinary judicial business. As to Lyndhurst's neglect of legal studies, Campbell is corroborated by Charles Sumner, who wrote to a friend: "You may understand that Lyndhurst does not keep the run of the law, from his remark that he did not know who the present reporters were."† It is as true that these six years were passed by Lyndhurst in ceaseless efforts to recover the Seal as that he did not attempt to deepen and widen his lamentably deficient knowledge of the principles and practice of the Court of Chancery. His absorption in politics may account for the fact, that when in September, 1841, he resumed his place on the Woolsack

"he was—as Campbell, who was present, says—exceedingly nervous and, looking bewildered, did not seem at all to recollect the forms with which he had been so long familiar. Lord Melbourne in a loud whisper said to me, 'Who would think that this is the same impudent dog who bullied us so unconscionably in his Reviews of the Sessions.'"‡

This statement excites the wrath of Martin, who does not like to admit that his hero was subject to even the ordinary weaknesses of human nature:—

"The idea of Lyndhurst, with his immense power of self-command and his unerring memory, presenting such an appearance is preposterous. But there are people alive who were present and remember that at no time did he show himself more self-possessed;—and he adds, as to Lord Melbourne's 'loud whisper,'—'These wonderful episodes of Campbell's are always given "in a stage whisper" or "a loud whisper." The observation, if true, is little to Lord Melbourne's credit. But it is so unlike the man, so absolutely inconsistent with the real facts of Lord Lyndhurst's resumption of his place on the woolsack, that it may safely be dismissed as unworthy of credit.'"§

The observation to us is eminently characteristic of Melbourne, and we prefer Campbell's statement as to facts which he saw and heard, to Martin's assumption of its incredibility.|| The truth is that Lyndhurst's brow of "Olympian Jove was combined with weak facial proportions," and he was habitually nervous. This even Martin himself is compelled to admit,¶ and there is abun-

\* Quoted by Martin, p. 395.

† "Life of Sumner," vol. ii. p. 77. The letter is dated in 1838.

‡ "Lives of the Chancellors," vol. viii. p. 132. § P. 373, and note.

|| See also "Life of Melbourne," vol. ii. p. 368, by Mr. Torrens, M.P., who seems to have been present on this occasion. At the time of William IV.'s accession, Greville notes, that "the Chancellor did not know his own business" in the proceedings consequent on the change of kings.—Diary, vol. ii. p. 16.

¶ P. 307.

dant evidence of it from other sources. Lord Teignmouth, who recollects Lyndhurst at the Bar, noticed on one occasion that on his rising his hand shook so much that Teignmouth attributed it "rather to temporary indisposition than nervousness."\* On another and a memorable occasion his nervousness struck a colleague. It was on the opening of the Session of 1829 when Lyndhurst read the King's Speech which revealed the change of the Cabinet's policy on the Roman Catholic question. For him to do this after his anti-Catholic speeches of 1827-8 required all his *dura frons* and *perdita audacia*, and no wonder that on this occasion, at least, he displayed no little *verecundia*. The Chancellor, Lord Ellenborough records in his Diary, "was so nervous on reading the passage relating to Ireland that he did not give it its full effect."†

Campbell describes, in terms which again excite Martin's rage and indignation, the manner in which Lyndhurst, in his last Chancellorship, discharged his judicial duties. At that time we had constant opportunities of observing Lyndhurst. We remember his lazy, listless demeanour in Court, and his muttered comments on the arguments of counsel which Martin describes,‡ and we testify that Campbell is accurate in saying—

"his excellent good sense and admirable tact kept him out of scrapes. Avoiding danger he was careless about glory, and not by any means over-anxious or scrupulous about the business of his Court being disposed of satisfactorily. He sat in the Court of Chancery as little as he possibly could, and his great object was to shirk the decision of perplexed and difficult questions. Upon appeals from the Master of the Rolls or the Vice-Chancellors he almost always *affirmed*, by which he had the treble advantage of lessening the number of appeals, of having the good word of the Judge appealed from, and of shunning the necessity of giving reasoned judgments."§

To this Martin replies :—

"If Lyndhurst had been what Lord Campbell asserts he was, how comes it to pass that he never delivered judgment on any important case or spoke on any question of constitutional principle or legal reform without producing the impression that he was so thoroughly master of the whole subject that it cost him no effort to state it with a clearness and a brevity unattained by any other lawyer of his time?" (p. 396).

\* "Memories of Many Years," vol. ii. p. 201.

† "Diary," vol. i. p. 336. The passage in the speech ran thus :—"His Majesty recommends that when this essential object [putting down the Catholic Association] shall have been accomplished, you should take into your deliberate consideration the whole condition of Ireland, and that you should review the laws which impose civil disabilities on His Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects."—*Lives of the Chancellors*, vol. viii. p. 61.

‡ *Vide* p. 286.

§ "Lives of the Chancellors," vol. viii. pp. 134-5.

This is beside the question. It is agreed on all sides that Lyndhurst had unrivalled powers. All that Campbell says is that habitually he did not call them into use. Martin gives us *ex cathedra* his theory of the duties of a Judge of Appeal, and in so doing makes an attack equally ignorant and unprovoked on Lord Cottenham:—

“Another ground of charge against Lyndhurst by Campbell is, that he almost always affirmed; and why not, if the judgment appealed from be sound? \* Which is the more likely to be right—the man who comes with an open mind to the investigation of a case, or he who, like Lyndhurst’s successor, Cottenham, approached, according to Campbell, the consideration of every question brought before him on appeal in such a way that it was said of him ‘he always presumed the decree to be wrong till the contrary was clearly proved.’ The quality of mind which this indicates is not that dispassionate judgment which ‘tries all things—proves all things,’ but an inward self-complacency, which starts with setting up its own fancied astuteness as superior to that of other men, and out of a desire to show its independence or originality is more often apt to be wrong than right in its conclusions. To affirm heedlessly is obviously as fatal to a judge’s character as to give an original judgment heedlessly.” †

Martin evidently knew Cottenham as little as he knew Lyndhurst. Cottenham, when he became Chancellor, was said to have “magnificently disappointed the profession.” That very acute observer and accurate relater, Charles Sumner, was astonished at the concurring expressions of praise of Cottenham which he heard from every quarter. He seemed to Sumner the “model of a patient man,” and he accurately describes him as “never interrupting counsel except to interpose some pertinent, searching question.” ‡ The remark about his presuming every decree to be wrong is taken without acknowledgment from Campbell, who merely quotes it as a jest of the “wags in the Court of Chancery.” Cottenham’s avowed principle of action was to “treat every appeal as an original hearing,” and according to the practice which prevailed in his time he was right. Appeals to the Chancellor, as they were popularly called, were in fact and in strict language called “Rehearings.” Any one who, as is our case, remembers Cottenham’s judicial habits, or has ever studied his judgments, will treat with contempt the unfounded assertion that he was “heedless.”

We resume our quotation from Martin:—

“Campbell expresses surprise that Lyndhurst’s recorded decisions during his third Chancellorship were few and unimportant. Surely

\* Yes; but how if the judgment be unsound? † P. 397.

‡ “Life of Sumner,” vol. i. pp. 311, 334, 336-8; vol. ii. p. 74.

quality not quantity is the true test of the excellence of a judge's decisions. It generally is the weak and ill-instructed man who loads the reports indiscriminately with elaborate judgments. But when the question was new or difficult or important, when a 'reasoned judgment,' to use Campbell's phrase, was appropriate, Lyndhurst was not found wanting."\*

From whatever cause it arose, the fact is that Lyndhurst in none of his Chancellorships made to Equity jurisprudence such contributions as did Cottenham in questions relating to the law of married women's property, to the reformed municipal corporations, and to railway and other companies, which sprang up in great numbers during his judicial career.

"The adjustment of the rights and obligations of those great bodies opened," truly says Sir Denis Le Marchant, "a new province of jurisprudence, on which he left a record of powers which will bear comparison with those displayed by Lord Mansfield in the larger domain of commercial law."†

There was one case in Lyndhurst's last Chancellorship which escaped the researches of Campbell and is seemingly unknown to Martin, but which we happen to remember from the accident of being in Court on the day on which it was decided. It was *The Duke of Leeds v. Earl Amherst*; there can be no better example of Lyndhurst's powers when he called them into action; and the question for decision—viz., What is a portrait?—was one which he was pre-eminently qualified to decide. In his first Chancellorship, at the yearly dinner of the Royal Academy, he made a speech of "great feeling, dignity, and good taste." "He was," he said, "cradled in this institution; when young, he had familiarly known all the great masters who created and adorned the establishment—Reynolds, Gainsborough, Barry, &c., and from all these and others he had received great and lasting obligations."‡ Late in his life he expressed in the House of Lords the same feelings.§ His only purely literary production was a pamphlet on the internal government of the Royal Academy.|| The case we refer to shows that in his seventy-fourth year he had not forgotten his youthful associations with artists and their works. The facts were these—the Duke of Leeds bequeathed to his daughter all the portraits of the Duke of Schomberg at Hornby Castle. Among these was a large equestrian picture of the Duke. In the background or perspective, the artist had introduced some troops—the body of the largest of these figures does not exceed the size of one of the

\* P. 397.

† "Memoir of Earl Spencer," p. 65.

‡ "Diary of Lord Colchester," vol. iii. p. 492.

§ "Martin," pp. 19, 527. It was on March 4, 1859.

|| *Vide* Appendix to "Life," p. 523 *et seq.*

hoofs of the Duke's horse. It was contended that the introduction of these subordinate figures made this picture not a portrait, and that therefore it did not pass under the bequest. Lyndhurst gave an admirably reasoned judgment, remarkable for the artistic and critical knowledge it displayed. Those interested in artistic matters will read it with delight. It is too long to transcribe in full, but the following extract gives an idea of Lyndhurst at his best. After remarking that, the main object of a portrait being a likeness of the individual, it was reasonable to introduce subordinate circumstances illustrative of his position and station, he proceeded :—

“ And here I refer to instances. There are a hundred that could be mentioned, but I will select two or three. There is the portrait of General Amherst; he is dressed in his uniform, the uniform of the day in which he lived and flourished; he is on horseback, the horse in motion, and there are troops in the background. That is one of the finest pictures painted by Sir Joshua Reynolds; always called the portrait of General Amherst. It has all the circumstances which occur in this picture, all properly introduced, not detractive from its character of a portrait. Who ever doubted that that was properly called a portrait of General Amherst? It probably represents one of those battles in which he was engaged, and in which he acquired so much distinction. Then we come to that grand portrait by Sir Joshua Reynolds of Lord Ligonier, which is in the National Gallery. There also there are troops in the background, denoting probably that exploit of his in which he separated himself and a small body of troops under his command from the rest, for the purpose of rescuing the Duke of Cumberland from the position in which he had been involved. Can anybody doubt that being called a portrait of Lord Ligonier? It is a proper accompaniment, which points out a fact in his history; like writing over it the name, to say ‘ the portrait of Lord Ligonier, distinguished so and so.’ Again, there is a portrait, now in the possession of Sir Robert Peel, painted by Lawrence, of the Duke of Wellington. He is in the field of Waterloo, wrapped in a cloak, with a telescope in his hand, and the battle in the distance: that is a portrait of the Duke of Wellington. Who ever called it otherwise? It is monstrous to say it is otherwise. What name would you call it? The Battle of Waterloo? That would be quite an absurdity. It is the Duke of Wellington on the field of Waterloo. It is a portrait of the Duke of Wellington, and properly called a portrait.”

And after referring to several other instances, he continued :—

“ Look at an historical picture; I will take the instance of Mr. West's picture of the death of General Wolfe. A remarkable picture; it is filled with portraits. That does not alter the character of the picture; it is still an historical picture representing the death of General Wolfe. They are said to be remarkable likenesses, but it does not affect the nature of the picture, because the portraits are mere accessories, the



historical picture is the principal. If the portrait be the principal, the other things that are introduced are meant to be mere accessories, characteristic of the individual, or pointing out some particular position in which he acquired distinction.\*

It cannot be said that Lyndhurst in his various Chancellorships did nothing; but he did little, and nothing important, to reform the practice and correct the abuses of his court. The Duke of Wellington told General Alava that he had done all he could to prevail on Lyndhurst to undertake Chancery reform, but Lyndhurst had not the energy for it.† He originated and carried some other measures of legal reform of secondary, but not one of first, importance. For factious purposes he made himself the mouthpiece of a confederation of London attorneys who from interested motives opposed Brougham's Local Courts Bill. Lyndhurst defeated the Bill, and delayed for over twelve years the establishment of our County Court system.‡

On his career as a statesman there is no need to dwell at length. If the chief note of statesmanship be foresight followed by a subsequent general acceptance of his opinions, that note is in Lyndhurst's case wanting. He used to say "I have tried to do something for my country in my place in Parliament,"§ but that something was mainly resisting and obstructing the great measures which since Lord Grey's advent to power have received the sanction of Parliament. It is impossible to say that his conduct on the Roman Catholic question was that of a statesman. Foresight there was none in the man who could make his speech of 1827, repeat it in 1828, and yet be "amongst the most nimble in that quick movement of sudden transition which took place in 1829;"|| and nothing can be weaker than Martin's attempt to vindicate his consistency. Nor is his position in regard to the Reform question more creditable to his character for statesmanship. Martin denies that he might and would have remained Chancellor in the Grey Ministry;¶ but Greville, who frequented the political society of that time and was an intimate friend of both Lord and Lady Lyndhurst, and therefore a witness of greater weight than Martin, affirms that

\* *The Jurist*, vol. ix. (1845) 359, *et seq.*

† "Memoir of Earl Spencer," p. 289, note.

‡ Martin, p. 308 *et seq.*; *vide* quotation from Greville, p. 312, note. Conf. "Lives of the Chancellors," vol. viii. p. 90 *et seq.*

§ Preface, vol. i.

|| Brougham's speech of February 24, 1835.

¶ Pp. 272-3. On this last page Martin says:—"It is now known that the King, acting upon the advice of the Duke of Wellington, suggested that the Great Seal should be offered to Brougham." We wish Sir Theodore had given his authority for this statement. It is either unsupported or contradicted by every published Diary, Memoir, or other record of the events of that time.

when the Duke went out "Lord Grey was very anxious to keep Lyndhurst as his Chancellor, and would have done so if it had not been for Brougham."\* With this agrees the remark made by Lyndhurst's secretary to Campbell which we have quoted. Had this idea been carried out, we should have had as good speeches from Lyndhurst in favour of reform as we had against it. Indeed, Martin would have us believe "that Lyndhurst had no doubt a very considerable measure of reform was necessary; and in his speeches in opposition to Earl Grey's successive Bills he made no secret of this conviction."† We have often read Lyndhurst's anti-Reform speeches, but can find no trace of any feeling in favour of a very considerable measure of reform. Greville, on the authority of Lady Lyndhurst, relates a story (which he did not believe) that the Duke, after his memorable declaration against all reform, "resolved to offer a resolution to the effect that, in any future case of borough delinquency, the representation should be transferred to a great town;‡ and Campbell refers to some general observations by Lyndhurst, in his speech of October, 1831, indicating an inclination in favour of well-considered reform."§ He may therefore have suggested to the Duke the plan of which his wife was aware.

Looking at the course which the Lords took, both before and after 1832, with regard to corrupt boroughs,|| it is clear such a scheme would have indefinitely postponed reform. This probably was Lyndhurst's idea of "well-considered reform," for in fact in all the reform debates he speaks as if he fully agreed with the general feeling of his party as expressed by one of their leading organs. "If schedule A and the £10 clause stand, there is an end of the monarchy, the church and the funds. Universal misery must ensue; if these portals of pandemonium stand open."¶ In conformity with this opinion was his proposal to postpone the disfranchising clauses and schedule A until after the enfranchising clauses were carried, and so was the close of his last speech on the bill. After stating his belief that its tendency was to destroy the monarchy and the constitution, he thus concluded: "The Reformers are triumphant, the barriers are broken down, the waters are out; who can predict their course, or tell the devastation they will occasion."\*\*

\* "Diary," vol. ii. pp. 64, 89, 93.

† P. 271.

‡ "Diary," vol. ii. p. 60.

§ "Lives of the Chancellors," vol. viii. p. 76. Conf. "Martin," p. 290.

|| *Vide* "Fifty Years of the House of Lords," pp. 48 *et seq.*

¶ *Blackwood's Magazine*, May, 1832.

\*\* "Martin," p. 304.

In a recent number of this REVIEW we stated our views of the result of the first Reform Act, and of the cognate measure, "The Municipal Corporations Reform Act," and there we beg leave to refer our readers for the expression of our opinion on the claim to statesman-like foresight\* for Lyndhurst, the malignant opponent of both. Martin would have his readers believe that "Lyndhurst did not try to defeat the Municipal Bill, but honestly attempted to improve it; and the best evidence that he succeeded is the fact that the Commons accepted his most important amendments, and modified others in a way to which he did not object."† Martin must either be himself or think his readers are wholly ignorant of the history of the measure, or he would not venture on such rash and baseless assertions. Lyndhurst's opposition to Municipal Reform was the more remarkable because from the Tamworth manifesto it is plain Peel contemplated legislation on the subject in the spirit of the Whig measure, if his Ministry—in which Lyndhurst was Chancellor—had remained in office. Nor is Martin more accurate as to the relations between Lyndhurst and Peel in 1835-6. He rejects as incredible the idea that "Lyndhurst aspired to oust Peel from the Leadership"‡ of their party, and describes, "as a choice specimen of the way history is falsified," the statement in the *Times* memoir of Lyndhurst§ that when, in consequence of the havoc made by Lyndhurst and his majority in the Municipal Corporations Bill, the Melbourne Ministry thought of resigning, and Peel, disgusted at Lyndhurst's conduct in mutilating the bill which he, Peel, had supported, had retired to Drayton Manor, William IV. directly appealed to Lyndhurst to take the reins if Peel refused; that Lyndhurst accepted the King's "expression of his desire as an injunction," and that it was arranged that he should be Premier with, at the King's own suggestion, an earldom and the disposal of twelve seats in the House of Commons for promising young aspirants of the Tory party, three of whom were Mr. Disraeli, Mr. Thesiger (afterwards Lord Chelmsford) and the late Mr. Bickham Escot. Martin boldly asserts that

"In no one particular is there the slightest foundation for the story thus elaborately told. Monstrous in itself, as implying gross treachery in both the King and Lord Lyndhurst—in the King to his Ministry, to whom he was ostensibly giving his confidence, and in

---

\* WESTMINSTER REVIEW, N. S., No. CXXIV. Oct. 1882, pp. 456 *et seq.*

† P. 340. As to the alterations in the Bill, conf. "Fifty Years of the House of Lords," pp. 70 *et seq.*

‡ P. 341.

§ *Times*, Oct. 13, 1863, reprinted in "Mornings of the Recess," vol. ii. p. 28, quoted by Martin, p. 342.

Lyndhurst to Sir Robert Peel, with whom he was then acting, . . . it is ludicrous in the suggestion that twelve seats in a reformed House of Commons could have been placed at Lyndhurst's disposal."\*

We remark, in passing, that the King's hatred of his Ministers was so intense that he would only receive them on compulsion, and that he had with them none of the social intercourse usual between the Sovereign and his Ministers.† It would not have been difficult in 1835, and long after, to have found twelve or more seats for nomination boroughs, and it has been suggested that these seats might have been wholly or in part county seats. We learn from a contemporary that

"It was generally supposed to have been told on the authority of the person who, after Lyndhurst himself, was chiefly concerned with the supposed transaction. If Mr. Disraeli directly or indirectly made the communication to the *Times*, he must have had some foundation for a statement which nevertheless cannot have been literally true. . . . The theory that the story is purely fictitious is itself improbable."‡

In this opinion we thoroughly concur.

As to Lyndhurst's relations with Peel we cannot accept the dictum of Martin. He did not in 1835, or at any time, know Lyndhurst who was not then married§ to or even known to his second wife, and his daughters were then too young to know the *arcana* of their father's political life. We must therefore look to the evidence of those who were living and engaged in the politics of 1835. Campbell in his autobiography narrates: "About this time Lyndhurst and other ultra-Tories had formed a plan of deposing Peel from his lead. Stephenson|| lately told me that in 1835 or 1836 Lyndhurst consulted him as to whether Follett might not do to be set up as a leader in Peel's place."¶ And he further records that when he remonstrated with Lyndhurst on his striking out clauses in the Municipal Corporations Bill, which Peel had supported in the Commons, a proceeding at the "impertinence" of which Martin is shocked,\*\* Lynd-

\* P. 343.

† "Greville," vol. iii. p. 364.

‡ The *Saturday Review*, Dec. 22, 1883, p. 802. The *Times* reviewer of Martin's "Life of Lyndhurst" does not refer to this story or Martin's denial of it. The forthcoming *Life of Lord Beaconsfield* by Lord Rowton, will probably throw light on the events of this time.

§ At the close of the session, 1838, Lyndhurst went to Paris. "Here he was introduced to Georgiana, daughter of Lewis Goldsmith, Esq., to whom, after a short interval, he was married on August 5, 1838."—Martin, p. 379.

|| One of the managers, we believe, of the Tory party.

¶ "Life of Campbell," vol. ii. p. 67. Conf. "Life of Sumner," vol. ii. p. 56.

\*\* P. 341.

hurst's only answer was—"Peel! what is Peel to me? d—n Peel!" and this, he adds, "was not mere bravado or laxity of talk." Elsewhere however he admits that "this might be only *badinage* intimating that he would not be slavishly led by Peel, although he might still consider him the head of the party."\* Campbell is supported by Greville from whom we learn that Lyndhurst did not think Peel enough a man "of the world for his position, and that he himself "had not been much consulted"† in the formation of the Ministry of 1835; that Lyndhurst, ambitious to be the head of the Tory party, in defiance of Peel's opinion, overruled Wellington and insisted on opposing the principle of the Municipal Bill;‡ that in the committee on the bill Lyndhurst again "overruled the Duke and neglected Peel;" that Lord Russell had no doubt Peel highly disapproved of Lyndhurst's proceedings which it was evident he did not pretend to guide, and that it was known in the Tory party that Peel was angry at Lyndhurst's conduct.

Lyndhurst's political courage his versatile ability and his masculine eloquence were known to the world, but—to quote Lord Beaconsfield—"his intimates only were acquainted with the tenderness of his disposition, the sweetness of his temper, and the playfulness of his light and airy spirit."§ Of these characteristics there are abundant illustrations in this volume.

It is said that "he passed his later years in search of a religious belief."|| As to this there is evidence which appears to be unknown to Martin. We do not know that, like Brougham, Lyndhurst ever "avowed himself as belonging or inclined to the Evangelical party,"¶ but we read of him "being, when a very clever young lawyer, at a garden-party at Henry Thornton's at Clapham, at which Wilberforce, Hannah More, Zachary Macaulay, Babington, the young Grants,\*\* and young Stephen,†† were among the guests."‡‡ This early acquaintance with the 'Clapham Sect' may be the cause of his afterwards, when Chancellor, appointing the future Lord Macaulay a Commissioner in Bankruptcy. As to his latest years Lady Bloomfield says—

\* "Lives of the Chancellors," vol. viii. p. 109.

† "Greville," vol. iii. pp. 189-90.

‡ *Ibid.*, pp. 283, 341, 391.

§ Quoted by Martin, p. 379, from the Preface to the Collected Edition of Lord Beaconsfield's Novels, p. 18.

|| "Some Professional Recollections," by a former member of the Incorporated Law Society, p. 125.

¶ Teignmouth's "Reminiscences of Many Years," vol. ii. p. 278, note.

\*\* *i.e.*, Robert Grant and his brother Charles, afterwards Lord Glenelg.

†† Afterwards Sir James Stephen.

‡‡ On the authority of Mr. Colquhoun, quoted by Dr. Stoughton in his sketch of William Wilberforce, p. 180.

“My brother-in-law Captain Trotter gave me some very interesting details about Lord Lyndhurst whom he visited constantly during his last illness, reading the Bible with him regularly every week for a year and a half before he died. Trotter said at first it was alarming, for Lord Lyndhurst’s mind was so wonderfully bright and clear, and his views decidedly sceptical; but he always bowed to the authority of Scripture and accepted readily any doctrine founded on that. He died a humble but most sincere believer.”\*

“When approaching ninety” (says Sir Henry Holland) “he exercised his mental faculties keenly on the religious questions of the day, especially those suggested by the volume of ‘Essays and Reviews’ just published. Some of these were obviously new to his thoughts, and it interested me much to mark a mind thus powerful, and largely exercised upon other subjects, grasping for the first time a question of evidence such as that of Scriptural Inspiration on which he often conversed with me.”†

Within six months of his death he was visited by the late Bishop Wilberforce who found him “bright, cheerful, busy; specially occupied about religious reading, clear in faith; Colenso’s doubts no shake to him.”‡ By whatever process of reasoning he had attained to a religious faith which to him subjectively was “an anchor of the soul both sure and steadfast, entering into that within the veil.” As death rapidly approached—

“His mind seemed absorbed in the contemplation of that new world which he was about to enter. He was asked if he was happy. ‘Happy? Yes, happy!’ he replied in feeble accents but loud enough for all to hear, and then with a stronger effort he added ‘Supremely happy!’ Soon afterwards he passed gently and tranquilly away” (p. 513).

We end this review with our estimate of Lyndhurst as a public man, which we express partly in his own words, and partly in those in which Chief Baron Pollock, who well knew both Lyndhurst and Campbell, described Campbell.

From Lyndhurst we borrow the words: What was he but “a successful lawyer?” and to him we accommodate Pollock’s description of Campbell:—

“He was undoubtedly a very considerable man, with various and eminent qualifications for success in life, but he was quite as remarkable for being unscrupulous as for any other quality. . . . It would be false to say he had no truth or honesty in him. He had, and he had much. He had all that was not inconsistent with his interest and personal ambition; but we think he had very little more.§

\* “Reminiscences of Court and Diplomatic Life,” vol. ii. p. 159.

† Quoted by Martin, p. 512.

‡ “Life of Bishop Wilberforce,” vol. iii. p. 90.

§ P. 520.

## ART. IV.—REPRESENTATION AND MISREPRESENTATION.

**T**HE equalization of the franchise in counties and boroughs will necessitate, as is admitted by all parties, a further measure next session to correct the inequality in the size of constituencies which the present Bill will greatly aggravate. But besides its effect in increasing this inequality, it will seriously lessen the probability that different constituencies will return members representing different shades of opinion, and this will not be corrected by any redistribution of seats. It is desirable, therefore, that the whole method now adopted for returning members to Parliament should be considered, in order to ascertain whether it accomplishes its objects satisfactorily, or whether an improvement in the methods of voting is required as well as an alteration in the constituencies and in the numbers of members returned by them.

The objects of this paper will be, first, to point out the deficiencies of the present system ; secondly, to describe the different methods that have been proposed for amending it—viz., the adoption of equal electoral districts returning one member, or the substitution of some method of proportional representation for election by simple majorities ; and thirdly, to show how the latter, if adopted, can be gradually introduced without any great or sudden change in our electoral system.

Most persons will probably agree that the most important objects to be attained in any system of representation are, first, to secure that when an appeal is made to the country on any political question the majority in the Parliament chosen shall hold the views of the majority of the electors ; and secondly, that the members chosen shall so reflect the views of their constituents that the measures passed during the existence of the Parliament shall also be in accordance with the wishes, or at any rate be passed with the tacit consent, of the majority of the voters. It is true that there are some who contend that the different classes of the community should be represented in Parliament, and that questions should not be decided merely by the wishes of a majority of the voters ; but though it is doubtless desirable that all classes of the electors should be fairly represented, no system would seem to be satisfactory which carried out the wishes of the minority of the people merely because they belonged to a particular class, and the opinion that every voter should have an equal voice in the election of a House of Commons appears to be daily gaining strength throughout the country.

Assuming then that the object to be attained is the government of the country by the majority of the people, we must examine whether the present system, if amended by such a Redistribution Act as would proportion the number of members chosen in each constituency to the number of its electors, would accomplish this end.

And first, does the present system secure that at a general election a parliament shall be returned in accordance with the views of a majority of the electors? It is obvious that theoretically it does not. If two-thirds of the constituencies were nearly equally divided, but had a slight Conservative majority, while the remaining third, from their local position or the character of the population, had a large Liberal majority, it is clear that two-thirds of the members elected would be Conservatives, while of the whole number of voters a large majority would be Liberal. Nor does this result seem improbable; thus Scotland, Ireland, and Wales might upon some question be almost unanimously of one opinion, while the English constituencies were, mostly by small majorities, of the contrary opinion; or, as pointed out by Mr. Fawcett in a recent speech, the centres of the working-class population might be almost unanimously in favour of some Bill, while the other constituencies were nearly equally divided, but on the whole against it. But what is more important is that the danger is not merely theoretical, but such a result has actually taken place.

In the year 1874, on an appeal to the country by the Liberals, a Conservative majority of fifty was returned, while in the contested constituencies the Liberal voters were estimated to have been in a majority of 301,662; and it can be shown that if there had been a contest in the whole of the constituencies the balance of parties would not have been altered. The number of the electors in the uncontested constituencies which returned Liberals was 182,396, and in the uncontested constituencies which returned Conservatives 389,360; or an excess in these Conservative constituencies of 206,964. The real majority of Conservatives over Liberals in the uncontested constituencies would be less than this, but in any case there would remain a majority of Liberal voters in the whole kingdom of about 100,000. The nation, therefore, was Liberal, yet the Parliament they elected had a substantial Conservative majority.

It has been thought by some that this result arose from inequality in the size of the constituencies and from the existence of small pocket boroughs, and that it would not recur after such a redistribution of seats, as would make the number of members proportionate to the number of voters in each constituency. And no doubt it was partly due to this cause, but only partly, for it can



be shown that even if the constituencies had returned members in proportion to the number of their electors there would still have been a Conservative majority of sixteen.\*

The election of 1874, therefore, shows conclusively that under the present mode of electing representatives, even after a redistribution of seats, if there be no provision for the representation of minorities the Parliament returned at a general election will not always express the opinion of the majority of the electors on the question submitted to them. In judging of the evil likely to result from this it must be remembered that the questions submitted to the constituencies at a general election are usually questions of importance upon which the feelings of the country have been excited; and there might well come times when the knowledge that the wishes of the country were misrepresented in the House of Commons, and that changes were carried out or abuses preserved against the express desire of the people would lead to civil discord; in any case such a state of affairs would greatly weaken the prestige and influence of Parliament.

It may, perhaps, be thought that Parliament would not long withstand the wishes of the people, but this is only true when in case of a dissolution the wishes of the majority of the nation would be expressed in the new Parliament; as long as the course pursued by a government is approved in the majority of constituencies there will be little hope of its alteration, merely because it is opposed to the wishes of the majority of the people.

Besides the matters upon which by a dissolution the nation is able to express its own opinion, there is a great mass of legislation in which the nation only speaks through its representatives, and we have next to consider how far the present system of representation by majorities secures that their representa-

---

\* The total number of voters in constituencies which returned none but Conservative members was 1,002,652; in addition to this there were 247,578 voters in constituencies entitled to return three members, and who would but for the minority clause have returned three Conservatives, making a total of 1,250,230 voters in constituencies that would have returned Conservatives. The number of voters in constituencies which returned none but Liberal members was 1,115,042, and in Glasgow which returned two Liberals and one Conservative 56,727, or 1,171,769 voters in all in constituencies which would have returned Liberals. The constituencies returning Conservatives, therefore, contained 78,461 more electors than those returning Liberals, and as the average number of voters to each member was 4,790 they would have had sixteen more members if they had returned members in proportion to their size. The remaining constituencies numbering 701,124 voters returned one Liberal and one Conservative, and would not have affected the question. If, therefore, the constituencies had been rearranged and grouped so as to return members in proportion to their size, there would still have been a Conservative majority of sixteen in Parliament, notwithstanding the majority of Liberal electors in the country.

tives shall, in their action in Parliament, carry out substantially the wishes of the majority of the people. It has been a subject of remark that the majority in Parliament when it has represented the majority of the voters has often over-represented it. In a large number of the constituencies parties are nearly equally divided, and a small change in the popular opinions will very largely change the character of the representation. This was formerly much less the case than at present; the opinions in different parts of the country were much more distinct, and the differences in the character of the franchise added to the probability that the constituencies would be very decidedly of one character or the other; but in times of great excitement the successful party has always obtained a disproportionate majority in Parliament, and now the vast increase in communication between different places, the increasing number of persons living in the country and working in town, and the spread of newspapers and books, have all tended to make the constituencies far more like one another than formerly, and to bring into each constituency the division of opinion that exists in the county as a whole. The difference is still to some extent preserved by the different franchises in counties and boroughs; but when these are done away with, as is certain to be the case before any redistribution of seats takes place, there will be still more probability that the opinions of the constituencies will be substantially alike, and that the opinion even slightly the more popular in the country will secure an overwhelming majority in Parliament. This result of the present system we may again test by facts. Taking as an instance of former elections, when public opinion was highly excited, the first Parliament elected after the Reform Act of 1832, when there was a strong Liberal feeling throughout the nation, an examination shows that the Liberal and Conservative votes throughout the country were in the proportion of three to two, and the Liberal majority in Parliament should have been 131. It was no less than 307, the Liberal members being nearly three times as numerous as the Conservatives. Again, at the last election, the actual Liberal majority was 60, there being 359 Liberals, 237 Conservatives, and 62 Home Rulers; and if each constituency had returned members in proportion to the number of its voters, as explained above, and the minority clause had been done away with, the numbers would have been 431 Liberals, 198 Conservatives, and 24 Home Rulers, or a Liberal majority over Conservatives and Home Rulers of 208. It is of course impossible to say what was the actual Liberal majority in the country, but taking the returns of the constituencies in which there were contests, and estimating as far as possible the state of opinion of

those constituencies in which there were not, it is probable that the actual Liberal majority over the Conservatives and Home Rulers was not more than 230,000, which should have given a majority of only 54 members in Parliament.

But, it may be asked, is it not desirable that the party which has a majority in the country should have a good working majority in Parliament, considering the power of obstruction even a small minority can exert? And is it not therefore desirable that the majority in Parliament should be greater than that in the country? Without denying that there is some force in this argument, it may be doubted from the experience of the past whether a Government with a very large majority—which for that very reason is liable to split and become disorganized—is better able to carry its measures than a government with a small and compact majority. But apart from this, while obstruction may be met in other ways, there is danger that, where one party in the State is largely over-represented, the wishes of a minority of the nation will prevail in Parliament. The Government is bound to carry out the wishes of the majority of the House of Commons; and if the Government itself should only bring in measures which will secure the substantial approval of the whole of the members of their party, amendments would certainly be moved representing the wishes of the majority of the House, although opposed not only by the opposition but by a section of their own party, and these would be carried by members representing only a minority of the electors, and therefore presumably against the wishes of the people. To illustrate the mode in which this might work, let us suppose the question of the Disestablishment of the English Church were brought before the constituencies, and that three-quarters of the constituencies returned members pledged to support it (in making this supposition we express no opinion as to the probability of such an event), though the votes given for and against the measure throughout the country were only in the proportion of six to five—not an improbable discrepancy when the franchises throughout the country are equalized. Disestablishment being resolved on, the further question of disendowment would have to be considered; and it might well be that 350 of the 490 Liberal members would be in favour of very stringent provisions, and would be able to carry them, although the Conservatives and remainder of the Liberals were opposed to them; such provisions, representing the wishes of only two-thirds of the Liberal party, would represent the opinions of little more than a third of the voters, and thus the will of the minority of the nation would prevail. If a second appeal to the country were made, no alteration would take place unless the feeling

was sufficiently strong to cause a division in the Liberal party : but if this took place it would shift the majority over to the side of the Conservatives, who would be opposed even to the dis-establishment of the Church, and the wishes of what had been shown to be a minority of the nation would in this case also prevail. It is thought by many that this danger will be met partly by the effect of public opinion, and partly by the good sense so characteristic of the English people, which has prevented the Government of the country from running into extremes, and no doubt it is possible to over-estimate the evils likely to occur. But it is doubtful how far a public opinion, which is incapable of expressing itself at the polling booth, would materially affect the course of legislation. In the discussion on the Agricultural Holdings Bill, and the Irish Land Act, as has been pointed out by Professor Fawcett, but little consideration was given to the wants and wishes of the agricultural labourers who had no votes, while those of the tenant farmers, whose opinions might affect the seats of the county members, were not similarly neglected ; and though under any form of government one may hope that the nation may continue to prosper, this is no reason for failing to secure the best form that is possible, the more so as in questions on which party feeling runs high, a single mistake often causes damage that may take long to repair. It may be that the effect of the legislation following, in the way we have described, the wishes of a party which were really in a minority would be to make the rest of the nation oppose the Government, so as to bring into power another Government on the next general election. But under the present system, if this did occur, the new Parliament would be equally out of harmony with the nation itself, though in the opposite direction ; thus, if measures more radical than the electors approved were passed in one Parliament, a Government representing a reactionary Conservatism would probably be brought into power by the next, and we should experience the evil of changes from one extreme to the other of party government, a result towards which there are already some signs of our approach.

There is another way in which, under the present system, the wishes of a minority may prevail over those of the majority. In many constituencies there is a small number of voters holding strong views upon some particular point—such as the Irish Question, or Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister—who practically hold the balance between the two parties, and who, if their views are not very distasteful to the rest of the constituency, succeed in securing that the candidate brought forward should be one in agreement with their views. In this way the opinions of a comparatively small number of voters may often

obtain in Parliament a large support, which may be further increased by the pressure which those holding similar views in other constituencies can bring to bear upon their members to at least abstain from voting when the question is before the House. It is true that if the question is of such importance that a dissolution is likely to take place upon it, members would desire to vote in accordance with the opinions of the majority and not of the minority of their supporters; but in minor matters the wishes of a comparatively small but energetic minority not unfrequently prevail. The practical danger of this state of things seems more than likely to be illustrated at the next general election. In many constituencies there is a considerable number of Irish voters who are able to hold the balance between the parties, and although it may be hoped that English feeling will be sufficiently strong to prevent candidates giving way unduly to the pressure of the Irish electors, it is obvious that in addition to the danger of the Irish Home Rulers in Parliament being able to keep the balance between the Government and Opposition, there is the danger that English members may be subject to great and undue pressure to vote in accordance with the wishes of the Irish voters in their constituencies. The dangerous influence which may be exerted by a body of men who hold their opinions strongly and are scattered through the different constituencies is shown by the present position of affairs in America. Large sections of the population are as indignant as Englishmen themselves that the United States should be used as a place for planning and providing funds for the dynamite outrages in England; but it seems doubtful whether the Government will dare to adopt strong measures of repression, because the Irish voters hold the balance of power in many constituencies, and it is necessary for the Government therefore to avoid any measure which would be unpopular with them. Hence, it would seem that the present system fails to secure that the wishes of the majority of the nation should be carried out, either after a general election, or in the general business of Parliament.

Hitherto we have referred especially to the questions which divide the two great parties in the State, but there is happily much legislation which is outside party lines, and the questions dealt with by it are becoming of more importance in public estimation. The dwellings of the poor, colonial government, criminal law, and other matters of social and practical moment are constantly coming before the House, and upon such questions there is still less security under the present system that the wishes of the majority of the electors will prevail. The members sitting in the House have been elected by little more than half of the electors in the country. Those who have elected

them have had in the choice of their candidates some opportunity of expressing their opinions on these and other matters, but the electors who voted for the unsuccessful candidates, although they, too, in the choice of those candidates, may have had regard to these questions, have no effect upon the constitution of Parliament. Thus in a constituency returning a Conservative, some guess may be made at the opinions of the Conservative electors on the question of temperance legislation, but no effect at all is given to the opinions of the Liberal electors upon such important questions, though they may be less numerous than the Conservatives only by twenty or thirty. It is of course true that the opinion of one-half the electors of the country will probably be to some extent similar to those of the other half, but this will be by no means universally the case; and at any rate cannot justify depriving nearly one-half of the electors of the power of influencing the decision of Parliament on these questions. In a three-cornered constituency, since all the electors will have had a voice in selecting one or other of their members, all will have had some weight in deciding the votes of Parliament on these social questions.

In addition to the main point that it should enable the majority to govern, there are other requirements which should be fulfilled by a good system of representation. In the first place it should provide for the House of Commons containing a representation of the minority sufficient to secure that in the discussions in Parliament their views may be fairly represented, and that they shall not be condemned unheard; and this would seem to apply not only to the case of the regular opposition, but also to that of any considerable body of opinion in the country. The present system makes no provision for this. As has been shown, the representatives of the regular Opposition are often much below their proportionate strength, and though it might be supposed that other opinions would find expression in Parliament through the views of different members, even if not predominant in any one constituency, yet this in practice is found not to be always the case, since the necessity that a candidate under the present system should not be distasteful to any section of the electors makes it difficult for a man, however able, holding any unpopular opinion to get chosen as a candidate.

Probably different opinions will be held as to the extent to which important sections of the community should be directly represented. That crotchet-mongers would add to the obstruction which already almost incapacitates Parliament for its work is true, but the picked men of a body of voters forming a quarter or one-sixth of a constituency do not deserve that name, and it is not only fairer that such a body of opinion should be directly

represented, but far abler representatives of those opinions would probably be selected by their own friends than the members of Parliament who, selected without reference to them, happen to hold such opinions. It is well that the degree in which the representation of minorities is secured by different systems of voting should be clearly understood. Under the present system, and under that of equal electoral districts, no one can be elected who does not obtain the votes—*i.e.*, the approval, of half the electors. This seems likely to discourage the selection of the really best man, since a man of strong character is sure to have some enemies, and as in the case of the American Presidency, and for the same reason, the best man is often passed over. The present system of minority voting makes very little alteration in this, since no one can be returned (except in the cases in which too many candidates stand) who does not secure the whole of the minority, which must be very nearly half the constituency, or else two-thirds of the majority. In the case of cumulative or alternative voting, a candidate will be returned who obtains the quota, which is obtained by dividing the number of voter by one more than the number of seats. The difference between cumulative and alternative voting with regard to the power of the voter is that in cumulative voting the voter can, if he likes, influence in some degree the election of all the candidates by splitting his votes, instead of influencing to a greater degree the return of one. No such power would, of course, be possessed in electoral districts returning one member, nor is it easy to see why this privilege should be given in some constituencies only if it is of importance. In the alternative voting the elector has only the power of giving one vote, but that will certainly be effective in returning some member, and every elector will therefore have a similar influence in electing the Parliament by which they are to be governed.

Again, it is very important that the electors should be able to exercise a free choice among all the persons who are willing to serve them. It is by this means that they are able, as we have said, to express their opinions upon questions which are not of party significance. Under the present system, on the contrary, the selection of candidates rests almost entirely with the party leaders, whether these be the committee of an elected four hundred or the officers of an association; since if an independent candidate stands he only endangers the success of the other candidates of his party without securing his own. Nor are the leaders always able to exercise a free choice, they are sometimes obliged to adopt a candidate who has come forward, in order to avoid dividing the party. This is well illus-

trated by the elections for the borough of Northampton. For three successive elections Mr. Bradlaugh had stood with two other Liberal candidates, and in each case had been the lowest of the three; but in two cases out of these three Liberal candidates standing had caused a Conservative to be returned. In the election of 1880 Mr. Bradlaugh again insisted on standing, and the electors had therefore to choose between returning a Liberal candidate, whom they had three times shown they considered ineligible, or allowing a Conservative to be elected; a position in which no constituency ought to be placed.

One other defect of the present system is that from time to time it enables the minority to elect the candidate in a particular constituency, and though this does not materially affect the relative strength of parties in the House, as it may occur to each party in turn, it does give an undue advantage to the party that is most disciplined. This arises from the fact that more candidates come forward on one side than there are vacancies, while on the other side this does not occur, and the latter, though really in a minority in the constituency, thus usually succeeds. This difficulty is avoided in France by a system of double ballots, no candidate being elected in the first instance unless he receives an absolute majority of the whole of the votes polled; a second ballot otherwise taking place at which a simple majority is sufficient to return the candidate. The first ballot usually serves to indicate which of the candidates on each side should retire, and thus the difficulty above mentioned is practically met. Such a system, however, lengthens the election and causes unnecessary expense, and in the end only partially achieves its object, since the candidates cannot be compelled to retire; it does, however, enable several candidates of each party to stand in the first instance without injuring their party, and would be in that respect a valuable addition to the present system in England if it is to be retained.

That the present system is defective in all these respects will probably be admitted by all who have studied the question, and these evils are likely to be greatly aggravated by the new Reform Bill. The assimilation of the franchise will, as has been shown, make it more likely that minorities should be either over or under represented, and a similar effect will be produced by the redistribution of seats, if it gives members to the larger towns at all in proportion to the number of their population. The reason, as we have seen, that the members returned to Parliament are not entirely of the predominant party is, that in different constituencies different opinions prevail, but this advantage is lost when many members are returned by one large constituency and by a simple majority vote. The evil of this was felt even with



regard to constituencies returning three members at the time of the last Reform Bill, and led to the introduction of the minority clause, but if a larger number of members than three are to be returned for a single constituency, the reason for such a provision will be very greatly strengthened.

Many modes have been proposed for lessening or removing the defects of the present system; they may, however, be divided into two classes, the first of these proposes to divide the country into constituencies returning only one member, cutting up the larger towns and counties into electoral divisions or districts; it is thought that by thus increasing the number of constituencies it will be more probable that the different opinions held by different sections of the nation will be predominant in one or other of them, and it has even been suggested, in the *Spectator*, that the constituencies should be purposely so divided that some divisions would be likely to contain a majority of Liberals, and others a majority of Conservatives. The alternative proposal is to divide the country into constituencies each returning several members, or to group constituencies together, allowing all voters the privilege of voting for any candidate proposed for a constituency in the group, and then to secure either by limited, cumulative, or alternative voting in the way to be hereafter explained, that Liberal and Conservative members shall be returned in proportion to the number of Liberal and Conservative voters in the constituency or group. These latter systems are included for convenience under the general term Proportional Representation. It is not likely that either equal electoral districts or proportional representation will be entirely carried out by the new Reform Bill, but one or other will probably be partially adopted, and it is important, therefore, that their relative advantages and disadvantages should be carefully weighed with a view to making some progress towards whichever is decided to be best. To do so is the main object of this paper.

The system of equal electoral districts appears to be mainly advocated with the view of securing that whichever party forms the majority of the nation shall, at a dissolution, secure a majority in Parliament; it is very doubtful, however, whether it would to any considerable extent have this effect. We have seen that in 1874 if each constituency had returned a number of members proportional to its size, a liberal electorate would still have returned a Conservative Parliament. If the smaller constituencies had been combined and the larger ones divided, so as to give equal electoral districts, the loss of variety by combining the smaller constituencies would probably nearly, if not quite, have counterbalanced the increase of variety obtained by the division of the

larger ones ; not entirely, perhaps, as the total number of constituencies would be considerably increased if none were to return more than one member ; but this would be more than counterbalanced by the assimilation of the county and borough franchises ; and we see no ground for believing that equal electoral districts with the new franchise would be more likely to secure the authority of the majority of the nation in Parliament than the present constituencies with the present franchise, if returning members in proportion to their size.

The system of equal electoral districts would, indeed, prevent the aggravation of the present evils which, as we have pointed out, is likely to result from having large constituencies returning seven or eight members, and it is partly with this view that it is put forward by its present supporters, but, as we have shown, more than this is required.

The system of equal electoral districts, does not profess to deal with the other defects above pointed out. It affords no opportunity to the nation as a whole to express its opinion on questions not relating to party. It does not provide for the representation of any of the smaller parties in the State, and it leaves the choice of candidates as much fettered as at present.

In addition however to the inadequacy of the proposal there are at least two grave disadvantages which would follow its adoption :—

First, it would involve a re-arrangement of the constituencies every ten years. If each constituency returns several members the proper proportion of electoral power may be secured to each by increasing or diminishing the number of members when the population changes, without altering the constituency itself ; but if each constituency is to return only one member, and to contain the same number of electors, the boundaries of the constituencies themselves must be changed, at short intervals. Such a process would waste the time of Parliament and embitter party feeling, apart from its effect upon the constituencies so interfered with. Even if alterations were only made when the inequality in the size of the constituencies had become considerable, an alteration of boundaries would be required in several constituencies after each census, entailing all the difficulties of a fresh Reform Act.

But secondly, the constituencies under such a system would have no existence, except for the purpose of the parliamentary elections, and in the intervals between the elections it would be difficult to keep alive in them any political feeling. In the case of a municipal borough the electors are in the habit of meeting for the purpose of considering and managing their local affairs, and being accustomed to meet they are able from time to time when an election occurs to perform satisfactorily the higher duty of selecting a representative for the Parliament of the nation.

The political life of Birmingham, Leeds, and other great towns, well illustrates this; but all must be sacrificed if electoral districts are adopted. Even the political organization and interests which might arise in such a constituency after a long series of years will be impossible when the boundaries are constantly changing, and districts which in one decade are in one constituency, will in the next decade be in another. The corporate life of her great cities has always been one of the most useful forces in the English constitution, and it would need great advantages to counter-balance the loss which will be felt if Birmingham, Leeds, Liverpool, and Manchester cease to form part of our body politic. The difference between the political life in them and in the great metropolitan boroughs may indicate what will be the effect of the subdivision for parliamentary purposes of our great municipalities.

The other mode that has been proposed of remedying the present evils is to adopt one of the forms of proportional representation which we must now consider.

The first of these consists in giving to each voter a less number of votes than the number of members to be elected, as is at present the case in the constituencies returning more than two members. This will secure that, when parties are nearly equally divided, the party which is in a minority will obtain one or more of the seats. For example, if a constituency consists of 6,000 Liberal and 5,000 Conservative voters, and returns three members, then if each voter has only two votes, if three Liberal candidates stand, and the 12,000 Liberal votes are equally divided between them, each candidate will receive only 4,000 votes; while if two Conservative candidates stand each will receive 5,000 votes. Only two Liberal candidates therefore would in fact stand, who would be returned with 6,000 each, one of the Conservative candidates being elected as a third member.

This illustration will show the defects to which this system is open. If either party miscalculates its strength, and runs more candidates than it can return, it will probably return one less than the number to which it is entitled. Thus, in the above case, if three Liberal candidates had stood, only one Liberal would have been returned out of the three members, though the Liberals were the majority. It is in many cases impossible to judge of the strength of parties before the election, and this result therefore would not be infrequent. The system also invites most elaborate and oppressive party organization, since the only chance of returning their members, where the predominant party has a sufficient majority to do so, is by securing that the votes are divided amongst the pairs of candidates equally, which can only be done by strict obedience to party

directions as to voting. Two other objections have been urged against the system—first, that it leads to political apathy, the minority member having no inducement to favour the success of his party, which would involve him in a contest; but this is equally the case in equally balanced constituencies returning two members. Secondly, that unless it is introduced throughout the country it unfairly affects the influence of the large towns in party divisions. Thus Manchester, which returns two Liberals and one Conservative on account of the minority clause, has less weight in a party division than Salford, a far smaller borough, which has only two members, but having no minority clause, sends two Liberals to Parliament. These defects have undoubtedly rendered the system unpopular though, as far as it prevails, it helps to secure the due proportion of parties in the House of Commons.

Another form of limited voting is to give each voter only one vote. This would have a very similar effect, but would allow a smaller minority to return a representative. Thus in the former case the minority could not return a member unless it formed two-fifths of the whole constituency; in the latter case it would do so if it amounted to anything above one-fourth, since the other party could not then return three members, each having more than one-fourth. This system however, like that of cumulative voting, is liable to the objection that a very popular candidate may secure so many of the votes that the other candidates of his party may fail to succeed.

A modification of the system of limited voting has been proposed by Mr. F. Seebohm, with a view to meet some of these objections to it. He proposes that two or more candidates should be allowed to stand together as joint candidates, with a declaration stating whether votes given to them jointly should be divided equally among them or should be applied to secure their return as far as they will go in the order in which the names appear. In this plan each voter would have only one vote, which he would be permitted to give either to one of the candidates individually, or to a group of candidates proposed jointly. If the group had declared that the votes should be equally divided amongst them, each candidate would be held in the counting to have received his proportion of the votes given for the group in addition to those given for him separately; the advantage being that it would render unnecessary the elaborate party organization required under the present system to secure that the votes should be equally divided amongst the candidates of the predominant party. If the group had given notice that the votes given to them would be divided according to the second method, the number of votes necessary to return a candidate would first be

ascertained by dividing the total votes polled by one more than the total number of members to be returned, and adding one ; so many of the joint votes would then be allotted to the member first in the group as, with those given to him separately, would make up this number ; of the remainder, so many would be allotted to the second name in the group as would be sufficient, with his separate votes, to make the required number, and so on till the votes were not sufficient to return any more members in the group. The advantage of this second mode of dividing the votes would be that it would enable a party to run any number of candidates which they had a chance of returning without the risk of failing to obtain the number of members to which they were entitled. This scheme therefore removes two of the principal objections to the system of limited voting ; it fails however to provide the electors with freedom of choice among the candidates presenting themselves ; indeed if the order in which the votes are to be allotted to members of the group is fixed, it still further diminishes it ; further, the objection is not entirely removed, that a popular candidate may obtain so large a proportion of the votes of his party as to endanger the success of the other candidates.

The second system of proportionate representation is cumulative voting, and this, though it has not been tried in parliamentary elections, has been adopted by Parliament as the mode of electing School Boards throughout the country. Under this system every elector has as many votes as there are members to be returned but is allowed to give them all to one candidate or to divide them among several in any proportion he sees fit. The system appears to have given considerable satisfaction but a feeling that it, too, is open to some objections appears to be spreading. In the first place, a very popular candidate, by securing a very large number of votes, ruins the chances of the other candidates of the same party, and leaves the party as a whole under-represented, while occasionally the fear of this induces voters to vote for the less popular candidate, with the result that the most popular one is after all not returned. Another defect is that the effect of the mass of the votes being given to one or two of the most popular candidates is to enable other candidates to be returned by a comparatively small number, and thus representatives of small cliques of the electors are at times successful. Cumulative voting does not, any more than limited voting, provide for the electors having a free choice among any candidates who are willing to come forward, without risking the success of their party.

Experience of this mode of election has been valuable in showing, first, that a slight additional difficulty in the mode of voting does not lead to any great number of rejected votes, and

secondly, that a system which secures for the different bodies of opinion their due proportion on the Board prevents the sudden alterations in its course of action which are beginning to be apparent in governments under the present system of electing the House of Commons.

In the case of cumulative voting, as in that of limited voting, it has been proposed to minimise the defects by allowing candidates to stand together in a list, and providing that the votes given for the list should be allotted so as to return, with the help of the votes given singly for them, the members of the list in the order in which they stand in it; an additional modification being proposed that, if the residue of the joint votes is insufficient to return the next candidate in the group, but is sufficient to return a candidate lower in the group, on account of the number of votes given to him separately, they shall be attributed to this latter.

The following are the rules that have been suggested by Mr. Westlake, in an article in the *Contemporary Review*, for carrying out this system:—

“1. At every such election every voter shall be entitled to a number of votes equal to the number of members of the School Board to be elected, and may give all such votes to one candidate, or may distribute them among the candidates as he thinks fit.

“2. Any two or more candidates may be nominated together as a list, in which their names appear in a certain order. The name of no candidate can appear on more than one list.

“3. Any voter may give all or any of his votes to any list so formed, and may also give all or any of his votes to any candidates on any list, just as if they had stood separately.

“4. The number obtained by dividing the whole number of good votes given at the election by the number of members to be elected, plus one, and increasing the quotient, or the integral part of the quotient, by one, shall be called the quota.

“5. The votes given to any list shall be attributed to the first candidate on it until thereby, together with any votes given to him singly, he has obtained the quota. They shall then be attributed to the second candidate on the list, until he has similarly obtained the quota, and so on.

“6. Any residue of the votes given for a list which is insufficient to make up the quota for the last candidate on it reached under the preceding rule, shall be attributed to the next lower candidate on the list, if any, for whom it can make up the quota, until his quota is made up, and so on. Any final residue which is insufficient to make up the quota for any candidate remaining on the list shall be attributed to the candidate remaining on it to whom the most votes have been given singly, and in case of equality to the first such candidate.

“7. Those candidates shall be declared to have been elected to whom the largest numbers of votes shall have been given or attributed.”

Any scheme of cumulative voting is however still open to the objection that a popular candidate choosing to stand alone may disarrange the relative strength of parties, and lead to the election of candidates not entitled to be returned, while, if party discipline be strong enough to compel such a candidate to form one of a group, it will take more than ever the choice of the successful candidates out of the hands of the electors.

The third system of proportional representation is that of alternative voting or, as it is sometimes called, the single transferable vote. This has not yet been practically tried in England, but was brought before Parliament in a Bill introduced in 1872 by Messrs. Walter Morrison, Henry Fawcett, Auberon Herbert and Thomas Hughes. In this system each voter has one vote only but is allowed to indicate on his voting-paper other candidates to whom he desires his vote to be given in case it should not be required for the candidate for whom he first votes, and the order in which he wishes it should be attributed to such other candidates.

This scheme is free from the objections that have been pointed out in regard to the other two, and will be admitted by most persons to be theoretically the most perfect. We shall therefore examine rather more at length its mode of working, the means by which it may be carried out in practice, and the objections which have been raised to it.

In this, as in other systems of proportional representation, the country is divided into constituencies or groups of constituencies, of which most are of such a size as to return several members each, though not necessarily the same number in each case. Each voter is allowed to give only one vote; this secures, as in the case of cumulative voting, that as a general rule the members will be elected in proportion to the opinions of the voters: thus if, for example, Birmingham formed one constituency with 35,000 voters and was entitled to seven members, and the voters were in the proportion of five to two, Liberal and Conservative, they would, if properly organized, so divide their votes as to return five Liberals and two Conservatives; it would however, but for the provisions to be presently mentioned, be liable to the same objection that, if too many of the Liberal voters voted for their most popular candidate, the less popular might receive a smaller number of votes than the third Conservative candidate; and so, too, if a large number of Liberal candidates came forward, and only three Conservatives, the three Conservatives would probably be returned. To obviate these objections it is provided that each voter may indicate upon his voting-paper the names of any other of the candidates for whom he desires his vote to be given, in case it be not required for the election of the candidate for whom he has first voted.

It is obvious that where each voter has one vote, any person who obtains a number of votes greater than the number of votes given divided by one more than the number of vacancies ought to be elected; thus, if there were 35,000 electors voting in Birmingham and seven members to be returned, any candidate obtaining above 4,750 votes ought to be declared elected, since you could not have eight candidates each having more than this number. Upon the above system, when a candidate had obtained this number, the remaining votes, instead of being wasted, and so enabling candidates of the opposite party to be returned, would be given to the candidate whose name appeared second on the voting papers, or if he had also obtained 4,751 votes, the candidate whose name appeared third on the voting-paper. If, after this had been done, the number of candidates obtaining 4,751 votes were not sufficient to fill the vacancies, the candidate obtaining the least number of votes would be declared not elected, and his votes distributed among the candidates not yet elected, appearing second, third, &c., on his voting-paper, and this process would be continued until the whole had been distributed among the whole of the seven candidates, each obtaining 4,751 votes.

This system secures that the members shall be returned substantially in proportion to the voters of different opinions in the constituencies. The two causes which prevent this result being always perfectly obtained will be presently considered. It relieves the members from the pressure of any section of their constituents, since their votes cannot be necessary to the return of the greater number of the members, and will be given to one or two candidates who represent their opinions. The plan also enables any number of candidates on either side to stand without materially affecting the prospects of their party, and thus enables the electors to express their opinions on non-political questions.

This latter point we may illustrate by the Northampton election of 1874. The votes were—Phipps (Conservative), 2,690; Gilpin (Liberal), 2,316; Merewether (Conservative), 2,175; Henley (Liberal), 1,790; Bradlaugh (Liberal), 1,655. Assuming that the votes given for Mr. Bradlaugh were merely plumpers, and those given for the other candidates split votes, it is probable that if each elector had had only one vote, the numbers might have been—Phipps, 1,690; Gilpin, 1,410; Merewether, 1,000; Henley, 900; Bradlaugh, 1,655. The number of votes required to elect a member being one more than one-third of the total number of votes, or 2,219, no one would in the first instance be declared elected, and Henley, being the lowest, would be declared not elected, and his votes given to the second name on his papers. These would be in all cases Gilpin's, as the two stood together,



and thus Gilpin would have 2,310 votes, and would be declared elected. Merewether, the next lowest, would then be declared not elected, and his votes given to the second name on the paper, which would be the other Conservative candidate, Phipps, who would thus have 2,690, and be also declared elected. Thus, the fact of three Liberal candidates standing would not result in two Conservatives being returned, as was the case in 1874, but would give the same result as if two candidates only had stood. Of course in this illustration the advantage of the system in representing the two parties proportionally is not fully seen, there being only two members instead of seven or eight to be returned; but whatever the number of members to be returned it would be found that they would be returned substantially in proportion to the number of voters of each party.

In practice there are two considerations which will prevent the scheme working with theoretical perfection. First, unless the whole nation forms one constituency, which is the form advocated by Mr. Hare, but which is open to objections to be presently pointed out, the members cannot usually be divided so as to exactly represent proportionally the Liberal and Conservative voters. Thus, if a constituency had seven members the Liberal electors might be more than four-sevenths and less than five-sevenths of the whole, and either the Liberals or Conservatives would necessarily be slightly over-represented. There would however be only a small difference which would be smaller in proportion as the number of members to be returned was greater, and as it would be in some constituencies in favour of the Liberals, and in some of the Conservatives, the effect upon the Parliament as a whole would be inappreciable.

There would appear to be serious difficulties in the way of any attempt to work the system for the whole country; the number of candidates would in such a case be so large that electors would find it very difficult to know who to vote for, and they would only be able to place on their papers alternative names representing a very small proportion of the candidates; the representation would lose most of its local character, and the constituents would thus be unable to exercise even a due influence over their representatives; and lastly, it would tend to the formation of central caucuses in the hands of professional politicians. All these evils may be avoided by properly limiting the size of the constituencies.

The second reason why this "single transferable vote" scheme would probably fall short of its theoretical perfection is that many of the electors would give only two or three alternative names, and in some cases none, and thus at the end the required number of candidates with the full number of votes would not be obtained. This difficulty would be easily met by providing that when the votes had been distributed till

only the required number of candidates to fill the vacancies remained, these should be declared elected, though not obtaining the full number of votes. This might, in certain rare instances, result in one party in a constituency obtaining one more member than their numbers entitled them to, but this, too, would be in some constituencies in favour of one party, and in some in favour of the other, and would have little if any effect upon the constitution of the Parliament as a whole. It is probable, too, that when voters had come to understand that it could not in any way or degree injure the chance of the election of the candidate first voted for, if the names of the other candidates were given in the alternative, that most of them would add in some order the whole of the candidates belonging to their party.

That alternative voting, if practicable, has many advantages few would deny. What then are the objections that have been raised to it? They appear to be: First, that it is novel and unconstitutional; secondly, that it is complicated; thirdly, that it would lead to the return of persons of extreme opinions on various subjects, instead of those representing the general sense of the community; and fourthly, that it makes the result of the election uncertain. The first objection we should hardly have noticed but for the fact that it has been put prominently forward by Mr. Bright. All reforms consist in the adoption of new methods. The scheme of election of School Boards has accustomed the electors to different systems of voting and has shown that other systems than that now in use may be safely adopted; and if the effect of the alteration of the county franchise will be to introduce into our mode of representation dangers not formerly existing, or to increase those already felt, it is truly constitutional to introduce such changes into our representative system as will counteract these evils. But the objection, such as it is, seems to rest mainly on misunderstanding; it seems to be supposed that the proposed alteration is intended to give some undue influence to minorities. If by this is meant that one object is to secure that both parties in the State shall be fairly represented in Parliament, this is an object which has always been sought by legislation, and small boroughs and different franchises have been defended on the ground that they secured it. If it is meant that the new method would secure that minorities should rule instead of majorities, the truth is directly the opposite; it is the present system which has led to this, and is likely to lead to it still more if continued in the future, and the object of the alteration is to secure that the majority shall always be in power, which is in strict accordance with constitutional usage.

A more serious objection is the alleged complexity of the proposed system. In practice, however, no difficulty has been found in working the system adopted in the election of School

Boards and, so far as the duties of a parliamentary elector are concerned, alternative voting, if confined to small constituencies, would present little if any greater difficulty. The voter would only be required to write against the names of the candidates the figures 1, 2, 3, 4, &c., in the order in which he desired to vote for the different candidates, a process no more difficult than that required at the School Board elections. If some difficulty were experienced by very illiterate voters, it may be doubted whether any great loss would arise to the community if such voters failed in recording their votes. If thought desirable, the means now provided for recording the votes of those electors who cannot read might be extended to voters declaring their inability to properly fill up their voting papers. The real complexity of the scheme, such as it is, is in the mode of counting the votes when they have been recorded; but this would of course be done by skilled persons, and to such the rules would present no difficulty; nor could the fact that an elector failed to understand the exact mode in which the votes were counted at all influence his mode of exercising his franchise; it would be sufficient for him to be told that he was to vote for the one candidate whom he most desired to see elected, but was entitled to vote in the alternative for any other candidate whom he also desired to see elected, and that in doing so he would not in any degree injure the prospects of the candidate for whom he first voted.

A third objection that has been taken is that any such system would introduce into the House of Commons men representing various extreme opinions, rather than men representing the ordinary sense of the country. The same objection equally applies to the system used at the School Board elections, and we have therefore the means of testing by experience how far this objection is a valid one. The system no doubt does secure the election of representatives of certain sections of the community. Thus on the School Boards it is common to find one or more Roman Catholic representatives, while it has hitherto been almost impossible for a Roman Catholic to obtain a seat in Parliament, except for an Irish constituency. Similarly, under such a system of election working men would probably more frequently be returned, and prominent leaders of the temperance movement would find seats in Parliament; but experience shows that there would be little danger of representatives of exceptional opinions, such as the "Tichbornites" or the anti-vaccinationists, obtaining seats. A fourth objection that has been urged is the uncertainty as to which of the ballot papers given for the favourite candidate would be used for his election, and which would be used in aiding the return of the candidate appearing second upon them. If 1,000 votes were sufficient to secure the return of a member for a constituency in which there were three candidates, A, B, C;

and if, of 2,000 votes given for A, 1,000 had B's name second and 1,000 C's second, it is clear that if the first 1,000 were used to secure the return of A, C would be returned, whereas if the second 1,000 votes were attributed to A, and the others to the name appearing second upon them, B would be returned. Some mode of deciding which votes should be attributed to A must therefore be adopted. It has been proposed that this should be done by ballot, and Mr. Parker Smith has shown that the effect of this would be with almost absolute accuracy to select a proportional number of the votes having B and C second upon them; thus, if 1,000 votes were given for A B, and 500 for A C, twice as many of the A B votes as of the A C votes would be used in the election of A. It seems however very undesirable that the member to be elected should be in any degree subjected to chance, and it is more reasonable that the votes first given should be attributed to A, and that only when he is elected the votes should be given to the second candidate appearing on the paper. This no doubt would lead some keen politicians to delay their voting till the end, in order to give more effect to their second vote; but there seems little objection to this, as the majority of the voters will always be urged to vote early, and no one is likely to put off his voting so late as to imperil there being time for it to be received. In any case an elector's vote can only be counted once, and if he cared so much for the candidate whose name appears second on his voting paper he would have probably put his name first. As there would be several polling stations in each constituency, some rough-and-ready method would be required of deciding which votes had been first given; this might readily be done by numbering the voting papers consecutively from one upwards, and distributing them among the polling districts in rotation, giving No. 1 to the first polling district, No. 2 to the second, &c. In counting the voting papers upon which A's name appeared first, they would be given to him according to their numbers, until he had obtained his quota. Voting papers with higher numbers would then be counted for the candidate appearing second on them. This would free the matter from all uncertainty, and would enable a scrutiny at any time to be held to ascertain what members were elected. It seems sometimes to have been supposed that under this system a voter whose vote is counted for the name second on his list has more or less influence on the election than others; this is entirely without foundation. Each voter would only have his vote counted once, and for one candidate; but the system of alternative names provides that it shall be counted once, and shall not be wasted by being given to a candidate already elected, or whose election even with his vote is impossible.

It will be seen that this system only does under the ballot

what would be done by the voter himself, without any special provision, in open voting. A voter who voted late would not give his vote for a candidate already elected or so far behind as to have no chance of success; yet it has never been suggested that there was anything unfair in this, or that such an elector had more power than those who polled early.

Mr. Droop, who is a strong supporter of proportional reform, in a paper read before the Statistical Society in 1881 expressed fears that the time required for counting the votes under this system would be so great as to form an objection. This however arose from the assumption that the ballot papers to be attributed to the favourite candidates would be decided by ballot, and would then have to be separately marked in order to provide for the possibility of a subsequent scrutiny. With numbered ballot papers to decide those to be attributed to the name first appearing on them, any number of clerks could be employed to count, and even in a constituency of 100,000 electors there would be no difficulty in announcing the result in the course of a day.

Two other questions remain to be considered. We have said that in any system of proportional representation the constituencies, whether single or grouped, should return at least three members. The size of the constituencies should, it seems, be determined by the following considerations:—If they are too large, the electors would not be properly able to judge between so many candidates; if the system of alternative voting be adopted, they would fail to indicate any considerable proportion of the candidates on their ballot papers. The candidate, too, would not be able to keep up much knowledge of his constituency. If, on the other hand, the constituency is too small it is not possible usually to divide the members nearly in proportion to the opinions of the electors. Thus, if there are only three members the members must be two to one, while the voters may be equally divided. Another consideration which should have weight is, that the larger the constituency the smaller is the *proportion* of voters which will be able to return a member. Thus if a constituency returns ten members an eleventh part of that constituency would be able to choose a representative. If too small a proportion can do so it would admit crotchet-mongers into Parliament, and the obstruction already existing would be increased. Probably from five to ten would be the best number of members. The number should however be mainly regulated by local considerations. As has been pointed out, it is very desirable that municipal and parliamentary boundaries should be the same, and if a system of proportional representation is eventually adopted throughout the country, it

will probably be found best that the counties should be taken as the parliamentary unit. Boroughs of a sufficient size to return three members being first excluded from them for parliamentary purposes, and forming separate constituencies.

In order to accomplish this it will not be necessary to destroy the existing constituencies with their historical associations, it will be only necessary to provide that all the voters in the county should be entitled at a general election to vote for any candidate proposed for either of the constituencies of the county, the particular constituency for which the members elected should sit being determined either by the choice of the members themselves or in a way to be presently explained. Even should it be thought desirable to retain some constituencies returning one or two members, the system of alternative voting would be applicable to these, and would secure for them that the electors would exercise freely their choice upon any candidates wishing to come forward, and would thus enable the views of the country upon social subjects to be much more accurately ascertained.

There is one other difficulty which it is necessary to consider, which is common to all systems of representation in which there are constituencies returning several members—viz., how vacancies arising in the interval between two general elections should be filled. Various suggestions have been made; in the smaller constituencies they might be filled as at present, though this would have the disadvantage that the death of the minority member would result in the election of a member of the opposite party, although there might be no change in public opinion; and year by year Parliament would less truly represent the proportion between the parties in the State; it would also render it difficult for a minority member to accept office, as he could not count on re-election. Some have proposed to substitute some system of co-optation, such as at present exists in School Board elections, but this would deprive the nation of the advantage which by-elections afford by indicating any change of public opinion; nor would the nation easily consent to the election of members otherwise than directly by the electors. If the system of alternative voting be adopted, the difficulty might be obviated in the following way—the different divisions of a county, and the boroughs in it, might, as at present, form independent constituencies for the purpose of by-elections, but each returning only one member, and the total number being the same as the number of members to be returned at a general election for the whole county. At a general election, after the votes have been counted, the numbers given for each of the successful candidates in each of these subsidiary

constituencies would be put down, the votes given for them first on the voting paper only being counted; the successful candidates would then be declared members of these different constituencies according to the number of votes they had obtained in them, the candidate who had obtained on the whole the largest number of votes being declared the member of the constituency of whose votes he had obtained the largest proportion; the member who had obtained the second largest number of votes would then be allotted to that one of the remaining constituencies from which he had obtained the largest proportion of votes, and so on, each member representing some one constituency.

It is obvious that the Liberal members would become the representatives of the most liberal part of the county, and the Conservatives of the most conservative part; while among the members of the same party each would represent the part of the county in which he was most locally popular. It would be necessary if these constituencies varied in size, as they would probably do, to judge by the proportion of votes obtained by the candidates and not by the actual numbers, but this would occasion no difficulty. At a by-election the voters of the particular constituency represented by the deceased or retiring member would alone vote, and unless there had been a change in public opinion would usually return a member of the same party as their previous representative; in any case, if the number of votes given at the general election for the different candidates in the constituency were published, as they should be at a by-election would afford as good a test as at present of any change in public sentiment, and if in any cases the minority members should even, under this system, be replaced by members of the opposite party, the government would always have it in its power to correct this by a dissolution.

The same purpose might also be accomplished more simply, and so as sufficiently to carry out the same object, by providing that the candidates when elected should choose their constituencies, the member obtaining the largest number of votes choosing first, and so on in rotation. This would hardly require any alteration of the present law, which allows a candidate elected for several constituencies to choose for which he will sit. A similar system might be applied in the case of the other two schemes of proportional representation, but with somewhat more difficulty. Such a scheme would have the advantage of retaining to a large degree the present constituencies with the historical interest and political life belonging to them, while securing for the nation the advantages which have been pointed out as attaching to proportional representation.

A Society has recently been established under the presidency of Sir John Lubbock, with offices at Palace Chambers, Westminster, for the purpose of securing, as far as possible, the recognition of the principle of proportional representation in Parliamentary elections, and other representative institutions of the country, and has already received the support of nearly 200 members of Parliament. The Society as yet has expressed no opinion as to the best form of proportional representation, since this may depend upon the particular circumstances of each case, nor does it insist that the system should be applied in the first instance to all the constituencies. The main object is to secure that in all constituencies returning more than two members, which after a redistribution of seats are likely to become more numerous, some system of proportional representation shall be retained.

The programme of this Society so forcibly expresses the need of a change in our present system that it is worth quoting at length :

“The extension of the Franchise which is proposed in the Bill which Her Majesty’s Government have introduced renders the consideration of the system under which members of Parliament are elected a matter of urgent importance, it being obvious that the present system of voting will under a uniform franchise tend to diminish that variety in the representation which has hitherto been considered essential to the constitution of the House of Commons.

“This system is also open to grave objections because, while it does not in all cases obtain for majorities their due predominance in the Legislature, it fails to secure for minorities that proportion of representation to which their numbers fairly entitle them. The present system of voting, no matter how the constituencies are arranged, may bring about either, on the one hand, the rule of the minority or, on the other, the political extinction of the minority.

“It renders therefore the result of a general election uncertain, and to a large extent a matter of chance; it leads to violent fluctuations in the balance of political power and consequently in the policy of the country.

“These objections will be greatly aggravated if large constituencies are to return a number of members at all in proportion to their magnitude, unless some plan of proportional representation be adopted. Thus, if Liverpool were to return eight members as an undivided constituency it would be obviously unjust that 31,000 electors belonging to either of the great parties in the State should return eight members while 30,000 belonging to the other should be altogether shut out from representation.

“It would also be most objectionable that it should be in the power of a few voters by changing sides to transfer eight seats from one party to the other, making a difference of sixteen votes on a division.

“Unless some method of proportional representation be adopted, it



is probable that Ireland will be greatly misrepresented, and that those who hold moderate and loyal opinions, although numbering more than one-third of the whole electorate, may be everywhere out-voted and reduced to silence.

On the other hand the Irish electors in England have been hitherto almost entirely excluded from direct representation. It would be far better that the Irish electors in our great cities should return members of their own than that their votes should be the subject of more or less secret negotiation with the leaders of the different parties.

“The Proportional Representation Society, in preparing or supporting any measure dealing with the actual details of voting and the machinery of elections, will keep in view the following practical requisites :—

- (a) That the majority of the representation be secured to the majority of the electors.
- (b) That the minority be secured a fair hearing.
- (c) That the mode of voting be one easy to be understood and put in practice by the average elector.
- (d) That every vote should have its due weight in determining the result of the election.

“Whilst mainly directing its efforts to the improvement of parliamentary representation, the Society will use its best endeavours to maintain the same principles in the election of other representative bodies, such as the municipalities and School Boards of the kingdom, and to support any amendment which may render our representative system still more just and efficient.

“Under any true theory of representation, the elected body should be, as far as is practicable, an accurate reflection of the state of opinion in the country. Without therefore prejudging far the principle may be subsequently carried out, this Society deems it indispensable, as a first step towards securing the true representation of the electors, that whenever a constituency returns more than two members some form of proportional representation should be adopted.

“The Proportional Representation Society is based upon the acceptance of the foregoing principles, and has been formed for the purpose of promoting, by all means in its power, the adoption by Parliament of such a measure of reform in the representation of the people as will secure that, while the majority should govern, every considerable section of the electors should be sure of a hearing in Parliament.”

Local associations in connection with the parent Society are already beginning to be formed, and it is hoped before long to organize in this way the friends of proportional representation throughout the country.

In conclusion, it may be well to point out how this system of representation might be introduced into the country without any violent change, and so as to include in itself some of the advantages of equal electoral districts. Let the new Reform Bill

provide, in the case of all boroughs returning more than two members, that they be divided into electoral wards equal in number to the members to be elected ; and to such boroughs let the system of alternative voting be applied ; the members, after they have been elected by the voters of the whole borough, choosing for which ward they will sit ; in case of a by-election the voters belonging to the ward of the deceased or retiring member being alone allowed to vote. It would not be necessary that the wards should be the same size, since their only object would be to replace a member who died or retired, and they would have no effect on the answer given by the country to any question submitted at a general election. If this system worked smoothly it might in a few years be extended to all single-member constituencies throughout the country. Lastly, when public opinion had become ripe for it, and the county government system had become firmly established, a Bill might be passed enabling each voter to vote for any candidate standing for any of the seats in the county, whether boroughs or divisions of the county ; the elected members choosing which of the constituencies in the county, if more than one, for which they had been proposed they would represent. In order not to lose the advantages of municipal life, all boroughs large enough to return three or more members should be excluded from the county and made counties of themselves.

To summarize the results at which we have arrived : We have shown that our present system is deficient, since it does not secure either that the majority should govern, or that the minority should be heard, while it prevents a large part of the electors expressing their views on social and other questions which are not matters of party politics, and places the choice of candidates almost entirely in the hands of party organizations. We have pointed out that these difficulties are likely to be increased by the Franchise Bill. We have examined the proposal to form equal electoral districts and have shown that it will not accomplish its objects while it will introduce fresh evils. We have examined the schemes for proportional representation and have shown that they would all secure that the majority would govern on party questions ; that all considerable sections of the nation would be heard ; and that two of these schemes have been proved by experience to present no practical difficulty in working. We have stated the objections which have been alleged against the third plan—that of alternative or transferable voting—and shown that they can all be avoided, and that this scheme is free from any objection that is found in the present system or in the systems of limited and cumulative voting. We

have pointed out the few simple rules which would make its working certain and rapid; and lastly, we have shown that it could be introduced gradually without any sudden changes, and also without the loss of the political life and political history which are to be found in many of our present constituencies.

This is no party question; it is in the truest sense Conservative, securing that no one class shall overwhelm the other by its numbers, and preventing any extreme party obtaining from a wave of popular feeling a control over the legislature; but it is equally a Liberal measure, providing for the growth and improvement of our institutions giving to all parties and classes their share in the government of the country, and enabling the majority of the people always to rule.

Societies for the promotion of these views are now to be found in most of the nations of Europe, and the support they have received seems to point to the near approach of the time when they will be everywhere recognized as necessary to secure a good representative system. England, which has taught the principles of freedom to all other nations, will not, it may be hoped, be the last in recognizing the importance of these improvements in securing that the House of Commons shall be the true exponent of the people.

---

#### ART. V.—THE QUEEN'S LATEST BOOK.

*More Leaves from the Journal of a Life in the Highlands from 1862 to 1882.* (London: Smith, Elder, & Co. 1884.)

**I**F Horace Walpole's "Catalogue of Royal and Noble Authors" were to be completed to the present time, this volume, if it would be the last, would not be the least singular publication by a royal author which the completed catalogue would contain. Indeed we are tempted to quote the motto which Walpole prefixed to his said catalogue: "Dove diavolo, Messer Ludovico, avete pigliate tante coglionere."

The Queen has been more or less openly associated with other publications. Sir Arthur Helps avowed that for his sketch of the Prince Consort prefixed to his collection of the Prince's speeches he was indebted to the Queen for information which she alone could give. "The Leaves from the Journal of a Life in the Highlands," was edited by Sir Arthur, but it contains "Notes" expressed to be by the Queen herself. Sir Theodore Martin's "Life of the Prince Consort" was not only inspired but

revised by the Queen, who there also inserted notes of her own. Before the publication of this volume we saw an announcement that it was to be edited by Sir Theodore, but his name is not in the title-page. Probably the allusion in the preface, which is evidently the Queen's own composition, "to friendly assistance which has not been wanting" refers to aid given by him. When the Sovereign ceases to speak to her people through Ministers or official biographers and unmasked and alone comes into the crowd of authors, her works become as much subject to criticism as those of any of her subjects. We therefore propose to handle this book as freely as any other which happens to come before us, but we hope to treat it with all the candour and respect due to every author and more especially to one who is not only a lady but the Sovereign of these realms.

The motives which led the Queen to give this book to the world are thus stated by herself:—

"Remembering the feeling with which her former book was received, the writer thinks that the present volume may equally evoke sympathy, as, while describing a very altered life, it shows how her sad and suffering heart was soothed and cheered by the excursions and incidents it recounts, as well as by the simple mountaineers from whom she learnt many a lesson of resignation and faith in the pure air and quiet of the beautiful Highlands" (Preface).

The Queen was not deceived in her expectations as to how her new book would be received. The publishers announce that the first edition was exhausted on the day of publication—that a second edition is in preparation, and that in consequence of the demand for the work orders will be executed in rotation as received.

When we come to examine the contents of this volume, let us bear in mind the illustration which the book and the demand for it supplies of the truth of Lord Brougham's remarks:

"Can it be said that the English people are of a republican tendency—that they care little for the affairs of princes or their smiles—that they are indifferent to or impatient of kingly government? Rather let it be asked if there is on the face of the globe any other people to whom the fortune and the favour of kings and queens are so dear an object of concern? . . . No people, no rational set of men, 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."\*

When the intended publication of this work was announced,

---

\* "Statesmen of George III.:" tit. George IV.

a paragraph forecasting its contents appeared in a weekly paper, the name of which is not generally borne out by its contents. The paragraph we refer to broadly stated that the Queen's book would be found to contain strong expressions of Her Majesty's opinion on the political questions of the day—on the leaders of both parties; an avowal of her preference of some of them over their rivals; and her opinion of, or reflections on, the General Election of 1880.\* The book contains nothing of the kind; not even the names of Lord Beaconsfield, or Lord Salisbury, or Mr. Gladstone, or Lord Granville, or Lord Derby, are mentioned. Sir Stafford Northcote and Sir Richard Cross are each once mentioned, the one as sending a telegram, the other as being present on a public occasion. Two public questions only are mentioned; there is one sentence in which the Irish Church Bill is named, and Dr. Norman Macleod's opinion against Scottish Di-establishment is recorded but not, as has been—we think—erroneously supposed, with any endorsement of it by the Queen. There might have been no election in 1880 for any allusion to it there is in this book. In fact, matter of public interest or public importance there is none in the book, from one cover to the other.

It has been truly remarked, that although it is known that

“The Queen, though living in strict seclusion, interests herself keenly in affairs of State, and is busily engaged in all the functions which yet remain to royalty, and exerts a very considerable influence in politics and social concerns, yet this volume contains not one single indication of Royal interest in anything concerning the welfare of England or the world.†

This is true, but it is equally true that if the book was to be published at all it could only contain matters of private and domestic life; and then the question arises was it worth while to publish such a book. We do not go so far with the reviewer whom we have quoted as to say that the book contains “hardly anything but tedious reiterations of narrow-minded selfishness and small frivolities,” but we agree with him that “most of its contents are very prosaic.” A rhymester, whose name we forget, celebrated the old summer-house which stood near Kensington Palace as the place,

“Where thou, Great Anna, whom three realms obey,  
Dost sometimes counsel take and sometimes tea.”

---

\* This was soon authoritatively contradicted in an evening review.

† Review of the book in *The Weekly Dispatch*.

This book may be called a record

"How Great Victoria whom three realms obey,"  
Doth sometimes counsel take but ever tea."

Mr. Trevelyan describes, how when Lord Macaulay was in India, he and Miss Eden bid against each other for an old novel called, "Santo Sebastiano, or the Young Pretender," "a very silly production," till Macaulay secured it at a fabulous price, and Mr. Trevelyan adds, "As an indication of the thoroughness with which this literary treasure has been studied, there appears on the last page an elaborate computation of the number of fainting fits that occur in the course of the five volumes."\* They amount to twenty-seven in all. With equal thoroughness we have studied the literary treasure which our Sovereign has bestowed upon her people. We have reckoned up the number of times in this volume of 403 pages that our Royal author mentions the fact of her drinking tea, and we find they amount to fifty-six. To record, much more to publish, such a daily event in domestic life is trivial enough, but the circumstances mentioned in connection with some of these tea-drinkings, which often took place in the open air and in a carriage, are more trivial still—*e.g.*, "The kettle took some time boiling, as we had only cold water from the burn. When we go out only for the afternoon we take two bottles filled with hot water, which saves much time" (p. 102). Royalty even cannot escape the minor miseries of life; once the kettle was left behind; another time it would not boil, and the tea was not good. At two out-door tea-drinkings, the Royal personages and their attendants were "nearly devoured by midges," who are no respecters of persons.

We read these minute records with a smile. There are still more frequent entries in this journal which we read with regret because, though they express the feelings of a kind and generous nature, they are likely to be misunderstood, misrepresented, and ridiculed. The book is largely devoted to an *éloge* of the late John Brown, whom her Majesty describes as her "devoted personal attendant and faithful friend," and to whom and to her "loyal Highlanders," the Queen gratefully "dedicates these records of her widowed life in Scotland." The book concludes with a character of Brown,

"The faithful attendant who is so often mentioned throughout these leaves is no longer with her whom he served so truly, devotedly, untiringly. In the fulness of health and strength he was snatched

---

\* "Life of Macaulay," vol. i. p. 132.

away from his career of usefulness, after an illness of only three days, on the 27th March of this year [1883], respected and beloved by all who recognized his rare worth and kindness of heart, and truly regretted by all who knew him. His loss to me (ill and helpless as I was at the time from an accident) is irreparable, for he deservedly possessed my entire confidence; and to say that he is daily, nay hourly, missed by me, whose lifelong gratitude he won by his constant care, attention and devotion, is but a feeble-expression of the truth.

“ A truer, nobler, trustier heart,  
More loyal and more loving, never beat  
Within a human breast” (pp. 403-4).

We do not doubt that this high commendation was deserved. It strikes us however to be overcharged in expression. The memory of Her Majesty's lost servant seems, if we may be allowed to say so, to have overclouded even her memory of her lost consort. We have indeed seen it mentioned in one of those weekly papers whose writers resort to their imagination for their facts, that a memorial of Brown is to be placed in the Royal Mausoleum at Frogmore, a rumour for which we trust there is no foundation. Had the mention of Brown and his services been confined to the dedication and conclusion of the book, it would have been open to no reasonable objection, but unfortunately on nearly every page there is some reference to Brown that illustrates what we have heard called the inconsistent partiality felt for him by his royal mistress. Here is an instance :—

“ Was much distressed at breakfast to find that poor Brown's legs had been dreadfully cut by the edges of his wet kilt on Monday, just at the back of the knee, and he said nothing about it; but to-day one became so inflamed and swelled so much, that he could hardly move. The doctor said he must keep it up as much as possible and walk very little, but did not forbid his going out with the carriage, which he wished to do” (p. 33 *et seq.*)

And he did accompany his royal mistress and the Princess Helena on an airing, on which occasion they “ took tea almost in the dark.” On the next day “ Brown's leg was much better.” We cannot refrain from remarking that if “ poor Brown” had not worn the dress of a Highland cattle-stealer of bygone days, and been content to wear the ordinary femoral habiliments of the nineteenth century he would have escaped this accident. Any how if it was worth while to record the event, there certainly is a want of dignity in a royal or indeed in any author's publishing such trivialities.

Again, it is thought proper to record and publish that on a visit to Loch Maree “ good Brown waited and brought in my

usual glass of water," (p. 341.) On the occasion of the Queen and the Empress Eugenie visiting the Glen Gelder Shiel "Brown caught some excellent trout and cooked them with oatmeal, which the dear Empress liked extremely, and said would be her dinner." (p. 395). On another page we learn that when the Queen signed her name to official documents Brown "always helped to dry the signature" (p. 324). The Queen on hearing of Madame Van de Weyer's death "sent to tell Brown, who was very much shocked." On one of the "dear and blessed anniversaries" of the Prince Consort's birth the Queen relates: "After breakfast I gave my faithful Brown an oxidized silver biscuit box and some onyx studs. He was greatly pleased with the former, tears came to his eyes and he said 'It is too much.' God knows it is not for one so devoted and faithful" (p. 368).

On the death of Sir Thomas Biddulph we find this entry: "We were so distressed that we had not remained at the house; and Brown so vexed and so kind and feeling" (p. 376). The Queen attended the christening of the child of one of Brown's brothers, the child being named Albert (p. 113). She was also present at the service at his father's funeral, and was grieved she could not be in the kirk-yard. On this occasion she partook "of whisky-and-water and cheese, according to the universal Highland custom." (p. 319). Her encomium on "the simplicity and dignity" of the Presbyterian administration of the ordinance of baptism will be gall and wormwood to her High Church prelates and chaplains.

The Queen's "Recollections of her dear and valued friend Dr. Norman Macleod," the well-known minister of the Barony Parish, Glasgow, and editor of *Good Words*, are much more satisfactory and interesting. His feelings towards Her Majesty he thus expressed: "I admire her as a woman, love her as a friend, and reverence her as a Queen, and you know that what I say I feel. Her courage, patience, and endurance are marvellous to me" (p. 229). While the Queen on her part felt it "impossible to give any adequate idea of the character of this good and distinguished man! So much depended on the personal charm of manner—so warm, genial, and hearty, overflowing with kindness and the love of human nature; and so much depended on himself, on knowing and living with him, that no one who did not do so can truly portray him" (p. 231-2).

On receipt of the painful and most unexpected news of Dr. Macleod's death, the Queen records:—

"When I thought of my dear friend and all he had been to me, how in 1862, '63, '64, he had cheered, comforted, and encouraged me—how he had ever sympathized with me, and how much I always



looked forward to the few occasions I had of seeing him when at Balmoral, and that this, too, like so many other comforts and helps was for ever gone, I burst out crying."

And Her Majesty adds:—

"There was no one to whom in doubts and anxieties on religion I looked up to with more trust and confidence, and no one ever reassured and comforted me more about my children" (pp. 227-8).

Elsewhere she says—

"No one ever raised and strengthened one's faith more than Dr. Macleod. His own faith was so strong, his heart so large, that all—high and low, weak and strong, the erring and the good—could alike find sympathy, help and consolation from him (p. 231).

And again—

"He possessed a keen sense of wit and great appreciation of humour, and had a wonderful power of narrating anecdotes. He had likewise a marvellous power of winning people of all kinds, and of sympathizing with the highest and the humblest, and of soothing and comforting the sick, the dying, the afflicted, the erring, and the doubting. A friend of mine told me that if she were in great trouble, or sorrow, or anxiety, Dr. Macleod was the person she would wish to go to! and so it was; one felt one's troubles, weaknesses, and sorrows would all be lovingly listened to, sympathized with, and entered into" (p. 235).

It is in the Queen's notes of her conversation with Dr. Macleod that her two references to questions of the day occur. On one occasion she mentions that the Doctor "regretted much *this* Irish Church Bill,"\* a phrase which might make us suspect the measure did not find much favour in Her Majesty's own sight. On another occasion she writes—

"Dr. Macleod is greatly alarmed for the Established Church of Scotland, as he fears that an attempt will be made to pull that down also; though, thank God, there is no difference of form or doctrine there, and were this to happen the Free Church and United Presbyterians with the present Established Church would become one very strong Protestant body.†

We have read the following comment on this passage:—

"Evidently Her Majesty did not share the alarm of good Dr. Macleod, but anticipated good rather than evil from the disestablishment of the Scottish church. Note, too, that she attaches importance not to

---

\* P. 220, under date June 6, 1869. The Bill had been introduced in the previous March.

† P. 221, under date October 3, 1869.

the existence of, a 'very strong *Presbyterian*' but a '*Protestant* body.' The head of the English church at least does not think with Dr. LITTLEDALE that we are bound to reject Protestantism as a delusion.\*

We read this leaf from the Queen's journal as being merely a record of Dr. Macleod's opinion and of his thankfulness and not as expressing Her Majesty's own opinions and feelings. We admit, however, that the meaning of the passage is not free from doubt. Anyhow, it is additional evidence of the existence of a state of things which elsewhere in this volume plainly appears. Lord Brougham in one of his most celebrated speeches, which was made at the time when George IV. visited Scotland, referring to that event, said—

"Strange as it may seem, and to many who hear me incredible, from one end of the country to the other, he will see no such thing as a bishop; not such a thing is to be found from the Tweed to John o' Groat's; not a mitre; no, nor so much as a minor canon or even a rural dean; and in all the land not one single curate. Let us hope (many indeed there are not far off who will with unfeigned devotion pray) that His Majesty may return safe from the dangers of an excursion into such a country—an excursion most perilous to a certain portion of the Church, should his royal mind be infected with a taste for cheap establishments, a working clergy and a pious congregation."†

We fear that in the Queen's repeated excursions to Scotland, she has not escaped the infection which excited Brougham's apprehensions for George IV. The early leaders of the Tractarian party used to speak of the Scotch church as *Samaria*, with which they the chosen people could hold no dealings; and a deceased prelate who at one time stood high in the Queen's favour and councils, condemned the Presbyterian ministry of Scotland as "unapostolic and intrusive," spoke of Presbyterianism as "the substitution of a human invention for apostolic orders," and said that "when in a kirk he thought himself rather in heathendom than anywhere else."‡ But what are the opinions of Her Majesty, who, in contemplation of law, is "by God's ordinance, according to Her just title, Defender of the Faith and Supreme Governor of the Church"§ in England, though in Scotland neither she nor any other earthly being is allowed to assume

---

\* *The Liberator* for March, 1884, p. 33.

† Speech at Durham Assizes in defence of Williams for a libel on the Durham clergy. "Brougham's Works," vol. ix. p. 226. Edition 1873.

‡ "Life of Bishop Wilberforce," vol. iii. pp. 384, 5, 6.

§ See the Declaration prefixed to the Thirty-nine Articles in the Book of Common Prayer.

that name? She highly approved not only of Dr. Macleod's sermons but of his extempore prayers.\* We have referred to her expressions of admiration of the Presbyterian administration of baptism. The Presbyterian Communion service is "most touching and beautiful, and impressed and moved me more than I can express. I shall never forget it" (p. 152 *et seq.*). The Queen also mentions Dr. Macleod's "admirable explanation of the Sacrament—viz, that it was not a miracle, which people often consider it to be" (p. 224). We are also told: "Since 1873 I have regularly partaken of the Communion at Crathie every autumn" (p. 155, *note*). The anarchy prevalent in the English establishment which is shaking it to its fall is completed by its Supreme Governor expressing not only her approval but her preference for a ministry and sacraments which, according to English divines, is not a ministry and are no sacraments.

Dr. Macleod, we are told, "admired and loved the national music of his country," and wrote a description of it as a preface to a book of pipe music by the Queen's head-piper. A great writer, who is a dignitary of a very different church to that of Dr. Macleod, speaking universally, says of music:

"Is it possible that that inexhaustible evolution and disposition of notes, so rich yet so simple, so intricate yet so regulated, so various yet so majestic, should be a mere sound which is gone and perishes? Can it be that those mysterious stirrings of heart, and keen emotions, and strange yearnings after we know not what, and awful impressions from we know not whence, should be wrought in us by what is unsubstantial and comes and goes and begins and ends in itself? It is not so—it cannot be. No; they have escaped from some higher sphere, they are the outpourings of eternal harmony in the medium of created sound; they are echoes from our home; they are the voice of angels, or the magnificat of saints, or the living laws of Divine governance, or the Divine attributes; something they are besides themselves which we cannot compass, which we cannot utter, though mortal man, and he perhaps not otherwise distinguished above his fellows, has the gift of eliciting them."†

In terms almost if not altogether as enthusiastic Dr. Macleod speaks of "The bagpipe and its music:"

"To those who understand its carefully composed music there is a *pathos and depth of feeling suggested by it which a Highlander alone can*

---

\* *Vide p. 216 et seq.*

† Newman's "University Sermons," Sermon xv. : *The Theory of Development in Religious Doctrine*, p. 346. Edition 1872. It may not be known to all our readers that Cardinal Newman is a great musician.

fully sympathize with, associated by him as it always is with the most touching memories of his home and country; recalling the faces and forms of the departed; spreading forth before his inward eye panoramas of mountain, loch and glen, and reviving impressions of his early and happiest years. And thus, if it excites the stranger to laughter it excites the Highlander to tears, as no other music can do, in spite of the most refined culture of his after-life. It is thus, too, that what appears to be only a tedious and unmeaning monotony in the music of the genuine pibroch is not so to one under the magic influence of Highland associations. There is indeed in every pibroch a certain monotony of sorrow. It pervades even the 'welcome,' as if the young chief who arrives recalls the memory of the old chief who has departed. In the 'lament' we naturally expect this sadness; but even in the 'summons to battle,' with all its fire and energy, it cannot conceal what it seems already to anticipate, sorrow for the slain. In the very reduplication of its hurried notes, and in the repetition of its one idea, there are expressions of vehement passion and of grief: 'the joy of grief,' as Ossian terms it, which loves to brood upon its own loss, and ever repeats the one desolate thought which fills the heart and in the end again breaks forth into the long and loud agonizing cry with which it began. All this will no doubt seem both meaningless and extravagant to many, but it is nevertheless a deliberately expressed conviction" (p. 233).

To Highlanders this may be true. We ourselves are English and cannot understand it, but we think that not even a Highlander could imagine "the swollen bagpipe" emitting the voice of angels, the magnificat of saints, the living laws of Divine governance, or the Divine attributes.

Having thus extracted from the mass of personal *bagatelles* of which this book is composed what approaches nearest to matter of public and general interest, we close our notice of it by expressing a wish—which arises from our unfeigned respect for its Royal and gracious author—that it had never been published.

---

## ART. VI.—CO-OPERATION OR SPOILIATION.

**A** FEELING of uneasiness has long been experienced at the many signs of discontent which have appeared of late years among the working-classes throughout the civilized world. And it cannot be denied that the various symptoms of dissatisfaction which thus disclose themselves from time to time are such as to justify this feeling. The frequent discoveries of revolutionary plots, the recent dynamite outrages in London, the oft-repeated attempts at political assassinations, and the web of secret societies of which certain evidence has just been discovered at Vienna, are unmistakable proofs that some potent agent is at work disturbing and agitating the lower classes of all nations. A desire for political equality and freedom is generally laid down as the cause of this fermentation. But if we examine the question more closely we find that this cause is not sufficient to account for the phenomenon ; for in France and America, where political equality is to be found, the spirit of discontent among the working-classes is just as strong and deep, though it may not show itself in such violent forms as in Russia, where one man is as a god, and the rest of the nation are but his creatures. In England, even, a similar state of things is apparent to those who look below the surface. At present the signs are slight, but none the less unmistakable for those whose eyes are not blinded by prejudice or ignorance.

So long as discontent reigns amongst a class excluded from its just political rights, a liberal statesman has nothing to fear ; such a disposition of mind should to him be rather a matter of rejoicing. He feels that the people are only clamouring for what he thinks it is right that they should have, and he knows the louder they cry the easier they make it for him to gratify their lawful aspirations. But the matter assumes a very different aspect when their desire has been granted, and still the discontent remains. A statesman then is in the position of a doctor who has administered his last most trusted remedy, yet finds that the disease continues unabated. If he be a wise physician, before giving up the case as a desperate one he will subject the symptoms to a fresh examination in order to discover whether his diagnosis was correct. Should our statesman adopt the same system, he would discover, in the first place, that the disease which it is his duty to cure is not a fatal one, and

secondly, that the error in his diagnosis arose from supposing that the wish for political freedom was the active cause of the widespread discontent which is stirring up alike the idle and the hard-working sections of the labouring classes. This discovery should be no matter of surprise. For what, after all, is political equality? It is only a means to an end; the end being the equal distribution of the blessings of wealth and civilization throughout the whole of the nation. When therefore it is apparent that the means are not equal to producing the desired result it is only natural that a feeling of dissatisfaction should arise, and that men should begin to cast about to discover the full solution of the problem.

It is true that political equality or, in other words, the right of the whole people to choose their own administrators, has helped us a long way towards the wished-for goal; for without it no nation could have shaken off the fetters of class tyranny, or have learnt to think for itself. But is it not equally true that it is powerless to assist us over the many intervening stages which still lie between us and anything approximating to a perfect state of civilization? This could not well be otherwise; for political equality only gives a people indirect influence in forming the laws by which they are governed. But most laws have only a negative and repressive influence; they have no positive creative power. If political inequality reigns we may be sure that laws will be enacted injurious to the nation as a whole; but the converse by no means follows—that where political equality is found, the legislative force can create good ones.

Political equality, it must be repeated, is one of the greatest boons a nation can acquire, but it is only *one* of the boons which, as civilization advances, every nation has a right to demand. And moreover it contains within itself, while it stands alone and unsupported, the germs of future corruption. Of this truth! America is a strong and conclusive illustration. There political equality has reached its fullest development, but we certainly do not find the benefits of civilization evenly distributed throughout the country. The people as a mass are neither happy nor contented, corruption is rife, and before many decades have passed away the fetters of plutocracy will weigh as heavily on the Americans as did the chains of the feudal system on the nations of Europe during the Middle Ages. The reason is self-evident. Where wealth is in the hands of a small portion of a community, and political power is controlled by the majority, corruption must arise and from corruption renewed inequality and injustice must follow. If one class has all the dollars, and another all the votes, it is a natural result that the dollars and votes should change hands;

despite all the artificial barriers—Corrupt Practices Bills, Bribery Bills, &c.—which the law may endeavour to erect, a man with a starving family will find the means of exchanging his vote for the wherewithal to supply his children with food. It is clear then that political equality alone, after a certain time, is of no use in diffusing the benefits of civilization; it is as powerless to achieve that end as one shear of a pair of scissors is to cut a piece of cloth without its fellow. The fellow blade which political equality requires to assist it in its work is material equality, and until the junction is effected civilization cannot advance beyond a given point; not only can it not advance, but, as has been shown, it must retrograde. And it is the feeling, as yet only half-formulated, that such is the case which is causing so much discontent amongst the working population throughout Europe and America. The problem then to be solved is, How are we to secure a more equal distribution of wealth without throwing the present organization of society into chaos. On the lines on which we are at present advancing it would seem that, instead of approaching this consummation even by degrees, we are drawing further and further from it; day by day the wealth of the few is increasing, and the poverty of the many is growing greater. The following figures show at what an appalling rate the inequality in the division of wealth is augmenting:—Between 1868 and 1879 the increase in the annual wealth of the United Kingdom was £242,000,000; of this sum £99,000,000 fell to the lot of the working-classes, while the share of the capitalists was £143,000,000. [All people whose incomes exceed £300 are here reckoned as capitalists. It may seem overstraining the term to call a small grocer whose profits exceed £300 a year a capitalist; but the object is to make a broad distinction between those who live entirely on their own labour and those whose income is even partly derived from capital. The line of demarcation however must necessarily be wanting in perfect accuracy]. Now the increase in population during the same period was 1,127,000: of this number, 1,096,000 belonged to the working-classes, and 31,000 to the capitalist class. Or, in other words, the capitalist class contributed 3 per cent. to the increase of population, and secured 59 per cent. of the wealth, while the working classes added 97 per cent. to the population and only came in for 41 per cent. of the wealth.

What a mighty force lies in these figures when once grasped! Who can conceive the disturbing effect they will produce when clearly realized? And the coming generation of the people, whose intellects will have been sharpened by the education mill through which they will have passed, cannot fail to appreciate

the inequality of reward disclosed by such statistics. It cannot be doubted that the already wide-spread feeling of discontent will be thereby immensely augmented. It is, moreover, the hard-working industrious portion of the working classes—those on whom the order and well-being of a country so much depend—that will be most affected. They will naturally say to themselves, “We are not idle, we toil as hard, nay, harder than those who are so richly compensated, and why should our share of the wealth which our labour brings into being be so small?” Many people will contend that it is an inevitable law of Nature that the few shall be rich and the many poor—that it has ever been and will ever be so, and whoever dares to assert the contrary will have the epithet “Socialist” hurled at him, or at least be branded with the perhaps more damning terms of “visionary” and “utopian.”

Still the evil is one which, so long as the present system of the distribution of wealth continues, must increase and cannot diminish; it is not one of those diseases which can be left alone with the hope that it will cure itself. No thinking person can deny that when once the fact is thoroughly apprehended by the minds of the masses—that it is they who produce the wealth of the world, and that only a privileged few reap the reward, a revolution far more terrible than any which has been organized to secure political freedom will take place. It may appear a difficult task to devise any system by which material equality can be secured without destroying the incentives to industry and sapping the springs of individual exertion; but the task will seem less difficult after the false theories which seek to account for the development of wealth, simultaneously with the increasing poverty of the working classes have been cleared away.

One of the most popular of these is the “over-population” theory. So long, it is said, as the population continues to increase, that part of wealth which is distributed as wages must be split up into smaller and smaller portions, and therefore the rate of wages must diminish. This would naturally be correct if wealth did not increase as fast as population. But figures show that it not only increases as fast, but much faster than the population. In 1820, the population of the United Kingdom was reckoned at about 21,000,000, while the annual earnings were about £475,000,000 (£22 6s. for each person). Now, in 1879, the population was about 34,000,000, but the earnings had risen to the sum of £1,030,000,000 (£30 3s. for each person), that is to say, the population had increased 63 per cent. and wealth 115 per cent., while, if a more recent period be taken, it will be found that the ratio is still more disproportionate. The reason why the poverty of the industrial classes should not increase as their



numbers multiply is as clear as the fact that wealth outstrips population is indisputable. As has been well said, "every mouth born into the world brings with it, a pair of hands," but fortunately the powers of consumption of a mouth are a fixed term, and bear no relation to other mouths; ten mouths in one room can consume no more than the same number of mouths in ten separate rooms. This does not apply to the hands. Every one is acquainted with the familiar example of the power of division of labour—how ten men working together can in some instances produce between two and three hundred times as much as ten men working separately. The immense assistance which recent inventions have given to production must also be taken into account. A paper prepared by a committee of the American Social Science Association emphasizes this fact in a most striking manner. From it, as regards agriculture, we learn that one man by the aid of machinery can now do the work that 37½, 50, and 75 men respectively, according to the nature of their task, could formerly accomplish; that it took 100 men to produce as much cloth as one can now turn out; and that by the aid of machinery one carpenter can do the work of fifteen or twenty men with hand-tools. Many more instances can be adduced, but the above are sufficient for the purpose. It is obvious, then, that population has not outstripped production. The real cause of the evil in question consists in the unequal distribution or division of wealth. This, Mr. Henry George shows very clearly, but he also falls into a gross error. He argues that the working classes remain poor while wealth continues to increase, because rent absorbs the whole of the increased profits. His proposed remedy is, accordingly, to abolish private ownership in land, and to vest it in the Government as representing the nation. At least, this is the logical outcome of his arguments, though he finally suggests as a makeshift that the land should be left in the hands of its present owners, and only the amount of their rents taken from them in the shape of taxation. The bare fact that only eleven per cent. of the annual income of the United Kingdom proceeds from rent is enough to demonstrate the insufficiency of this remedy. No doubt many of the arguments which Mr. George adduces to support his theory are perfectly true, and it is even possible that sooner or later the cause which he pleads will prove triumphant. But even when that day comes the condition of the working-classes will not be materially changed; that is, it will be changed only in degree but not in kind. A remedy which proposes to attack only eleven per cent. of an evil, and which leaves eighty-nine per cent. untouched, can scarcely be regarded either as final or satisfactory.

And there can be but little doubt that if this act of what most

people call "spoliation" were to take place at the present moment, it would have a very injurious effect on the people. The majority of the nation would not understand the principles which alone could justify it, and it would therefore have the same influence as if an Act of Parliament were passed to legalize robbery. Not only would all feelings of honesty be destroyed, but the spirit of industry would be, perhaps, irreparably injured. It is to be feared that the small good Mr. George's scheme would effect would be more than outweighed by the great evil it would be certain to occasion. From his own point of view, moreover, the remedy is lacking in thoroughness. He rightly argues that the rate of wages is regulated by the amount any man can make working on his own account. Now, even if the Government be the sole landlord, as population increases, the margin of cultivation must sink, and hence the amount a man can earn by his own exertions will proportionately decrease, and the universal standard of wages throughout the kingdom will be lowered. It is true that the increased value of the land will go to the government and so help to lessen taxation; but this benefit will be shared by the nation as a whole, whereas the diminished value of labour will be felt by the working-classes alone. If 150 men are each paid fourpence, which is procured by making fifty of the number pay one shilling, those fifty are certainly better off than if they were obliged to pay the shilling without getting back the fourpence, but still the relief afforded them cannot be regarded as very complete. No; part of Mr. George's theory is indisputably true, but the other part, even if it were advisable on other grounds to adopt it, is insufficient, and therefore dangerous, as it leaves so much of the evil he proposes to remedy untouched. One might as well try to force a large man into the clothing of a diminutive youth, and expect him to be properly clothed. Better have him partially clad than not at all, some people will say; certainly, if giving him insufficient garments did not prevent him trying to procure proper ones for himself.

It does not appear, either, as if trades-unions and similar associations, so long as they continue to confine themselves to their present line of action, can ever fundamentally change the position of the working-classes, although they have contributed greatly to ameliorate it. But the contest between workmen and employers is fought under too unequal conditions for the former ever to hope to gain. Capitalists, unless they can gain what they consider an adequate recompense for their anxiety, risk, and toil, will not continue to employ their wealth as capital at home; they will prefer to withdraw it from the country, and put it out to interest abroad. But labourers have no such alternative; their only choice is between

work at starvation wages, or starvation itself. Interest is always a harbour of refuge, until the storm has blown over, to the capitalist. Death is the only haven in which the working-man can shelter. Besides, working men—as working men—cannot expect more than a certain share in the profits of any undertaking. It is not as if the rate of profit could be indefinitely raised, but the merest tyro in political economy knows that this only results in a falling off of demand and in consequent loss to both the industrial classes and their employers.

We have now seen that the remedies proposed for superseding the unequal division of wealth which at present exists are either insufficient or unsound, and likely to cause more harm than they could effect good. Can no means be found at once lawful and just by which the earnings of the country can be more evenly distributed? The question concerns the wealthier portion of the community perhaps as much as the poorer classes. There can be little doubt that the feeling of discontent existing among the people of all countries is due to the state of material inequality which is increasing every day. A dread weighs on the minds of all thinking men that unless something be done to obviate this and to check the growing tendency of wealth to accumulate in a few hands, a reign of "spoliation" will burst upon us far more terrible in its consequences than the Reign of Terror in France at the end of the last century. If to the rich the development of such an industrial system means the preservation of their present wealth, and to the lovers of order a respite from anarchy, to the poor it means a new existence. It means that they would cease to be mere beasts of burden; it means that they would have leisure to cultivate their minds and indulge their tastes; it means that they could look forward to an old age comfortably provided for, instead of having the dread always before them of spending their last few years of existence in abject destitution, or dependence on public charity; it means, in a word, that they would cease to be the slaves of toil, and become sharers in the dignity of life. Is it possible then to organize a system by which these boons can be diffused throughout the whole of the nation? The answer can be given confidently in the affirmative. To make this clear it will be necessary to examine more closely the theory of wages. It has been distinctly shown that the axiom which lays down that the rate of wages depends on the proportion between the wage fund and the wage earners is radically false and unjust; but it must be admitted that it is practically true so long as the present system of the distribution of wealth continues. Let us see the reason of this anomaly. As population increases the value of labour is enhanced; this is accounted for in theory by the principle of the

division of labour. And actual facts show that it is the case ; otherwise thinly populated countries would be rich, and thickly inhabited ones poor, whereas the contrary is shown by statistics. But the increase of wealth does not go to those who produce it—the working classes but to the capitalists. Employers of labour naturally look after their own interest first of all, as would the labouring classes if it were in their power ; hence they raise their profits as much as possible by giving their workpeople the lowest wages they will consent to accept. It is evident that no man will take less wages than he could make by working for himself. Now what a man can earn for himself is regulated by the margin of cultivation ; as this sinks wages sink also, and the margin of cultivation must continue to fall as the population increases. It is most important to grasp thoroughly this truth, for it is the key of the whole economical difficulty under which we are at present suffering, that the identical factor—viz., increase of population, which raises the value of labour diminishes the rate of wages. When this is understood, the statement that the increase of population enhances the value of labour ceases to appear a contradiction of the proposition “ that as the margin of cultivation sinks wages sink also, and the margin of cultivation must continue to fall as population increases. The truth is that a low rate of wages is not caused by an increase of population, but an increase of population brings about a fall in the margin of cultivation, and capitalists take advantage of this powerful lever to reduce the rate of wages. Hence we see that the working classes are not paid according to the value of their work, but that their wages are dependent on an outside standard. The important point then is to make them independent of this standard, and to enable them to secure the full value of their labour for themselves. The solution of the problem lies in the terms of the proposition. We have seen that the bulk of the wealth of the country goes to the capitalists ; the only way then for the working classes to share in this wealth is for them to become capitalists themselves, and the only just, peaceable and efficacious means by which they can accomplish this is by Productive Co-operation. By a certain class of writers communism is advocated rather than co-operation, but the very caustic comparison drawn between the two by the Bishop of Durham is sufficient to convince most people of the advantages the latter possesses over the former. He says, “ Communism aims at converting the community into one gigantic workshop, which is at the same time one gigantic nursery. Thus communism is the direct negative of co-operation. Co-operation is a development and extension of liberty. Communism is state tyranny in its most aggravated form. Co-operation stimulates production and pro-

notes thrift. Communism paralyzes the one and discourages the other by substituting State help for self help. Co-operation makes self-reliant men ; communism makes spoon-fed children."

To carry out this scheme of productive co-operation, the first and most important consideration which every working man should take to heart is *not to pledge the whole value of his labour for the means of daily sustenance*. Let him once grasp the importance of this, and everything else will follow. If the leaders of the Trades Unions would only urge the men to follow this course, they would indeed be acting a useful part. Let them exhort their members to band themselves together, and to say, "we will no longer pledge the whole of the value which our labour gives to every industrial enterprise ; we will only take part of our wages in money, the rest we will have paid us in shares of the undertaking on which we are employed." And from the day on which such a movement begins to spread throughout the country, material inequality will begin to diminish, and the wealth earners will become the wealth takers, not merely the wealth-producers. From that day the working man will cease to feel that at the end of each successive year he is no better off than he was at the termination of the previous one, and that *his* capital, which is youth, energy and strength, is constantly diminishing, while he is unable to replace it by any other equivalent. On the last day of the old year the rich man may console himself by the thought that though he is a year older he is also more wealthy and powerful. To the scholar the merry chime of bells which ushers in the new year brings the soothing reflection that he has accumulated a fresh store of learning during the past twelve months. The statesman can think with satisfaction over the measures he has passed which will bring fame to himself and prosperity to his nation for generations to come. The only thought, however, which can recur to the working man is that he is a year nearer to the time when his capital—the capacity to work—will be exhausted. Is it any wonder then that a deep feeling of discontent is to be found throughout the industrial population ? How different it would be if he knew that the past year had added a fresh sum to the capital, which would enable him to decrease his manual labour as he advanced in life, and ensure him a comfortable provision for his old age.

It may be safely predicted that if the working classes would adopt this system of receiving their wages, within a measurable space of time poverty would be hardly known, and large fortunes would have disappeared, especially if the legislature could be induced to help in that direction by changing the laws of testacy and intestacy. The moral effect produced, if this plan of

paying wages partly in money and partly in shares were carried out, would be no less striking than the economical revolution it would gradually bring about. Not only would the interest of a man in his work be largely increased, and therefore the effectiveness of his labour enhanced, but he would also be forced to exercise his mind and judgment before entering on any employment. Now it is all the same to him whether the undertaking on which he works is successful or not, so long as it gives him food, clothes, and lodging while he is engaged upon it; under the other system he would have to be careful how he chose his work, and would therefore have to give his mind to subjects which at present interest him no more than agriculture does the horse who draws the manure cart.

From whichever point of view we may regard the doctrine of productive co-operation, it is of the utmost importance, yet because there is nothing sentimental or exciting about it, none trouble themselves to preach it. Orators and statesmen in plenty are to be found who will occupy themselves with the new Reform Bill which, necessary though it be, is only a means to an end; and yet few care to waste their breath or their thoughts over a problem which, if successfully solved, would wipe out the great blot on modern civilization—the increase of poverty simultaneously with the increase of wealth.

Doubtless the preliminary difficulties in carrying out a complete scheme of productive co-operation are considerable, but at the same time they cannot be regarded as at all insurmountable. Chief amongst them is that of procuring sufficient capital to carry out any considerable undertaking; but there are more ways than one in which this can be done. The plan which has succeeded so admirably at Oldham may be regarded as one of the most satisfactory, as it has proved itself to be one of the most practical. In this case the men found the necessary capital by the money which they saved in consequence of having adopted the principle of distributive co-operation. It has been calculated that the distributive stores, taking wholesale and retail together, save about  $11\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. for consumers. Now the united annual income of the working-classes amounts to between three and four hundred million pounds; supposing this amount to be spent at distributive stores, what is necessary for rent and taxes being deducted, in twenty years the saving effected would amount to more than six hundred millions sterling, which sum would be sufficient to make every working man his own employer. The history of co-operative distribution is so well known that it would be superfluous to enter into a detailed account of it; but it may not be uninteresting to give a few facts for the purpose of showing that the above calculation has a solid basis to rest

upon. All the world knows how, in the year 1844, twenty-eight poor men started a co-operative store at Rochdale with a capital of £28, and how from this small beginning a society sprang up which is in possession of a capital of £220,000 and pays £48,000 annually in profits to its members. Encouraged by this success, society after society was formed, until, according to the Parliamentary returns for 1881—later statistics are not published—they numbered more than 1138, and were doing an annual trade of over twenty-three millions sterling, out of which they were making a profit of £2,026,452. During the twenty years 1862 to 1881 the trade of these societies amounted to £246,638,414, and the profits to £19,656,683, of which eight-and-a-half millions remain within the movement, and eleven millions have been withdrawn by the members. In the year 1864 the Co-operative Wholesale Society was formed in order to supply the numerous retail co-operative stores which had at that date been formed. Its object is to cut off the expense which a retail store incurs in purchasing from a wholesale dealer. As the idea of the retail co-operative store is to enable its own members to enjoy the profits of the retail dealer, and in so far to purchase their articles at a cheaper rate, so the purpose of the Wholesale Society is to save the retail societies the expense of the wholesale dealer. The net profits realized by the Co-operative Wholesale for the first year were £445, and the turnover £88,420; while according to the balance-sheet of the Society for the year ending 1883, the net profits were £47,885 and the turnover had reached the enormous total of £4,546,889. As Mr. Hughes pointed out in 1878, three million Englishmen had participated in this movement, and he proceeded to ask, "What does that mean? Why, it means that the scramble of life, the struggle for existence, has been made easier for all these English folk. All who are the least aware what that struggle implies will ask for no nobler testimony of work for any movement. And all I would ask is, Why what has been done already in twenty-five years, imperfectly no doubt, for 3,000,000 should not in fifty years be done far more perfectly for 10,000,000? It is the first steps, as we all know, which are the difficult ones, and these have been taken, and taken successfully."

To show how much money has already been made by the industrial classes from the saving effected by co-operative distribution, it may be stated that there are already seventy-one co-operative spinning companies established in the neighbourhood of Oldham alone, with a united capital of more than £5,548,780, three-fourths of which has been subscribed by working men; while throughout the United Kingdom there are

355 Cotton Spinning, Doubling, and Manufacturing Companies registered under the Joint Stock Companies Acts. Their nominal capital amounts to more than nineteen millions sterling, a large proportion of which has been taken up by the industrial classes. In addition to this there is more than half-a-million invested in various other productive co-operative bodies. A man must be a sceptic indeed who would venture to argue in the face of these figures that there is not at least one way by which the labouring classes can accumulate sufficient capital to become their own employers. Still, it would be wise to lose no time in making the most of this means, for as soon as co-operators become in the majority—as yet they only form a growing minority—employers will certainly lower the rate of wages to bring it into harmony with the diminished cost of living. Could a more forcible example be given of the unfairness of the present system of the distribution of wealth ?

Another means of raising capital for productive co-operation has been suggested, though as yet not carried out ; but the idea commends itself by its common sense and simplicity. It is, that the money which is subscribed towards the Trades Union Societies, and which at present when not required is put out at interest, should be utilized to underwrite or syndicate any sound co-operative undertaking. If care was taken in the selection of the works to be supported, and a mortgage to the full value of the money lent secured, no apprehensions need be entertained about losing the money so advanced, and an incomparably better use would be made of the money than if it were merely put out at interest. It is much to be regretted on all accounts that no connection exists between the Trades Unions and the Co-operative Societies ; but a congress between the leaders of the two bodies is under discussion, and it will be a thousand pities if this meeting does not result in forming a close bond of interest and sympathy between the two movements. Both have the real interest of the working-classes at heart ; both include among their members many men of intellect, energy, and character, and each body would be of great assistance to the other. It is therefore to be hoped that before long their forces will be united in the great work of peacefully revolutionizing the condition of the industrial population.

Mr. Lloyd Jones, than whom no man has worked harder or longer to promote the co-operative movement, in his work entitled "Co-operation ; its Position, its Policy, and its Prospects," says :

"As organized bodies our trades-unions ought to possess much thought as well as much power of action outside and beyond what is called for in their unions. The leaders of these unions, as well as



their members, should continually ask themselves how the co-operative idea can be applied, so as gradually to bring about an altered relationship of the man to his work, and ultimately that sort of union between capital and labour which shall be beneficial to both."

Professor Hodgson, in a speech at the Co-operative Congress so far back as 1876, says: "One of the most hopeful signs of the movement is (what seems to be a fact) that trade-unionists regard co-operation with increasing favour." Mr. Burt, M.P., and Mr. Odger hold the same opinions, the latter distinctly stating that "the great majority of trade-unionists are in favour of co-operation." Mr. Nuttall even goes so far as to affirm that "it would be better for the Amalgamated Engineers to invest their £120,000 even in the worst kind of co-operative production than in savings-banks." Mr. Hughes, Q.C., in a lecture delivered by him on the "History and Objects of Co-operation," says: "At their congresses they (the trades-unionists) have again and again pledged themselves to co-operative principles and, in spite of Sir E. Beckett and his followers, those who know them best will not easily believe that such pledges are only given with a view to throw dust in the eyes of the public." After such opinions as these it is hard to believe that ere long a junction pregnant with important results will not be formed between the trades-unionists and the advocates of co-operation.

A third way of securing capital for the labouring classes—that of inducing them to take only part of their wages in money—has already been touched upon in this article. It is true that this would only be an incomplete form of productive co-operation, but if it were to stop at that point even, it would be a great improvement on the present division of profits. It is not, however, intended that this plan should be final; it is only suggested as one of the stepping-stones to the complete union of labour and capital. Objectors contend, that the scheme bristles with difficulties; on account of some of which, it is said, it would not find favour with the employers, while owing to others the labourers would be equally averse to it. Capitalists would object to the system because it would involve submitting their books to their workmen, and so making public their accounts; but this is no more than all joint stock companies have to submit to, and they seem to thrive upon it. Again, it is urged capitalists would be unwilling to forego any share of their profits; this however is false reasoning, for the capital saved in payment of money-wages could be employed in extending the business, and so enlarging the field of the profits. Moreover, such objections as these would be more than counterbalanced by the solid advantages which capitalists would reap from the system. The rate of profits has

been said to depend on the "cost of labour," and the cost of labour, as we know, is a function of three variables, one of which is the value of labour. Now few will deny that the value or efficiency of labour would be enormously augmented by the fact that each workman knew that he was working for his own as well as his master's profit. How marked a difference there is between the energy with which a labourer will dig up his own little garden plot even after the toil and fatigue of a hard day's work, and the listlessness which characterizes him as he tills his master's fields!

Lord Derby, on this point, in his speech at the Leeds Co-operative Congress in 1881, remarks :

"It must strike any impartial observer that more work is likely to be done, and that it is likely to be better done, on the co-operative system than on that of ordinary wages, and that for a very simple reason. In the former case every man is working for himself—for others also, no doubt, but amongst others for himself. In the latter case he is working for an employer, with whose interest he cannot be expected to identify himself very warmly; it is only human nature that his zeal should be stimulated by knowing that he personally is to reap what he sows, whereas the man employed by the day or hour can scarcely be expected to care to do more than is required to secure himself from dismissal."

Besides, putting the matter of option aside, what power would the masters have to object if the workmen insisted as a body in being paid in the manner suggested? This, however, according to some, is exactly what the workmen will never do; their wages are small enough as it is, and it is not in human nature that they should surrender the smallest fraction of them for an uncertain and prospective benefit. So argue the opponents of the idea. But they forget that the working classes are already in the habit of sparing no small portion of their earnings to contribute to trades-unions, friendly societies, burying societies, and similar institutions. It would certainly be a sounder economical practice to employ such savings in the form of productive capital on the works where they were personally employed, and whose success they could help to ensure by their own individual exertions.

The great incentive to thrift and industry afforded by this scheme would, moreover, probably result in as much money being received as wages, after deducting the amount reserved for shares, as a working-man now makes under the present system. It is a well-known fact that the "accumulative" instinct is one of the strongest in human nature. But before this can come into play, it is necessary that a gathering nucleus should be formed—just as some small excrescence is necessary in the shell of an oyster before a pearl can grow. Now it is rarely the case that the working-

classes have the opportunity afforded them of making this nucleus, and hence one of the great causes of their want of thrift. It is so easy to spend a sixpence here and a shilling there, but so difficult to realize that the accumulation of these sixpences and shillings would in a short time make up a considerable sum. It would be very different under the proposed system; then men would only receive sufficient for their daily sustenance, out of which they could squander nothing, while at the end of a certain time they would be in possession of a lump sum which would appear too large to waste heedlessly. Once having made this start, the accumulative instinct would make its influence felt, and would not only tend to increase the amount of money saved, but also to diminish the amount of time wasted. This last consideration is a very important one; the average working-man is believed to be unemployed about five-thirteenths of his time, and three-thirteenths of this unemployed time is believed to be lost owing to his own fault.

Let us take an example of how this system might work. Four blocks of buildings similar to Artisan Dwellings, each containing fifty rooms, would take about 185,000 hours to construct, or one hundred men working ten hours a day for 185 days. A skilled artisan is paid about 9*d.* an hour for his work; therefore, as things are at present, he would receive 7*s.* 6*d.* per day for 185 days, and not be one penny the richer for it at the end of the time. But supposing he were to receive only three-fifths of his wages in money and the rest in shares, he would then have made 4*s.* 6*d.* a day during the 185 days, and on the expiration of that period he would be in possession of £28 in shares.\* This, of course, is a favourable instance, but it shows what might be done.

It is contended, however, by some people that even if the industrial classes succeed in gathering together enough capital to become their own masters they will not be able to utilize it for productive purposes. There are some industries without doubt which are less adapted than others for co-operation. The most striking instance is where a combination of much capital, great skill in management, and a small number of workmen is found. A scale of trades is now in process of arrangement, showing the relative proportion of these three factors; and when this is drawn up, it will be easy to see which industries should be selected in the first case, and which should be reserved until the science of co-operation is fully developed.

---

\* An attempt is now being made to raise a sum of money for the purpose of erecting artisan's dwellings on this system; it being thought that the present moment is eminently suitable for an effort of this kind.

Meanwhile, both theory and experience can be adduced to prove that working-men are thoroughly capable of carrying on the great majority of trades on their own account. To argue, indeed, to the contrary, proves a thorough want of knowledge of human nature. In co-operation, self-interest—combined it is true with the necessary quantity of altruism—is the main-spring of all action. And what quickens the energies, sharpens the understanding, and enforces discipline so powerfully as self-interest? Now one of the principal objections raised against productive co-operation by self-styled practical men is that the management is rarely satisfactory. Management can be divided into two heads—external and internal: external management is concerned with buying and selling and the markets in general, and internal with the carrying on of the business in the mill or factory. Under both these heads energy, intelligence, experience and knowledge of mankind are eminently necessary; without the latter quality a man will be fleeced in his dealings outside the mill, and inside he will be unable to preserve discipline. In any scheme of productive co-operation the manager or managers are naturally chosen by the men themselves. It is perfectly certain that among the older hands a man may be found quite as intelligent as, and infinitely more experienced than, the son of a mill-owner, fresh perhaps from school or college. Self-interest will induce his colleagues to elect such a man and, having elected, to obey him; and self-interest will impel him to do his utmost to fulfil his duties. It is said that working-men will not respect or heed one of themselves; but depend upon it the spur of self-interest, aided by the genuine feeling of respect towards a man whom by their own choice they acknowledge to be their superior, will do more towards compelling obedience than any tinsel reverence founded upon superiority of station. Men will work better when it is their interest to do so than when their industry is only stimulated by fear. It is only a further development of the theory of free labour *versus* slavery. It must be remembered, too, that in a co-operative mill or factory every workman stands in the place of employer to his fellow. This is what Lord Derby says on the subject, in a lecture delivered by him in Leeds: "In co-operative industry the master's eye is everywhere. I have heard it affirmed—whether truly or not I cannot judge—that in occupations where men are hired by the day, it is an unpopular thing for any one to do more than his mates, and that the exhibition of more than ordinary industry and skill is likely to be resented rather than imitated and admired. At any rate, whether this be so or not, it is certain that no man will object or complain because his neighbour is shirking his work. Why should he? It's no business of his. But introduce co-operation,

and every working-man is an employer and an overlooker too—the master's eye is literally everywhere. Slow work or scamped work means so much less return to the associated body, and those who are working together have the strongest possible interest, not only in doing their own appointed task, but in seeing that everybody else does his. Practical employers will alone be able to estimate with any approach to accuracy the percentage of gain due to that constant and vigilant superintendence, but that it must be great is obvious from the nature of the case."

Mr. F. V. Neale, in his "Economics of Co-operation," has some sound remarks in the same direction; he says: "Each productive enterprise would be carried on by a body of men specially interested in making the capital employed in it as remunerative as possible, because they would derive the entire benefit arising from any increase in its productiveness; and peculiarly able to ensure to it this remunerative character because they would themselves have to do the work in which this energy is to be displayed and this economy effected."

It would seem then that, as regards discipline and supervision, a manager elected from themselves by a body of co-operative workmen is as fully, if not better, qualified to discharge his duties than a man would be if he owned the establishment. If we look at the question of experience and ability, there can hardly be any doubt as to our decision. Which man is most likely to possess these two qualities—he who has inherited the business simply because it belonged to his father, or he who was elected for the post by his fellow-workmen merely because he was distinguished for these two very qualities?

"Ah, theories, theories! more or less wanting in reason," exclaims the sceptic; "what we want is practical proof." Here, then, are a few examples taken at random from the balance sheets of co-operative productive societies to show the business they are doing. The Twenty-seventh Half-Yearly Report and Balance Sheet of the Hebden Bridge Fustian Co-operative Society for the half-year ending December 1883, shows a profit of £1,127 0s. 9d., which is divided as follows:—

	£	s.	d.
Dividend on shares at 7½ per cent. per annum	614	10	4½
Members' purchases, £6,217 at 9d. per £ ...	233	2	9
Non-Members' purchases, £2,783 at 4½d. per £	52	3	7½
Labour, £2,592 at 9d. per £... ..	97	4	0
Reserve Fund ... ..	100	0	0
Balance . . . . .	30	0	0
	<hr/>		
	£1,127	0	9

. It will be noted that this is the twenty-seventh half-yearly report, so that this is no freshly started, new-fangled establishment. The profits, as will be seen, are divided between capital, labour and the consumer, which in the majority of cases mean one and the same person ; for the capital is almost entirely subscribed by the workers, and it appears that about three-fourths of the purchases were also made by members.

Here is the report of the Greenacres Cotton Spinning Co. Limited, Oldham, for the forty-seventh quarter ending July 1883 :—

“Ladies and Gentlemen,—We have pleasure in submitting to you a Statement of Accounts for the quarter. The amount disposable (after paying £150, being the probable loss through Messrs. Holgate's failure) is £3,050 19s. 6½*d.* We recommend the payment of 12½ per cent. dividend, or 2s. 6*d.* per share, and the balance, £1,300 19s. 6½*d.*, to be carried forward to next quarter.”

“Yours respectfully,

“THE DIRECTORS.”

The thirty-eighth and thirty-ninth quarterly reports of the Star Spinning Co. Limited, Royton, for August and November 1883, declare a profit of £1,505 6s. 5*d.* and £1,128 11s. 5*d.* respectively, and a dividend of eight per cent. It is interesting to remark that among the directors of this mill is a “warper,” a “salesman,” a “minder,” and an “overlooker,” showing that the management is strictly in the hands of the working-classes.

The balance sheet of the Royton Mill shows a curious series of vicissitudes. This company was formed in 1871 ; the first two years were spent in building, no trade operations being carried on, but in 1874 we find the Company declaring a dividend of 40 per cent. This high rate of interest was naturally not kept up for long, and in 1876 the dividend had sunk to 17 per cent. During 1877, '78 and '79 the mill worked at a loss, but in 1880 it picked up again and declared a dividend of 14 per cent., and since then the profits have maintained a steady balance between 12 and 14 per cent. There must have been some marked reasons for these sudden variations, but the writer is not sufficiently acquainted with the history of the undertaking to give them, though the extreme depression of trade from the end of 1876 to 1879 may be enough to account for them. The figures given above are only taken from the balance sheet which enters into no details. It is a matter of congratulation that the movement is gaining ground in London, as is shown by the following extract taken from the *Pall Mall Gazette* of the 13th of March :—

“The attempt to establish in London a co-operative Society of

Artisans on the lines of the famous *Maison Leclair* in Paris, promise to prove a success. The Directors of the Decorative Co-operators Association, of whom Mr. Albert Grey is chairman, have just issued their first annual report. The balance-sheet shows a loss of some £26 on the first year's working, to which must be added £60 for interest due to share capital. On the other hand, the last six months, taken by themselves, show a distinct profit; and the fact that out of the total sum expended in wages, amounting to nearly £3,000, three-fourths were paid during the last half of the year, will show how the concern is growing."

We find that thirty-five of the Oldham Spinning Companies mentioned above returned last year a dividend of 10 to 15 per cent., and that three out of these, the "Windsor," the "Green Lane," and the "Oldham and Lees" Cos. pay as much as 16 and 17½ per cent.

Enough figures have now been quoted to show conclusively that the industrial classes can make productive co-operation a thoroughly sound and profitable commercial undertaking. No doubt there have also been many failures, but this was only to be expected in a new movement. And besides, if this were an argument against co-operation, it is also an argument against all commercial enterprises; for, making allowance for the number of non-co-operative undertakings which are carried on, it will be found that the proportion of failures in the latter case is much greater than where the work is conducted on the co-operative principle.

It may be said that the instances given above are selected from industries peculiarly favourable for co-operation. To show how wide is the sphere already embraced by productive co-operation, a list is now given of some of the various co-operative firms either supported or employed by the Co-operative Wholesale:— "Agricultural and Horticultural Association," "Co-operative Printing Society," "Coventry Watch Society," "Dudley Nail Society," "Frame-makers' and Gilders' Association," "Hebden Bridge Fustian Society," "Household Furnishing Association," "Leeds Silk - Twist Society," "Leicester Second Hosiery Society," "Leicester Elastic Web Society," "Rochdale Corn Mill," "Rochdale Pioneers' Society" (tobacco), "Sheffield Cutlery Society," "Blake Sole-sewing Machine Company," "Rochdale Manufacturing Society," "Leeds Woollen Cloth Co.," "Leicester Coal Co.," &c. &c. The balance-sheets of these companies are not to hand; but the fact that the Co-operative Wholesale has dealings with some of them to the amount of three and four thousand pounds a quarter warrants the presumption that they are carrying on a flourishing business. In Germany the principle of productive co-operation

has also taken a firm hold on the industrial classes. On this point Lord Reay, quoting from returns made by the late Dr. Schulze-Delitzsch, in his address at the Co-operative Congress held at Oxford in 1882, said :—

“ The statistical returns of German productive associations are still insignificant as compared with those of German credit associations, but they are still encouraging. They include wine-growers, tobacco-nists, upholsterers, printers, and other manufactures, with 762 members. The net profits are £5,000. Besides, we have five dairy associations, with 117 members, and sales amounting to more than £23,000.”

Such facts as these, taken together with those quoted above, place the possibility of carrying on productive co-operation successfully beyond all doubt. The division of profits in such societies is a point which at present is raising much discussion. Some contend that all profits should go to the shareholders. Others maintain that they should be divided in a certain ratio between labour and capital. The latter contention appears to be by far the more just, although, where the rights of labour and capital are united in the same person, this may not seem to be of much consequence. Still, cases naturally occur where one man has a large number of shares and does little work ; and another man has only a few shares but puts in many more hours' work. Co-operation has, for its first and primary object, to show that a system can be successfully carried out by which the profits that have previously gone into the hands of one man—the mill-owner, let us say—can be secured by the workers collectively. But it has a secondary and hardly less important mission, and that is to demonstrate that the profits of labour should return to labour, and not be absorbed by capital. The only way of enforcing this doctrine is to give a bonus to labour in proportion to the rate of profit. This principle is advocated very strongly by some of the leading co-operators. Mr. Lloyd Jones says in support of it :—

“ . . . the first question should have been how to apply more fully the co-operative idea in the interests of the co-operative business. Bonus to labour is the suggestion always uppermost in such a discussion ; which means that every working-man in such an establishment should be encouraged to become a shareholder that he may be in part his own employer. . . . that the profit realized should not be divided on capital in the usual way, but that capital should have an understood and liberal payment as percentage, and that, after providing for depreciation in plant and contingent losses in business, then labour to be recognized as entitled to bonus in addition to wages.”

In an able paper on “ How to make Productive Co-operation a Success,” Mr. Alfred Smith expresses the same idea :—

[Vol. CXXI. No. CCXLII.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. LXV. No. II. F F



“In the writer’s opinion no productive concern can ever hope to become really successful that does not provide the means of giving all the workpeople it employs a share in the profits of the undertaking. By this means all will take a greater interest in their work. They will work harder, labour more economically, waste will be avoided, and all will be actuated, from the oldest to the youngest, by the one desire—namely, making the affair successful. I know there are difficulties in practically carrying out the giving of bonus to labour but in my opinion all can be overcome by a society or company fully believing in the advantages arising from making labour interested in its work.”

These ideas have been already carried out by several societies with the most successful results, but it is to be hoped that they will be adopted universally; otherwise there is a danger that the productive co-operative movement will merely end in creating a large number of small capitalists in place of a small number of great capitalists: a great gain indeed, but nothing comparable to that which would ensue from the just and general recognition of the value of labour.

---

## ART VII.—CODIFICATION OF ENGLISH LAW :

### A RETROSPECT AND A PROSPECT.

1. *De la Codification en général, et de celle de l'Angleterre en particulier, en une série de lettres adressées à Mr. C. P. Cooper, avocat Anglais.* Par J. D. MEIJER. Amsterdam. 1830.
2. *Digest of Law Commission: First Report of the Commissioners and other Papers referred to in the Letter of the Secretary of the Commissioners to the Inns of Court, dated the 22nd of November, 1867.* London: Eyre & Spottiswoode. 1867.
3. *Essays upon the Form of Law.* By THOMAS ERSKINE HOLLAND. London. 1870.
4. *An English Code: its Difficulties and the Mode of Overcoming Them. A Practical Application of the Science of Jurisprudence.* By SHELDON AMOS. London. 1873.
5. *A Digest of the Law of Evidence.* (Third Edition.) By JAMES FITZJAMES STEPHEN. London. 1877.
6. *Improvement of the Law by Private Enterprise.* An Article published in *The Nineteenth Century* (vol. ii. pp. 198–217). By JAMES FITZJAMES STEPHEN. London. 1877.

7. *The Criminal Code (Indictable Offences) Bill, 1878: A Bill to establish a Code of indictable Offences and the procedure relating thereto.* London: Butterworths. 1878.
8. *The Municipal Corporations Act, 1882: an Act for consolidating, with Amendments, Enactments relating to Municipal Corporations in England and Wales* [15 & 16 Vict. cap. 50].
9. *The Bills of Exchange Act, 1882: an Act to Codify the Law relating to Bills of Exchange, Cheques and Promissory Notes* [15 & 16 Vict. cap. 61].
10. *The Rules of the Supreme Court, 1883.* Ordered to be printed by the House of Commons, July 11, 1883.

## PART I.—RETROSPECT.

THE word "codification" seems until recently to have had for English lawyers all the terrors of a bugbear; and not only, we may add, for the majority of practitioners but for some theoretical jurists as well. Up to the last ten or twenty years there was believed to be something in the spirit and genius of our law, and still more in the history of its growth, which rebelled against rigid systematization, as against the imposition of a form on matter to which it is alien and unsuited. There is much in a name, especially where our countrymen are concerned. The term "democracy" we distrust, as suggesting Parisian communes and mob-riots or government by street-barricades and "holy dynamite," though we by no means dislike—on the contrary, to a large extent, we adopt—the thing. Similarly the words "code" and "codification" to many of us irresistibly suggest military despotism and visions of Napoleon "going down to posterity with the French Code in his hand," or recall Justinian and the decadence of empire; while we forget that the Napoleonic code was substantially the work of republican jurists and came ready to the Emperor's hand; and that Scævola and the school of Roman jurists originating with him rendered the subsequent labours of Tribonian possible and fruitful. So potent has been this magic of a distasteful name that eminent historians have been found to generalize on this flimsy basis, and elevate a prejudice into a proposition, such as that deliberately maintained by Merivale, to the effect that a code always has been in the past (and probably will be, he leaves us to infer, in the future) a badge of national servitude or degradation. Nor will jurists or chroniclers admit that codification has ever become an English practice at all, so great is

their hostility to this unhappy term. It is not worth while for us to dispute for a moment the statement that no comprehensive code *eo nomine* has yet been introduced by parliamentary authority into our jurisprudence ; but it is very material to point out that any assertion that England has not been *in fact* codifying, or (to avoid the objectionable word) systematizing its law in successive efforts from even the earliest times, is grossly incorrect. To trace these steps in their continuity and development—an inquiry often somewhat neglected by theoretical jurists—will constitute the most convenient foundation and point of departure for a subsequent discussion of our present position and future prospects in this field.

Customary law and procedure were the two subject-matters with which our earliest systematizers of law had to deal. The latter, indeed, has been, in the initial stages of the jurisprudence of all countries, the first care and chief province of the reformer (both in the literal and in the popular sense of the word), while the former must also have largely engaged his attention, because, in such primitive times, there was as yet little written matter extant to be handled by him.

The first attempt to express in an orderly and knowable shape, and to render public in the form of a treatise, the then existing body of English substantive law, was contained in the famous work of the Chief Justiciar Glanville, "On the Laws and Customs of the Kingdom of England," composed in the reign, and some say at the command of, Henry II. (*circa* 1189 A.D.). Questions of procedure, collections of precedents of writs, and generally matters relating to the practice obtaining in the *Aula Regis* occupy, as we are prepared to find, a large proportion of the book but by no means the whole ; and it is material to observe that both in those parts which deal with the substance, and in those which deal with the form of the law, there is a tendency and disposition to introduce order and logical arrangement into what even in those days was (as described by the Chief Justiciar) "a multiplicity of enactments." The codificatory instinct, by whatever name it may be called, which impels a jurist to map out the field of law into a system of rationally co-ordinated principles is revealed in the following extract from the preface :\*

"To reduce in every instance the laws and constitution of this realm into writing would in our times be absolutely impossible, as well on account of the ignorance of writers, as of the confused multiplicity of enactments. But there are some well-established rules which, as

---

\* As cited and translated by Lord Campbell, "Lives of the Chief Justices," vol. i. p. 26.

they more frequently arise in court, it appears to me not presumptuous to put into writing, to assist the memory and for general reference. A certain portion of these I mean to submit to the reader in the following work, purposely making use of a familiar style and of words which occur in legal proceedings. My object has been to instruct not only the professional lawyer but such as are less accustomed to technical learning. For the sake of perspicuity I have divided the present work into books and chapters."

The three grand essentials of a code were thus kept in view in Glanville's project, inasmuch as his design was to render a quantity of uncertain, variable, unrelated, and little known customs (1) fixed and certain, (2) coherent and logical, and (3) publicly accessible.

The "Tractatus de Legibus et Consuetudinibus Angliæ" was followed by another work written with much the same intention and with an almost identical title by Henry de Bracton, Chief Justiciar in the time of Henry III. (*circa* 1265-1267). The latter work is very remarkable, not only for its carefully thought-out form and its elegancy of expression but by reason of the fact that the author in composing it went out of his way (unlike Glanville) to consult a foreign model, the Roman Civil Law. This, which has been imputed to it as a defect by some critics, is of course, in reality, one of the greatest merits of the book; so much so, that Lord Campbell (an intelligent but by no means uncompromising advocate of system in the exposition of English law) writes in reference to the treatise which he says, made use of the Roman Digest rather by way of illustration than otherwise: "There seems great reason to regret that the prejudices of English lawyers in all ages have inclined them to confine their attention almost exclusively to the technicalities of their own particular code—ever more distinguished for precision than for enlarged principles. The work we are considering certainly gives a complete view of the municipal law of England in all its titles as it stood when the author wrote; and for systematic arrangement, for perspicuity, and for nervousness, it cannot be too much admired." As such, we claim Bracton's disquisition as one of the earliest efforts in the direction of what is *in fact* codification. The treatise was succeeded by two other works on the same lines, and similarly looking to ancient Rome to supply an exemplar of form if not of substance—the one written by Britton (often mistaken for Bracton, whom he very closely copied), and the other called "Fleta," not because any person so named was the author, but because it was written in the Fleet Prison (by whom, we shall probably never discover).

The only other writer to be mentioned as belonging in any conspicuous degree to this first period of what the reader will

now allow us to call codification, is Ralph de Hengham who did for the procedure what his predecessors had done for the substance of our law. Created Chief Justice of the Court of King's Bench by Edward I. at the almost incredibly early age of thirty, De Hengham proceeded immediately on his appointment to justify its wisdom, not only by the expedition with which he transacted the business of his court, but also by the composition of his once famous "Registrum Brevium," and his two books of "Summæ" (drolly styled by their author "Hengham Magna" and "Hengham Parva"), together constituting an accurate, logical, and complete a code—with reference to the state of the law then existing—of procedure in an action from writ to execution, as do the latest similar codes represented by the recently issued "Rules of the Supreme Court 1881," with reference to the practice in vogue at the present day. "It may be considered," says Lord Campbell, "as creating order out of chaos in the legal world."

The mention of Edward I. reminds us that we are now on the confines of a second period of English codification, in which we find that statutes have more particularly increased and multiplied, and require more pressingly than customs or the common law to be dealt with by the methodizer. Before crossing this boundary, however, we may note that up to the date of Edward I., during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the writings in which we find the substance of the common law and the forms of procedure systematized were commentaries, as they would now be called; but commentaries in no essential feature distinguishable from codes. That is to say, these treatises did everything which early codes did or were expected to do for the people. In their respective degrees they got rid of that *misera servitus incerta lex* by rendering the law public and cognizable. They further provided that which all codes, whether of an early or late period, ought to provide, an orderly and intelligent arrangement, division, and distribution of the various parts and branches of the law as then known. At the present day, of course, we are oppressed with those "camel-loads of commentaries," to which even the code of Justinian gave birth, and what we now want is not commentary, but an escape from commentary; not textbooks, but codes in a more modern and restricted sense. *Now* a commentary is the very antipodes of a code; but we must remember that *then* commentary and code were really synonymous. Too much of the modern textbook is occupied with dissertations on the correctness or otherwise of recent decisions, on the extent to which they are applicable, and on the possibility of their being reversed on appeal; or with attempts to reconcile conflicting rules of law laid down by tribunals of co-ordinate jurisdiction, and disquisitions as to how far a particular expression in a judgment may be

considered "necessary to the decision," as containing or involving the *ratio decidendi*, rather than a mere *obiter dictum*; or lastly, with historical narratives and investigations of the manner and steps by which the law on any particular subject was built up or came into being. This is of course to ignore the characteristic mark of a true code, which is to expound existing jurisprudence in the smallest number of general propositions which shall embrace the whole law and nothing but the law on the given topic. But in those remote days of the first Henrys the common law was so small in bulk, and its history was so short, that to expound, discuss, and trace the origin of the current laws and customs in a good treatise written in terse and precise sentences (such as those of Bracton, whose expressions were often much neater, and at the same time more comprehensive, than many of the clauses and long-winded preambles of contemporary statutes), and with due regard to logical distribution, was in effect to codify, and to codify in the best form possible to a jurist of the time.

The main obstacles to every effort in the direction of intelligent and intelligible "nomography" (to adopt Bentham's expression) during this period were the curious but persistent belief then entertained by the most influential classes that the re-expression of *form* thus attempted was somehow bound up with, and dependent for its success on, the Roman Civil Law, coupled with the further but much more erroneous notion that it was from the *matter* of the pandects and codes of imperial Rome that the canonists sucked their pernicious doctrine of unqualified subjection to Church and King. These objectors could not understand that the method might possibly be utilized and serve as a salutary model without any taint of the pestilential substance being worked in with it. The study of the civil law, it was urged, was the beginning of all the unholy suggestions then made with the view of imposing first its form and then its matter on the living laws and customs of the land; and it was from this Mezentian marriage of the quick with the dead that monks and royal favourites hoped to win a bloodless victory over England's liberties. *Principiis obsta* was the cry; "let us have no dealing, for whatever purpose, with the accursed thing."\* The nobility in particular, from a very early period, opposed with the utmost vigour the alleged attempt on the part of foreign ecclesi-

---

\* In that very unessential and severable sentence of the Digest, "Quod principi placuit, legis habet vigorem," they detected the possibility (in monkish hands) of upheaving the basis of rational freedom; even the attempt to introduce torture as a legal means of extracting evidence they associated as effect with the study of Roman Law as cause.—De Lolme's "Constitution of England," p. 181.

astics, who had thronged to England in the Conqueror's train, to introduce a code of the mysteries of which they alone would take care to possess and retain the key. Animated by these feelings, the nobles looked with sullen ill-will on the teaching of the Roman law at the universities and on the success which attended the lectures of Vacarius, its first English expositor, who at Oxford was then drawing crowds to his lectures on the Pandects recently discovered at Amalfi [*circa* 1130]. King Stephen, at their instigation, went so far as to publish a proclamation absolutely forbidding the study of the civil law; and the famous "una vox" of the counts and barons at the Parliament of Merton—"nolumus leges Angliæ mutari quæ hucusque usitatæ sunt et approbatæ"—was prompted by a sense of the yet lingering influence of the Roman as filtered through the canon law; while at a still later date, not strictly falling within the limits of the period now under consideration, this ever-watchful and jealous order, in the reign of Richard II., again found cause to protest that "the kingdom of England was not before this time, nor, according to the intent of the king our lord and lords of parliament, ever shall be ruled or governed by the civil law." [Parl. Westmonast. 11 Rich. II. Feb. 3, 1379.] This feeling of distrust on the part of the nobility was not long in spreading to the commons; and so it was that, the general body of the laity becoming unanimous on the point, "these laws" in the words of De Lolme (pp. 103, 104), "to which their wisdom in many cases, and particularly their extensiveness"—[and, we may add, their form and method]—"ought naturally to have procured admittance, when the English laws themselves were yet but in their infancy, experienced the most steady opposition from the lawyers; and as those persons who sought to introduce them frequently renewed their attempts, there at length arose a kind of general combination among the laity to confine them to monasteries and universities."\*

To sum up the noticeable features of the period just traversed:—the steps in the codification of our law were nearly all taken by Chief Justices; the matter on which their ingenuity was exercised was mainly the common law administered by themselves, of which the *gremium judicis* was thought to be the sacred and ample repository; the means of codifying was the commentary or methodical treatise; while, in matters of arrangement, models

\* Compare Blackstone, vol. i. pp. 17 *seq.*; vol. iv. p. 421. See also on the struggle maintained by the laity against the study of the Roman law and its application to English laws and customs, Reeve's "History of the English Law," vol. i. pp. 529-533; vol. ii. pp. 171-177, and particularly pp. lxxxvii.-xciv., and cxiii.-cxxxii. of Mr. Finlason's Introduction in the first volume of that work.

were supplied by the Roman Civil Law which, for this purpose (notwithstanding much violent opposition on the ground that its methods could not be adopted without infiltration of the substance) was freely resorted to and consulted.

We now come to a period when Sovereigns, or the keepers of their consciences, mainly directed the work of codification; when the matter taken in hand was the statute-law of the land, now fast increasing both in bulk and importance, owing to the legislative energy of Edward I. and others, and overshadowing the common law, the significance of which proportionately waned; when the instruments employed for codifying statutes were other statutes of a consolidating and amending, or of a declaratory character; and lastly, when the Roman Civil Law, little heeded as it was by royal reformers of (and by means of) Acts of Parliament, came to be more and more disregarded and discredited.

It is for the substance of his legislative reforms that our first Edward is principally remembered; but it may be doubted whether he should not be held in at least equal honour for his successful endeavour (the first of its kind in our legal history) to give to the statutes then existing—whether introduced before or by him—a definite arrangement and logical shape. To this latter quality of his work, quite as much as to the former, the title so often bestowed upon him of the English Justinian seems to point. The careful methodizing, as well as the bold devising, of a workable system of judicial machinery, which characterized his reign, excited the admiration of Matthew Hale (himself no mean advocate of codification), as expressed in his “History of the Common Law” (p. 162). “More,” writes Hale, “was done in the first thirteen years of his (Edward I.’s) reign to settle and establish the distributive justice of the kingdom, than in all the ages since that time put together.”\* If the observation of Balzac, when criticizing Sir Walter Scott’s works, may be deemed applicable to other fields than those of literature and art, then may we say that the genius of Edward I. in legislation was “complete” in a remarkable degree. “Le génie n’est complet que quand il joint à la faculté de créer la puissance de coordonner ses créations.”

So durable indeed was the foundation and design, so great the solidity and symmetry of the legislative code of Edward I. that it sufficed till the days of Elizabeth and James I. without

---

\* On the various departments of law subjected to this energetic process of simultaneously reforming and methodizing—“establishing” on the one hand and “settling” on the other, to use Hale’s language—see Blackstone’s “Commentary,” vol. iv. pp. 425–427; and compare Matthew Hale’s “Considerations touching the Amendment or Alteration of Laws,” printed in Hargrave’s “Law Tracts,” at pp. 266, 268, 270.



eliciting any noteworthy complaint or demand for reform or restatement, unless we are to except the expression on the part of Edward VI. of a not very confident "wish that, when time shall serve, the superfluous and tedious statutes were brought into one sum together, and made more plain and short, to the intent that men might better understand them ; which thing shall much help to advance the people of the commonwealth."\* Towards the end of the sixteenth century, however, there appeared to have grown up a real need for the re-expression and rearrangement of the patchwork accretions to the original system, and we find that King James, in 1609, becomes conscious of the fact, and himself (in an address to Parliament from the throne) complains, after his quaint and pedantic fashion, of certain "cross and cutting statutes," which he thought might usefully be taken in hand, reconciled, and welded together, in order that, amongst other things, "all contrarieties should be scraped out of our books." "And this reformation," he adds, "might, methinks, be made a worthy work, and well deserves a Parliament to be set of purpose for it."† These were "grave 'orts," but they led to nothing. Monarchs like James I. might suggest the idea ; it required a Chancellor like Bacon to work out the scheme, and even then the filling in of the outline was still to be done.

Even without the instigation of James, a powerful incentive to so supple a courtier, we might be sure that the intellectual habits and instincts of Bacon would sooner or later have led him at least to contemplate such a labour. And contemplate it he did : but, unfortunately like, so many other schemes, both in law and philosophy, excellently devised by this great thinker, the contemplated Digest, though mapped out broadly and in its main features, never got beyond this stage, and our only legacy is a series of most luminous and fruitful suggestions. Here, as in other provinces of thought, the philosopher (to adopt his own metaphor) led the way to the Promised Land but himself entered not. What his idea and hope in the matter was appears from that majestic sentence revealing his characteristic confidence and amplitude of scientific prevision :—"Quod si leges aliæ super alias accumulatae in tam vasta excreverint volumina, aut tantâ confusione laboraverint, ut eas de integro retractare et in corpus sanum et habile redigere ex usu sit ;

---

\* Cited in Mr. Holland's "Form of Law," p. 52.

† Nor does he omit to mention the advantages to be derived from a similar removal of contrarieties from the reports of decided cases. But the tentative tone of the speech is in marked contrast to the bold and florid language of Justinian's address to his Commissioners and to the workmanlike legislation (not suggestions) of Edward I.

id ante omnia agito, atque *opus ejusmodi opus heroicum esto*" ("De Augm. Scient.," Bk. viii. Aph. 59). The necessity of an *opus heroicum* to cope with the problem Bacon sagaciously foresaw, but the heroic undertaking itself he has left to posterity.

It was tautology and redundancy which Edward VI., and "contrariety" or inconsistency which James noticed as blots on the statutes of their respective periods. A consolidating process was the remedy prescribed for the one disease, a partly repealing and partly expurgating process for the other. Bacon, as we shall see, suggested the combined use of these processes, amongst others, as calculated to secure the elimination both of "homoionomics" (to use his term) and "antinomies." Meanwhile it is to be noted that even in 1577 the elder Bacon (Nicholas, the Lord Keeper), was entrusted with the execution of some project for trimming the Statute-book. The heads of the scheme (which, though neatly planned, failed, like the rest, of any practical issue), were as follows :\*—"First, where many laws be made for one thing, the same are to be reduced and established into one law, and the former be abrogated." [This is the earliest definite recommendation of the consolidation of Acts of Parliament, as we now understand it, and may be described as the parent of the processes of a much later day which have given us our Municipal Corporations Act, Public Health Acts, Highway Acts, and the like.] Next follow suggestions as to the mode of printing and of abridgment. Then comes a very important "item": "Where part of an Act standeth in force, and another part abrogated, there shall be no more printed but that that standeth in force." [After three centuries this elementary work has at length been done for the entire body of statutes in "The Revised Edition" lately published, from which the repealed portions of partially repealed statutes, as well as the entirety of such as are wholly repealed, are expunged].

Observing that the Commission appointed by James I. in 1610, as the outcome of his temporary enthusiasm on the subject of the possible reconciliation of "cross and cuffling statutes," had not led to any movement on the part of the legislature, nor in fact resulted in anything whatsoever except a Report containing a list of obsolete statutes from 3 Edw. I. to 2 Jac. I., together with suggestions for repeals and amendments,—the younger, and more famous Francis Bacon propounded to the king, in a letter written after his downfall and disgrace (May 2, 1621), his

---

\* Holland's "Form of Law," p. 115.

plan for a "Digest of the Laws," frankly offering it as a bribe\* in these extraordinarily complacent terms:—"Because he that hath taken bribes is apt to give bribes, I will go further, and present your Majesty with a bribe; for if your Majesty give me *peace and leisure*" [broad acres and access to the Court?] "and God give me life, I will present you with a good History of England, and a better Digest of your Laws. And so, concluding with my prayers, I rest, clay in your Majesty's hands, Fr. St. Alban."† The offer is repeated in another letter of the same year, in which the fallen Chancellor refers to his previous proposal and to the fact that he had proceeded in the "History" as far as the conclusion of the reign of Henry VII., which portion he therewith sent to his Majesty and dedicated to the Prince. "Because in the beginning of my trouble," he writes, "when in the midst of the tempest I had a kenning of the harbour which I hope now by your Majesty's favour I am entering into, I made a tender to your Majesty of two works, a History of England and a Digest of your Laws; as I have by a figure of *pars pro toto* performed the one, so I have herewith sent your Majesty by way of an epistle a new offer of the other."‡

As the history of which Bacon here claims part-performance was never completed, so also, and for the same reasons—"peace and leisure" having been already secured—the Digest of the Laws was never so much as begun. With the second "tender by way of epistle" Bacon seems to have thought that his obligations in the matter ended. Indeed in 1622, the year after that in which the "new offer" was made, having obtained whatever concessions he was ever likely to obtain from king or king's favourite, he did not scruple to write in his Epistle Dedicatory to "An Advertisement touching a Holy War:—"Although it be true that I had a purpose to make a particular digest or recompilement of the laws of mine own nation, yet *because it is a work of assistance and that I cannot master by my own forces and pen, I have laid it aside.*" But though he wrote nothing in the way of a Digest of the statute law of the land, yet in his collections of Maxims, in his pamphlet on "The Use of the Law," and in others of his tracts on legal subjects, Bacon has amply showed us with what orderly arrangement of principles he would have enriched, and in what concise and nervous sentences he would have expressed, the common law of England if he had

---

\* He was anxious at this time to be allowed to retain some part of his estates, all of which had been formally forfeited, and not to be debarred from access to the Court, which also formed part of the sentence against him.

† "Bacon's Works," Montagu's edition, vol. xiii. p. 31. ‡ *Ibid.* p. 37.

proceeded further in his undertaking. Not even the Aphorisms of the "Novum Organon," we may well believe, would have excelled in elegance such a body of *leges legum* (to use his expression for the primary and radical propositions of a legal system) as he could have compiled, and of which, as it is, he has bequeathed to us some three hundred examples both *lucifera* and *fructifera*. This part, however, of Bacon's work belongs properly to the first beginnings of the period of common law codification which we are shortly about to investigate. Meanwhile it is of interest to observe how fully this great master of method had, in his scattered thoughts on statute-codification, anticipated the views and suggestions of the theoretical jurists and governmental commissioners of this century. In the eighth book of his "De Augmentis Scientiarum," after dealing with various other topics more or less connected with "Universal Justice or Fountains of Equity," which he had adopted as the theme and title of the book, he comes to the heading, "Of the Excessive Accumulation of Laws" (Aph. 53-64). Having explained "the primary dignity of laws, that they be certain," he shows in what respects they may be accounted uncertain,—namely, (1) where no law is prescribed, and (2) where the law is ambiguous or obscure (Aph. 9). On the former cause of uncertainty he dilates in Aphorisms 10-52, while under the latter head he explains that the causes of obscurity are fourfold, and amongst them he names as prominent and influential "the excessive accumulation of laws," which most nearly concerns us at present, and on which he proceeds to deliver his weighty opinions.

Bacon is in the first place an evident and zealous advocate if not of general consolidation at all events of consolidating statutes dealing with specific provinces of law. To "repeal and cancel all former enactments, and substitute *an entirely new and uniform law*," is, he holds, a much better method than that other which he mentions of piecemeal tinkering, or "confirming and strengthening former statutes on the same subject, and then making a few additions and alterations." The former is "the best course for securing *harmony in times to come*," though "greater care is required in deliberating about the law itself, and former Acts must be carefully searched and canvassed before it pass" (Aph. 54). He then suggests (Aph. 55, 56), following the model provided by the famous institution of the *Thesmothetæ* at Athens, that there should be a periodical review of the existing state of the law by properly appointed magistrates, whose duty it should be to point out subsisting "antinomies" or contradictions between statutes, and to call upon the legislature to extinguish one or other of the inconsistent matters or pass a new

Act reconciling them.\* Such Commissioners were also to report on, and propose the repeal of, all such laws as they should find to have become practically obsolete. Expurgation proper (which the above recommendation can hardly in strictness be said to deal with†) is discussed in the 60th Aphorism (treating of “New Digests of Laws”), in which the whole philosophy and duty of a statute-codifier is admirably summed up. “First,” Bacon says, “let obsolete laws, which Justinian calls old fables, be omitted.” [By obsolete laws are here meant not such as have fallen into disuse and are no longer enforced—these are referred to above—but such as have been formally repealed but still encumber the Statute-book]. “Secondly, let the most approved antinomies be received, and the rest abolished.” [This has yet to be done formally. Though the easy problem of mere expurgation has been solved by the “Revised Edition of the Statutes,” this second of Bacon’s requirements, so far as it is satisfied at all, is satisfied only by those ingenious modes of conciliatory interpretation which could only be harboured in the *gremium* of a judge forbidden to look outside the four corners of a self-contradicting instrument or series of instruments.] “Thirdly, let Homoiouomies, or laws which are of the same import and nothing else but reiterations of the same thing, be erased and let the one which is the most perfect among them be retained in place of all the rest.” [The nearest modern approach to the process here recommended is to be found in the favourite device of framing “consolidating statutes.”] “Fourthly, let such laws as determine nothing, but only propose questions, and leave them undecided, be dismissed in like manner. Lastly, let those laws which are found to be wordy and too prolix be more compressed and abridged.” [The two last-mentioned undertakings are more germane to the problem of codification in the strictest sense and are as yet, it is needless to say, almost unattempted.]

Valuable as these suggestions were they (as we have seen) bore no immediate fruit. The labour of working out his own design seemed too much for Bacon alone, according to his account.

---

\* The same suggestion (in a modern dress) is made by Mr. Sheldon Amos, who would like to see a permanent Commission established to advise the Legislature, on the occasion of any Bill coming before them, as to the whole state and history of the existing and pre-existing law on the subject-matter of the Bill. See below on this.

† Bacon here proposes something much more than rearrangement of form; he in fact proposes to arm such Commissioners as he suggests with novel and rather dangerous powers—powers, namely, to disregard laws still formally in force and unrepealed. The ordinary Courts too, ought in his opinion (Aph. 58) to have direct authority to decree against “sleeping laws” (such, for instance, as the Blasphemy Laws and the Lord’s Day Act have almost become at the present day).

If he had found time or, we may perhaps say, if he had found it worth his while, he would doubtless have perfected the work in all its details, as no man before him and few since could have done. The pen which put together the detailed records of phenomena comprised in the "Historia Ventorum," the "Historia Densi et Rari," and the "Historia Vitæ et Mortis," could have found little difficulty in first setting down and tabulating the statutes with all their homionomies and antinomies, their repetitions and contradictions, and then expurgating, co-ordinating, and abbreviating the materials thus acquired, and welding the shapeless mass into a coherent and well-balanced whole. But it was not to be: neither Elizabeth's nor James's reign saw any practical issue of Bacon's proposals other than that which we have detailed. Under the Commonwealth, however, several Commissions were appointed, in 1665 (under the Lord Keeper Whitelocke), in 1652, and in 1653, "to revise all former statutes and ordinances now in force, and consider [amongst other things] how the same may be reduced into a compendious way and exact method, for the more ease and clear understanding of the people." The result of these, as also of yet another Commission under Charles II. in 1666, was, as before, *nil*.\*

During this period, extending over more than four centuries, from Edward I. to James I., we hear very little of the Roman law. English statutes of the time bear on their face the sign and seal of national aspirations, impulses, and prejudices; so much so, indeed, that, ranged in chronological order, they constitute by themselves a valuable narrative of our "island story;" and, as Marlborough learnt his history from Shakespeare, so a neither more nor less complete chronicle might be extracted from the unexpurgated Statute-book.† To this essentially native material only native logic and method could be applied, or was ever suggested as proper to be applied. Accordingly, the decline of the civil law was naturally contemporaneous with the phenomenal legislative activity of the thirteenth and beginning of the fourteenth centuries. The dispute "between the laws of England and Rome," says Blackstone (vol. iv. p. 421), "so vigorously carried on throughout the reign of Henry II.,

\* We should add that at about this date Matthew Hale in his tractate entitled "Considerations touching the Amendment or Alteration of Laws" (published in Hargrave's Law Tracts, p. 253), though treating mainly of *substantial* amendments of statutes, takes occasion to specifically advocate the employment of consolidation as regards their *form*.

† Even Bacon, in his scheme for an expurgated Statute-book, proposes that the obsolete and expurgated enactments be carefully preserved "and that the old volumes do not altogether perish and pass into oblivion; but that they be preserved at least in libraries," though he would prohibit "the ordinary and promiscuous use of them" ("De Augm.," Bk. viii. Aph. 63).

was kept on foot till the reign of Edward I., when the laws of England, under the new discipline introduced by that skilful commander, obtained a complete and permanent victory.\* Emboldened, finally, by the precipitous flight of the civil law to whatever sanctuary it could find in a university or a monastery, there were not wanting those who (not contented with merely disputing the applicability of, or rather the necessity for applying, the form of the one to the genius and substance of the other) proceeded to make somewhat idle comparisons between the two systems in point of dignity and general merit, claiming, like Fortescue in his "*De Laudibus Legum Angliæ*" (*temp.* Hen. VI.), not only a superiority but a greater antiquity for the English law. (De Lolme's "*Constitution of England*," p. 104).†

By the time of the "*Annus Mirabilis*"—if we must fix any particular year—we come to the close of what is at best a very meagre epoch of codification, and that entirely devoted to statute law, and we enter upon, or rather (as we are reminded by the names of Elizabeth, James I., and Bacon) we have already to some extent entered upon, a new period of common law codification, to the entire disregard of Acts of Parliament, of the systematization of which we hear no more from 1666 to the earlier part of the current century. This third period, extending over the seventeenth, the eighteenth and part of the nineteenth century, presents the same leading features as the earliest of all. Judges (such as Littleton, Coke, Hale, Holt, and others) are again, as before, the principal condensers and codifiers or advocates of codification. The matter which these judges systematize, or desire to see systematized, consists once more of the principles of the common law, as imbedded in *gremio judicis* or in judicial reports, now rapidly assuming a much greater importance than in the days of the old Year Books : and the instrument of codification mainly employed or suggested is the commentary, such as those of Littleton, Coke, and Matthew Hale, or the Abridgment or Digest (as then understood), such as those of Rolle, Bacon, and Comyns ; while the Roman civil law again rears its head, occasioning a repetition of those violent controversies to which in this country, from the days of the barons of Richard II. to those of Jeremy Bentham, it has always given rise, evoking sympathies and antipathies, advocates and adversaries ; attracting on

---

\* Cf. Hallam's "*Middle Ages*," vol. iii. p. 517.

† It is only fair, however, to add that this unmeasured onslaught was apparently provoked by some attempt on the part of John Holland, Duke of Exeter, and William de la Pole, Duke of Suffolk, to reintroduce the civil law, and as Coke (who cordially hated the Roman system) maliciously insinuated, to "exhibit the torture as a beginning thereof" ("*Instit.*" Bk. iii. p. 35 ; De Lolme, pp. 180, 181, n.).

the one side the large and learned patronage of a Hale or a Holt, on the other the acrid contempt of a Coke.\*

As early as the thirty-fifth year of Elizabeth's reign, we find traces of a plan excogitated by her Majesty (whether at Bacon's instigation or not)† for the consolidation and re-expression of the whole body of the existing laws—common law no less than statute law. In a passage from the Epistle Dedicatory prefixed by Bacon to his "Maxims of the Law," we find the following adumbration of what appears to have been a very comprehensive scheme:—

"I am an unworthy witness to your Majesty of a higher intention and project, both by that which was published by your Chancellor in full Parliament from your royal mouth in the five-and-thirtieth of your happy reign, and *much more by that which I have been since vouchsafed to understand from your Majesty—imparting a purpose for these many years infused into your Majesty's breast, to enter into a general amendment of the states of your laws and to reduce them to more brevity and certainty, that . . . the judge [may be] better directed in his sentence, the counsellor better warranted in his counsel, the student eased in his reading, the contentious suitor that seeketh but vexation disarmed, and the honest suitor that seeketh but to obtain his right relieved.*"‡

It is quite clear from the above, as well as from the "Maxims" themselves (which are offered as the first-fruits of this codifying zeal, and as a specimen of the manner in which the common law was capable of being stated in short but comprehensive and logically arranged propositions), that a revision and reconstruction of the common law, equally with the statutes, was in contemplation; more especially as Bacon writes immediately after the passage already cited that there is "no precedent full in view but of Justinian," the mention of which Emperor gives

---

\* Coke, indeed, is a very characteristic, perhaps the most characteristic, figure of the period on which we are now entering. He was a laborious, disputative, and logical commentator on the common law, but hated, with an equally hearty hatred, not only Roman law, but the statute law also, and, indeed, anything that was not common law. There is a story related of him, that on a friend desiring to propound a question of law to him, while playing at bowls, he inquired:—"Is it statute law or common law? because, if the latter, I should be ashamed if I could not answer it; if the former, I should be ashamed if I could."

† Probably it was; and Bacon may have been too good a courtier to represent the design as originating with himself.

‡ The main advantages of a code to the judge, the practitioner, the student, and the public, are in the last few sentences tersely summed up. It is noticeable that the desirability of a Code from an *educational* point of view—so vigorously insisted upon by Sir James Stephen and other recent advocates of codification—is here for the first time perceived and expressed.



the supple Chancellor an opportunity not only of offering homage to Elizabeth [“yet I must say, as Cicero said to Cæsar, *nihil vulgatum te dignum videri potest*”], but further of expressing what we may believe to have been his real sentiments on the advisability of trusting, in such an enterprise, to native logic rather than to a slavish adoption of the form and structure of the civil law. The whole of the Preface which follows this “Epistle Dedicatory,” and in which are explained the principles on which these *leges legum* should be extracted and arranged, is admirably sound and felicitous, and should be read, together with the “Maxims” themselves, by any one anxious to see from a study of this very brief fragment—for such it is—what an excellent analytical code of the existing law (other than statutory law) Bacon could have compiled had he chosen.

Of the generality of contemporary commentaries Bacon obviously entertains no very high opinion, though commending Littleton on the ground that his work was arranged in more orderly fashion than any of the others, and laid down sound and philosophical propositions, without citing cases\*—thus containing many of the essentials of a code. It is evident from his criticisms on this head, as well as from the other more direct evidence which we have brought forward, that he must have often turned over in his mind the question of common law codification—an easier task, perhaps, in his day than the systematization of statute law which, as we have seen, he found to be too great an undertaking for his individual pen. In another place (“De Augm.” Bk. viii. Aph. 61) he expressly recommends an independent digesting of the common law as well as, and apart from, the statute law. “It will be very useful in a new Digest of Laws to digest and arrange separately on the one side all the laws received as common law, the existence whereof is as it were from time immemorial; and on the other side the statutes which have from time to time been superadded. . . . And this was the plan followed by Tribonianus in the Digest” [which contained the opinions and maxims of the learned Gaius, Papinian, and other jurisconsults; thus corresponding to our common law as embodied in reported cases] “and the Code” [which, comprising the Imperial constitutions or decrees, corresponds to our Statute-book.]

Casting an eye over the entire field of law, Bacon was desirous that it should be taken in hand as a whole, to the neglect of no one part or subject. No such philosophical and comprehensive outlook must be expected from his great rival Edward Coke, the sound but narrow and militant advocate of the common

---

\* Montagu's edition of Bacon's Works, vol. xiii. p. 141.

law as against Roman law, statute law, equity, and contemporary foreign law alike. Yet his famous Commentary on Littleton, and his other Institutes published by order of the House of Commons, may, in virtue of some of the qualities which they exhibited, be accounted as in some small degree approaching to a code, vehemently as the author himself would have repudiated that designation; in whose eyes a *compendium* was a *dispendium*, and to whom historical lore and endless qualifications were far more important matters than system or comprehensive principles. If Coke could ever have been persuaded to accept thorough codification in any serious sense of the word, he would assuredly have suggested the application of that process to the common law,\* in the doctrines, genius, and history of which he was steeped and saturated, rather than to any other department of our jurisprudence. As for statutes, he had too hearty a contempt both for the substance of them and for the manner in which they were “on a sudden penned or corrected by men of some or very little judgment in law,”† to imagine their case at all remediable. The only suggestion ever made by him on this head was the contemptuous expression of a wish that at least no new law should be penned without the assistance of persons competent to advise and report fully on the existing state of the common law, which it was sought to repeal, amend, or declare—a useful requirement, as we have seen, at all times, but in many cases not more complied with, though much more necessary, now than then. If this rule were always adhered to, adds Coke, “then should very few questions in law arise, and the learned should not so often and so much perplex their heads to make atonement and peace, by construction of law, between insensible and disagreeing words, sentences and provisoes, as they now do.”

In the speech from the throne in 1609, to which we have already referred, King James I. was not unmindful of the claims of the reported decisions of the courts, no less than of the statutory enactments, to be reduced to some methodical form: “I would wish,” he said, “both these statutes *and reports*, as well in the Parliament as *common law*, to be at once maturely reviewed and reconciled.” It may be observed, however, that some of the “contrarieties” which King James found in the reports then existing were “contrarieties” and doubts of Coke’s own making,

---

\* By common law it will be understood that we now mean whatever English law is not statute law, ecclesiastical law, or equity; and in it therefore, we include not only traditional and unwritten principles but the law to be extracted from reported decisions of cases, the volumes of which, since Plowden and Dyer succeeded to the compilers of the Yearbooks, had been steadily growing in bulk and importance.

† “Reports,” vol. ii. Preface.

whose habit it was in his own Reports (the first five parts of which appeared from 1601–1603) to “represent a great many questions ‘to be resolved’ which were quite irrelevant or never arose at all in the cause.” Therefore even in these Reports, according to Lord Campbell,\* “he is often rather a codifier or legislator than a reporter.” In so far as he detected anomalies and want of symmetry in the existing system, and brought them out by juxtaposition of contrarieties, he performed at least one of the most negative and preliminary services of a codifier; in so far as he resolved questions “according to his own fancy” well, as he often did, he showed himself a good legislator.

The next work of note was Chief Justice Rolle’s “Abridgment” (*circa* 1630; amended by the author up to *circa* 1650), a book often consulted even now, and exhibiting a fine analytical method. It is true that the subjects are arranged on that most arbitrary of all principles—the alphabetical. But the subjects treated under the alphabetical titles are wide, and within those several limits the whole common law relating to the particular subject is admirably mapped out and logically distributed. As such, we are entitled to claim the “Abridgment” as an accession to the series of writings tending, by way of example, in the direction of the goal of codification. It is remarkable that Rolle, like Coke, reported contemporary, as well as digested previous, decisions; † and that this felicitous union of the two offices of reporter and codifier in the person of the same jurist was now becoming not uncommon.

Matthew Hale, the great judge who next handed on the torch, not only showed himself capable in his treatises of excellent codification, but wrote and spoke words expressly advocating it. The “Common Place Book,” which he compiled during his seven years of laborious studentship before being called to the bar (1630–1637), not to mention his later works, was so admirably arranged that it has been described by Lord Campbell, who had examined the MS. preserved at Lincoln’s Inn, as “in reality a Corpus Juris embracing and methodizing all that an English lawyer on any emergency could desire to know.” ‡ But more than this, we have it from the lips of his biographer, Dr. Burnet, that he was distinctly in favour of a systematic codification of English law, and that only his conviction (common to him with Bacon) that the work was too much for one man, and should be undertaken, if at all, at the command of the Sovereign, prevented him

\* “Lives of the Lord Chief Justices,” vol. i. p. 340.

† See his “Divers Cases in the Court of King’s Bench in the time of King James I.,” and compare Campbell’s “Lives of the Chief Justices,” vol. i. pp. 421, 433.

‡ “Lives of the Chief Justices,” vol. i. pp. 517, 518.

from setting to work himself on such an enterprise. Indeed when some of his friends were complaining to him that

“they looked on the common law as a study that could not be brought into a scheme nor formed into a rational science, by reason of the indigestedness of it, and the multiplicity of the cases in it which rendered it very hard to be understood or reduced into a method; he said that he was not of their mind, and so quickly after he *drew with his own hand a scheme of the whole order and parts of it on a large sheet of paper, to the great satisfaction of those to whom he sent it.* Upon this hint some pressed him to compile a body of the English law: ‘it could hardly ever be done by a man who knew it better, and would with more judgment and industry have put it into method.’ But he said: ‘As it was a great and noble design, which would be of vast advantage to the nation, so it was too much for a private man to undertake; it was not to be entered upon but by the command of a prince, and with the communicated endeavours of some of the most eminent of the profession.’”\*

It is, perhaps, to this or some such incident in Hale’s life that reference is made in a very curious and virulent little tract (anonymous) of the year 1737, entitled “The Law and Lawyers, laid open in Twelve Visions; to which is added Plain Truth in Three Dialogues between Truman, Skinall, Dryboots, Three Attorneys, and Season, a Benchur.” The title, the motto from Tacitus† (altered to suit the purpose of the moment)—*corruptissima respublica, plurimæ leges*—and the names of the interlocutors, sufficiently indicate the tenor and animus of the pamphlet. After censure of the “indigestedness” of the laws and praise of Justinian and Tribonian, and “the great Lord Verulam,” for their endeavours towards supplying or adumbrating a code (Preface and pp. 3 *seq.*), he continues (at p. 4):—“The Lord Chief Justice Hales” (*sic*), “as I have been informed by relations (who in confirmation of the truth of it, showed me several MS. writings of his that way tending), entertained some thoughts of the same nature. But how it happened it was not proceeded upon they could not tell me, and the reader must be in the dark as well as I.” The “MS. writings of his that way tending” were probably some of those (amounting in all to thirty-two folio volumes, and costing him £1,000 worth of copying and

\* “The Life and Death of Sir Matthew Hale,” by Gilbert Burnet, D.D., London, 1682, pp. 80, 81.

† “Annal.,” lib. iii. § 27. Tacitus does not say that “the more laws a State has, the more corrupt it is.” He speaks of a great complexity of laws existing in his time in what was a very corrupt and socially disorganized state, and the words are: “*corruptissimâ republicâ plurimæ leges.*” By altering the ablative to the nominative and detaching the four words from their context, the anonymous pamphleteer makes Tacitus lay down a law which he certainly never intended.

secretarial work) which were shown in 1667 to his friend Richard Baxter,\* and were ultimately bequeathed to and are now jealously guarded in the library of Lincoln's Inn. By his will Hale forbade the publication after his death of the greater part of his manuscripts, in the absence of any express direction to the contrary. In consequence of this injunction, not only his "Great Common Place Book" above mentioned (a folio volume), but also his "Notes concerning Matters of Law" (in quarto) and his "Black Book of the New Law," as well as a mass of other writings dealing with substance rather than form, are still in a manuscript condition. Not so, however, his excellent preface to Rolle's "Abridgment," which was published in his lifetime (in the year 1668), and wherein he speaks seriously of the necessity for a thorough digesting of the existing Law Reports, rapidly becoming, even then, unmanageable in bulk and irreconcilable in some of their details. A variety of his other writings were published after his death, presumably by his express direction. Of such works (to be found for the most part in Hargrave's "Law Tracts") those which contain or in any way illustrate his views as to the methodization of the common law are "An Analysis of the Civil Part of our Law" (no date)—[was this a transcript or development of the "large sheet of paper" mentioned by Burnet?]<sup>†</sup>—and also, apparently founded on the above,<sup>‡</sup> his elaborate "History of the Common Law of England in Twelve Chapters" (1713) in which, though ostensibly approaching his subject by the historical method, he could not avoid giving incidental, but none the less effective, specimens of the analytical. "This work," says Lord Campbell,<sup>‡</sup> "may be considered a sketch of what might have been expanded into a complete Civil Code." The latter work probably, and not as Lord Campbell thinks, the former, is referred to by Hargrave in the preface to his collection of "Law Tracts" (p. xii.) as "Lord Hale's previous Digest" on the foundation of which Blackstone's "Commentaries" are said to have been raised as an appropriate and worthy superstructure.

Before leaving Matthew Hale, we may remark that he was the first of the Chief Justices to study with any seriousness the equitable doctrines of English jurisprudence, on which, as well as on the common law, he brought to bear the qualities of a logical and analytical intellect. "One of the greatest men of the profession of the law" furnished to Dr. Burnet this description of Hale's

\* See Baxter's "Additional Notes to Burnet's Life," p. 125.

† See list of Hale's works in Chalmers's "Biographical Dictionary," and remarks thereon.

‡ "Lives of the Lord Chief Justices," vol. i. p. 581.

mode of invading and handling this till then somewhat alien department. "He did look upon equity as a part of the common law and one of the grounds of it"—a sentence to make Coke turn in his grave—"and therefore, as near as he could, *he did always reduce it to certain rules and principles, that men might study it as a science*" ("Life of Matthew Hale," p. 112). The above, of course, is to be understood as more immediately applicable to the Exchequer Chamber, and to the opinions delivered by him when called upon, as he often was, "to advise and assist the Lord Chancellor or Lord Keeper for the time being;" for he is not known to have made any specific suggestions for the codification of this important branch of the law, or to have written any treatise on the subject. We only make a passing allusion to the matter to show that the systematizing impulse was at work in Matthew Hale, even as regards topics where it might least have been expected to operate; and that, in short, whatever the province with which he came in contact, he "cultivated law as a science," to use Lord Campbell's well-chosen words, and "beautifully methodized the code which he found to be in force," while by no means neglecting (as is sufficiently clear from his "Considerations touching the Amendment or Abbreviation of Laws") to "give invaluable instructions as to the manner in which it might be improved."

Shortly after Hale we meet with another great name in judicial annals, that of the Lord Chief Justice Holt [died 1710]. Holt, though principally famed for his conversance with and learned exposition of the matter of our law, is also not without interest to us on account of the loyal attachment which he always exhibited to the cause of systematic distribution and formal arrangement—in fact, to the cause of codification. Such an attachment might be considered highly probable *a priori* from his known familiarity with the methods of the Roman jurists and the forms of the civil law; but apart from this, the author of the pamphlet above cited, "The Law and Lawyers" (1737), bears direct testimony (if we may trust it) to the fact. "The Lord Chief Justice Holt," he writes, "was often known to wish such a work [that is, such a work as Hale had suggested] "might be undertaken at the public charge, and expressed his readiness to countenance it."

It is remarkable that three men so incomparably equipped for the task of codification as were Bacon, Hale, and Holt, both by reason of the quality and bias of their minds and of their high office and other favourable circumstances, should yet have done little more than, in various ways, "express their readiness to countenance it." Each of them seemed to wait for the "command of a prince" to originate the undertaking, and

the "public charge" to see it through. Neither they nor any of their successors till very recently appear to have conceived codification to be possible, except by the aid of Commissions with a Government at their back. We shall have occasion hereafter to advance arguments tending to show not only the costliness but the futility of this hitherto accepted system of midwifery, and to consider whether, if no "prince" or "public charge" was forthcoming from the days of King James and Bacon to those of Holt, there is more likelihood that any such will be forthcoming now, when the matter to be codified has so enormously multiplied.

Next to Holt we have to mention a series of men like Comyns, Danvers, Bacon, Vyner and others, whose various Digests and Abridgments; able and learned as they are, exhibit (with the exception of the Digest of Comyns) a distinct decline in power of systematizing, and a seeming incapacity to cope with and compress large masses of ever-increasing material. These writings betray a tendency to drift further and further away from the type of a code—from the commentary type of a code, we of course mean, such as we see in Glanville and Bracton. Jurists appear to have now almost given up in despair any idea of a "scheme" such as Hale thought could and ought to be worked out, and, taking comfort in the *compendia dispendia* doctrine of Coke, to have abandoned themselves to the compilation of semi-historical treatises. We may even observe at this epoch the growing attractions of a mode of distributing topics which may be deemed the last refuge of analytical impotence, the alphabetical order of arrangement. This method—if it is to be called such—is adopted by the lesser Bacon, whose name we have just mentioned, though vigorously denounced by the greater Bacon who had preceded him. When describing the requisites of even a textbook on legal terms for the use of students the latter writes: "Let not this treatise be digested in the order of the alphabet *but leave that to an index*; and let the words which relate to the same thing be arranged together" ("De Augm." Bk. viii. Aph. 81). Even Rolle's "Abridgment" was constructed, as we have seen, on the alphabetical principle to some extent; but most of the titles and headings were in this case wide enough to comprise codelets, as we may call them, well-ordered in themselves though independent of the rest. It only required a more harmonious and closer union to convert the archipelago into a Venice.

Soon another stage is reached, when we find that the official duties of Judges have become too absorbing to admit of their compiling even such treatises as the above. With the names, accordingly, of Mansfield and Blackstone the record of this last period

comes to an end. Mansfield was the first of the really famous English Judges who added absolutely nothing to the literature of our jurisprudence (unless, as has been suggested, any manuscripts of his were destroyed when his house in Bloomsbury Square was burnt down by the Gordon rioters). Throughout his long career as Lord Chief Justice and Lord Chancellor he revealed so constantly and so unmistakably, in his deliverances from the Bench and in Parliament, his abiding appreciation of the sound logic and actual, though not formally or philosophically expressed, coherency of the English law, that he left no time to attempt its codification himself, or to do more than express his general sympathy with its advocates. The "Commentaries" of Blackstone, on the other hand, so lauded by his contemporaries, so ridiculed by the Benthamite codifiers of a later day—rich rather in historical and literary graces than in the analytical and other severer intellectual qualities befitting a code—the "Commentaries" of Blackstone may be taken as the *ultima Thule* and final product of a long series of treatises which had been for some years steadily improving and expanding when looked at in the light of histories and works of research, and step by step degenerating if regarded as codes. They constitute the link between the old and the new; exhibiting in the utmost perfection (to use a paradoxical phrase) the imperfections of the old, and thereby challenging the onsets of students of the new—such as the Benthams, the Mills, and the Austins of a later day. The commentary or institutional treatise had by this time changed its form from that of an embryonic code to a highly finished history.\* Nothing further therefore was to be expected from it in the interests of codification, at any rate for the moment. And from the Bench still less: it was becoming obvious that the disinclination of Judges to take in hand the formal systematization of the law by means of any written analysis was in proportion to the vigour and efficiency with which they executed their proper and more immediate functions. The only hope for the cause of codification lay, it was apparent, in the hands of jurists outside the Bench, or even outside the profession, or at least outside the practising portion of it. Moreover, the visions of the "public charge," prophesied by Hale and Holt, were as far from

---

\* "After Bacon," says Lord Campbell ("Lives of the Chief Justices," vol. ii. p. 566, n.), "Blackstone was the first practising lawyer at the English bar who in writing paid the slightest attention to the selection or collocation of words." The literary no less than the historical merit and success of Blackstone's work determined irrevocably the form of succeeding treatises for nearly a century. It was such a surprise to find a really artistic piece of work issue from a legal workshop that students of law soon learnt to demand in a textbook literary merit above, and even to the exclusion of, other qualities.



realization as ever : and private enterprise began to be talked of as a possible means of at any rate partial codification. By the time of Mansfield and Blackstone we have the common law in a condition tending to excite the languid admiration of the politicians of the day for its supposed substantial good sense, and the utter derision of contemporary satirists (as readers of Swift\* and Sterne† will remember) for its defects and blemishes on points of form and intelligibility—blemishes which, it was evidently thought, must needs remain as they were without possible remedy, or rather go on increasing as fast and as inevitably as the laws themselves should increase.

During the period just traversed—that is, from the beginning of the seventeenth to nearly the close of the eighteenth century,‡ the Roman law began to acquire once more a certain fascination for English Judges, and that not only as regards the substance of its provisions,§ but also as regards the method of its arrangement.

The attitude of Bacon towards the civilians was one of temperate approbation : he appears to have been more willing to take lessons from them in method and terminology (where these were convenient or felicitous), than to ingraft any of their substantive enactments on the native stock. He was at the same time perfectly candid in his acknowledgments of the source whence any such assistance was derived. "Such grounds," he writes in the

---

\* There are several passages in Swift's works indicative of a sense of the "indigestedness" of the existing law, in point of form. "If books and laws," he writes in one place, "continue to increase as they have done for fifty years past, I am in concern for future ages, how any man will be learned, or any man a lawyer." ("Thoughts on Various Subjects." Sir W. Scott's edition of Swift's works, vol. ix. p. 233). Compare "Gulliver's Travels," part iv. ch. v.

† So disgusted with the multiplicity of legal records and authorities was the lay mind of Sterne, that he was tempted to make himself ridiculous by inveighing in unqualified terms against deference to precedents of any kind, or on any occasion, instead of advocating the logical condensation of their disorderly bulk. "Precedents," he says, "can only be useful to heralds, dancing-masters, and gentlemen-ushers, because in these departments neither reason, virtue, nor the *salus populi* or *suprema lex*, can have any operation."

‡ The first edition of Blackstone's work was published in 1765, and Lord Mansfield finally resigned the Lord Chief Justiceship and retired into private life in 1788.

§ On this topic much of course might be and has been said. We need merely refer to Holt's famous judgment on the law of bailments, taken almost bodily from the Digest, and those numerous decisions of Lord Mansfield which provoked the patriotic spleen of Junius. "From Holt's acquaintance with the civilians," says Lord Campbell ("Lives of the Lord Chief Justices," vol. ii. p. 137), "he most usefully liberalized, defined, and illustrated the general laws of contracts in this country." Lord Campbell (*Ibid.*, vol. ii. p. 438) similarly dilates on the assistance which Lord Mansfield derived from Justinian, and at the same time defends him from the attacks of Junius, who accused this Judge of favouring Roman and foreign at the expense of native law.

preface to his "Maxims of the Law," "as are common to our law and theirs, I have not affected to disguise into other words than the civilians use, to the end they might seem invented by me, and not borrowed or translated from them." A much more wholesale adoption of the fundamental terms and divisions of the civil law than Bacon would have sanctioned, characterized the curious little book of the English civilian, Dr. John Cowell, styled "Institutiones Juris Anglicani ad methodum et seriem Institutionum Imperialium compositæ et digestæ." This work was, as the title indicates, a digest of English law written strictly after the pattern and form of Justinian's Institutes. The Roman division into books, titles, and chapters was adopted, and the headings of the titles and the arrangement in other respects most scrupulously followed. Some topics of the Institutes (such as those relating to the Forms of Marriage, Status, Capitis, Diminutio, and the like), had of course to be rejected bodily from the English work, to which they were totally inapplicable; but where other subjects are handled we find Bracton, Fleta, and the "Doctor and Student" masquerading in the old garments of the civil law, and made to speak through the masks of Ulpian and Papinian. At the date of the production of this book Coke, with his intolerance of everything but the pure well of English common law undefiled, was supreme at Westminster: it need hardly be said, therefore, that Cowell was a University man—he held the post of Regius Professor of Civil Law at Cambridge—and not a practising lawyer. Nor will the reader be surprised that when an advocate was rash enough to cite "The Interpreter, or Law Dictionary," another of this learned civilian's works, in opposition to an opinion previously expressed by Coke from the Bench, that the latter dismissed Cowell, with the contemptuous nickname of "Cow-heel" as not worth a moment's consideration. The Common Law Judge's disparagement of the academic study of the civil law was not forgotten or forgiven in the classic shades of the universities, and many a rhymed doggerel of the period is extant to bear testimony to the ill-feeling which was as strong on the part of the doctors as on that of the judges.\*

\* These lines, for instance, denote more graphically than politely the academic estimate of the achievements in Roman Law of Common Law Judges of the stamp of Lord Coke:—

" In Institutis  
 Comparo vos brutis;  
 In Digestis  
 Nihil potestis;  
 In codice  
 Satis modice;  
 In Novellis,  
 Similes ascllis."

The Coke type of Judge, however, soon disappeared, as did also, on the other hand, the Cowell type of jurist. The men of Westminster began to entertain more respect for the Pandects, while the men of Oxford and Cambridge took to studying more closely the laws of their own country; till we find a Hale produced from the one class and a Blackstone from the other. Hale, we are told (Burnet's "Life," p. 249), "set himself much to the study of the Roman law, and . . . . often said, that the true grounds and reasons of law were so well delivered in the Digest that a man could never understand law as a science so well as by seeking it there." And, notwithstanding the great improvement in this respect since Coke's time, he yet "lamented much that it was so little studied in England."

Just as Hale found cause to remind practising lawyers that they might with advantage occasionally turn their eyes elsewhere, and make themselves acquainted with other systems besides their own, and especially with the too much neglected civil law of Rome; so, conversely, Blackstone took occasion, when lecturing in the University of Oxford, to urge his audiences, exclusively saturated as they were with the doctrines and forms of the civilians, to remove the reproach that was so often being fastened upon them of absolute ignorance of the laws of their own country. "If an Englishman," he justly said, "must be ignorant of either the one or the other, he had better be a stranger to the Roman than the English institutions." But while asserting this, he hastens to correct the false inference which might otherwise be drawn from these words standing alone, and to proclaim, though in guarded and temperate language, his sense of the great merits of the Roman law in point of form and from an educational point of view.\*

With the close of this period, the principal features, dates, and names of which, connected with the cause of codification, we have now set forth, we arrive at a time of which De Lolme (speaking in the year 1784) says: "The national civil code is as yet in the first stage of its formation, as the Roman law itself was during the times of the Republic and in the reigns of the first emperors."† We are approaching the era of fervid proselytism and thoroughgoing zeal in matters of codification, when the sturdy and uncompromising torrent of philosophical radicalism is for the first time let loose into the narrow and half-stagnant channel of intermittent judicial sympathy. Distinct, however, from the history of the literature relating to the codification of common law during the present century, there is the

---

\* "Commentaries," vol. i. p. 5.

† "The Constitution of England," p. 119.

history of a series of not entirely profitless efforts during the same period to improve the form of the Statute-book. The two movements, though contemporaneous, may be traced separately. Several advocates of the latter, for instance, stopped short in something like holy horror at any suggestion of the former. Before, therefore, we enter upon the latest stage of common law codification, and take up its story from the point now reached, let us see what the nineteenth-century Judges, Parliaments, Commissions, and writers have done to systematize or reduce in bulk the mass of our legislative enactments.

We left our "cross and cuffing statutes" in the year 1666 as "cross and cuffing" as ever. We must pass over the end of the seventeenth and the whole of the eighteenth centuries without a word, since, as regards any improvement in the form of our statute law, they are literally a blank; so that in 1765 we find Blackstone repeating the much earlier complaint of Lord Coke, and writing that "almost all the perplexed questions, almost all the niceties, intricacies, and delays, which have sometimes disgraced the English as well as other courts of justice, owe their origin, not to the common law itself, but to innovations that have been made in it by Acts of Parliament."\* Not till the year 1806 is the charmed sleep broken, and then only by the dubious spell of a Commission (most ominous word in connection with codification!). This Commission made some proposals with reference to the condensation and reconstruction of our statute law, which led to no result, and in due course the final dissolution of the Commission followed. The same fate attended another Commission, appointed in 1816, and a third, appointed in 1828. Three others, appointed in 1833, 1843, and 1849 respectively, under the auspices of Brougham, directed their labours exclusively to the criminal law, and issued thirteen Reports. They, or rather the first two of them, effected this much—that a Bill, entitled "A Digest of the Written and Unwritten Law relating to the Definition of Crime and Punishment," which sounded promising, though not purporting to be anything like a complete code even of criminal law, was introduced into the House of Lords in 1848, where it was decently smothered. However, the history of the various attempts made to codify the criminal law, beginning here and ending with the Criminal Code Bill introduced in 1879 and destined, perhaps, to receive legislative sanction at no very distant date, may be touched on more appropriately when we come to deal with the common law codification of this century; for though, of

---

\* "Commentaries," vol. i. pp. 9, 10. Blackstone then quotes with approval Coke's invective to which we have above referred.

course, statutes innumerable as well as principles of unwritten law must be dealt with and condensed in any criminal code, yet for the present it seems advisable to confine ourselves to an account of the measures taken for the formal improvement of statutory law, unmixed with baser—or better—matter. Of the importance of this lesser claim on behalf of codification, our judges, even thirty years ago, were by no means insensible. Their collective opinion was invited in a circular letter addressed to them in 1853 by Lord Cranworth. The unanimous answer was to this effect: “Codify statute law as much as you please; but do not touch our common law, or attempt with legislative profanity to disturb the *gremium* to which its most sacred oracles are entrusted.” Statute law was written already, and a code could only render the written matter a little shorter, without in any way altering its character; but “to reduce unwritten law to statute,” says the scandalized Talfourd, “is to discard one of the greatest blessings we have for ages enjoyed in *rules capable of flexible application*.” Everybody, therefore—judges, legislators, and the public—being to all appearances in favour of, at all events a revision and expurgation of the Statute-book, with a view to its ultimate consolidation, a temporary board was appointed by Lord Cranworth in 1853, which, after making three Reports, was superseded by a Commission, also appointed by Lord Cranworth in 1854. These Commissioners caused registers to be compiled of repealed statutes and also prepared the Expurgation Act of 1856 [19 & 20 Vict. cap. 64], formally repealing several statutes then practically obsolete. Two benefits were thus secured—both humble but indispensable preliminaries to the more difficult labour of consolidation—the one a clear and accessible statement or table of those statutes which encumbered Ruffhead, without having any right to be there, except only as history, being both actually defunct and officially returned as such; the other a limited extermination (such as Bacon had long since recommended\*) of “sleeping laws”—a slaying of the slain, annihilation in form of what was already extinct in fact. So unexpected, indeed, was the advance now made, that, two years after—

---

\* “De Augm. Scient.,” Bk. viii. Aph. 57. “It should also be a part of the office of the Commissioners to propose that obsolete laws and such as have fallen into disuse should be repealed as well as antinomies.” And the reason given is excellent. “For since an express statute is not regularly abolished by disuse, it comes to pass that through the contempt of obsolete laws the authority of the rest is somewhat impaired. And . . . the living laws are stifled in the embraces of the dead. And above all things a gangrene in our law is to be avoided.” And so, we may add, is dropsy, looking at the matter from the point of view of those who would add to the higher reasons of state advanced by Bacon the more humble argument for the expurgation of such laws arising from considerations of convenience.

wards (1856) Sir Fitzroy Kelly gallantly proposed to preside over the task of consolidating *all* the statutes, subject by subject, which he thought might be accomplished in two years. We believe that the "subject by subject" treatment here advocated is, after all, the best, and that, had Sir Fitzroy Kelly been allowed to proceed, our statutes might have been by this time codified, or well on the way towards codification—for we can never be sure of the duration of official zeal—instead of being, as they are, merely "revised." He was, however, met with the objection—so popular at this moment with theorists in reference more particularly to common law codification, and indeed so specious and taking at any time and with reference to any subject—that an exhaustive analytical scheme of the whole should precede any attempt to deal with the parts. The then law officers of the Crown, Sir Alexander Cockburn and Sir R. Bethell, brought forward this plausible but fallacious argument; and so the question was shelved till the year 1859, when Lord Campbell refused to "prolong the sickly days" of the Commission any further. From this point the cause of statute codification—and, indeed, as we shall see presently, of codification generally—became centred in the person of Lord Westbury, as we are reminded by Mr. Holland,\* who speaks with very just admiration of that statesman's consistent and continuous efforts to reconstruct our law on an intelligible plan. In 1860 we find him (as Sir R. Bethell and Attorney-General) informing the House of Commons of certain arrangements which he had made for dealing with the statutes, both civil and criminal. But first of all a complete register of obsolete Acts of Parliament would be compiled, with a view to their repeal. [A few such Acts had, as we have seen, been already repealed by the 19 & 20 Vict. cap. 61.] This register was soon prepared, and thereupon the whole series of really obsolete statutes still recorded in the Statute-book was definitely and formally repealed in three parcels by three successive Expurgation Acts, in 1861, 1863, and 1867.† Lord Chelmsford, when introducing the last of the above named Expurgation Acts, stated that he was, in concert with Sir T. Erskine May and three others who were to report in due course, considering the best mode of indexing and classifying the statutes; and further that an index of each subsequent year's legislation would be published. In the following year (1868) Lord Cairns nominated a Committee to arrange for the issue of a new revised and expur-

---

\* "Form of Law," p. 119.

† The obsolete statutes from 11 Geo. III. to 16 & 17 Vict. were repealed by the Act of 24 & 25 Vict. cap. 101; those from Magna Charta to James II. by the Act of 26 & 27 Vict. cap. 125; those from 1 W. & M. to 10 Geo. III. by the Act of 30 & 31 Vict. cap. 59.

gated edition of the entire body of the statutes. The "Revised Edition," extending over fifteen bulky volumes,\* made its appearance in 1870 and succeeding years. In this compilation, purporting to be a complete collection of all the unrepealed "public general" statutes and parts of statutes now in existence, and nothing more, we are presented with a great boon; and though it is true that the chief burden and problem of consolidation and codification, in the sense of the late Chief Baron Kelly, is untouched, and we have proceeded as yet no further than, as Mr. Holland calls it, the "sifting" stage, still the ground has undoubtedly been cleared for further operations. But unfortunately no further operations have been undertaken as regards *wholesale* codification of statute law, perhaps because the public and the legal profession have been so overwhelmed with this unexpected benefit at the hands of a Commission, that they think it only decent to wait for a century or two before asking for more; perhaps, also (to be just), because their attention has been diverted of late years to more pressing matters of codification, such as the Criminal Code Bill.

On the other hand, the "subject by subject" method of consolidation, so much derided by theorists, has been crowned with success in three notable instances during the last two years. We refer to the Municipal Corporations Act 1882, the Bills of Exchange Acts 1882, and the Rules of the Supreme Court 1883. The first of these Acts is a complete code of the statute law affecting municipal corporations, admirably arranged in thirteen parts, each dealing with a specific branch of the subject, and in 280 sections. It embodies and presents in a scientific form the matter of 65 statutes passed since the original Act of 1835 in this department of law. Amendments of substance, of course, there are, but the main effect and object of the Act is distinctly a codifying effect and object. We look upon this statute as a triumph of piecemeal codification. The second of the three statutes which we have mentioned embodies and codifies the whole statute law (mixed, of course, with a good deal of common law) relating to negotiable instruments. Thirteen previous statutes are wholly, and four partially, swallowed up in and repealed by this admirable code to which we shall again refer in greater detail when we come to deal with the common law codification of this period. Lastly,

---

\* Mr. Holland, in this as in other matters connected with codification much too sanguine, anticipated that five or six volumes only would be sufficient. Indeed in one place he mentions two as the possible limit. See generally as to statute codification since 1833, a neat and succinct account in Mr. Holland's "Form of Law," pp. 180, 181, and compare pp. 53-55, 117-122. See also Wilson's "History of Modern English Law," pp. 171-186.

the Rules of the Supreme Court, 1883 (framed in pursuance of powers conferred by the Judicature Acts, and now having the force of an Act of Parliament) constitute (though the title would not perhaps lead a layman to expect anything so substantial) a systematic and complete code of the entire civil procedure obtaining in the Supreme Court of Judicature and its various branches. The code is quite as long as, and in every sense more thorough than, for instance, foreign or colonial codes of civil procedure, such as the French, Spanish, or Canadian. We might mention other specimens of "subject by subject" codification of statutory enactments, such as the Public Health Act, 1875: but enough has been said to show that while Law Officers of the Crown are hesitating, and Lord Chancellors are summoning and disbanding successive armies of Commissioners who suggest and report and go their ways,—while money is spent and nothing is done and time is passing,—a certain number of lawyers and legislators are putting their heads together, and without asking for any commissions or issuing any reports, are quietly codifying, or passing Acts to codify, the statute law on such specific subjects as may from time to time require this mode of treatment, to the great benefit of the community, and to the no small confusion of those jurists who imagine that nothing can successfully be undertaken except under the auspices of an imposing and costly commission, and with the illusive watchword—"the whole before the parts."

Let us now turn to the other side—or rather one other side—of English jurisprudence—namely, the common law (including thereunder the criminal law). Up to the beginning of this century, whatever complaints were made concerning the "indigestedness" or other deficiencies in the form and fabric of our law, and whatever attempts were made to reform or remedy them, were directed alternately to one or other of its two principal sources, never (speaking broadly) towards both simultaneously. While Edward I. was effecting, or while, at a later period, Elizabeth, James, and Bacon were advocating, the reconciliation of "cross and cuffed statutes," or the expurgation of such as were obsolete, we do not hear of any attacks on the shape of the common law. On the other hand, when Glanville and Bracton, or when Hale or Holt, were paying attention to the common law, we discover few traces of eagerness to systematize the Statute-book. But with the commencement of the nineteenth century a vast quantity of energy (not so effective, unhappily, as might be wished) is brought to bear at one and the same time on both these (amongst other) branches of our jurisprudence. The first grumbings in regard to the chaotic collection of statutes are (as we have seen) to be found in a few books written before



the close of the eighteenth century. So also in others of the same date we may detect the preludes to the vehement storms even then developing, and about to rage with utmost fury in the succeeding century in connection with the name of Bentham, and on the question of Common Law Codification. If Blackstone rails against the excessive accumulation of unmarshalled, badly-framed, and contradictory Acts of Parliament, Roger North ("Discourse of Laws," p. 32) complains no less of the multitude of reports existing even in his day of unmethodized and detached judicial decisions.

From the year 1830 the question of the best means of giving form and logical arrangement to the existing body of decided cases and common law rules became a burning public question. It was discussed side by side with, or was involved in, the other question of statute codification, as part of the wider subject of general codification, but it is capable of separate investigation. Before discussing, as we propose to do briefly hereafter, the salient features of the extensive controversial literature of the subject belonging to this period, we may first inquire (in order to complete our retrospect) what has actually been done or said in the interests of common law codification, since, say, the above-mentioned year of 1830. The net result (apart from the polemical literature itself, which of course has a great value of its own, in common with other records of the discussions of public questions) may be comprised under the following heads:—

I. *Reports* (able; and historically, if not otherwise, interesting) of numerous *Parliamentary Commissions*.

II. Certain *Experimental Codes*, written by private persons, not taken up by any benevolent member of the legislature, and not arrived at any inchoate or other parliamentary stage, such as the Codes of Bentham, Humphreys, Disney, Cooe, and others, together with some specimens of codified portions of law furnished by members of the Bar at the invitation of the Commission of 1867.

III. The *Criminal Code Bill*, 1879, so far as it codifies the common law relating to crimes. This succeeded in reaching an advanced parliamentary stage, but is still a Bill.

IV. The *Bills of Exchange Act*, 1882, so far as it codifies the common law relating to negotiable instruments. Here we have an Act now in operation and expressed in the title to be "an Act to codify," &c. &c.

V. A series of *Textbooks*—*e.g.*, the works of Sir James Stephen, Mr. Frederick Pollock, and others—written in code-form and intended only for textbooks but having, besides an educational, a distinct practical value, in so far as they accustom students to the form and use of a code in expressing the law.

VI. *Codes found suitable for and workable in India* though not for the present adopted in this country; the growth of a school of Anglo-Indian codifiers beginning with Macaulay and ending with Sir James Stephen and his followers.

In 1863, as we have said, Lord Westbury, when introducing one of the several Statute Expurgation Bills passed at about that time, took occasion to develop a corresponding scheme for the codification, or rather the digesting (for he, like Mr. Holland and Mr. Amos, distinguishes the two) of the entire body of case-law. The speech in which this proposition was made caused a considerable flutter in juristical dove-cotes; for, after the observations of Talfourd and the other judges in regard to the codification of any criminal law other than statute, it was expected that not the most hardy of revolutionists would attempt to lay sacrilegious hands on that citadel and sanctuary of all that should be most inviolable, the common law.\* Several parliamentary and non-parliamentary speeches were provoked by that of the Lord Chancellor; some expressing alarm, others unqualified encouragement and approbation; others again applauding the object in view, but suggesting counter-schemes or modifications in the means proposed for carrying the object into effect.† Articles were written on it in the various quarterlies,‡ and it formed the topic of animated discussion in the meetings of societies devoting themselves to public questions,§ besides providing the foundation for many of the arguments and ideas relating to codification which are to be found in the works written by Mr. Holland and Mr. Amos, of which the titles head this article. The practical, though not very immediate, outcome of the speech, as far as Parliament was concerned, was the issue three years afterwards of a Royal Commission (Nov. 22, 1866) "to inquire into the expediency of a digest of law, and the best means of accomplishing that object, and of otherwise exhibiting in a compendious and accessible form, the law as embodied in judicial decisions." This Commission reported in

---

\* Lord Westbury's speech is reported not only in Hansard's "Debates," vol. cxxi. p. 776, but also in a separate form under the title of "The Speech of Lord Westbury, L.C., on the Revision of the Law." Edited by John Fraser McQueen, Q.C. London: W. Maxwell. 1863.

† *E.g.*, the speech of Sir J. P. Wilde reported in the *Times* of Sept. 24, 1864.

‡ Notably an article in the WESTMINSTER REVIEW for April, 1865, and another in the *Quarterly Review* (principally devoted, however, to Sir J. P. Wilde's counter-scheme), vol. cxvi. pp. 519 *seq.*

§ See the paper of Mr. Vaughan Hawkins read before the Juridical Society on January 23, 1865, on "Digests and Codes with reference to Law Reform," published in vol. iii. pp. 110-128 of the "Juridical Society's Papers;" see especially pp. 120-124.

favour of a Digest, and then invited, by authority of the Government, the members of the four Inns of Court to submit specimen Digests of three selected and named portions of law. Three of the specimens sent in were approved in respect of their several subject-matters: but the whole matter eventually ended in smoke, and none even of the approved specimen-digests ever obtained any parliamentary recognition. Thus this so promising Commission, from which Mr. Holland's enthusiasm anticipated so much, and the appointment of which was, as he thought, to "mark an epoch in the history of the question,"\* turned out to be as fruitless and as little epoch-making as regards actual and direct results as every Commission, and every parliamentary scheme for anything approaching wholesale codification, has hitherto always been and, in our opinion, always will be.

So much for Commissions; now as to Experimental Codes. Here the name of Bentham is of course first in honour as in order of time. His "General View of a Complete Code of Laws"—such a complete code to be mapped out into separate codes: the Penal, the Civil, the Political, the International, the Maritime, the Military, the Ecclesiastical, the Financial, and that relating to Procedure—is well known, or perhaps rather known of than known. The method to be adopted in handling the proposed task is described with much elaboration in his "Codification Papers" and elsewhere. Of the various particular codes of which he has furnished drafts, the Penal Code is sketched out with the greatest degree of detail. Useful, however, as Bentham's draft codes were in stimulating discussion and inquiry, they proved too revolutionary in matter no less than in form—too violently opposed to the existing order of things and to established conventions, as well as too much encumbered with a repulsive phraseology—to win legislative favour. They were, in fact, impracticable. Not even the elaborate and detailed letters written by their author offering to devise codes gratuitously and impartially for either the United States of America on the one hand, or the Emperor of all the Russias on the other, elicited more than vague compliments and promises from the former and a ring as souvenir (promptly returned "with the imperial seal unbroken") from the latter. Bentham was too burning and zealous a reformer to bend and buckle his great talents to the task of taking and methodizing the law as he found it. He might, there can be little doubt, by keeping distinct the two functions of codifier and reformer, have done valuable work in both fields. But he was not content to do this: to his impetuous spirit it would have seemed almost as bad as countenancing the

---

\* "Form of Law," p. 54.

abuses of the time, if he had taken upon himself the disgusting office of setting in order, without in any way rebuilding, re-touching, or destroying, an essentially rotten fabric. It did not apparently occur to him that a complete execution of the codifier's labour would have served, more eloquently than anything else, to show the glaring need of his undertaking the additional duties of the reformer; and that any failure on his part in the latter capacity could in no wise diminish whatever value might attach to, or whatever success might have attended, his efforts in the former. In mixing up these two kinds of undertaking as he did, he was foredoomed to find that his usefulness in the one sphere was grievously prejudiced by an opposition which—whether judicious or not—was offered only to the direction that his activity assumed in the other.

Passing from Bentham, we ought to notice a piece of work of some importance in its day—Humphreys's famous draft code of Real Property Law, the appearance of which elicited not only criticisms from Bentham himself, when dealing with this branch of the English law (Part VI. pp. 389 *seq.*), but also an elaborate polemical treatise by Park, "On the Humphreysian Code," containing an able *exposé* of objections, and serving generally to open up the whole question of the possibility of reducing this department of our jurisprudence to code form, in view of the special difficulties attending the application of this treatment to the peculiar subject-matter.

An attempt is being made at the present time\* to arrange methodically the doctrines of equity as discoverable in judicial decisions. This arrangement is described by its author, Mr. Trowse, to be an experimental code; but, if so, the form adopted cannot be considered happy, or one to be imitated by those who are disposed to undertake this important labour in a scientific spirit. It will be sufficient to state that the order of titles is alphabetical, and that, according to one of the postulates laid down by Mr. Trowse before commencing his work, all cases involving special circumstances are systematically left out of consideration; the consequence being that the student has to content himself with a meagre residue of more or less abstract and colourless propositions, the co-ordination of which is absolutely non-logical.

Apart from these experimental codes of special departments, there have been sketched out certain maps of the titles of the whole common law—skeleton codes, so to speak, with large blanks and gaps to be worked out in detail, analogous to that written out at a much earlier date "on a large sheet of paper"

---

\* *Law Magazine*, August and September, 1883.

by Matthew Hale. Amongst the recent inventors of such skeleton forms we may refer to Coode, the author of a valuable essay on Legislative Expression, and a member of one or more of the numerous Commissions on statute-consolidation, and Mr. Sheldon Amos, who contributes a scheme of the heads and divisions of English law in general to his work on "An English Code."

Nor should the various specimen Digests composed at the invitation of the above-mentioned Commission of 1867 pass unnoticed here. Each competitor was, by the terms of the letter addressed by the Commissioners on November 22 of that year to the four Inns of Court, requested to direct his attention to one of the following three subjects:—(1) Negotiable Instruments; (2) Mortgage and Lien; (3) Rights of Way, and other Easements and Servitudes. He was to give in the first place a general summary in an analytical form of the law comprised under the head chosen, and then a detailed working out of some title or subdivision of the general scheme, in order to give an idea of how he proposed to fill in the outlines. The Commissioners inform us in their Report that they received 187 specimens. The three adjudged to be the best on the several subjects are published among the papers accompanying the Report. Mr. Macleod's digest of the law relating to Negotiable Instruments is the only one of the three which exhibits the smallest acquaintance with the most elementary conditions of a Code or Digest, or which departs to any extent from the beaten track of the ordinary textbook. What the unsuccessful specimens must have been like, we forbear to imagine. One of them was composed by Mr. Holland, and is printed in his otherwise most interesting work (pp. 79-100), of which the title is prefixed to this article. Though it cannot be considered a felicitous piece of work, it is only fair to explain that it appears to have been thought out in strict accordance with, and as a necessary corollary of, the (in our view) extraordinary and false theory entertained by the author of what a Digest should be—a theory based on an excessive admiration of the scheme of the Roman Digest. Because it was possible for Tribonian to incorporate under the various titles of his Digest the *ipsissima verba* of the five great "prudentes," and to give in their entirety on any point the "case" and "opinion" both—the case being generally imaginary, a "put case" in fact—therefore Mr. Holland seemed to think that a combination under various heads of short extracts of complicated judgments of English judges on complicated facts would constitute a Digest of English Law.

To the above we should add in conclusion a class of experimental codes on criminal law of the greatest possible interest, inasmuch as, though only one of them secured the patronage, or

even the bare recognition of the Legislature, they may all be regarded as having paved the way for a measure which must sooner or later become law, and so provide an example of the scientific systematization of that branch of our law which most requires to be accessible and intelligible to all citizens—the Criminal Code Bill, 1879. We refer to such amateur codes as (apart from Bentham's Penal Code already mentioned) the draft Criminal Code of Anthony Hammond (published *circa* 1825 "by authority of Sir Robert Peel"); "The Outlines of a Penal Code on the basis of the Law of England," published (with a commentary) by John Disney in 1826; the Digest (above noticed) "Of the Written and Unwritten Law relating to the Definitions of Crime and Punishment," actually introduced as a Bill to the House of Lords in 1848, but there speedily abandoned, and Sir James Stephen's "Digest of Criminal Law."\* The last-named work is a specially instructive subject of study, not only on account of the style and research displayed in it, but because its compilation led, we may presume, to the selection of the author as one of the judges appointed to draft the Criminal Code Bill, introduced to Parliament in 1879, and because it was doubtless largely utilized by him in his labours consequent on that appointment.†

The Criminal Code Bill, 1879, the last and best fruit of all these parturitive movements, was printed in 1878. It is not, it is true, capable as yet of active operations; but it has been formed, it is comprehensive, it shirks no questions, it exists, and only requires the kindly assistance and nursing of Parliament to become a force. The foundling is on the doorstep for the charitable legislator to take up and utilize. The Bill was drafted by Sir James Stephen and consists of 425 sections, divided (after the intelligible fashion of most modern Acts reaching any considerable length) into Parts dealing with distinct subject matters. These Parts are:—1. Introductory Provisions. 2. Offences against Public Order, Internal and External. 3. Offences by and against Public Officers, and against the Administration of Justice. 4. Acts injurious to

---

\* A third edition of this work has just been published. A large quantity of matter which found a place in the pages of the earlier editions has now been transferred to the same author's not less interesting "History of the Criminal Law," which has recently appeared and justly excited attention. We agree with a contemporary critic that the "History" and the "Digest," together with the draft code of 1879, "furnish a noteworthy indication of what might be done towards codification of a great branch of English jurisprudence by individual effort but for the great legislative block which condemns the present generation to hope almost in vain for the realization of reforms of vital importance."

† For an account of the successive attempts to codify English criminal law prior to 1879, see the Report of the Commissioners on the Criminal Code Bill, 1879, at pp. 5 and 6.

the Public generally. 5. Offences against the Person, the Conjugal and Parental Rights, and the Reputation of Individuals. 6. Offences against Rights of Property, and Rights arising out of Contract. 7. Procedure. Though we have thought it best to consider this Bill in the light which it throws on the possibility of codifying Common Law, it will be seen how extensively it deals with Statute Law also, when we mention that it repeals and substantially re-enacts in logical shape 11 Acts of Parliament wholly and 41 partly.

The arrangement, as well as the details, of this important Bill were subjected to a minute and searching criticism on the part of the late Lord Chief Justice. It cannot be doubted however that the order of titles and the mode of distributing the various matters is vastly superior to the methods of arrangement adopted, for instance, by Bentham or Disney. It is remarkable that Disney's plan is faulty in the same respect, though not to the same extent, as Bentham's—that is to say, the reader's attention is continually being diverted from the consideration of whatever merits it may possess as a logical analysis to glaring alterations of substance from time to time intruded by the author upon his notice. Moreover, Bentham had at least a definite and clearly conceived *fundamentum divisionis*, which was the necessary outcome of his ethical philosophy; while Disney appears to have no pre-arranged order, no method which can be pronounced scientific and self-consistent, whether regarded in the light of its adaptability and kinship to the subject-matter, or as the expression of any fixed theory personal to the author. We find him first dealing with the head of "Punishments" (in 8 titles; one general and the residue on the various degrees from Death down to Security for Good Behaviour); then (in one title) with "Accomplices, Insane Offenders," &c.; and finally (in 17 titles) with Crimes—arranged on no discoverable principle—from High Treason to Threats and Threatening Letters.

The Criminal Code Bill has its counterpart, as regards civil law, in the Bills of Exchange Act. True, the latter covers a far less area, but then it is an Act in full operation, and not a Bill. As such it is the first actual and undoubted piece of common law codification which has found a place in our Statute-book. This codifying Act, passed in 1882, was drafted under the direction of the Institute of Bankers, a body of busy men who were apparently not content to wait for the realization of the imposing theory of "the whole before the parts" to which we have already alluded, but proceeded in a vigorous manner to push forward and finally accomplish a solid little code of the greatest possible importance to themselves, which now stands on its own bottom, and, from all that one can observe, is none the

worse for doing so, or for not having at its back a gigantic skeleton-scheme of universal codification, to some department or limbo of which it may be ceremoniously relegated. The theorists to whom we refer are doubtless as shocked by the appearance of this utterly unprotected and self-reliant codelet as Molière's physician is by the patient who is so indelicate as to expire or revive in direct opposition to "les règles" or, as lawyers would say, to "the books." Still the fact cannot be denied. The very sensible observations of the *Law Journal* (July 22, 1882), made when this Act was in the stage of a Bill awaiting the scrutiny of a House of Lords Committee, have been amply justified by the event. "Lawyers look upon Bills of this class with no great favour. It is supposed that they send us all to school again. . . . This, however, is not really the case. . . . Bills of this kind, in fact, facilitate the lawyer's knowledge, and make him able at once to lay his hand on his authority when consulted. To some extent, perhaps, Codes make men their own lawyers; but no lawyer believes that he has anything to fear from that result. . . . The Bill . . . . may be confidently accepted as an admirable contribution to the codification of commercial law." The Act consists of exactly a century of sections and, like the Criminal Code Bill, is divided into Parts. These Parts are five in number (Part II. with its subdivisions being the most elaborate and vital): a recital of their headings will show the ground covered and the scheme according to which the divisions of the subject are distributed:—

Part I.—*Preliminary*. (The Interpretation Clause here is excellent.)

„ II.—*Bills of Exchange*.

- (a) Form and Interpretation.
- (b) Capacity and Authority of Parties.
- (c) The Consideration for a Bill.
- (d) Negotiation of Bills.
- (e) General Duties of the Holder.
- (f) Liability of Parties.
- (g) Discharge of Bills.
- (h) Acceptance and Payment for Honour.
- (i) Lost Instruments.
- (j) Bills in a Set.
- (k) Conflict of Laws.

„ III.—*Cheques on a Banker*.

„ IV.—*Promissory Notes*.

„ V.—*Supplementary*.

The present importance of departmental codification—an augury of its probable success in the future—may be observed not only in the actual legislative results to which we



have already directed the reader's attention, but also in the form of the best English law textbooks now being published. Mr. Justice Stephen in his "Digest of Evidence" (not to mention others of his institutional works) has provided an excellent model, and under his leadership an admirable school of code-textbook writers is gradually being formed and gives substantial proof of its activity. The method of expounding a branch of law by means of aptly worded and logically co-ordinated propositions, to which are appended brief examples or illustrations taken from the leading cases and showing the law in action, as it were, and its application to the affairs of life, but from which is rigidly excluded the mass of historical and argumentative matter which forms the intolerable padding of the old style of treatise, is daily becoming more and more popular. We may single out from a not inconsiderable number such a work as Mr. Frederick Pollock's "Digest of the Law of Partnership." The author compiled this able code expressly in the hope and belief that such a type of textbook would not only possess a distinct educational value in itself (this being also the opinion of Sir James Stephen, as expressed in his Introduction to the "Digest of Evidence"), but would stimulate students to take in hand experimental codification on their own account in other fields. Thus it would do no harm to any practitioner or student to arrange in this particular form, if only for his own use, the knowledge acquired by him professionally on any subject; while the matter so put into shape might at any time become available (if adequate in other respects) for purposes of code-legislation, and would be ready to receive recognition at the hands of Parliament or of any public body of men interested in the reduction of the particular subject-matter to a system capable of comprehensive survey, ready assimilation, and rapid use. Such special codes would moreover, if well-formed and still more if obtaining legislative approval, react upon the textbook writers and tend to give redoubled encouragement to, and define with greater exactitude, the true interests of formal reconstruction of the common law.\*

---

\* The above-mentioned "Digests" of Sir James Stephen and Mr. F. Pollock are of course in our view, as we need not now remind the reader, essentially codes. That is, they contain (1) tabulated propositions, (2) examples or illustrations, (3) short explanatory notes, with the titles of the cases cited, and references. Strike out (3), and veritable codes in every respect are left. We are obliged to point this out once more, because unfortunately the word "Digest" is also applied to such a work as Fisher's "Digest of the Common Law" (a most uncodelike though, as every lawyer knows, an exceedingly valuable and praiseworthy production), or Mr. Odgers's "Digest of Libel"—a very elaborate work, as long as that of Starkie on the same subject, and historical, argumentative, critical, and polemical into the bargain; and that, too, on a branch of law which if stated in strict code-form could hardly—(we

The most marked success of the method of codification in detail, as applied more especially to our common law, is to be looked for in India. There codification has proceeded almost by leaps and bounds as compared with its progress here, and one after another vast tracts and impenetrable jungles of unmethodized English jurisprudence and native customs have been reclaimed, cultivated, and forced into order under the spell of its magic *divide et impera*. The history of recent Anglo-Indian legislation is full of promise to any one contemplating a somewhat similar, though it must needs be a much less rapid, course of events in England. We have established and applied to the social circumstances of the Queen's Anglo-Indian subjects successive codes of distinct branches of common (with other) law. Why should not equally satisfactory results attend a like procedure in respect of her British subjects? It is quite true, as Mr. Sheldon Amos points out,\* in deprecating too confident inferences of this kind, that there the codifier has been able to reform in the popular as well as the literal sense of the word, and in virtue of the authority conferred on him in the one capacity to heal over the anomalies, fill up the *lacunæ*, make plain the rough places, and generally systematize the chaos which his labours in the other capacity would have served to disclose. It is also true that in another way the problem in India is not what it is in this country, where we have a *substantial* coherency and unity in our laws, only asking for proper manipulation to formally express the sound logic which it already, so to speak, contains in solution; because in India a mass of substantially incoherent and independent native customs have to be taken into account, and welded together, as best may be. It should be remembered, therefore, that while in one respect their task is easier than ours, and the codifier less hampered, in so far as he is in possession of a shorter cut to his goal in virtue of his authority to make material amendments in the law, yet in another respect their task is more difficult, and the codifier more hampered, because he has a greater variety of un-

---

have tried it ourselves)—occupy more than, say, fifty articles averaging from twelve to twenty lines each. [The Criminal Code Bill deals with defamatory libels—the criminal law relating to which is not much shorter than the civil law—in a single chapter (xxvi.) consisting of ten very moderate-sized articles.] To call such works “Digests,” however useful they may be in other respects, is to degrade the term. Any so-called Digest is either a Code or nothing. A good Code is a good Digest, and a good Digest is a good Code. A Code is simply logically-distributed matter, a *digesta mater*. So is a Digest, *ex vi termini*. The circumstance that one of these terms has somehow come to be applied more particularly to such reconstructed systems as have received legislative sanction, is purely accidental, and quite insufficient to scientifically differentiate the two expressions.

\* “An English Code,” pp. 86–95.

related matters to deal with. In both respects, at any rate, and from both points of view, codification in India stands on a somewhat different footing from codification in England: the object there being not (as here) to reconstruct and render explicit as a perspicuous, accessible unity what is already implicit as an ill-arranged, and not easily discoverable unity, in such a way that there should be neither more nor less in the product than in the factors,—but to make one and intelligible whatever is manifold and contradictory in substance, however different the outcome may be from the matter operated upon, and whatever means it may be necessary to use in order to cut the Gordian knot. All this is true, but it is after all only matter for deduction: the conclusion from the one case to the other still holds good to a large extent, though it must be tempered and qualified by the considerations to which we have alluded. In addition to the above, Mr. Sheldon Amos requires this further difference of conditions to be taken into account. In India, he says, there have only been codes, not a code—that is, not a universal or organic code, or a code of codes even, such as the Greek Basilica of the Eastern Empire. We must not therefore, he urges, too readily argue from the success of the several Indian codes to the probable success of an organic code of the entire law of this country. This caution, however, is only applicable if this writer's rooted prejudice in favour of an organic scheme to precede any special code is well founded: if it is not, then the success of the Indian codes is a very strong argument, subject to the above-mentioned deductions, in favour of codification by stages and in detail.

It is not without significance that the codifying work which has been done in India has been done, in large measure, by the men who have most advanced the cause of codification here, and applied it to the circumstances of our own country,—whether by means of theoretical writings and experimental codes (such men as Bentham, James Mill, Macaulay, and Sir Henry Maine), or by actual codification for parliamentary purposes (as Sir James Stephen), or by writing textbooks in the form of codes.\* To these men—clearly competent to do the same work in the same way for England, though of course with all necessary modifications—India owes at this day her Penal Code, her Criminal Procedure Code, her Civil Procedure Code, her Succession Code, her Evidence Code (Act), her Contract Code (Act),

---

\* It is noticeable that Sir James Stephen's "Digest of Evidence," written as an institutional work for this country, is (with slight alterations) the actual code originally drafted by him for India.

her Divorce Code (Act), her Companies Code (Act), her Easements Code (Act), and others.

There appear to have been two well-defined periods of Indian codification: \*—the first from 1834 to 1864, in the course of which the ideas of Jeremy Bentham and the elder Mill, unworkable in themselves, obtained at last in Macaulay an “eloquent mouthpiece” and in Sir Barnes Peacock the qualities essential to judicial draftsmanship. As soon as to the *νοῦς θεωρητικὸς* was thus united a corresponding *νοῦς πρακτικὸς*, there were produced in rapid succession the Indian Penal Code (presented to the Governor-General in 1837, though it did not become law till 1860), the Code of Civil Procedure (1859), and the Code of Criminal Procedure (1861). During the second period (1864 to the present time) the superior codifying genius of Sir James Stephen and his school, and the influence of Sir Henry Maine, have made themselves felt. To these influences we should add the adaptiveness of Sir Arthur Hobhouse, and the activity of Mr. Whiteley Stokes (described in this REVIEW as “a master of technical detail”), to whom it has largely been due that in this latter period the Succession Code, the Evidence Code, the Contract Code (July, 1866), the Companies Code, the Divorce Code, and the Easements Code have been passed. Though the above are officially styled Acts, we call them Codes, as they undoubtedly are, in as real a sense as the Bills of Exchange Act 1882 is a Code.

The above then are the actual legislative results of the codificative energy of this century; other efforts there have also been, as we have noticed, particularly in the domain of controversial literature, where numerous pamphlets, reviews, essays, treatises, satires, and other writings—from those of Bentham to those of Sir James Stephen—bear witness to the large and important space which this question has filled in the polemics of the time. It is somewhat melancholy, indeed, to observe how vastly the suggestive and controversial element exceeds the practical and legislative in this province. Counsels, theories, schemes, complaints, and attacks, may be counted by thousands, where Indian Criminal Codes or English Criminal Code Bills may be numbered by units. We can only hope that the flood of discussion inaugurated by Bentham is at last about to bear judicial fruit; though it is true that we are beginning—and rightly beginning—the work at exactly the opposite end to that hitherto usually advocated by jurists. And so far as this mass

---

\* An interesting abstract of Anglo-Indian codification, from which the above facts are taken, is to be found in this REVIEW for April, 1882, pp. 587 and 591. See also the Report of the Indian Law Commissioners in 1879, and the first Report of the Law Digest Commissioners, 1867, at pp. 18-21.

of polemical matter may be deemed to indicate an increased interest in the question on the part of the general public—so far as it tends to show that codifiers need not necessarily be sovereigns, judges, or even practising lawyers—it wears a distinctly encouraging aspect.

A word, before concluding, on the Roman law considered from the point of view of nineteenth-century codification. The study of this system during the period which we have just traversed, though it has increased in absolute area and amount, has exercised a much less relative influence than in some of the earlier periods discussed, on the theories regarding codification of common law. The interest in the question of the applicability of the forms and divisions of the Digest to the systematization of our jurisprudence has not declined, but has become more intelligent and discriminating. Consequently, though few codifiers would in these days accept the opinion of Matthew Hale that the Roman law is the place of all others in which to study scientific method as applied to law, or follow the practice of Dr. Cowell in his "*Institutiones Juris Anglicani*," arranged on the model of Justinian's Institutes; still fewer, on the other hand, would approve of the unmeasured contempt which Bentham showered on the whole form, manner, arrangement, and logic of all Roman law. Austin is far more temperate—indeed, expresses real admiration for the "*elegantia*," or formal consistency and sound distribution of matters, which in his opinion characterized the Pandects; and when we get to Mr. Holland, we seem to discover even something of a lapse into the old excessive devotion to the work of Tribonian. Throughout his "*Form of Law*," he shows himself thoroughly imbued with the idea of the necessity of following as closely as may be each step in the process adopted by the Emperors, nor can he apparently conceive, or at any rate approve, of a code in this country that should not have experienced a decent period of that species of gestation known as "*digesting*." Sir James Stephen, on the other hand, and Mr. Sheldon Amos, look with by no means extravagant, but with judicious, favour on Roman law. Though willing to encourage its use from a general educational point of view, they evidently consider that in the question of English codification of common law the one thing necessary is good logic and analysis; and that whether that logic proceeds direct from a sound brain, or is brightened and sharpened by the study of the Roman or, for the matter of that, of any other system of law, makes not the smallest difference. On the face of those specimens of codes now in existence, to which we have alluded, there is certainly little apparent evidence of any study of the Roman law. Sir J. Stephen's "*Digest of Evidence*," and the Contract Code for

India, smack as little of the method and form of the Pandects as even the Penal Code of that most uncompromising opponent of everything Roman, Jeremy Bentham. The influence of Sir Henry Maine, again, has certainly been indirectly but essentially antagonistic to the study of Roman law for purposes of logic, or as a model of scientific arrangement: not because he underrates its value in this regard, but because his energies and talents have been so entirely devoted to its treatment as a branch of the study of the history of juristical institutions and conceptions, that he has been forced to pay less proportionate attention to its interest from other points of view. And it cannot be doubted that (whether fortunately or unfortunately) the views of the historical school so expressed, and characterized by this bias, or, we will say, tendency, are coming to be more regarded and absorbed by students than those of the analytical jurists who look at the "*Corpus Juris Civilis*" with other eyes and with other objects, and profess with Falck (quoted with approval by Austin) that "it is not so much the matter of these juristical writings, as the scientific method employed by their authors in explicating the notions and maxims with which they had to deal, that has rendered them models to all succeeding ages, and pre-eminently fitted them to produce and to develop those qualities of the mind which are required to form a jurist."

It remains now to consider, before contemplating the future of codification in this country, what views have been advanced during the last fifty or sixty years for and against codification in general, and codification of English law in particular. We may then be able to apply this prolific wealth of controversial theory to the existing facts which we have just passed in review, and to form some estimate of the course which codification is likely to take in England, and of the extent and mode in which it may most usefully be employed. To this task, for which the present essay has we hope in some sort paved the way, we propose to address ourselves in another paper.

G. S. BOWER.

## INDEPENDENT SECTION.

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

## COMPULSORY VACCINATION.

RESEARCHES into the past history of the race disclose a long vista of physical and moral evil, and the belief in their causal connection may be traced back to the earliest records of human suffering. The Hebrew seer enumerates war, famine, blight, and pestilence as supernatural punishments of moral wrong. Greek and Latin literature abound with similar views. Occurring perhaps once in a generation, the spectacle of the plague-stricken city and the disease which no medicine could cure was contemplated with deep dismay. Unseen powers were enforcing dread decrees: Elohim rose in anger or Apollo drew his bow. The spiritual defenders of the community were passionately solicited for the mighty aid of procession and prayer, and the decline and withdrawal of an epidemic was clearly perceived by the multitude to be due to the pacification of offended deity. In the Middle Ages zymotic outbreaks became frequent; their fatality was at times excessive, but it was remarked that they fell with heaviest weight on children and on the poor. Lord Bacon observes: "The plague is not easily received by old people, but taketh soonest hold of those that come out of a fresh air, and of children;"\* and Owen Feltham says: "If the plague flies sprinkling poison, the poor are the fruit that are shaken from the burdened tree."† Formerly "the plague" in England, like "la peste" in France, was a generic term applied to every severe visitation; in later times the predominating zymotic has given the name to the epidemic. Let us not criticize with undue severity the older explanations of the rise and fall of epidemics, for their decline still presents formidable difficulties to the expert who maintains that each new sufferer is a centre of additional myriads of diffusible germs of the disease—a theory hardly consistent with the observation that the commencement of the

\* "Sylva Sylvarum," fol. 1627, p. 246.

† "Resolves, Divine, Moral, and Political." 1633.

decline is usually at the period of highest development and spread. Dr. Léon Colin has felt himself confronted with the difficulty: "the cessation of epidemics (he tells us) is at times as remarkable as their rise."\* May not a solution be found in the hypothesis that the epidemic contributes to its own decline by its direct action upon overcrowding, as well as by its habit of selecting the filthiest purlieus of a district for its main attack? In this way it will obviously destroy all the "susceptible." The *Conseil de Salubrité* of Paris in 1839† noticed this habit and explained the difference between the mortality of various quarters in a town, of various streets in a quarter, and of various houses in a street, by observing that although this had been attributed to indigence, it was restricted to indigence driven back into the most insalubrious quarters, streets, and houses, and into the midst of an atmosphere infected with filth and dirt. And Malthus says ("Essay on Population," 1803, pp. 330-1): "Epidemic diseases in Scotland, as usual, fall chiefly on the poor."

Walled cities have often developed zymotic scourges. In times of danger, when the victorious enemy scoured the plains, the beleaguered city became overcrowded through the immigration of the country-people with their herds, and dead and dying bodies of man and beast accumulated within. Athens felt the weight of this disorganization during its siege by the Peloponnesians in B.C. 430. Thucydides describes the pestilence which then prevailed as a disease "beflowering the sufferer with little pimples and whekls," which "never took any man the second time so as to be mortal."‡ The description of the plague of Alexandria in the third century, by the bishop of that city, may be cited as a proof that overcrowding, bad water, and excess of filth produced in ancient times the effects we see in our own day. "The river which washes the city flows polluted with blood and slaughter. Could the vast and impassable ocean, or that great river itself which flowed from Eden, wash away the filth? Dead bodies are putrefying in all the elements around us. Notwithstanding all this, men wonder and are at a loss to know whence come the constant plagues, whence these malignant diseases, these variegated infections, and this immense destruction of human life."§ The modern hypothesis of a blind contagium guided by no law is in direct contradiction with fact. Lord Bacon has observed, "The plague is not easily received by such as are continually about them that have the plague, as keepers

---

\* "La Variole," Paris. 1873.

† Quoted in Report of Health of Towns Commission, 1842.

‡ Thucyd. book ii. c. 49.

§ Eusebius, "Eccl. Hist." bk. lxvii. c. 221-2.



of the sick and physicians."\* The preponderance of facts in proof of the local origin of the late cholera epidemic in Egypt is overwhelming. Dr. de Pietra Santa, the talented editor of the *Journal d'Hygiène*, in thanking our Foreign Office for sending him a copy of Dr. Hunter's important report, says: "Whatever theoretical opinion is held on the cholera, we must, from the practical point of view, recognize the excellence and promptitude of the hygienic measures taken by the Government of the Khedive under the inspiration and initiative of Dr. Hunter and the English medical men placed under his orders."† Dr. Hunter observes in his Report that it is an abuse of language to speak of the public hygiene or of the sanitary regulations to be found at Cairo, for the one and the other are set at defiance. The canals too often resemble sewers, no precautions are used to keep the drinking water taken from them free from contamination by dung and filth of every description, and conditions favourable to the development and propagation of epidemic and other diseases abound everywhere. A report on the cholera at Damietta by Drs. Ahmet Chaffey Bey and Salvatore Ferrari‡ shows that cemeteries envelop the town like a girdle. The great Egyptian cattle plague originated here. The annual fair collects 15,000 strangers. In the fair week the cholera broke out in one of the most overcrowded and filthy parts of the town. It rarely touched the households of the rich, with the exception of their negro domestics. They add, "We have hitherto been strong partisans of importation; but we cannot admit it in this case because the alleged facts on which the importation rests are not authentic." The attacks sensibly diminished when Mr. Goodall caused about 1,000 dead carcasses to be removed from the river and buried, and the mortality fell almost miraculously on the rising of the Nile. Dr. Dutricux Bey does not deny the possibility of importation but he has never considered it to be an infallible article of faith, and the facts he observed in Egypt have convinced him that the cholera was of local origin—a remark which our agriculturists would do well to ponder when speculating on the causes of the epizootics which afflict their herds.

Count de Lesseps has just published his travels in the Soudan, in which he says, "Khartoum is situated on high ground at the junction of the White Nile and the Blue Nile. The climate is unhealthy for strangers by reason of the marshes surrounding the city. The waters stagnating on the low grounds, like those at Damietta at the mouth of the Nile, produce fevers strongly

---

\* "Sylva Sylvarum," p. 246.

† "Journal d'Hygiène," Aug. 30, 1883, p. 331.

‡ *Ibid.* No. 363, pp. 443-6.

resembling the first stage of Asiatic cholera. The plains near the Nile are highly cultivated, and their inhabitants bury all their dead in the river."

The plague appeared among Napoleon's troops at Alexandria at the beginning of the present century. The doctors were afraid to attend the patients. The General, in anger, himself undertook the supervision. "Water, air, and cleanliness were the chief articles of my pharmacopœia. The doctors laughed at my method, but experience demonstrated that it was preferable to their pills. The city was the most dangerous post. I ordered the troops to encamp, and cut off all communication with the town, and the malady ceased."\* Denon, who accompanied Napoleon, says of the Egyptian towns, "Meimund, with 10,000 inhabitants, is, like all the rest, surrounded with dunghills and heaps of rubbish, and on these eminences people sit in the evening and smoke their pipes. These heaps infect the air, and their acrid dust is one of the causes of Egyptian ophthalmia."†

Those who compare these associations of cause and effect with the metaphysical and transcendental doctrines of germs, contagiums, and empirical protectives now struggling for ascendancy at home and abroad, will turn with a sense of relief to the eloquent and impressive rebuke lately given to undue professional arrogance by Dr. Peter, in the Paris Academy of Medicine, on the occasion of a debate on the alleged discoveries by which M. Pasteur and other rivals of Jenner claim to have revolutionized the art of medicine: "For my part I have assisted in this discussion as a man of science in the exercise of free inquiry, who, as he contemplates the era in which he lives, marvels at the narrowness of the circle which bounds human thought, whose diameter can scarcely be sensibly enlarged by centuries of ever-renewed effort."‡

The origin of pestilence in natural causes has been maintained by the intellectual few in all ages, although in face of the general acceptance of theological and metaphysical explanations, the heresy was often a dangerous one. In the second century of our era, and in the reign of Marcus Antoninus, an epidemic, said to resemble that of Athens, alarmed the Italian cities, and high dignitaries of State applied to the pagan hierarchy for aid. Their answer directed a short invocation to Apollo, the sender of disease, to be affixed to the doors of those who solicited super-human help. The recommendation was extensively adopted. Contrary to expectation, it chanced that the houses defended by the preservative suffered in greater measure. "Now do not

\* Dr. Antommarchi's "Last Days of Napoleon," i. 182.

† "Travels in Egypt in 1798," London, 1803, p. 203.

‡ "Journal d'Hygiène." No. 345, p. 220.

imagine [says Lucian, from whom I quote] that I mean to insinuate that the use of the protective was the cause of the attack ; but the less enlightened, placing faith in the oracular sentence, became negligent of hygienic personal precautions, and omitted to aid the text in its efforts to save them ; having *words* fighting for them, and Apollo, ever youthful, driving away the pestilence with his arrows."\* Our author, a Babylonian by birth, had personally visited the holy cities of Asyria ; and even in those ancient centres of sanctity he found educated minds which like himself treated the popular superstitions with supreme though necessarily reserved contempt ; for then, as now, it fell to the lot of few to run counter to the cherished expectations of easy security inspired by the apparently endless chain of medico-theological infallibilities.

The ravages of the zymotic diseases appear to have been more extensive and fatal in mediæval times than in the preceding ages of Greek and Roman domination. The great empire which formerly overshadowed the civilized world, undertook in its prime the construction of aqueducts and sewers on a scale of surpassing grandeur for the improvement of the water supply and the discharge of sewage. The long lines of massive viaducts, beautiful in their ruin, which senates and emperors had deemed necessary for insuring purity in the primary requirement of public health, fell gradually into decay through the perennial disorganization caused by successive partitions of territory among the northern invaders and the creation of petty States doomed to centuries of internecine war. In the temporary gleams of peace and quietude increasing population and advancing commerce caused overcrowding, while the unfortunate practice of intramural burial, then introduced, slowly attained the height of its unsuspected power.

The opinion that small-pox will always make its appearance wherever insanitary practices and unhealthy surroundings exist in full strength has been stoutly combated by the discoverers of protectives. Yet those who investigate the ancient records of European municipalities which are being brought to light by antiquarian researches into their dusty abodes, will find that many of our mediæval cities were filthy to the verge of indecency. A proclamation in time of plague in the sixteenth century orders Londoners to keep the channels against their houses free from filth by often turning it aside that the water may have free passage. Another warns householders against casting ordure into the street before nine at night. In Mr. H. T. Riley's "Memorials of London Life," extracted from the

---

\* Luciani Opera : Alexander, cap. xxxvi.

City Archives, we find a number of writs and proclamations which appear to be temporary regulations in time of pestilence. "Let no swine wander about the streets." "Let no refuse be thrown from the windows," &c. Many streets were then unpaved, both in London and Paris. In 1369 prelates and nobles complained of the putrefying blood running from the shambles into the Thames, "generating grievous corruption and filth, so that no one could hardly venture to abide in his house there." (This is dated August 5, in the heats of summer.) Two years later the complaint was reiterated, the Court observing that "sickness and many other maladies have befallen our officers and other persons."\* An edict of Charles VI. in 1388 begins, "Whereas this city of Paris has long been full of dirt, rubbish, and ordure, which each person has left at his own door, so that it is a great scandal to the city and great prejudice to the inhabitants, who, by the infection of the stinking mass of filth, have fallen in times past into great illness and great mortality."† The Black Death of 1348 is supposed to have been a glandular typhus or plague, and the sweating sickness resembled cholera in all its essential features.‡

The great family of the zymotic or epidemic diseases is bound together by ties of more intimate connection than is generally admitted. Sir Henry Holland says:§ "The lining of the alimentary canal is to all intents a surface as well as the skin, pretty nearly equal in extent, exercising some similar functions, with others appropriate to itself, and capable in many respects of being acted on in a similar manner." "One step towards future success in inquiries on the connection between epidemic diseases will be the relinquishment of the too exclusive attention hitherto given even by physicians themselves to the eruptive part of certain maladies, an error which has naturally arisen from the obvious nature of the symptom, and the more ready diagnosis it affords." Prof. Boens, of Charleroi, cites a recent statement of Dr. Ollivier, who has long been in practice at Trazegnies, which deserves consideration. Dr. Ollivier says:—

"I was vaccinated, and I have practised vaccination for fifty years in the important commune of Trazegnies. Although I still carry the marks upon my arms I did not escape a dangerous attack of the malady, which took place when I was eighteen years old, under the following circumstances: In 1832 an appeal was made to the medical students in Brussels to lend their assistance to the crowded cholera

\* Riley's "Memorials," pp. 356-7.

† Quoted in Health of Towns Commission Report, 1842.

• ‡ Dr. Laycock's Report on York, Health of Towns Commission, First Report, vol. i. p. 250. London 1844.

§ "Medical Notes and Reflections," p. 318.

Hôpital de l'Industrie, which the authorities had just opened. In conjunction with a dozen of my fellow-students I offered my services. After several months thus spent I was suddenly seized with vomiting and pains in the bowels. It was concluded that I had contracted cholera. But the next morning the attack had developed itself into a severe case of confluent small-pox. Upon this, one of the staff remarked, 'If vaccination does not save from small-pox it seems to save from cholera.'\*\*

The comparatively modern practice of giving to each epidemic the name of the predominant zymotic may easily lead to incautious conclusions. It is probable that in every epidemic the main body of the zymotic diseases are at work: in other words, that different persons are differently affected from a common cause. Cholera epidemics have been observed to commence and decline with attacks of simple diarrhœa; and Dr. Colin informs us that towards the close of the great small-pox epidemic in Paris in 1871, "as the small-pox mortality declined that of other diseases, as measles, typhoid, pneumonia, increased."†

Consummate partisan adroitness is displayed in the untiringly reiterated statements of the deaths of certain members of royal families from the small-pox. In some of these royal houses measles is also recorded to have been fatal, and the fact is indicative of special causes. How could royalty insure itself against the universal risks of city life under the conditions here described? Pepys in 1662 says, "The Portuguese ladies in attendance upon the Queen complained much of the lack of good water to drink." Mr. Gifford reminds us that in 1596 Sir John Harrington made ineffectual attempts to introduce cleanliness into London dwellings at a period when the sweetest of them would have offended the dullest nose of modern times ‡ In the century in which Queen Mary died, Mr. Buckle informs us that the smells of London were so bad that it was necessary to have sweet herbs (old Gerard says meadow-sweet) or perfumes in the chambers.§ And this is corroborated by a letter from Mr. Samuel Gate in 1732, printed by Mr. Nichols: "In the churchyard of St. Paul's, Covent Garden, the burials are so frequent that the place is not capacious enough decently to contain the crowds of dead there interred, so that some of them are not laid above a foot under the loose earth. It is surrounded every way with close buildings, and an acquaintance of mine, whose

\* "La Variole, La Vaccine, et les Vaccinides," par Hubert Boens. Brussels, 1884.

† "La Varigle," 1873.

‡ Ben Jonson's Works, by W. Gifford, 1816, note.

§ Buckle's Posthumous Works.

apartments look into that churchyard, hath averred to me that the family have often rose in the night-time and been forced to burn frankincense and other perfumes to dissipate the contagious vapour."\* It has lately been incautiously observed by a controversialist that it is highly improbable that royalty could have been subjected to insanitary surroundings in Queen Mary's time, yet in 1717 the Duke of Shrewsbury, writing to King William III., said: "If a man cannot bear the air of London four days in the year he must make a very scurvy figure in a Court as well as in a Ministry."† The probability is, that royalty in those days was not aware that the small-pox was a product of insanitary surroundings.

M. Maxime Ducamp says of Paris: "A map of 1652 shows the stream of the old Menilmontant sewer. No house was on its banks: its breath was plague, and all avoided it. In 1720 the municipality permitted building in that quarter. But who would occupy houses there? Who would face the terrible stench of the great sewer? When the north wind blew, all Paris felt the pestiferous breath of the great *clouque* which enveloped it from the Bastille to Chaillot with its crescent of filth and putrefaction.‡ Our ambassador to France in 1619 says: "Paris is always dirty, and such a thick black unctuous oil that no art can wash it off. It gives so strong a scent, that it may be smelt miles off if the wind be in one's face as he comes from the fresh air of the country. This may be one reason why the plague is always in some corner or other of this vast city."§

The romance which weaves itself around the events which history leaves obscure, and spreads over its hazy solutions of continuity an ideal glow of sentiment and poetic colouring, has always found a grateful field for development in displaying with agonizing minuteness the devastations of pestilence in the insanitary cities of the Middle Ages. In this field Macaulay, the master of rhetoric, has executed a *chef-d'œuvre* of imaginative unreality in his episode on the death of King William's ill-fated spouse:—"The plague had visited our shores only once or twice within living memory, but the small-pox was always present, filling the churchyard with corpses, leaving on those whose lives it spared the hideous traces of its power, turning the babe into a changeling at which its mother shuddered, and making the eyes and cheeks of the betrothed maiden objects of horror to the lover." Here we find the England of those days described as a general purgatory, in which life was one long curse, and

\* Nichols' "Illustrations of Literary History."

† Lord Mahon's "History of England," i. 56.

‡ "Les Egouts de Paris," *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1873.

§ James Howell.

where the few whom the brilliant historian mercifully permits to recover had lost every attraction which could bind them to society and to each other! Yet our ancestors styled it Merrie England!

It may be observed that a true representation of the general mortality of England cannot fairly be inferred from that of London in the periods when its death-rate was twice or thrice its birth-rate. Malthus, writing in 1798, says: "It appears from the clearest evidence that the generality of our country parishes are very healthy" (edit. of 1803, p. 306). Not from small-pox alone were the graveyards of insanitary and overcrowded London filled with corpses in those evil days. Tables annexed to the Proceedings of the Vaccination Committee of 1871 (pp. 379 and 399) show that in 1660-79 consumption killed in London three times as many as small-pox, while the strumous diseases (scrofula, &c.) in 1681-90 destroyed 8,000 per million of the population annually, against 3,139 per million dying by small-pox; and this 8,000 was four times the proportion for the years 1816-55. Mr. Simon remarks ("Vacc. Evid." 379) that in the middle of the last century "the scrofulous death-rate of the city was more than five times as great as the present one." (Written about 1855.) The general mortality of London in 1660-79 is represented as eighty in the thousand of population: it is now about one-fourth of that amount. If increasing sanitation be the cause of the reduction in the scrofulous diseases, it may fairly be assumed to have acted in a similar manner on small-pox.

The scientific sagacity with which figures in the guise of statistics were manipulated in defence of the fashionable foible of inoculation may be illustrated by a quotation from page 78 of the "Annual Register" of 1762:—"If one person in seven die of small-pox in the natural way, and one in 312 by inoculation, as proved at the Small-pox Hospital, then the lives saved in a million by inoculation must be 139,652. The present generation, who have enjoyed all the advantages of inoculation, are inadequate judges of the extremely fatal prevalence of the original disease, and of their obligations to Lady Mary Montagu." This was written in 1762. On page 399 of *Vacc. Evid.* a table gives the annual average small-pox mortality of London in 1681-90 as 3139 per million of population, and in 1746-55 as 3044 per million.

Erroneous conclusions are apt to be arrived at when we study historic events through the veil of idealism; and we are liable to be misled, not so much by the exaggerations of the impressionist school of public instructors, as by the inevitable omission under such circumstances of the detailed facts from which alone

it would be possible to deduce causes and to derive practical information whereby to steer our course. In the art of clothing imaginary details with all the brilliancy of circumstantial reality, Defoe stands unrivalled. His vivid description of the Great Plague of London, which occurred in the earlier years of his childhood, has been accepted as the truthful report of an eye-witness and an official in the public service. Mr. Roscoe says it is one of the finest combinations of real parts with imaginative feelings and incidents that ever was produced. One of Defoe's most incisive pieces of irony has been similarly misapprehended. In the reign of Queen Anne a Bill was brought in to enact that all those who took the sacrament and test, and afterwards went to the meetings of Dissenters, were to be fined a hundred pounds, and on a relapse the fine was to be doubled. Yet in its preamble the Bill expressly condemned all persecution for conscience sake. In veiled language, where the fiery meaning flashes through the words, Defoe writes :—

“I do not prescribe fire and faggot . . . but it is vain to trifle in this matter. The light foolish handling of them by mulcts, fines, &c.—'tis their glory and their advantage. . . . If one severe law were made and punctually executed, that whoever was found at a conventicle should be banished the nation and the preacher be hanged . . . they would all come to church. To talk of five shillings a month for not coming to the sacrament, and one shilling per week for not coming to church: this is such a way of converting people as was never known. *This is selling them a liberty to transgress for so much money.* If it be not a crime, why don't we give them full licence? And if it be, no price ought to compound for the committing of it, for that is selling a liberty to people to sin against God and the Government.”

A striking instance of Defoe's irrepresible vein occurs in his veracious account of the plague:—“The physicians assured us that the danger of contagion was as well from the sound—*i.e.*, the seemingly sound, as from the sick; and that those people who thought themselves entirely free were oftentimes the most fatal.” On this principle, the Notification of Diseases Act would require the isolation of the “seemingly sound.” Yet the sublime daring of Defoe's soaring flight above the domain of reason, has not prevented it from being taken in earnest by modern enthusiasts. It is held to give an authoritative sanction to the pretentious truism that healthy unvaccinated persons are “possible” centres of infection. Those who are overawed by this alarming possibility should be reminded that every English infant is also a “possible” convert to Mahommedanism, and yet this possibility is an improbability of the highest grade.

---

\* Defoe's “Shortest Way with the Dissenters.”



Mediæval London was clearly responsible for its zymotic scourges, which held their erratic course unimpeded by municipal sanitation till the reign of George III. In 1710 Lord Tyrconnell, introducing a Bill for cleansing and paving Westminster and its liberties, observed: "The filth of some parts cannot but disgrace our nation in the eyes of foreigners. . . . The streets of the British capital abound with such heaps of filth as a savage would look on with amazement. If that be allowed which is generally believed, that putrefaction and stench are the cause of pestilential distempers, I might solicit the timely care of this assembly. The present neglect of cleansing and paving is such as ought not to be borne, and no magistrate has power to remedy it." The Chancellor of the Exchequer said: "As I neither think the grievance insupportable nor the methods proposed for removing it necessary or proper, I declare myself against the motion." The question being put, it was "passed in the negative" by 142 against 109.\*

Protectives against the various zymotics appear never to have been wanting. In the reign of the Stuarts plague-water was in great demand. One of Ben Jonson's characters says: "I'll undertake to fright the plague out of the kingdom in three months. I'll give away so much unto my man as shall serve the whole city with preservative weekly, each house his dose."† In the last century inoculation superseded older protectives against the small-pox. Dr. Buchan, whose "Domestic Medicine" was written about 1760, and attained its seventeenth edition in 1800, says:—

"It is a matter of small consequence whether a disease be entirely extirpated or rendered so mild as neither to destroy life nor hurt the constitution; but that this may be done by inoculation does not now admit of a doubt. The numbers who die under inoculation hardly deserve to be named. In the natural way, one in four or five generally dies, but by inoculation not one of a thousand. Nay, some can boast of having inoculated ten thousand without the loss of a single patient. I have often wished to see some plan established for rendering this salutary practice universal. The aim is great: no less than saving the lives of one-fourth of mankind."‡

Mr. James Moore, in 1813, expatiating on the superior advantages of vaccination, says: "An exact calculation cannot be made of the proportion of deaths among those who were inoculated and skilfully treated, because the interest and vanity of medical men prompt them to exaggerate their success and to

\* Chandler's "History and Proceedings of House of Commons," vol. xii. pp. 360-63. London. 1742.

† Mammon, in *The Alchemist*. Gifford's edit. vol. iv. p. 49.

‡ Edit. of 1800, p. 233.

conceal their failures. Even the reports of hospitals cannot be relied on. Notwithstanding the prevalence of small-pox, great numbers escaped it altogether.”\*

Variola and vaccinia are admitted to strongly resemble each other, and the resemblance would appear to extend to the arguments used in their support, and the excuses for their impotence to fulfil the glowing prophecies which presided over their birth.

There is no satisfactory proof of the oft-repeated allegation that the zymotic diseases are living entities divided by natural laws into definite species, and endowed with power to take possession of the human body by sudden aggression. In the beginning of the century Dr. J. F. Davis remarked: “If the characters of diseases were as fixed and determinate as those of plants there would be little difficulty in discriminating genera and species; but as they are subject to great variety and almost endless complication, the difficulty of accomplishing this is almost insuperable. The symptoms vary in different cases, and all of them are common to other diseases.”†

Species and genera are not entities—they are simply helps to classification; and each step taken in advance by physiological science furnishes an additional proof that our artificial divisions merge imperceptibly into each other. We may divide small-pox into species, as discrete, confluent, and hæmorrhagic, but the diagnosis in each case is often uncertain. Measles and small-pox were coupled together in the Swedish statistics till 1774, and Dr. Baron tells us that Sydenham first separated them in the seventeenth century. In 1873 a medical man wrote in the *Practitioner*: “Acute syphilitic lichen may so closely simulate the primary stage of small-pox as to render the diagnosis at first a matter of difficulty.” And in his forty-fourth Report (p. xix.) the Registrar-General says: “Large allowances have to be made for the changing fashion or caprices of medical nomenclature. There are times when the ordinary medical attendant designates all deaths from vaguely diagnosed affections of the respiratory organs as bronchitis, and other times when he prefers to designate them all as pneumonia.” In direct contradiction to these views is the oft-repeated statement that vaccine lymph is capable of passing through hundreds of children, from arm to arm, without change in its results or variation in its qualities. But the dogma is strangely deficient in proof. Dr. Jenner acknowledges he used horse-pox, and with the best results. He supplied the National Vaccine Establishment in 1817 from this source,‡ and we learn

\* Mr. Moore was surgeon of the Life Guards, and a warm supporter of vaccination. See his “History of the Small-pox.”

† *Gentleman's Magazine*, 1808.

‡ Dr. Baron's “Life of Jenner,” ii. 226-7.

from the evidence of the Committee of 1871 that the lymph he supplied is still in use.\* But Dr. John Harley says: "It is a question of immense importance whether disease arising from a single source can be propagated indefinitely in successive generations of healthy persons. It will doubtless be found that as there is in animals and plants a constant tendency to throw off super-added qualities, so a given disease will wear itself out and disappear in the course of a few generations, provided the victim's heirs strive to attain to a healthy standard and avoid similar contamination."†

To Lady Mary Montagu is attributed the credit of introducing small-pox inoculation into this country—probably as a patroness of her surgeon's sensational scheme; for it has since transpired that he received £1,000 for inoculating Prince Frederic. Her biographer says the faculty rose in arms to a man, foretelling failure; but she soon gained supporters among the higher classes, headed by the Princess of Wales. Mr. Moore, a director of the National Vaccine Institution in 1815, and the friend and coadjutor of Jenner, says: "Lady Mary would have explained it to some physician if she had known any one of them that had virtue enough to destroy so considerable a branch of their revenue for the good of mankind. The event showed that though this brilliant lady underrated the morals of physicians, she did not underrate her own influence in leading the fashion, for she actually effected a complete revolution in the practice of small-pox all over Europe."‡

The impotence of the medical profession, when opposed by the enthusiasm of the leaders of fashion, was equally shown on the introduction of vaccination. Mr. Joseph Hands, M.R.C.S., a pupil of Jenner, says in his pamphlet: "After Parliament had voted £20,000, after Oxford had granted its highest honours, the College of Physicians received the discovery with ridicule and contempt, and although the weight of evidence had compelled them to report favourably of vaccination, true to their instincts to the last, refused to confer on Dr. Jenner the fellowship of the College."§ Nevertheless, after a long struggle, the victory remained with fashion.

Lady Mary's mature opinions may be gathered from the following remarks written abroad in 1748, when she was nearly sixty years of age, at the period when Bishop Berkeley was promulgating his universal remedy for all complaints:—

\* Evidence Vaccination Committee, p. 318, question 5619.

† Address, St. Thomas's Hospital, London, October, 1873.

‡ "History of the Small-pox," by James Moore.

§ "Vaccination and its Opponents," by Joseph Hands, M.R.C.S.

"I find tar water has succeeded to Ward's Drop; it is possible by this time that some other quackery has taken place of that; the English are, easier than any other nation, infatuated by the prospect of universal medicine; nor is there any country in the world where the doctors raise such immense fortunes. I attribute it to the fund of credulity which is in all mankind. We have no longer faith in miracles and relics, and therefore with the same fury run after recipes and physicians; the same money which three centuries ago was given for the health of the soul, is now given for the health of the body, and by the same sort of people—women and half-witted men."\*

To show the ease with which statistics can be manipulated, Mr. George Hardinge's remarks in 1811 may be quoted:—"In a little time after James's Powder was adopted, the decrease of deaths by fever in the bills of mortality was an unequivocal proof that a new era had begun."† A forcible remark of Mr. Surgeon Moore, about the same period, is of universal application:—"Many respectable physicians said the calculations to prove inoculation were made upon a false principle, because the patients for inoculation had been selected confessedly on account of their being in perfect health, and it was to be expected that fewer of them would die than of those who caught the small-pox casually, many of whom were affected with other indispositions."‡ Both inoculation and vaccination were supported at their introduction with the sound of the theological trumpet. Mr. Joseph Cockfield, a friend of Nichols, says in 1766: "Who can refrain from paying a tribute of praise to the Creator of the universe; who can remain unconvinced of the general utility of the new-invented method adopted from the Oriental nations?" Compare this laudation of inoculation with the grand apostrophe to vaccination in 1801 by Dr. Barry, preaching on behalf of the Royal Humane Society:—"O ye mothers, fathers, friends of humanity! Hear with exultation and gratitude to Heaven that one loathsome and fatal disease which heretofore, on a fair calculation, blotted from the book of life, and that every year, forty thousand of the inhabitants of this kingdom, may now be exterminated through means of a safe and effectual remedy."

It was fifty years before inoculation crossed the Channel: the Duke of Orleans had two of his children operated upon, and the nobility paid their court to him by adopting the practice. In 1777, General Washington, alarmed at the ravages of small-pox among the British troops, inoculated his whole force. His fears

---

\* Lord Wharnccliffe's "Letters and Works of Lady Mary Montagu," ii. 373.

† Nichols' "Literary Anecdotes."

‡ "History of the Small-pox." 1813.

would have been lessened had he been aware that in the same year Mr. Wedderburn, our Solicitor-General, wrote to Mr. Eden respecting our army in America:—"The peculation in every profitable branch of the service is represented to be enormous, and, as usual, it is attended with shocking neglect of every comfort to the troops. The hospitals are pest-houses, and the provisions served out are poison."\* It is the fatal defect of controversial small-pox statistics that particulars so essential as these are almost invariably omitted. So far is the small-pox from being a universal danger, that it is with great difficulty a perfectly healthy person receives the infection. Dr. Grainger wrote to the Rev. Mr. Percy in 1762:—"I inoculated with my own hands three times my Louise before she took the infection."† And Dr. Jenner expresses his surprise at the insusceptibility of the carters:—"These people from their youth up have the care of the horses used for ploughing our corn lands. Great numbers of them, in the course of my practice, have come to me to be vaccinated, but the average number which resisted has been one-half."‡

For some time past the small-pox has been rife at Capetown, chiefly among the coloured people. Sir H. W. Tyler says:—"Capetown might easily be the healthiest of cities but it has been, for want of sanitary arrangements, one of the most unhealthy." Mr. Peter Kolb, Rector of Neustadt, officially visited the Dutch colony at the Cape in 1705-13, and he remarks that measles and small-pox are by no means so severe as in Europe: "Measles scarcely causes illness, much less death. It is much the same with small-pox; the parents are well aware that the disease is not attended with danger; some marks, but very few, appear on the skin, and a stranger would with difficulty recognize the disorder among the romping children." Kolb then quotes from Dr. Leydecker in 1699:—"It is extraordinary that the measles and small-pox, which commit such ravages in Europe, are never fatal at the Cape of Good Hope, although sufficiently known there." Kolb continues:—"Far otherwise is it in the sister colony of Batavia, where small-pox and measles are dreaded and are deadly."§ Batavia, built in a swamp and surrounded by marshes, was for years a proverbial hotbed of disease. Captain Cook's men suffered severely from fever during their stay in this dangerous place, only one escaping attack. Dr. Hunter, shortly after the British conquest, remarks:—"The city canals are filled

---

\* Lord Mahon's "History of England."

† Nichols' "Illustrations of Literary History."

‡ Baron's "Life of Jenner," ii. 390.

§ Kolb, "Reise an das Capo du Bonne Esperance," pp. 327, 328, fol. Nurnberg, 1719.

with filth, and the evening atmosphere is impregnated with pestilential vapours.\* Sir Stamford Raffles says :—"The water in use is a general cause of disease." These extracts convincingly prove that small-pox and measles are filth-diseases; that abnormal insanitary conditions are required to make them spread; and that they were truly described by a consensus of medical opinion in Voltaire's younger days as a *dépuration du sang*—Nature's attempt to dislodge impurities generated in the system by foul air, foul water, foul food, and foul habits. What is the value of statistics of small-pox and vaccination from which factors so important are studiously excluded?

The following remarks on yellow fever by a writer of some celebrity in his day, Mr. Thomas Paine, tend to confirm the conclusion that the whole question is one of cleanliness *versus* filth. He says the disease always begins in the lowest part of a populous mercantile town, and continues there without affecting the higher parts. The circuit it acts in is small. It is generated by impure air—air produced by decomposing matters. "A person seized with yellow fever in an affected part of the town and brought into the healthy part or into the country, and among healthy persons, does not communicate it to the neighbourhood, or to those immediately around him. Why, then, are we to suppose that it can be brought from the West Indies, a distance of more than a thousand miles, since we see it cannot be carried from one town to another, nor from one part of a town to another at home."†

The large rewards obtained by fashionable inoculators in the last century stimulated medical enterprise.‡ Dr. Dimsdale, in 1768, is said to have received £10,000 and £500 a year for inoculating the Empress Catherine; and Dr. Ingenhousz, who in 1767 inoculated the family of the Emperor Joseph II., was rewarded with a pension of about £600. It is shown in the Vaccination Evidence of 1871, p. 315, that Dimsdale estimated the annual small-pox mortality of Russia at two millions. But as the European mortality from all causes in those days is supposed to have been at least ten times as great as that from small-pox, it is difficult to believe that the annual deaths exceeded the annual births to such an enormous extent. The estimate recalls a gigantic exaggeration printed in the "Life of Jenner," ii. 83 :—"One-third of the people of this extensive empire (China), when the natural small-pox is raging, are supposed to fall victims to it."

\* See Raffles, "Java."

† Quoted with approval by Dr. W. Scott in his "House Book," 1826, from Paine's pamphlet on yellow fever.

‡ Nichols' "Illustrations," vol. v. 785.

Dr. Jenner was born in 1719, and propounded his new method of inoculation at the close of the century. In his own words, carefully prepared for his petition to the House of Commons on March 17, 1802, he claims to have discovered that a disease occasionally exists among cattle known by the name of the cow-pox, which admits of being inoculated on the human frame with the most perfect ease and safety, and is attended with the singularly beneficial effect of rendering through life the persons so inoculated perfectly secure from the infection of the small-pox.\* Secure it will be observed, not only from death but from infection by that disease. The claim for remuneration was recommended by the King through the Premier, and was supported in Committee by the Dukes of York and Clarence. Dr. Jenner applied to one of his aristocratic patronesses, Lady Peyton, whom Dr. Baron describes as one of the most energetic and successful of vaccinators, begging her to solicit the assistance of her brother, Lord Rous. Lord Rous replied that he was doubtful if his writing to Mr. Pitt would be of any service, and he concluded by saying: "In my own opinion there will be no occasion for very minute inquiries; the Minister will grant a reward, or he will not do it; and it will be decided whether he will do it long before it is brought before Parliament: at least it will not be worth trying for unless Mr. Pitt sanctions the application. Some of the medical men in England will certify that the cow-pox is completely established, and their testimony would outweigh a thousand certificates from those not of the profession."†

Jenner's proof was this: he selected persons who had passed through the vaccination disease and recovered: he inoculated them with small-pox, and if the inoculation did not take, he assumed they were secure through life. But thoughtful physicians have remarked that a protective, which may for a time prevail against an artificial attack, is of no value to the human race unless it also prevents an attack of the disease in the natural way—*i.e.*, when its causes are present.

A peculiar instance of Dr. Jenner's facility of belief in the latent powers of his discovery and of his easy acceptance of statistics, however incredible, provided they favoured his theory, may be seen in his "Letter to the Public," printed in the *Gentleman's Magazine* in 1803, p. 1015, where he says:—

"Some reports having gone abroad that the cow-pox has been found to secure the constitution from the plague, Dr. Jenner begs leave to lay before the public the evidence which he has received of this important fact. Dr. de Carro informs me that Dr. Anban writes to him that after many experiments he can now speak of the cow-pox being a

\* "Life," by Baron, i. 490.

† *Ibid.*, i. 486.

security against the plague almost as a certainty. Of six thousand vaccinated at Constantinople not one has taken the plague. Infants previously vaccinated have sucked without injury the milk of infected nurses. An Italian physician, Dr. Valli, was so persuaded of the truth of the new discovery that, upon the sole security of having been vaccinated, he shut himself up in a lazaretto and had contact with people attacked with carbuncles and buboes, without any effect. He then inserted into his own hand a mixture of the viruses of small-pox and plague, and felt no effect from the trial. Dr. Auban having heard that in some villages near Constantinople the cows were subject to some eruptions on their udders, he, with several gentlemen of the French embassy, went to those villages, and found the cow-pox then existing. The report of the inhabitants was that they had never seen the plague nor the small-pox among them, though both these diseases made dreadful ravages in the vicinity."

These sanguine anticipations of Dr. Jenner, on the faith of simple hearsay and purely negative evidence, were speedily cut short by the general refusal to be guided by what his biographer calls "his favourite method of reasoning by analogy," a method which is being carried to such an egregious extent in the inoculating mania which now infests France. England repudiates M. Pasteur's preposterous scheme of extending to all epidemic diseases the Jennerian principle of infecting the civilized world and its domesticated animals with the modified forms of each zymotic complaint (the cow-pox being, as its discoverer explained with much earnestness, small-pox purified by its passage through a cow). M. Bouley, one of M. Pasteur's most determined supporters, lucidly expressed the Pasteurian idea in his speech in the Paris Academy of Medicine in April last:—"To take the viruses of the most fatal diseases and to subject them to a culture which will mitigate their deadly powers in such a manner as will enable us to use them so as to create the disease in a modified and beneficent form, by which immunity shall be granted against a dangerous attack. What a vision! And this vision M. Pasteur has converted into a reality!"\* M. Pasteur himself, in the London speech which the Local Government Board deemed it for the public advantage to translate and print at the expense of the nation in 1881, referred to his inoculating experiments in these terms:—"I have given to the word vaccination an extension which science, I hope, will consecrate as a homage to the merit and the invaluable services rendered by one of England's greatest men—your Jenner." The easy method of reasoning by analogy is in much favour in vaccinal circles. Dr. Lettsom made a curious use of it in 1802 :

---

\* *Journal d'Hygiène*, No. 345, p. 218.



"When people reflect that they drink the milk of the cow, eat cheese made of milk, and the flesh of this healthy animal, their prejudices against the cow-pox must undoubtedly subside." Lettsom's argument evidently being, "If one animal secretion be beneficial, another cannot be injurious." The apophthegm that if it be right to compel education it cannot be wrong to compel vaccination, is based on a principle which admits of indefinite extension. M. Bouley, for instance, says: "Why should not copper, as well as iodine, arsenic and sulphur, be included among the agencies which can render the human body proof against the growth of germs like those of cholera and typhoid fever?"\* In this case the analogy has been acted upon, for we learn that in November last M. Pasteur informed the Council of Health of the Seine that "his dear and unfortunate pupil Thuillier (a member of the French Cholera Commission in Egypt) had submitted himself, even before his departure, to the daily use of preparations of copper."† But analogy is not scientific proof. It may be used to suggest probability; it may also serve to illustrate a process of reasoning; but it is not itself the process.

The whole secret of the reduction of epidemic disease to its lowest point depends on the adoption of the principle of municipal and personal cleanliness. But it must be cleanliness in its most extended sense. Unhealthy secretions should be removed from the body and decomposing matters from the dwelling. "Some of the most dreadful diseases incident to human nature might in my opinion (says Dr. Buchan) be entirely eradicated by cleanliness."‡ The energetic efforts made by vaccine partisans to exempt the small-pox from the universal liability to be thus repressed are supported by figures where they should be upheld by facts, and by inane and futile analogies in place of reasoned demonstration. In illustration we may refer to the statistics of the comparative small-pox mortality in the French and German armies during the war of 1870-71, which has been circulated for ten years and more on the most extensive scale and, having convinced senates and rulers, is at length openly acknowledged to rest on an "insecure basis," the figures having been disavowed by both Governments. The hypothetical 23,469 small-pox deaths in the "insufficiently-vaccinated" French army have been continuously pitted against the equally dubious 263 deaths in the German army, and, as in so many other instances, figures have been propounded in the belief that they were facts. Yet these now exploded figures were officially reported last year to

---

\* *Journal d'Hygiène*, No. 363, p. 438.      † *Ibid.*, No. 375, p. 598.

‡ Buchan's "Domestic Medicine," 17th edition, p. 105.

the Reichstag as "overpowering," with the acrid remark, "If such proofs of the protective power of vaccination do not convince, nothing will. Up to the present time these overpowering facts have had no influence on the anti-vaccinators. Now, as ever, they persistently gainsay them." (Report of Petitions Commission, 1883). These shadowy figures were used with great effect in the vaccination debate in the Great Council of Berne in February last, and doubtless influenced the division in which the proposed abolition of compulsion was lost by a single vote. "I will recall to your memory (said Herr Steiger) a fact not now for the first time brought into the discussions of the Great Council but which cannot be mentioned too often—viz., the colossal difference between the French and German armies in respect of small-pox. In twelve months the Germans lost 3,162, and the French 23,469. In the present agitation in men's minds, I have thought it advisable to refresh your memories with these facts, which do not occur every year; but, though a decade has now gone by, there they stand, a warning to peoples." Yet it is now acknowledged that the small-pox deaths among the soldiery were not collected by either Government, and consequently are not known.

These statistics appeared in the *British Medical Journal* in 1872, as follows:—"According to a statement made at the Statistical Congress held this year in St. Petersburg, the total number of deaths from small-pox in the German army during the recent Franco-German war was 263. This small mortality is attributed to the system of compulsory vaccination which every man who enters the army must undergo. On the other hand in the French army, where re-vaccination is not compulsory, the number of deaths, as stated by a French authority, was 23,169." "This terrible difference," says the *Wiener Medicin. Wochenschr.*, "must puzzle the greatest opponents of vaccination." The editor of the *Anti-Vaccinator* (November 1, 1872, page 209), says:—"Only a few days ago this paragraph went the round of all the papers. The statement is open to very grave suspicion as to its accuracy." When these statistics were used in the debate in the Commons on Mr. Taylor's motion on June 19 last, that gentleman challenged the figures, and the result may be seen in a letter from Dr. W. B. Carpenter to the *Daily News* of August 7 last, in the course of which he says:—

"I feel bound to make public what has recently come to my knowledge in regard to the number of small-pox deaths (23,469) alleged to have occurred in the French army during the war of 1870-1, which I stated in my letter to Sir L. Playfair, on authority which I had every reason to believe to be good. . . . The authority for the figures having been called in question, and an application to Dr. Colin (head

of the medical service of the French army), having elicited from him the reply that he did not know of any exact return of the total number of small-pox deaths in the French army, I requested Earl Granville to obtain what information he could on this point, and I have received through Colonel Cameron, the military attaché to the embassy in Paris, an explicit statement that the army medical returns of the Franco-German war are so incomplete as not to supply the total for which I asked. . . . The statement was cited as authentic—*i.e.*, as based on official returns, not only in various journals and publications, but also in an official report on anti-vaccination petitions made to a committee of the Reichstag (January, 1883) by Dr. Thilenius, who referred to Dr. Roth as the authority for it. If, in adopting Dr. Roth's estimate without any suspicion of its insecure basis, I have been blameworthy, I now make the fullest *amende* in my power."

On July 6, Mr. G. S. Gibbs, of Darlington, addressed an inquiry to the Minister of War at Berlin respecting the German small-pox losses, and the official reply, dated July 30 last, includes the statement: "For the time from July, 1870, to June, 1871 (the twelve months of the war), the numbers wished for are not recorded, and regret is expressed that on this account the desired information cannot be given."

The discreditable deficiency in scientific basis has long been a serious embarrassment to vaccine dogmatists. It was fondly hoped that aid would come from the germ theory; but the germ or microbe hypothesis has the radical defect of regarding zymotic diseases as separate entities, capable of living for indefinite periods of time in absolute independence of the human body; and it is, therefore, as deficient in scientific foundation as vaccination itself. The vague and misty forms, half seen, half hidden in the veiled obscurity of the microscope, have given no aid to pathology; and it is not by endless researches into what Miss Nightingale happily calls "imponderable nonentities" that the health of the race will be protected and preserved. It cannot be denied that the vaccine dogma is not scientific, but empirical. In vain the Vaccination Committee of 1871 tried to ascertain from its medical witnesses how vaccination operates upon the human system: no answer could be given. Professor Kussmaul, the great vaccinal authority in Germany, says:—"Up to the present time Science is unable to explain how the vaccine protection is maintained in the system;" and Dr. Stein, defending vaccination in the *Frankfurter Zeitung*, says:—"We believe in the utility of vaccine compulsion on the ground of experience, and not on the ground of scientific proof: in no medical work is a scientific foundation for vaccination to be discovered." Sir Henry Holland says:—"What is the change in a living body which gives exemption from a certain disease for the re-

remainder of life when the individual has once gone through it? In what physical conditions does a person, having had the small-pox or been vaccinated, differ from himself before such protection was given, or from a person who never obtained it? This question is as yet unsolved.\* It is further complicated by the physiological fact that the protected body is itself in a state of perpetual change.

Let me here quote from the Right Hon. Robert Lowe (now Lord Sherbrooke):—"Science means knowledge in its clearest and most absolute form and there is but one crucial test of the existence of such knowledge, and that test is prediction."† But how can this test be applied to an operation the duration of whose power is "different in different persons"—in other words, which protects until the protected person comes under the influence of the natural causes of small-pox? The great preponderance of vaccinated patients in the London hospitals has long been a source of obloquy to the dogma. Sir L. Playfair indeed says:—"The fact that there were absolutely more cases of small-pox among the vaccinated than among the unvaccinated during the epidemic is a fact which obviously must arise when 95 per cent. are vaccinated."‡ From this we may assume that the word "vaccinated" is no longer synonymous with the word "protected."

Although the public are required to believe in vaccination in the abstract, they are never explicitly told what it is that they are expected to believe about it. All is vague and much is contradictory. The leaders of the movement are compelled to admit that the experience which they allow to be their sole remaining proof is the experience of the results of vaccination, as recorded in their "statistics." Now statistics, to be of any practical utility, ought to represent "facts" respecting human nature, and the *onus probandi* ought to lie on those propounding them. Had this axiom been adhered to, the Franco-German statistics would have been nipped in the bud. But what says Lord Sherbrooke? "Facts respecting human nature are often intensely complicated, and often separated from us by vast intervals of place and time. Instead of being submitted to the scrutiny of our senses, they are gathered from relations extending over some thousands of years, subject to the distortion, falsification, and exaggeration which interest, bigotry, love, hatred, and party spirit can introduce. We are never sure that we have the whole of the case before us. We build upon sand." No one in the present day places faith in Dr. Jenner's original claim, as given in his petition to Parliament for remuneration. Nevertheless an amended creed is

\* "Recollections of Past Life." 1872.

† *Nineteenth Century*. 1878.

‡ Speech, June 19, 1883.

persistently withheld. Some deny absolutely the influence of sanitary improvements on small-pox. Were they to admit such influence, the great decline of the disease since 1800 could no longer be attributed to vaccination alone. Yet this decline continues to be claimed as due to vaccination only, even by those who would be bitterly offended by the charge of ignoring the influence of modern sanitary legislation. Many allow that the protective power of the cow-pox wears out with time (a proposition which angered Dr. Jenner beyond measure, when made by Lord Ellenborough, in 1814);\* yet they persist, when their argument requires it, in including among the protected all these worn-out and wearing-out cases, while, on needful occasions, they separate them from the protected flock. Such practices are far too common, and few indeed of the vaccine controversialists are wholly free from the charge. Again, it was stated in 1875, on official authority, that the epidemic of 1870-3 "prevailed, more or less, against many vaccination defences;"† and it is now alleged, by an authority of equal weight in vaccinal circles, that, "in the presence of a great epidemic, vaccination is overtopped."‡ Why, then, persecute the unvaccinated? Why hold over them the threat of a coming epidemic? Why press upon them a protection which (to borrow the words of Dryden) is

"Ever, save in time of need, at hand."

At a late meeting of the Berlin Medical Society, Professor Virchow alluded to a drawback which he said was incidental to vaccination—viz., that from time to time failures were met with which could not be explained. Doubtless the professor had in view the second petition to the Reichstag for the repeal of compulsion, which says, "In Berlin among the 17,020 cases of small-pox in 1871, no less than 14,287 had been vaccinated, of whom 2,418 died." That the numerous failures were a constant source of perplexity to Dr. Jenner, is shown by the many references to the subject in his correspondence. He urged that the old inoculation had also its failures, and he proclaimed the existence of a "spurious" and non-protective form of cow-pox in cattle,§ to the use of which the want of success was due; each failure being *ipso facto* a sufficient proof that the vaccination had been performed with the spurious article. In opposition to this the College of Physicians observed in their cautious Report of 1807, that "the public have been misled by the term spurious cow-

\* Baron's "Life of Jenner," ii. 197.

† "Public Health Reports for 1874," p. 9.

‡ Sir L. Playfair's Speech, June 19, 1883.

§ Baron's "Life of Jenner," i. 132.

pox, as if there were a true and a false cow-pox."\* One of the failures alleged against Dr. Jenner was the case of his nephew Henry, who was vaccinated when nineteen years old. Seven years later Dr. Jenner wrote, "Henry is very full of an eruption, the appearance of which stands midway between small-pox and chicken-pox."† The Rev. Rowland Hill wrote in 1807: "the enemies of vaccination are ever bringing forth their long lists of failures from every quarter,"‡ and Dr. Scully, writing in the *Gentleman's Magazine* in 1808, says: "almost every case of alleged failure to protect has been found to have been misrepresented or misconceived; either the cow-pox was not genuine or the small-pox was not genuine." Rowland Hill also assures us that in the only cases he recollects of small-pox after vaccination the disease was of the nature of chicken-pox. Dr. Johnson in his Dictionary says chicken-pox is so called because it is of no very great danger. Dr. Graham, *circa* 1830, says chicken-pox is entirely free from danger unless the eruption be of the confluent kind; and he adds that it is more common now than before vaccination was introduced. Possibly a change in nomenclature is taking place; for the deaths assigned to chicken-pox in England and Wales in 1872 were 72; in 1876 they rose to 109; in 1880 they were 133.

The convenient hypothesis of a spurious cow-pox has not obtained a permanent position in the vaccine creed; the existence of the genuine disease being sufficiently difficult to substantiate. Its place in the vaccine line of defence is now taken by a newer theory, and protection is said to be governed by the number and quality of the vaccination marks. Yet Dr. Lettsom, one of the fathers of vaccination, said in 1802: "Cow-pox produces but one small spot or pimple, and usually no more," and the single mark theory derives further support from the address of a learned professor to the British Medical Association, quoted in the Report of the Officer of Health of Leicester for 1870:—"A minute cut is made in the skin, and an infinitesimal quantity of vaccine matter is inserted into the wound. Within a certain time a vesicle appears in the place of the wound, and the fluid which distends this vesicle is vaccine matter, in quantity a hundred or a thousand fold that which was originally inserted." The *Gentleman's Magazine* for 1803, p. 609, says: "The Royal Jennerian Society state that the cow-pox only appears in one single pimple at the spot where the matter is inserted."

Proof ought to be adduced not only that vaccination is beneficial in some respects but also that it is not mischievous in

---

\* See Appendix to Vaccination Evidence of 1871, p. 395.

† Baron's "Life of Jenner," ii. 420.

‡ *Gentleman's Magazine*, vol. lxxvii. pp. 229-30.

others. Does the good outweigh the evil? In 1874 the number of vaccinated children who died under one year old in Leicester in the years 1872 and 1873 was published in the local press. In 1872 it was 357 and in 1873 it was 431. These deaths are at the rate of 3,570 and 4,310 per million of population. Some time afterwards a deputation waited upon the Town Council and the Board of Guardians, requesting that the deaths of the following year, including the certified cause in each case and the interval between vaccination and death, should also be made public; but it was ascertained that the required information was not in the possession of those bodies. The Government instructions to public vaccinators are, "Except as far as any immediate danger of small-pox may exist, vaccinate only subjects who are in good health." Here we may append the ravages of small-pox in Leicester for the 31 years 1852-82. The deaths averaged about 20 per annum. This is a small-pox death-rate of 200 per million of population. Half these deaths occurred in a single year (1872) at a time when, from difficulties with a contractor, the usual removal of manure from the town was materially disorganized. In the last ten years, during which vaccination has fallen so greatly in public esteem, the average has been less than ten per million.

The great point at issue between the defenders and the opponents of vaccination may be thus stated. Has sanitation, in the sense of municipal and personal cleanliness, any practical influence on the rise, spread, and fatality of the small-pox? The statistics by which vaccination is supported are based on the assumption that the answer to this question will be in the negative. The opponents of the practice hold that the influence of sanitation is supreme, and that a person by being vaccinated, and having thus received into his system a virus of unknown power and duration, may be fairly considered to be more and not less likely to zymotic attack, whatever its form. It is said that this great question of public health ought to be held as infallibly settled by Jenner's world-wide fame and renown. But Jenner's sanitary knowledge was of the most shadowy character. He suffered from typhus fever in 1786 and 1794, and on this latter occasion the disease nearly proved fatal. In 1806 a youth of sixteen was received into his house at Berkeley. While there he was twice attacked with typhus, and died of consumption in 1809.\* During Jenner's stay in London his two sons fell ill of typhus, and the father, writing to the Rev. John Clinch, says: "I do not recollect ever seeing a case that arose from the vapour of putrid animal substances."† Dr. Baron also tells us that in

\* Baron's "Life of Jenner," i. 105-6; ii. 118.

† *Ibid.*, i. 90.

1789 Dr. Jenner inoculated his eldest son, then eighteen months old, with swine-pox matter, and subsequently with variolous matter at five or six different periods.\* The youth died of consumption in 1810.†

The origin of typhus in insanitary conditions was evidently unknown to Jenner. That a teacher so unconscious of the elementary laws of sanitation should be able to compel the submission of posterity to the weight of his "dead hand"—that his crude speculations, his hypothetical guesses, his reasonings from analogy, should be imposed on the civilized world as dogmas too sacred for criticism, is a peculiarity of our time which will afford a wide field for the satirists of future ages. Let me remind the zealots who would suppress free thought on these subjects, that "the Anglo-Saxon race like freedom. They prefer a silken cord. They shrink from an iron chain."‡

The fall in the London small-pox mortality at the beginning of the century, when the cow-pox was slowly making its way, is a prominent statistic relied upon by the vaccine party as an incontestable proof of the value of vaccination. Lord H. Petty told the Commons, in 1806, that the average deaths for six years before the "discovery" were 1811. The first year the vaccine was introduced the number fell to 611. In the last year it was 1685, being very little less than the average before the discovery.§ The fall is unquestioned; but it must have been a fall among the unvaccinated. It was not, as some seem to imagine, a sudden fall from the average of last century to the average of the present century; it was a gradual intermittent fall from the sanitary neglect of the seventeenth century to the sanitary vigour of later times. In 1801 vaccination was an optional novelty, aiming at popularity. It was long before 10 per cent. of the population became vaccinated; and the question may be asked, why did not the 90 per cent. of unvaccinated persons continue to furnish their contingent of the annual 1685, or 3,000 per million, whichever it may have been in the inoculating times. What but increasing sanitation could have lessened their losses? There is sufficient ground for the belief that as late as 1840, less than half of the population were vaccinated, and Mr. Marson told the Vaccination Committee of 1871 that a very large number in this country are very badly vaccinated.|| In the Committee of 1871 Mr. Hibbert asked the medical officer of the Privy Council whether he remembered that in the year 1867 the noble lord the member for Huntingdonshire made a statement to the effect that 50 per cent.

\* Baron's "Life of Jenner," i. 130.

† *Ibid.*, ii. 141.

‡ Earl Granville.

§ *Gentleman's Magazine*, 1806, p. 853.

|| "Vaccination Evidence," p. 239.



of the population only were vaccinated.\* And this 50 per cent. included not only all the "imperfectly" or "badly" vaccinated, but also all those in whom the protective effects (as a recognized leader of the vaccine compulsionists of the day expresses it) had "worn away by age."

Compulsory laws ought not to be framed on imaginary statistics of mortality and its causes in times before official statistics were collected. Our knowledge commences with the Registration Act of 1837. Sir C. Dilke informs us that the average mortality of the country in the ten years, 1840-50, was 24·4 in the 1,000 of population, and in the two years 1881-2 it was 19·3. Let me explain what these figures mean: 24·4 and 19·3 in the 1,000 are equal to 24,400 and 19,300 per million: the reduction thus shown being 5,100 per million. Sir Charles, in contrasting the years 1847-53 with the years 1872-80 (I quote from Jarrold's authorized edition) says the reduction of the small-pox death-rate was from 100 to 51, while the corresponding reduction in other "causes of death" had been from 100 to 93. I will here remark that the Registrar-General includes premature birth and old age among the other "causes of death," and these causes surely ought not to be expected to decline *pari passu* with small-pox. It is even conceivable that deaths from old age and various other certified causes may increase with increasing sanitation. In 1881 the deaths ascribed to old age were 25,772, and those to premature birth, 12,048.

Sir C. Dilke may have felt himself induced to make the comparison between the fall in small-pox and that in all other causes; but it should be made between small-pox and the preventible causes—the zymotic diseases. And with this should be combined due allowance for the decline of inoculation and the increase of sanitation. The claim of the supporters of vaccination that small-pox has fallen in greater proportion than the general body of zymotic diseases, hangs upon the accuracy of their estimate that the small-pox mortality before 1800 was 3,000 per million of population. Dr. C. T. Pearce told the Vaccination Committee of 1871 that he put the question to Dr. Farr whether this estimate of 3,000 per million was to be relied upon, and whether there were any statistics that would enable such a conclusion to be arrived at; and Dr. Farr said emphatically, "No; it is a mere estimate: no statistics of the last century or of the previous one are to be relied upon."† A table on p. 379 of the "Vaccination Evidence" of 1871 contains the following London death-rates per million of population:—

\* "Vaccination Evidence," p. 180.

† *Ibid.* p. 45.

	1629 to 1635	1660 to 1679	1728 to 1757	1771 to 1780	1801 to 1810	1831 to 1835	1840 to 1854
Small-pox . . .	1,800	4,170	4,260	5,020	2,040	830	400
Measles . . .	160	470	370	480	940	860	580
Scarlet Fever . .	...	...	...	...	...	530	900

Since 1680 there has been a great fall in the zymotic diseases. The exceptional case of measles, which in 1882 caused 600 deaths per million in London, may probably be due to changes in the nomenclature of diseases, and the same remark will apply to scarlatina. Sir Henry Holland says: "Measles, scarlatina, whooping-cough, and infantile fever are often singularly concurrent in particular districts;" and he adds: "Morton, it is well known, considered scarlatina and measles to be varieties of the same disorder." Uncertainties of nomenclature in old times are due not only to the reception of the cause of death from "unskilled persons," but also to the limited number of death-causes in use compared with the present extended scale. Deaths are now officially divided among about 150 causes. In 1872 the number approached 100; a couple of centuries ago the list was probably much smaller. It is plain that the smaller the number of recognized causes the greater will be the average number of deaths under each head.

It is the subject of incessant boast that vaccination signally protects our postmen. Two of the healthiest vocations in the land are those of postmen and engine-drivers. So difficult is it to contract fatal small-pox in open-air life that it is probable that any imaginable amulet would afford equal security. Protection of such classes is seen to be so easy that a proposal is now being made that the engine-drivers of Italy shall undergo trial of a recently discovered protective which it is wished to confirm by a promising experiment, and they are told that by a duly regulated daily dosing with a preparation of arsenic they shall be saved from malaria. Dr. Buchan, writing about 1760, says: "I have seen poor women travelling in the depth of winter, and others begging by the wayside, with infants in their arms covered with the pustules, yet I could never learn that one of these children died by this sort of treatment."\* Dr. Buchan also observes:—"Few infants put into hospitals or parish workhouses live. These places are generally crowded with old, sickly and infirm people,

by which means the air is rendered so extremely pernicious that it becomes a poison to infants.”\*

An able writer in the *Quarterly Review*, some fifteen years ago observed :—

“ When the physician studies the history of epidemic diseases, he sees that their spread is limited by the predisposition of the people whom they affect, and that this predisposition is nothing else than a certain state of bodily constitution induced by previous habits of life. When that condition is fully established, a very small dose of the zymotic poison is sufficient to produce the most direful results. When, on the other hand, such predisposition is entirely wanting, through the previous observance of all the laws of health, the same poison, even though present in far greater potency, is altogether innocuous.”

One of the conclusions of the Health of Towns Commission of 1842 says : “ The various forms of epidemic, endemic, and other disease, caused, aggravated, or propagated chiefly among the labouring classes by atmospheric impurities, produced by decomposing animal and vegetable substances, by damp and filth, and overcrowded dwellings, prevail amongst the population in every part of the kingdom. Where the removal of the noxious agency appears to be complete, such disease almost entirely disappears.”

In certain circles of society, where healthy and wealthy families may choose to vaccinate from each other's children, the effects of the operation may be expected to be generally slight, and such parents usually express much displeasure at what they deem the exaggerations of the opponents of vaccination. In less favoured circles, where the dwellers in basements, or in districts impregnated with sewage gases, are vaccinated *pro bono publico*, the effects are not necessarily the same, and parents who have lost a child are angry at what they deem the contemptuous callousness of the superior classes. Many vaccinations are also made with lymph whose origin is unknown. Thus there is a great diversity in results. And if pure lymph—*i.e.*, direct from a cow suffering from the vaccine disease, can pass unchanged through hundreds of children, why not impure? But I hold that no lymph passes unchanged; it loses in virulence in its passage through healthy subjects, and it gains in virulence by the contrary process.

The advocates of the cow-pox ought to be careful that their case is coherent as a whole. When their object is to prove that vaccination saves millions of lives, not only is the saving due to improved water supply and altered medical treatment wholly ignored but all kinds of vaccinations are treated as of equal value. When, on the contrary, the intention is to excuse the ravages of

---

\* “ Domestic Medicine,” 17th edition, pp. 30, 31.

small-pox among the protected, the vaccinations are separated into good, bad, indifferent, recent, and worn-out by age. Thus the vaccine controversialist secures the advantage of both sides the shield, displaying each front in succession, as the exigencies of the conflict may require. And further, after long-continued denial of the influence of sanitation on the small-pox, there are signs of intended recession from a position felt to be untenable, and advice is being given to organize sanitary precautions on the most extended scale, thus aiding (as Lucian says) the protective in its efforts to save them. The variations in the vaccine creed are serious. In the report of the Vaccination Committee of 1871, it was stated by the surgeon of the London Small-pox Hospital respecting 22,792 cases in thirty-five years, that in those where vaccination had been properly and well performed the mortality was something less than 1 per cent. Taking all the vaccinations together, good and bad, the committee were officially told that the mortality in this hospital was 7 per cent.\* The mortality of the vaccinated in the great Birmingham epidemic of 1872-4 was between 12 and 13 per cent. Again: in the London Small-pox Hospital the per-centage of deaths among the unvaccinated for thirty-five years is given as 35 per cent. In the Birmingham epidemic it is stated to be nearly 50: the cases, vaccinated and otherwise, were 6,921—about nine-tenths had been vaccinated—and the combined mortality was nearly 16 per cent.† The old inoculators estimated the hospital mortality among the non-vaccinated at about 18 per cent. of cases. But a great increase in the mortality of the non-vaccinated, *pari passu* with great improvements in sanitation, cannot be conceded: *aliquis latet error*. Tissot, a celebrated physician who died in 1797, said, "Epidemics of small-pox, slight and severe, give a mortality of about 13 per cent. of those attacked." As the unvaccinated cases in hospital statistics are few in number in comparison with the vaccinated ones, a small reduction in their mortality may produce a large reduction in the percentage. This admits of easy explanation by the official statistics of the municipality of Bonn regarding their epidemic in 1870-2 when 116 cases occurred in a population of 25,000, of whom forty-two had been vaccinated once, sixty-nine more than once, four had not been vaccinated, and one was "not stated." The deaths were ten vaccinated, four re-vaccinated, and two unvaccinated. Two deaths in four cases enables the unvaccinated deaths to be represented as 50 per cent. And these two deaths were four and five months old respectively: the sufferers were

---

\* "Vaccination Evidence," p. 163.

† "Reports of Officer of Health for Birmingham."

the youngest in the list, and their fatality ought to be attributed not to non-vaccination, but to infantile debility.

A century or more ago four great causes of small-pox were in full vigour amongst us—intramural burial, hospital mismanagement, prison neglect, and lodging-houses for the migratory population. These causes have become nearly extinct, and the small-pox has declined with their decline. Bishop Latimer says: "I do marvel that London hath not a burying-place without, for it is an unwholesome thing to bury within the city. I think verily that many a man taketh his death in St. Paul's Churchyard; for I myself, when I have been there to hear the sermons, have felt such an ill-favoured unwholesome savour, that I was the worse for it a great while after. And I think it be the occasion of much disease."\* Voltaire writes to a Parisian: "In your churches the exhalations from the dead endanger the living; your cemeteries are proofs of barbarism."† A writer in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for 1801 complains of the pestiferous air of our churches, and Mr. Nichols quotes a letter written in 1732:—"The pernicious system of burying the dead in churches and churchyards is a subtle superstition of monkery." M. Ducamp says: "The cemetery of the Holy Innocents in the centre of Paris was a constant source of infection. Typhus reigned in permanence in the houses built against its walls; and to it is owing more than one of the pestilences which have ravaged the city."‡

Dr. Buchan says: "In most hospitals and infirmaries the sick, the dying, and the dead are to be seen in the same compartment. I have seen above forty children cooped up in one compartment all the while they had the small-pox, without any of them being permitted to breathe the fresh air."§ M. Arago says of the Hôtel Dieu: "All sorts of patients were admitted. Madmen slept two in a bed; and in 1786 small-pox patients slept five or six in a bed." Between 1760 and 1770 Madame Necker built a hospital on a new principle: there was to be one patient only in each bed.

Lord Bacon says: "The most pernicious infection is that of the jail when the prisoners have been long and close and nastily kept."|| Mr. Neild and Dr. Lettsom described the state of our prisons in their letters to the *Gentleman's Magazine* in the beginning of the century. Many of them were filthy and offensive in the extreme. Felons generally slept in dungeons under ground. The sewerage of Norwich Jail consisted of dead wells without drainage. The accounts are too revolting to quote. At Bristol, in 1801, seventeen persons slept nightly in the *Pit*,

\* "Latimer's Remains:" Parker Soc., pp. 66-7.

† Letter to Dr. Paulet.

‡ "Les Cimetières de Paris."

§ "Domestic Medicine," p. 219.

|| "Sylva Sylvarum," p. 246.

eighteen steps underground. Dr. Lettson says: "A person issuing from these sources of contagion may enter on board a vessel and, without apparent disease, may be so imbued with infection as to endanger the whole crew." Malthus says: "We know from constant experience that fevers are generated in our jails, our manufactories, our crowded workhouses, and in the narrow and close streets of our large towns" (p. 342, edit. of 1803). •

The Health of Towns Commission reported in 1845 that many infectious disorders originate in common lodging-houses. No provision is ever made for their ventilation. Dr. Howard of Manchester says: "in some instances the beds are placed in tiers, one above the other. The beds are rarely purified, even after having been occupied by patients suffering from fever. Cellars are sometimes used," and he adds, "No description can convey an accurate idea of the abominable state of these dens of filth and wretchedness."\* Lord Shaftesbury in 1853 said: "It is perfectly true that small-pox is chiefly confined to the lowest classes of the population, and I believe that with improved lodging-houses the disease might be all but exterminated."

Is it possible to admit that the abatement of these hotbeds of disease, and the reduction in the number of cellar-dwellings, can have had no influence in mitigating the small-pox? Yet such is the claim now made for vaccination.

The principle is boldly laid down that every human law, good or bad, ought to be implicitly obeyed. When this principle was pressed on Antigone she replied, "Neither God nor Justice sat in Council at the making of those laws;" and the noble army of martyrs to freedom, theological or scientific, have not always felt it their duty to be slaves. It may be the duty of the State to protect children against irregular opinions instilled into them by their parents—the Spanish inquisitors maintained this view with daring logic—but "the State," in the sense here used, practically means the officials of the State, and few will uphold the maxim that a department of State is fitter to discharge the parental duties of the nation than the parents themselves. Bishop Burnet rightly says: "The authority of parents over their children is antecedent to society, and no law that takes it away can be binding."†

In political struggles for place and power the successful party for the time being becomes "the State." But it does not thereby become the repository of all theological and medical wisdom, entitled to override the individual conscience on matters which

---

\* "Report of Health of Towns Commission."

† Bishop Burnet's "History of his Own Time," vi. 177. Oxford, 1823.

the State has accepted upon trust and decided without inquiry, on the faith of theories which it does not profess to understand and of prophecies which have been contradicted by events.

The tendency of the present generation is to transfer the rights and duties of the individual conscience to the State in all matters not strictly theological. But Charles James Fox, in 1780, said:—“I am a friend to *universal* toleration, and an enemy to that narrow way of thinking that makes men come to Parliament not for the removal of some great grievance felt by them but from a desire to shackle and fetter their fellow-subjects.”\*

The Vaccination Laws are incompatible with English feeling. For a temporary period the operation became popular with the lower classes, who underwent it in their desire to imitate their aristocratic superiors. It fell into contempt when forced upon paupers and felons. There is now wide-spread doubt and discussion, and free inquiry can no longer be suppressed by the fine, the distress warrant, and the jail. When the rulers of a proud nation cease to defend personal right there is discontent and opposition and anger,

The appeal of the independent thinker is for less State infallibility and more individual freedom; and our governors will do well to revert to the wise maxim of antiquity—“In matters doubtful let liberty reign.”

HENRY D. DUDGEON.

\* Lord Mahon's “History of England.”

## CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

## THEOLOGY.

MR. MATTHEW ARNOLD, after an interval of ten years, has issued a condensed and popular edition of his well-known "Literature and Dogma."<sup>1</sup> He clearly states, for the first time we believe, that his objects are "to reassure those who feel attachment to Christianity and to the Bible but who recognise the growing discredit befalling miracles and the supernatural," and also to induce the masses of the people to receive a "new religion of the Bible." This new religion, which was well discussed ten years ago, and, as far as we know, has not in the interim made much progress in the direction Mr. Arnold would desire, is somewhat as follows:—

To say that "there rules a great Personal First Cause who thinks and loves and is the moral and intelligent Governor of the Universe" is wrong, and will never make the masses read the Bible; but if we say, on the other hand, that "there rules an enduring Power, not ourselves, which makes for righteousness," then we may say to the masses: "*therefore* study your Bible and learn to obey this [power]." But suppose the plain man, which we presume to be the plain English of Mr. Arnold's *homme moyen*, rejoins that it seems to him to be very much six of one and half a dozen of the other: What then? And suppose our plain man goes on to say, in all reverence for the subject and for Mr. Arnold's competency in it, that he is at a loss to satisfy himself—though not unwilling—how this enduring Power makes for righteousness, seeing plainly, as all who run may do, that the scheme of the only part of the universe this power rules which it is possible for us to examine is the scene of one endless internecine war of forces, of plants, of fishes, of birds, of beasts, and of men; and to all appearance the very opposite of righteousness: What *then*? But quitting this for the time, let us turn to some of Mr. Arnold's other utterances. And first, as to the dogmatists, his statements are clear and fearless and have our full assent; save and except for the conclusions he draws from them. At page 20 he is justly severe upon "our mechanical and materializing theology, with its insane licence of affirmation about God, and about a future state," &c. Again, "what is called 'orthodox divinity' is in fact an immense literary misapprehension" (p. 121), and "learned religion, the pseudo-science of dogmatic theology, merits no indulgence" (p. 199).

"Our orthodox theologians freely fling about the word *infidel* at all those

<sup>1</sup> "Literature and Dogma: an Essay towards a Better Apprehension of the Bible." Popular Edition. By Matthew Arnold, formerly Professor of Poetry in the University of Oxford, and Fellow of Oriol College. Smith, Elder & Co.



who reject their literary and scientific criticism, which turns out to be quite false. It would be but just to mete out to them with their own measure, and to condemn them by their own rule; and when they air their unsound criticism in public, to cry indignantly: *The Bishop of So-and-so, the Dean of So-and-so, and other infidel lecturers of the present day!* Or, *That rampant infidel, the Archdeacon of So-and-so, in his recent letter on the Athanasian Creed!* Or, *'The Rock,' 'The Church Times,' and the rest of the infidel press!* Or, *The torrent of infidelity which pours every Sunday from our pulpits!* Just would this be, and by no means inurbane; but hardly, perhaps, Christian" (p. 123).

Quite so; but what is the upshot of all this? Why, that "the Church is necessary, the clergy is necessary, and the future of Christianity is hardly conceivable without them" (p. 12). Like the King of France in the nursery rhyme, our distinguished polemist with all his forces marches up the hill, and then marches down again. Then as to dogma itself, here is plain speaking as to the belief in the Trinity, who

"are related in the way described in the Athanasian Creed, so that the operations of the three together produce what the Westminster divines call "the contract passed in the Council of the Trinity," and what we [Mr. Arnold] for plainness describe as the fairy-tale of the three supernatural men" (p. 189).

Then a chapter of twenty-four pages, almost all of it admirable, is wholly devoted to the thrice-slain faith in miracles. "Our point is," says Mr. Arnold; "that the objections to miracles do, and more and more will, without insistence, without attack, without controversy, make their own force felt" (p. 110). "It is the *time-spirit* which is sapping the proof [of Christianity] from miracles—it is the *Zeit-Geist* itself. Whether we attack them or whether we defend them does not much matter. The human mind is turning away from them" (p. 96). "This being so, there is nothing one would more desire for a person or document [our italics] one greatly values, than to make them independent of miracles" (p. 99). Undoubtedly; and all this has our full concurrence. But what, after all, is the result? That the masses are to "study their Bible" which, Old and New, "from Genesis to Revelations," bristles with miracles as extravagant, as ridiculous, as melancholy, as vulgar, or as mischievous as ever were evolved out of the teeming imagination of all Hinduism. Oh, most lame and impotent of conclusions!

But we must carry this a little further. Mr. Arnold elsewhere says that the watchword of "The Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible," is "ingeniously absurd" (p. xxii); but nevertheless in the chapter on the Greatness of the Old Testament we are told that "to the Bible men will return, and why? Because they cannot do without it. Because happiness is our being's end and aim, and happiness belongs to righteousness, and righteousness is revealed in the Bible" (p. 196). Can mystification be carried much beyond this? A book—the Old Testament—which, especially as to the occurrences related, is almost one solid mass of unrighteousness, with its hecatombs of human beings (over 300,000 may be reckoned up); its double murders before the Eternal to stop an epidemic (Numb. xxv.);

its three-and-twenty thousand falling in one day for mere sensuality (1 Cor. x. 8); its hideous and treacherous murder of Sisera by Jael, "blessed among women" (Judges iv. 5); its regicide of Eglon by Ehud, whom "the Lord raised up" (Judges iii.); its Solomon, to whom "God gave wisdom," killing his brother Adonijah because he asked through the wise king's own mother for a wife (1 Kings ii.). And yet we are solemnly told it is "the Book of *conduct*" (p. 228). But why tread again this beaten track? Let us only make one more quotation on this part of the subject, to show to what straits Mr. Arnold's "trimming"—for it is little else—is bound to drive him in the end:—

"Now the Bible does not and cannot tell us itself, in black and white, what is the right construction to put upon it; *we have to make this out*. And the only possible way to make it out—for the dogmatists to make out their construction, or for us to make out ours—is by reason and experience" (p. 192).

And thus we find ourselves back again in the old parish road, with its well-worn ruts of "search the Scriptures" and Private Judgment. Like a trapper lost on the prairies, we have merely fetched a compass, made a "literary" excursus, covered much ground travelling in a vicious—or, if Mr. Arnold like it better, in a pious—circle, and simply returned to our starting-point. Orthodoxy we know to our cost; heterodoxy we also know, we hope; but this sort of thing is neither—it is (let the word be granted) paradoxy. We have no space to note over again Mr. Arnold's admirable passages on Culture, on Conduct, and on the Character, "Method," and "Secret" of Jesus—which last, though decidedly in the mystic style of the "Imitation" of Jacob Bohme, and of the so-called 'Philosophe Inconnu' of the last century—are still very remarkable. We continue to regret his sneers at Dissent (pp. xviii., 139, 230, &c.), partly thrown in, perhaps, to the literary exercise as a balance to the girds at the two metaphysical bishops who talk about "doing something for the honour of Our Lord's Godhead." And we must conclude by saying that in the attack on Émile Burnouf's Eastern religious lore (pp. 89, 199, &c.), the purely classical and Bible scholar shows himself, even after ten years' reflection, as narrow and as prejudiced as any metaphysical bishop of them all.

"Eastern religious lore" has just received a notable accession in the first volume of Professor Monier Williams's new book, "Religious Thought and Life in India"<sup>2</sup>—a publication of the very highest value, although its author modestly points out that he may be accused of self-repetition; and in truth it may be said that the new tome is not so handy as the admirable little book on "Hinduism"<sup>3</sup> which he wrote some years since for the Christian Knowledge Society. But the present is the more complete and continuous work to which

<sup>2</sup> "Religious Thought and Life in India, based on a Life's Study and on Personal Investigations, &c." By Monier Williams, Boden Professor of Sanskrit, &c. Part I. Vedism, Brahmanism, and Hinduism. London: John Murray.

<sup>3</sup> "Hinduism." By Monier Williams, M.A., D.C.L. &c. Seventh Thousand. S.P.C.K. 1880.

Professor Williams has ever been leading up; it abounds with entirely new matter; and it is sent forth after forty-three years' study of its subject and two visits to India, where he has travelled through the length and breadth of our Eastern Empire, with perfect knowledge of the languages that enabled him to communicate with all her pandits. For actuality, the two last chapters in the book—on modern Hindu theism—are of great interest; the lives of Rammohun Roy and the late Keshab Chander Sen especially. The lecture "India asks *Who is Christ?*" which Sen delivered in Calcutta in 1879, is remarkable in many ways. He curiously maintained Christianity to be the true national religion of his fellow-countrymen, and called upon India "to accept Christ who comes to us," said he, "as an Asiatic in race, as a Hindu in faith, as a kinsman and as a brother. Christ is a true Yogi<sup>4</sup> and will surely help us to realize our national idea of a Yogi" (p. 515). He denied the deity of Christ, of course, and did not by any manner of means intend to recommend the Christ of the Christian churches. But these utterances of his can only appear radically strange to those who are unaware that modern "Hinduism is Brahmanism modified by the creeds and superstitions of Buddhists and non-Aryan races of all kinds, including Dravidians, Kolarians, and perhaps pre-Kolarian aborigines; and that it has even been modified by ideas imported from the religions of later conquering races, such as Islam and Christianity" (p. 3); and Professor Williams goes even farther, and says that Vaishnuism, the belief in the one personal God Vishnu "not only as the Preserver but as above every other god, notwithstanding the gross polytheistic superstitions and hideous idolatry to which it gives rise [and these, we may parenthetically remark, are not confined to Indian religions] is the only real religion of the Hindu peoples, and has more common ground with Christianity than any other form of non-Christian faith" (p. 96). And in fact it is so all-embracing that "the Brahmins appropriated Buddha much as some of them are now appropriating Christ, and making him out to be an incarnation of Vishnu" (p. 114). The term incarnation here is loose, and must not be taken in a Christian sense. Sanskrit, which is the only language of Hinduism—also an arbitrary and unsatisfactory term—and the only source of theological nomenclature, has no exact equivalent for our "incarnation." The common word is *avatara*, which means not incarnation but descent; and in looking at the eight special avatars of Vishnu, in his character of universal Pervader, we may observe that in the three first he pervades the bodies of animals—a fish, a tortoise, and a boar; in the fourth he takes the form of a creature half-man half-lion, *nara-sinha*; while in the next he becomes a dwarf, the smallest type of humanity. It will be seen that each one of these descents is an ascent in the scale of animated existence—a step of evolution in fact. In the next three avatars, as Rama with the axe, Rama-chandra, and Krishna, he appears in the shapes of mighty heroes sent into the world to deliver the human

---

<sup>4</sup> One who practises austerities with the professed object of effecting union with the Deity ("Hinduism," p. 201).

race from evil demons. In the eighth, as Krishna—the avatar which has so often, and with much justice, been held up as bearing most resemblance to the incarnation of Christ—Vishnu is said to have manifested not only a part of his essence, but his complete self. Although of the kingly caste, Krishna was brought up among cow-herds and peasants, as his juvenile biography in the Bhāgavata-purāna minutely<sup>6</sup> details. While still a boy he destroyed the serpent Kaliya, type of sin and evil, by trampling and dancing on its head, and so on.<sup>7</sup> Now it is of especial importance to English theologians to remark that all these avatars, without exception, were for the deliverance or redemption of mankind. Matsya, the fish—we cannot avoid a reminder of the Messianic *dag* or fish of the Talmud and the well-known early Christian symbolism—Matsya came down to save Manu (the primeval man and not the lawgiver) from the universal deluge, when Manu built a ship by divine command and embarked in it with the seed of all existing things. The tortoise came down to recover what was lost in the deluge and, it is worthy of remark—if the digression may be forgiven—figured in acts which much resemble the myths of Early Japanese cosmogony.<sup>7</sup> The boar (*varaha*) delivered the world from the demon Hiranyaksha. The man-lion saved us from the tyrant Hiranya-kasipa. The dwarf wrested the dominion of the three worlds from the tyrant-demon Bali. The first Rama saved the Brahmans from the military caste, and the second came to destroy another tyrant-demon, Ravana. Krishna, finally, came down for the destruction of the tyrant Kansa, the representative of the principle of evil. In all these, then, we have the ideas of incarnation and redemption, and but too probably the germs of our own Christian mythology. And we shall even find Professor Williams (*pace* Mr. Matthew Arnold) endorsing what Emile Burnouf said twelve years ago in his “Science des Religions” about the primeval Trinity of the Aryans—as either Sky, Atmosphere, and Sun, or three forms of the Sun; giving rise perhaps to the mystic letters A. U. M.—afterwards the typical Om of the Brahmanical trinity—the initials of Agni, Varuna, and Mitra. And the accomplished author of “Literature and Dogma” must even bear to be told that

“it is certain that the Aryan race, from the first development of its religious sense on the soil of India, has shown a tendency to attach a sacred signi-

<sup>6</sup> “Le Bhāgavata Purāna, ou Histoire Poétique de Krishna,” traduit par Eugène Burnouf. 3 vol. petit in-4°. Paris: Imprimerie Royale. 1840.

<sup>6</sup> The parallel, for which we have no space here, can be followed up by the curious with the aid of that useful American compilation, “Bible Myths,” London, Quaritch, 1883. But the authorities cited sometimes require verification.

<sup>7</sup> Kurma, the tortoise, made his back a pivot for the mountain Mandara around which the gods and demons twisted the great serpent Vasuki. They then stood opposite to each other and, using the snake as a rope and the mountain as a churning-rod, churned the sea of milk violently till one by one fourteen inestimably valuable or typical objects emerged. In Japanese (*shintō*) cosmogony the *ama no uki-bashi* or “bridge of floating heaven,” was reached by lofty mounds (*hashidate*), and on it the deities Izanagi and Izanami took their stand when they stirred about the ocean with the sacred spear to find the land which formed the islands of Japan.

fiance to the number Three, and to group the objects of its adoration in triple combinations.(p. 5).

Even the God of Fire was sometimes held to possess a kind of trinity or triple essence in himself, consisting of terrestrial fire, celestial lightning and solar heat; and a finer illustration of the myth might be borrowed from modern science in the luminous and colouring, the dark and heating, and the chemical rays of the solar spectrum. "Such speculations," says Mr. Arnold with rhetorical mock modesty, "almost take away the breath of a mere man of letters." Nathless will they continue to be made, and we can only trust that the "mere men of letters" will quickly get their second wind and be none the worse for it.

Another, to us, most interesting section of Professor Williams's book is that which gives the genesis of the religion and nation of the Sikhs or "disciples" in the fifteenth and following centuries; and the faithful portraiture of current popular demonology, the evil-eye superstitions, spiritualism, and the actual miracles that are wrought every day, is worthy of reflective study. We may fancy ourselves among those egregious vulgar, the early Christians of eighteen centuries ago, when we read that "miracles are now of common occurrence all over India; no one is troubled by any misgivings as to their improbability, or supposes for a moment that a saint of any pretensions could be incapable of working them" (p. 267).

We may express a hope that when this work is complete it will be provided with an excellent index. As it is, some considerable familiarity with the subjects is required to find what one wants in this first volume of 528 pages. We express this hope because the index to "Hinduism" was insufficient. For instance, there were no headings for Ancestor-worship, Atonement, Cremation, Fasting, Immortality, Redemption, Sacraments, Trinity, or Vestments. Perhaps this want may be partly due to the "direction" of the committee of the S.P.C.K.; some of these headings being somewhat inconvenient for promoters of Christian knowledge. We would ask to be permitted to beg, too, that the index may also be made to serve the purpose of an etymological glossary of the numerous Sanskrit and Pali names and terms used throughout.

Mr. Lowe, the Hebrew Lecturer at Christ's College, follows up his Talmudic fragments and the *Manerbuch* of Nuremberg by an edition of the Cambridge manuscript of the Mishnah or "Second Teaching" the only English portion of which is one-half of the double title-page. It is therefore of interest only to good Hebraists. We know of but three different recensions of this Hebrew *corpus juris*, which is generally attributed in its written form to the Rabbi Jehuda Hanassi—Juda the Holy—190–200 A.D., although it was taught orally long prior to his time. The first is the basis of the Jerusalem Talmud, the

<sup>8</sup> "Literature and Dogma," p. 89.

<sup>9</sup> "The Mishnah," &c. Edited from the unique manuscript in the University Library of Cambridge by W. H. Lowe, M.A., Hebrew Lecturer at Christ's College—London: Clay & Son.

second of the Babylonian, and a third—without its commentaries—forms a code apart. The Cambridge manuscript (Add. 470-1) contains, on 250 sheets of parchment and in rabbinical characters, the complete text of the Mishnah on which the Palestinian Talmud rests, and is the oldest known. A bookseller of Cracow, as Mr. Lowe states in his brief Introduction, obtained it at Constantinople and offered it to the university in 1858. Though produced by an excellent scribe, it seems to have been copied in great haste and without revision, so that it bristles with errors. Nevertheless it must prove extremely valuable in checking the corruptions which have crept into the Mishnah in the course of centuries, and Mr. Lowe, with Benedictine patience, points out step by step with scrupulous minuteness not only the various readings, the additions and the obviously corrupt or doubtful passages, but the smallest graphic peculiarities or accidents. At least one learned Grand Rabbi<sup>10</sup> has already pronounced that this manuscript furnishes several new readings of much interest.

The second edition, revised and enlarged, of the "Bible Word-Book"<sup>11</sup> stands on the border-land of theology. It is in it and not of it. The vast number of apposite and uncommon quotations make the book excellent reading, and we can only regret the limitation of its scope to the Bible (including the Apocrypha) and the Prayer-book. From the absence of the word "Atonement," we may conclude—Dr. W. A. Wright being secretary to the Revisers of the Old Testament—that that nondescript word will disappear from the revised version; it has already been banished from the New Testament. Still, the history of the word—and very interesting it is—is allowed to remain under "At one." The word *Jesu* suggests to us an emendation of Schmidt,<sup>12</sup> who says that Ophelia's "by Gis" is a corruption of "by Jesus." It would be more correct to say an abbreviation of "by *Jesu*," and the *g* is soft; for *Jesu* was the form always used in the oblique cases, or with the optative mood, or in exclamations. One would scarcely turn to such a book for the word "Frenchmen," and still it is very properly included in illustration of 1 Macc. viii. 2 *m*, where the term Frenchmen is retained from the Geneva version, as applied to the Gauls who formed the Celtic colony in Galatia. Three good extracts from Holland's Pliny and Livy are given in support of this. The clear explanation given as to the misapprehensible phrase, "to gain a loss," also merits notice. We observe that such words as Cab, Gom, Gomor, Phylacteries, Thummim, and Urim, do not occur—in fact, the book is purely English. It has also been Bowdlered. Where all is so good, we do not wish to be hypercritical; but surely "apple of the eye" is not an archaic expression, and why give 'jaw-teeth' when 'jaw-bone' is excluded?

We can say of the English version of M. de Pressensé's "History

<sup>10</sup> Grand Rabbi Isidore Weill of Colmar.

<sup>11</sup> "The Bible Word-Book. A Glossary of Archaic Words," &c. By W. A. Wright, M.A., LL.D. Macmillan.

<sup>12</sup> "Shakespeare-Lexicon," i. 475.

of the Three First Centuries of the Christian Church,"<sup>13</sup> that it is very well translated. It is not often that renderings from the French are found so free from Gallicisms. The book itself is one of the countless number of similar productions in which the lion is always painted by the man, the long-dumb Pagan by the ever bitter theological Christian. The same lumbering old Jagannath car rolls along in the same old ruts. For instance, Apollonius of Tyana, one of the noblest characters that ever lived, is still, even by so enlightened a man as M. de Pressensé is supposed to be, represented, on the strength of the obviously mythical-miraculous portion of his "Life" by Philostratus, which this Huguenot historian has not had the patience to disentangle, as "simply a magician" (p. 518). Here is a shining light of the French Protestant Church declaring his belief in magic, as though he were still in the centuries of which he writes, or plunged in the present-day Hinduism which, no doubt, he despises with the whole of his theologian's heart. He pronounces, too, that "there is no room left to doubt the continuance of miracles in the Church of the third and fourth centuries" (p. 14). But why stop there? Why reject all the miracles of the Saints of the Roman Church which happened in the fifth, sixth, and following centuries since then, and which are still popping up every day? As Mr. Matthew Arnold says, "it is impossible to find any criterion by which one of these incidents may establish its claim to a solidity which we refuse to the others;" and "no acuteness can save such notions, as our knowledge widens, from being seen to be mere extravagances."<sup>14</sup> In looking through such books as M. de Pressensé's, one is almost tempted to wish that Gibbon had written his monumental history in French, as he once thought of doing.

We must also mention a volume of sermons<sup>15</sup> by another Huguenot pastor, in which morality seems to outweigh dogmatism. Still we find such silly sayings as "God knew our frame when He gave us the Sabbath." By the way, we did not know before that "the cynical joys of the gin-palace" (p. 464) were to be had by Paris workmen; but this gem of a phrase is perhaps due to the translator, if we may judge from the foolish preface. Yet another volume<sup>16</sup> of "lectures delivered as part of a religious service"; as six sermons in defence of Christianity are euphemistically called. The author himself says "they are suggestive rather than exhaustive, and could not aim at a complete treatment of the various matters touched upon" (p. xi). In other words, they do not tell the whole truth. Then why print and publish them? Probably to give an opportunity for a preface which takes up about half the book, and labours, as well as can be made out, to prove the resurrection of Christ from the raising of Lazarus—probably the most noteworthy instance of the argument in a circle yet

<sup>13</sup> "The Early Years of Christianity." By E. de Pressensé, D.D. Translated by Annie Harwood-Holmden. Vol. II. Fourth Edition. Hodder & Stoughton.

<sup>14</sup> "Literature and Dogma," p. 97.

<sup>15</sup> "The Gospel in Paris." Sermons by Rev. E. Bersier, D.D. Nisbet.

<sup>16</sup> "Characteristics of Christianity." By Stanley Leathes, D.D., Rector of Cliffe-at-Hoo. Nisbet.

tried. At page lxxxvi an extract from a well-known brief letter of Darwin's is given: "As far as I am concerned, I do not believe that any revelation has ever been made"—and on this Dr. Leathes makes the helpless and hopeless remark: "What then becomes of the comparative study of religions?" Well may Mr. Arnold<sup>17</sup> declare that "the finest heads for letters and science, the surest tact for these, have turned themselves in general to other departments of work than criticism of the Bible."<sup>18</sup>

Mr. Bardsley's "Glimpses through the Veil,"<sup>19</sup> dedicated to the Surbiton congregation "whom it is his joy and privilege to premonish, feed and provide for," ingenuously claims in the following extract from the preface a forbearance which we are but too glad to accord. "Sometimes," he says, "on reading what I have written, I am as much delighted as if it was the work of an approved author." Stony-hearted indeed must that reviewer be who would go out of his way to dissipate such harmless happiness.

Dr. Dickson's book on St. Paul's terminology<sup>20</sup> is an elaborate and interminable technical effort to reconcile the random statements of a headstrong, turbulent, fanatical man, whose inconsistencies the unprejudiced are content to regard as largely the result of a mere groping in the dark. This treatise is chiefly founded on a "recent monograph of Dr. Wendt of Gottingen." We must confess we were not fully aware of what even Scotch nineteenth-century theology run mad could do until we took up this book. Read this, for example, which is verbatim from p. 341:—

"If, forsooth, Christ was fully *σάρξ* and, *notwithstanding*, the sinless son of God, He was Himself precisely as *σάρξ* a judgment pronounced by God over sin, to the effect that sin does *not* belong to the conception of the *σάρξ*, that the creature does not, as such, stand in moral dualism overagainst God, but rather that, as in Christ, so also in the community associated with Him *notwithstanding all creatureliness* a fulfilment of the divine will has become possible."

This is indeed, as Rabelais said, ridiculing the Schoolmen in his "Philosophical Cream," written Sorbonicolificabilitudinally. We congratulate Glasgow.

A sixteen-years-old book in two volumes, now rolled into one, the prefaces and appendix being omitted,<sup>21</sup> is the next upon our table. Written as though there were no such thing as modern criticism, its value to the student is less than nothing. The following extract exemplifies Dr. Candlish's way of dealing with such little difficulties as the myth

<sup>17</sup> We owe him many apologies for so often quoting him, but then he should not write so well and so much to the point. Nor can we forget Boyle's saying that testimony is like an arrow shot from a long bow; the force of it depends upon the strength of the hand that draws it.

<sup>18</sup> "Literature and Dogma," p. 122.

<sup>19</sup> "Glimpses through the Veil; or, some Natural Analogies and Bible Types." By Rev. J. W. Bardsley, Vicar of Christ Church, Surbiton. Nisbet.

<sup>20</sup> "St. Paul's Use of the Terms Flesh and Spirit." By W. P. Dickson, D.D., Professor of Divinity in the University of Glasgow. Glasgow: Maclehose.

<sup>21</sup> "The Book of Genesis Expounded," &c. By the late Rev. R. S. Candlish, D.D. Edinburgh: A. & C. Black.



of the Deluge. "I pass over the catastrophe itself," he says, "without discussing the various questions which have been raised concerning it" (p. 105). We do the same with this book.

The "Pulpit Commentary"<sup>22</sup> continues to drag its huge weight along, the present volume of nigh six hundred super-royal octavo pages being devoted to the first Pauline Epistle to the Corinthians, with Exposition, Homiletics, and Homilies, which no doubt are useful as "cribs" if not otherwise, to the vast majority of those average parsons who are only too well satisfied at being led by the nose in manner following, for instance :—

"There is no need, in explaining x. 4, to suppose that the rock was rolled along with the advancing camp of Israel through the wilderness of wandering, and that upon the chant of the chiefs, 'Spring up, O well!' the water gushed forth for the supply of the thirsty tribes. It is enough to accept the plain record that the miraculous event did happen, once at the commencement and once towards the close of the pilgrimage of the chosen people" (p. 336).

And so forth, and so forth; but not a word as to the world-wide and world-old superstitions about the divining rod.

---

#### PHILOSOPHY.

ONE of the most important announcements of recent years in philosophical circles is the discovery of the manuscript of an unpublished treatise by Kant.<sup>1</sup> The manuscript contains the continuation of that discussion of the principles of science which was commenced in the "Critique of Pure Reason," and carried further in the "Metaphysical Principles of Natural Science," but never completed. In Kant's system there has hitherto been a gap between the treatment of these metaphysical principles and the discussion of the higher dynamical categories. If the announcement prove well founded, it would seem that the gap was filled up by Kant himself; and if the work before us reaches another edition, it will in consequence assume a more extended form. The foundation of the Kantian doctrine, so far as the theory of matter is concerned, may be recalled in a few words. The operation of the categories in the pure forms of space and time produces, as it were, a dynamical foundation, the condition of our perception of Nature and of the existence of any form of experience of an external world. To this dynamical foundation belongs the conception of matter which, according to Kant, although it may be obtained from experience by abstraction, can only be so abstracted because it has in the first place been there as the condition of external nature. The investigation starts with a definition of matter as that which is capable of being moved in space. It is, therefore, necessary to investigate, in the first place, the conception of space and of motion,

<sup>22</sup> "The Pulpit Commentary," &c. 1 Corinthians. Kegan Paul, Trench & Co.

<sup>1</sup> "Kant's Theorie der Materie." Von August Stadler. Leipzig: S. Hirzel. 1883.

and this portion of the investigation receives from Kant the title *Phoronomy*, a branch of knowledge which finds its nearest modern equivalent in kinematics. It deals with motion without reference to the mass which is moved, and without reference to the cause which brings about the motion, while modern kinematics depends upon purely mathematical data. *Phoronomy* for Kant was in reality nothing more than the application of his theory of knowledge to the criticism of some of the broadest principles of physics. Herr Stadler's book is divided into three parts. The first deals with *phoronomy* proper, the second with dynamics, and the third with mechanics. He applies the principles which he states as the result of his study of the "Critique" and the "Metaphysical Principles," to modern conceptions (such as that of the conservation of energy) which were not before Kant himself. The book is an exceedingly useful one not merely to the student of Kant but to the modern student of the relations of science and philosophy, irrespective of his point of view, for it deals with a class of problems which have received an exceptionally unfortunate treatment. They have been alternately claimed exclusively for metaphysics, and exclusively for science. Except by Kant, they have never been dealt with by any one who was at once a metaphysician and a man of science. That they require to be considered in both references is apparent from the spectacle of the unedifying controversies which are continually raging about them in our time. Herr Stadler's book not only gives an exhaustive account of the investigations in this direction of the only great thinker who has ever competently dealt with them but has added much acute and original criticism to the discussion.

Mr. Keynes<sup>2</sup> has correctly surmised that one of the most useful pieces of work which a logician can do, in the present condition of the science, is to furnish a textbook of formal logic as it now exists. The teaching of Jevons, in particular, has so modified the requisites of the student that the old textbooks are somewhat out of date, Mr. Jevons's own little book being too elementary for any but mere beginners. Mr. Keynes has therefore set himself to the useful task of producing a new textbook of logic. His work is the very antithesis of one which we lately had occasion to review in these columns—that of Mr. Bradley. The latter sacrificed everything to the controversial discussion of some of the most profound questions not merely of logic but of metaphysics. Mr. Keynes has carefully avoided controversial topics. His definitions are taken from the most various authors; thus the definition of a concept is that of Sir William Hamilton, while the division of propositions is stated in four different ways: those of Whately, Mill, and Bain; Hamilton and Thomson; Fowler and Mansel. The book is divided into four parts: the first deals with terms, the second with propositions, the third with syllogisms, and the fourth with the generalisation of logical processes in their application to complex propositions. Its method of stating different views

---

<sup>2</sup> "Studies and Exercises in Formal Logic." By John Neville Keynes, M.A. London: Macmillan & Co. 1884.

without, as a rule, attempting to decide among them, is a very useful one; but it is impossible to help thinking that a book which is to follow this plan ought to have been a much larger one. Thus the discussion at page 159 of the question whether the syllogism can be based exclusively on the laws of identity, contradiction and excluded middle, can hardly be intelligible in its condensed form to any one who is not already familiar with the subject. This, however, is a defect which is common to all textbooks of logic which seek to do more than expound a single point of view as though it were the only one. The book makes no pretensions, its definitions are, as a rule, very clear, and it is likely to be very useful as a manual for degree examinations.

The inaugural address delivered by the well-known Professor of Chemistry in the University of Berlin,<sup>3</sup> on assuming the Rectorship of the University, does not belie its promise of interest. Professor Hofmann's views are none the less worthy of attention from the fact that the chair which he occupies is one of science. The burden of the address is the impossibility of substituting for the old classical training of the *Gymnasien* the scientific studies of *Realschulen*, at all events so far as concerns preparation for university life. The problem does not perhaps fall strictly within the range of the subjects of a review devoted to philosophical works, but there can be no question that it is one of great interest, as being the outcome of the strife between the old spirit and the new—a strife which is raging nowhere more keenly than in the field of philosophy proper. Whether philosophy is to be relegated to the position of one among the special sciences, or whether it is to maintain a function co-ordinate to that of all science, is an issue not far removed from the practical controversy as to the separation of the scientific portion of German University teaching from that which embraces literature and philosophy proper. It is remarkable that Professor Hofmann should adhere in the emphatic way in which he does to the old-fashioned belief not merely that the scientific can but be a branch of the philosophical faculty but that there is no preliminary training for the universities to match, or in any way take the place of, a classical training. It is even more remarkable that this view should be endorsed in the "opinions" appended to the pamphlet and signed with some of the most celebrated scientific names of Germany, including that of Helmholtz. Such testimony is very powerful. Looking at the question from the point of view of philosophy proper, it is difficult for the competent student to avoid arriving at the conclusion that philosophy has suffered by its divorce from science considerably more than science has suffered from its divorce from philosophy. In the interest of philosophy the separation of the two classes of students would therefore be to be deprecated, and it is, to say the least, interesting that the converse proposition should be supported by such powerful testimony as is contained in the interesting little pamphlet before us.

<sup>3</sup> "The Question of Division of the Philosophical Faculty." By Dr. August Wilhelm Hofmann. Boston: Ginn, Heath & Co. London: Trübner & Co. 1883.

English conceptions of philosophy differ from those of Germany, German conceptions from those of France, and French conceptions from those of Italy. The book before us consists of the second volume of the translation of a treatise on the origin of ideas,<sup>4</sup> by an eminent Italian philosopher. Perhaps it is the insularity of English thought which makes it difficult to feel much sympathy with the habit of mind of the writer. What Rosmini's point of view is it is not at all times easy to tell. Hegel he has studied, but so had M. Cousin, and from M. Cousin we did not get much light on the Hegelian system. Hegelian studies appear to have made as little impression on Signor Rosmini as they did on M. Cousin. Again, he has studied Locke and Berkeley. The nature of his study of Berkeley becomes apparent when we turn to the criticism of Berkeleian idealism. The following is his refutation of Berkeleianism in his own words:—

“In the corporeal sensations and feelings (I call them by the word corporeal in order to determine them; let the word be taken for the present as an arbitrary sign) we experience in our sensibility an action not caused by ourselves but by an energy or force different from us. This energy or force felt by us, when intellectually conceived, is the idea of a being; in other words, the mind conceives that energy as really existent; and this in virtue of a necessary principle, that of substance. This energy is real as well as limited; and therefore the being conceived is also real and limited; for that being is neither more nor less than the same energy considered precisely in that determinate existence which we conceive it to possess. Much less can this limited being which differs from the sentient subject (the *Ego*) and is called *body*, be God; for God is only conceived by us as a Being every way Infinite. Therefore bodies, limited substances, the proximate causes of our sensations, exist.”

The reasoning about Hume is in a similar strain. This sort of writing does not commend itself to the English reader, and it may be predicted with some degree of certainty that the treatise on “The Origin of Ideas” will not become popular among English students of philosophy. Neither here nor in Germany can a revival of scholasticism be regarded as otherwise than beside the point.

Mr. Lacy's book<sup>5</sup> is devoted to a hostile criticism of Mr. Herbert Spencer's philosophy, and particularly to that portion of his system which seeks to establish the doctrine of our ignorance of anything but the fact of the existence of things in themselves. In other words, it is a criticism of Mr. Spencer's doctrine of Transfigured Realism. We have considerable sympathy with Mr. Lacy's objection to what is called Transfigured Realism, but we have no sympathy with him in so far as he returns to the merely assertative answers to it of Reid and of Hamilton. For these are in substance, if not in name, the doctrines which he opposes to Mr. Spencer, and they have long ago been dead if not, as might have been hoped, buried. A great battle

<sup>4</sup> “The Origin of Ideas.” By Antonio Rosmini Serbati. Translated from Fifth Italian Edition of the *Nuova Saggio*. Vol. II. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1883.

<sup>5</sup> “An Examination of the Philosophy of the Unknowable.” By William M. Lacy. Philadelphia: Benjamin F. Lacy. London: Trübner & Co. 1883.

is at present being fought between two schools of philosophical thought, and the issue is awaited with much interest. But the weapons are of modern construction and not the old-fashioned instruments which Mr. Lacy would have us employ. Nobody questions the deliverances of consciousness; the whole question is what those deliverances really are.

---

### POLITICS, SOCIOLOGY, VOYAGES, AND TRAVELS.

THE republication of the late Mr. Walter Bagehot's "Essays on Parliamentary Reform"<sup>1</sup> is well-timed. The volume consists of three essays, originally published respectively in 1859, 1860 and 1872. The first and third deal with the electoral systems existing at the corresponding dates; the second takes us back to the days before the first Reform Act. Mr. Bagehot's exhaustive examination of the electoral system as it was in 1859 and his criticism of the proposed changes had a considerable effect on the thinking public of the time, and we have no doubt Mr. Disraeli owed to Mr. Bagehot a good deal of his success in "educating" his party. As the problems then discussed were only half solved by the subsequent Act of 1867, and the difficulties pointed out by Mr. Bagehot were for the most part shirked, his criticisms and suggestions are scarcely less valuable now than they were when he wrote. Mr. Bagehot was no mere *doctrinaire*. Every page of his writings shows how thoroughly he understood the political genius of the English people and their parliamentary institutions, and he had made a special study of the manner in which these have grown to be what they are. On this account his writings are of even more value to an English statesman than are John Stuart Mill's. Exhaustive and profound as is the essay on "Representative Government," it deals chiefly with abstract principles equally applicable to representative institutions anywhere. To apply these principles to any given people, an intimate knowledge of the history and political genius of that people is necessary. This knowledge Mr. Bagehot possessed in a high degree, and to this fact, more even than to his moderation, candour, and judicial impartiality, is due the sense of conviction which his arguments leave on the reader's mind. While a staunch Liberal and Reformer he was no enthusiast. He never hesitates to point out the dangers and risks that beset the course he is advocating, and when he decides in favour of running those risks he does so deliberately because, after careful weighing, the balance inclines to that side. While insisting that the representation previous to 1867 was defective in two particulars—viz., (1) in giving too great influence to the landed interest and (2) in entirely excluding representatives of the working classes—Mr. Bagehot's great fear was that in giving the franchise to the masses we should do it in such a fashion that all other classes would be swamped

---

<sup>1</sup> "Essays on Parliamentary Reform." By the late Walter Bagehot, M.A., and Fellow of University College, London. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., 1883.

and practically disfranchised. The great principle for which he contended was that while Parliament as a whole should represent the nation as a whole, and be on all important questions in harmony with the average sentiment of the whole people, yet, at the same time, each particular class and interest should have its spokesmen in Parliament to make known the wants and feelings of that class. This latter provision is especially necessary in England, for, as he remarks, "a free government is the most stubbornly stupid of all governments to whatever is *unheard* by its deciding classes." He is in favour of a property qualification, because it satisfies better than any other the two main requisites of a franchise test—namely, that it is (1) "conspicuous," and (2) "difficult to manufacture;" and it is indirectly an intellectual test too, since inherited property guarantees a certain amount of education, and acquired property implies ability. The working classes ought to have adequate means of expressing their wants in Parliament but not a predominating influence there. The best way to effect this is to give them "a good deal of influence in a few constituencies" rather than "a little influence in all." It would be impossible to effect this under a uniform franchise; there must be variety of qualifications in different constituencies. His remarks on this question may be read with especial profit at the present moment in view of the position it occupies in Parliament. The second essay is a very able sketch of the "Unreformed Parliament" (*i.e.*, previous to 1832), the characteristics of its members, the varying rights of suffrage in different boroughs, and the influences by which members were brought into the House and to which they were subject while there. The variety of the rights of suffrage is very remarkable. Out of the thirteen boroughs which existed in Somerset and Lancashire no two were alike, and there is almost every conceivable variety from "mayor, aldermen, and common council-men only," as in Bath, to "all the inhabitants," as in Preston. On the whole, he maintains, the "Unreformed Parliament" satisfied the two main conditions of a good Parliament; it was, at least until near the close of its existence, substantially in accordance with the public opinion of the nation, and it gave a means of expression "to all whose minds required an expression," for below a certain level of political capacity "you may easily give nominal power, but cannot possibly give real power." But it had no claim to some of the merits commonly attributed to it. That the old system of patronage gave us strong and stable administrations is a proposition of which history affords little or no confirmation. On the contrary, this system exposed Ministers to two great dangers. The king might, as George III. did, take this patronage out of their hands at any moment and use it against them; and in the second place, a majority kept together by the hope of enjoying Ministerial patronage was under great temptation to desert in the moment of danger. Whether the old system was favourable to the introduction and training of efficient statesmen is a doubtful question. Mr. Bagehot points out many important qualifications to which the affirmative side of the theory is subject. In the essay on

the functions of the House of Lords, Mr. Bagehot points out how the separation in sentiment, and to some extent in interest, between the two Houses of Parliament which began in 1832 was completed in 1867. He advocates a cautious, very cautious, use by the peers of their power of veto; and on this subject he lays down the maxim that the Lords should always yield whenever "the opinion of the Commons is also the opinion of the nation, and it is clear that the nation has made up its mind." We cannot here examine the weighty objections urged by Mr. Bagehot against the uncontrolled treaty-making power possessed by the Cabinet, but assuredly it is a question of the highest importance.

With the laudable desire of throwing as much light as possible into the "darkness" into which Parliament is about to "leap,"<sup>2</sup> Earl Fortescue has reprinted an article on Reform which first appeared in the *Nineteenth Century* for March, 1881. It is hard to say whether he approves or disapproves of the extension of the franchise to the counties, but he maintains that agricultural labourers are better fitted for the franchise than the "wage class" in towns. He makes some suggestions which are at least worth considering. One is that those householders in counties who do not possess the county qualification should have votes for the neighbouring boroughs, while those who do possess that qualification should alone vote for the county members. "We should thus, while giving general household suffrage, keep up a separate constituency, as at present, in the counties." Another suggestion is, that the mode of voting should be by voting papers, because this would draw out a great number of voters who are now too apathetic to go to the polling booths. He admits the dangers of fraud and intimidation under this system, and it seems questionable whether better members would be secured by the votes of such apathetic citizens.

Mr. Hyndman's "Historical Basis of Socialism in England"<sup>3</sup> bears traces of having been hastily put together. The author has collected a considerable store of evidence concerning the economic condition of the wage-earning classes from the fifteenth century down to the present time, and has endeavoured to analyze the causes which have led to changes in this economic condition at different times during this period. Viewed as a collection in a popular form of such evidence, the book is valuable, containing, as it does, copious extracts from old and contemporary writers, from Sir Thomas More to the present Lord Shaftesbury. But in the arrangement of this material there is unfortunately little skill. The chronological order, which is essential in a book of the kind, is by no means consistently adhered to; and it is often extremely difficult to ascertain to what period the statements in the text have reference. The result is, that as a historical sketch the impression left on the reader's mind is somewhat blurred and indistinct. We

<sup>2</sup> "Our Next Leap in the Dark; with Postscript on the Corrupt Practices Bill." By Earl Fortescue. London: Wm. Ridgway, 1884.

<sup>3</sup> "The Historical Basis of Socialism in England." By H. M. Hyndman. Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1883.

cannot of course follow Mr. Hyndman through the whole four centuries which his sketch covers. But we may glance at his treatment of two periods of special importance, in both of which great and rapid changes took place in the economic condition of England, and in both of which the change was distinctly unfavourable to the poorer classes. The first of these was, roughly speaking, the Tudor period, during which "the labourers of England, in the widest sense of the term, were reduced to destitution—plunged from the age of gold into the age of iron," owing to the three well-known causes, (1) the enclosing of common lands, (2) the conversion of arable lands into pasture, (3) the suppression of the monasteries and consequent transfer of church lands to laymen who thought only of extracting profit rents from them. This period is of special importance if, as Mr. Hyndman thinks, the modern proletariat owes its origin to these events; and in support of this view, Mr. Hyndman might, had he chosen, have quoted Professor Thorold Rogers, who tells us, in his "History of Agriculture and Prices," that "from the epoch of Henry VIII.'s death the degradation of the English labourer begins;" that peasant and artisan suffered equally for three centuries; and that while the artisan succeeded in recovering his position, in part at least, by the abolition of the laws against combination in the early part of this century, the peasant has gone from bad to worse down to the present moment. There can be no doubt that great numbers of the agricultural population were at this time driven from the country into the towns, and that they formed the nucleus of a wage-earning class divorced from the means of production and dependent on the rising capitalist class. The stimulus which events outside England towards the end of the sixteenth century gave to exchange of commodities caused production on a large scale by capitalists for profit to take the place of production on a small scale by workers for the supply of their own wants. Wherever these causes operated the small producers owning the means of production were gradually converted into mere wage-earners dependent on capitalists for those means. The second of the two periods in which vast economic developments proved so disastrous to labourers comprises the latter part of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the present. During this period manual labour gave place to machinery in most branches of industry. Great numbers were in consequence thrown out of work, while competition was intensified by the employment of women and children in mines and factories, under conditions degrading and injurious to mind and body. The workers were reduced to practical slavery, compelled to accept mere "starvation wages." The first effects of this enormous stride in economic evolution were thus disastrous to the workers, inasmuch as its tendency was to complete their separation from the means of production, and to place them more than ever at the mercy of those who possessed the means—namely, the capitalist classes. Mr. Hyndman has little difficulty in proving from parliamentary and official reports what utter hells the factories and mines became under unrestrained freedom of contract, and with what difficulty the worst practices were put down by Parliament



urged on by indignant public opinion. He pays a well-merited tribute to the "truly noble men" who laboured with the present Lord Shaftesbury in inducing Parliament to interfere for the protection of the oppressed factory workers. But he is needlessly, and indeed unjustly, bitter against the "capitalist" champions, Bright and Cobden. That there were hideous evils to be remedied, if only a remedy could be discovered, was admitted; but that direct Government interference was the best remedy, or indeed any remedy at all, was open to grave doubts. For our own part, while holding that experience has proved Lord Shaftesbury to have been in the main right, we find no difficulty in believing that Mr. Bright was perfectly sincere in declaring that the proposals then before Parliament would not effect the desired end. Again, in the agitation for the repeal of the Corn Laws, Mr. Hyndman sees nothing but "a gang of self-seeking manufacturers," "hypocritical employers," whose only motive was to balk the Chartists and Socialists, to stave off the Factory Acts, and to make larger profits for themselves by the reduction of wages which they saw would be possible if food were made cheaper! By the passing of the Ten Hours Bill in 1847, as Mr. Hyndman declares, "the pseudo-science of political economy, which bourgeois political economists have formulated, met with its first great check." The main causes of the final success of the demand for parliamentary protection of workers were, in Mr. Hyndman's opinion, three: (1) The dangerous, though unsuccessful, risings of the people; (2) The efforts of Owen, Sadler and Oastler, the trade-unions, and Lord Shaftesbury; (3) The rivalry between the landlords and the capitalists, which made the former anxious to cripple and expose their enemies. In his treatment of this modern period Mr. Hyndman has allowed himself to be carried away by a rancorous bitterness which blinds him to the motives of opponents, and deprives his book of much of the beneficial influence it might otherwise exert. As an economist, Mr. Hyndman is simply a compiler from the works of Marx, Lassalle, and other German Socialists. It is but fair to add that he does not pretend to any originality beyond what is implied in applying their principles to English economic history. But his contempt for the "middle-class" economists, whose boasted science is "a science in much the same sense that astrology and alchemy were sciences," is unbounded. Beyond sneering at their so-called laws he makes little effort to disprove their conclusions, and his sneers are quite beside the mark, unless we are prepared to extend the functions of political economy very considerably, and throw upon it the task of deciding what is a fair distribution of wealth as well as that of discovering how and why wealth is distributed as it actually is. It is a comfort to find that he condemns Mr. George's principles as "fundamentally unsound." But the outlook is gloomy enough, for he assures us that "the present distribution of wealth is so faulty as to render certain a general overturn, peaceful or bloody, ere many years have passed." By fair means or foul, the workers must possess themselves of the means of production, and this is to be accomplished in some way or other by the combination and organiza-

tion of workers throughout the "Celts-Teutonic" world. There is neither index nor table of contents, so that the difficulty of finding what Mr. Hyndman has to say on any particular subject is very considerable.

Although Mr. Hyndman makes no mention of them, several unostentatious but very successful experiments, full of promise for the future of labour, and indeed of capital too, have been made, and are still being conducted, both in the British Isles and in France and Germany, with the object of enabling the workers to participate in the advantages of the capitalist. To Mr. Hyndman these methods would probably be unsatisfactory because, after all, they are the result in each case of a free contract, in which the capitalist by virtue of his possession of the means of production is enabled to make what terms he likes, and, however liberal he may be, the workers are none the less at his mercy and dependent on his bounty. But the force of this objection is very much weakened if the system of profit-sharing can be shown to be to the pecuniary advantage of the capitalists, and this is exactly what the latest instances do undoubtedly prove. We have before us at this moment three publications, each of which contains accounts of successful industrial enterprises in which the workers were allotted a share of the profits which, in ordinary cases, go wholly to the owner of the means of production. Amongst these enterprises the place of honour, whether we consider the time when it was made or the adverse circumstances which it had to strive against and which it overcame, belongs, strange to say, to an Irish experiment. It is really a surprising fact, which deserves to be better known than it is, that more than fifty years ago, as Mr. Stubbs reminds us, in one of the most backward and disturbed districts of the West, "while other landlords were flying in terror from this scene of outrage, murder, and lawlessness, far exceeding in extent and violence anything of recent occurrence, and leaving the armed police and soldiers to cope with men upon whose hearts 'famine had written fiend,' there was one Irish landlord, at least, brave enough to face the storm and, in faith that 'force was no remedy,' had the courage to set himself calmly to the task of seeing how far the principles of co-operation, which he had learnt from the great English Socialist, Robert Owen, would go towards a solution, on his own estate at any rate, of the Irish land question." What is still more surprising is that the experiment proved a brilliant success, both socially and economically, and to all appearance gave promise of the brightest future at the moment when "from a cause personal to the landlord, and in no respect affecting the principle or merits of the scheme," it was suddenly put an end to. Those who are interested in this, so far as we know, solitary attempt at co-operative farming in Ireland, can read the full account of it in a little book called "The History of Ralahine and Co-operative Farming," by Mr. E. T. Craig, the organizer of the scheme. The story is briefly retold and its lessons pointed out in Mr. Stubbs's excellent little book now before us.<sup>4</sup> Mr. Stubbs's

<sup>4</sup> "The Land and the Labourers. A Record of Facts and Experiments in

main objects are to demonstrate the economical advantages of small holdings, and to "urge the adoption of some system of agriculture, probably co-operative, which shall once more make it economically advisable to increase largely the amount of English labour applied to English land." To one or other of these alternatives—small holdings or co-operation—Mr. Stubbs looks for any permanent elevation of the rural labourer. As to the advantages of small holdings, he gives some very convincing details from his own experiments. The bulk of the book, however, is taken up with accounts of various experiments in co-operative farming—some successful, others failures—and an examination of the causes which led to failure in some cases. In this way he describes and examines the attempts at Assington and Brampton Bryant, and the whimsical experiments of Mr. Lawson in Cumberland, besides some remarkable attempts in Germany. But far more interesting and hopeful are such humble associations as the Cow Club of the miners of North Seaton, and the co-operative pig-keeping which Mr. Stubbs himself started in his own parish. Mr. Stubbs's literary style is as pleasant as his genial heartiness, fine temper, and well-informed enthusiasm on behalf of his friends, the agricultural labourers of England, are excellent. We cordially trust that his noble appeal to his fellow clergy on behalf of the labourers of England will not fall on ears that hear not.

Mr. Sedley Taylor's "Profit-sharing"<sup>5</sup> covers more ground than Mr. Stubbs's book, and is pervaded by a more strictly scientific spirit. Not that Mr. Taylor is wanting in enthusiasm for the moral and educational advantages of the system, which he proves abundantly are most valuable, but that he knows that the future success of the principle and its adoption depend on its economic rather than its moral effects. He has collected and described examples of profit-sharing enterprises in many different fields of industry—manufactures, railway companies, collieries, insurance societies, as well as agriculture. Amongst the most successful of these we find the well-known French houses, Leclair, Chaix, and the Magasins du Bon Marché. On the other hand, the attempt made by the Messrs. Briggs at their Whitwood Collieries is the most conspicuous failure. The practicability of the system is proved by the extent to which it has been adopted. At least one hundred Continental firms are now working on this basis with good financial results, while the movement is rapidly spreading; and Mr. Taylor asks with much force whether there is any reason why, if successful abroad, it should not be equally so amongst ourselves. It is true that in a majority of the few instances in which

---

Cottage Farming and Co-operative Agriculture." By Charles Wm. Stubbs, M.A., Vicar of Granborough, Author of "Village Politics," &c. London: W. Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1884.

<sup>5</sup> "Profit-sharing between Capital and Labour." Six Essays by Sedley Taylor, M.A., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge; to which is added a "Memorandum on the Industrial Partnership at the Whitwood Collieries (1865-1874)." By Archibald Briggs and the late Henry Curren Briggs. Together with "Remarks on the Memorandum." By Sedley Taylor. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1884.

it has been tried at home the result has been disappointing, but these instances are too few to justify any general conclusion from them, and in fact an examination of them discloses in each case a cause of failure extraneous to the principle itself. Mr. Taylor lays down some useful generalizations as to the conditions under which the principle has the best chance of economic success. The book is well worthy the attention of all economists, and still more of all employers of labour.

Miss Hart, who has already done much to advance the application of the principle of industrial co-operation in England, has published an excellent little sketch of the *Maison Leclaire*,<sup>6</sup> one of the most important of Mr. Sedley Taylor's instances. This record of the founder's labours is well worth reading. But a word of warning seems necessary. *Leclaire* was more than a practical philanthropist: he was a man of genius too; and enthusiasts must bear in mind that the brilliant success of his scheme was largely due to the highly exceptional combination of rare qualities he possessed. But that success shows at least what grand results are possible under favourable conditions.

The recent activity of the advocates of Socialistic schemes, as indicated by the works we have already mentioned, has naturally called forth protests from various quarters. In defence of the opposite principle of individualism, we have three pamphlets published by the Liberty and Property Defence League. The object of this League, as we learn from its manifesto,<sup>7</sup> is to oppose "all attempts to introduce the State as competitor or regulator into the various departments of social activity and industry, which would otherwise be spontaneously and adequately conducted by private enterprise." The manifesto points out that the genuine English character of the Socialistic movement in this country makes it "far more formidable than its showier Continental type." It does not flaunt its creed before the world nor waste its strength in breathing out threats of confiscation and violence but quietly proceeds "in thoroughly English fashion to attain what it wants by Acts of Parliament passed in accordance with constitutional forms." The extent of the evil is, according to the League, most serious, not less than one-third of the legislation proposed in 1883 being infected by it. The League very frankly states that its position is that of an advocate bound "on every occasion to make out the best case possible for individualism." This is a perfectly fair and legitimate position to take up. The most ardent Socialist cannot deny that there is danger in Socialism—that it may "arrest the development of the race by destroying the originality of the individual," and that with the best possible intentions the interference of

<sup>6</sup> "Poverty and its Remedy." A Brief Sketch of the "*Maison Leclaire*" (11, Rue Saint-George, Paris) and its Founder. By Mary H. Hart.

<sup>7</sup> "Socialism at St. Stephen's in 1883." Work done during the Session by the Parliamentary Committee of the Liberty and Property Defence League. "Liberty or Law?" By Wordsworth Donisthorpe, Barrister-at-Law. "The State and the Slums." By Edward Stanley Robertson. Published at the Central Offices of the Liberty and Property Defence League, 4, Westminster Chambers, London, S.W. 1884.

the State is peculiarly liable to cause new evils totally unforeseen, and worse perhaps than those it was intended to remedy. The history of past legislation in England and elsewhere abounds with striking instances of such disastrous results. We are ready to admit even that State interference is *in itself* an evil, and can only be justified by the existence of a greater evil, and of a high probability that the proposed interference will effect a cure and not bring worse evil in its train. We therefore welcome the appearance of an association pledged to examine every legislative proposal with a view to determining whether it fulfils these conditions, and we agree with Mr. Donisthorpe that the *onus probandi* rests in all cases with those who would limit the freedom of the citizen. There is all the more need for such a watch on future legislation because, as Mr. Donisthorpe points out, "the Conservative party has, through its leader in the Upper House, thrown in its lot with State-Socialism." The third of these League pamphlets is devoted to showing the difficulties in the way of dealing with the dwellings of the poor. It puts very forcibly the well-known objections to all such well-meant efforts, and endorses Mr. Hyndman's opinion that what is given by the State in the form of low rents will slip through their hands into the pockets of their employers when competition drives them to accept starvation wages.

Mr. John Fiske, whose "Outlines of Cosmic Philosophy" has been justly described as the first important contribution made by America to the evolution philosophy, has given us a very interesting and pleasantly written volume of essays,<sup>6</sup> apparently lectures and papers read on various occasions in America during the years 1876-82. The subjects are, as the title seems intended to suggest, very miscellaneous, but they are all treated from the evolutionist's point of view, and may, perhaps, be fairly included within the elastic boundaries of sociology. The book opens with a survey of "Europe before the arrival of man," and closes with a graceful tribute *in memoriam*: Charles Darwin. Between the first and the last chapters Mr. Fiske introduces us to "our Aryan forefathers;" discusses the question "Was there a primeval mother tongue?" analyzes "the causes of persecution;" inquires into "the meaning of infancy;" and ventures to forecast the probable future of religion. These are but a few of the subjects of Mr. Fiske's essays, but they are enough to show that he has not confined his "excursions" to any single direction. There is a cheerful optimism running through these essays. Their temper and tone are such that the most bigoted opponent cannot take offence at anything. The complete absence of Americanisms is remarkable; indeed the literary style is as pure as it is attractive. The chapter on the various races which have at different times inhabited Europe, is already a little out of date. Mr. Fiske makes no mention of the theory which has now almost won its way to general acceptance, that the Aryans did not come, as has been hitherto supposed, from Asia to Europe; but that, on the contrary, they were of European origin. The cradle of the

<sup>6</sup> "Excursions of an Evolutionist." By John Fiske. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1884.

Aryan race was, there can be but little doubt, in Northern Europe, probably on the shores of the Baltic, whence they spread over almost the whole of Europe and a good part of Asia, as far at least as India. The Scandinavians are probably the purest Aryan blood now to be found in any part of the world. Mr. Fiske shows with admirable clearness the steps by which we are enabled to arrive with something like scientific certainty at a tolerably definite date when the River-drift men—the earliest European people of which we know anything—began to disappear, and their place to be taken by the Cave-men. From the circumstances under which remains of the former race are found we know that the event in question must have taken place simultaneously with the coming on of the glacial epoch, which Mr. Croll's astronomical calculations prove must have been about 240,000 years ago. We have thus got one fixed point in the chronology of pre-historic Europe. How long before this the River-drift men inhabited Europe we do not know, but very long it must have been. Quitting these fascinating palæontological speculations and hurrying past some intermediate chapters, we come upon a series of papers on strictly sociological questions, of which the most interesting is an analysis of the causes of persecution. Rejecting Buckle's theory that the decline of persecution has been determined solely by intellectual causes (*e.g.*, the growth of scepticism), and that it does not indicate any improvement in the moral nature of mankind, Mr. Fiske seeks to discover "the underlying causes of the temper of mind which has led men to persecute one another." Amongst the minor causes he finds two—one moral, the other intellectual. The disposition of man to "domineer" over his fellow-men, to assert his own personality at the expense of neighbouring personalities, is the *moral* root from which the persecuting spirit springs; the assumption that one's own opinions are infallible is its *intellectual* root. But a far more potent cause than the foregoing is found in the survival of that intense feeling of corporate responsibility which pervades all the life of primitive and even early historic societies. "To remove the heretic lest God curse us all for his sake—this no doubt has been the feeling that more than any other has justified the use of rack and thumb-screws." It is easy to show how this feeling of corporate responsibility would arise out of the necessities of primeval society, where the tribe, the highest form of political organization, was in a state of constant war with every other tribe; and it is also easy to see how the same feeling would gradually die out, as it has died out, as society advanced towards wider political aggregation and greater stability, the responsibility being shifted from the community to the individual. But it is not so clear, as Mr. Fiske assumes it to be, that the *moral* root of persecution, the disposition to "domineer," has lost much of its vitality; nor has Mr. Fiske been as successful as we could have wished in showing how this disposition is affected by the evolution of society. In Europe the universal political empire of Rome, and the universal spiritual empire of Christianity, were powerful agents in breaking down the sense of tribal responsibility, although that feeling long survived as a

tradition from the pre-historic times which gave it birth. Protestantism itself is essentially an assertion of the principle of individual as opposed to tribal responsibility in matters of opinion, and the decomposition of orthodoxies which characterizes the present age is a further assertion of the same principle. As regards the future of religion Mr. Fiske takes a very cheerful view. When the business which occupies the present generation, the task of substituting the conception of gradual evolution for that of special acts of creation, has been finished "all educated people will be evolutionists, and it will then be seen, more clearly than it is now, that while the doctrine of evolution has enormously increased our knowledge of the phenomenal universe, it really leaves all ultimate questions as much open for discussion as they ever were."

"The Laws of Literary Property,"<sup>9</sup> by Mr. Scrutton, appears to us unsatisfactory both in design and in execution. The attempt to combine an examination of the principles on which literary property ought to be founded with a statement of the actual law, is open to the objection that men who want to know for practical purposes what the law *is*, will care very little for Mr. Scrutton's or any one else's opinion as to what it *ought* to be. Nor in the execution of this design can we think that Mr. Scrutton is very successful, at least in the theoretical or philosophical part, which is diffuse and feeble, if not positively erroneous. The faults of design are due perhaps to the conditions under which the bulk of the book was written, and the author appears to have been fully aware of the risk he ran in publishing a Prize Essay. In addition to an examination of the English Copyright Laws affecting literary, musical and artistic property, and of the principles which ought to govern these laws, the book also contains a history of the English Law of Copyright, two chapters on Colonial and International Copyright, and finally, a short essay on the "Communitistic" character of the law. Mr. Scrutton has a curious way of seeing things upside down. Thus, when he says that the Copyright Laws are Communitistic, his meaning appears to be that they are not sufficiently anti-communitistic. Again, he speaks of reversion of a man's property to the community on his death as "a *system* which was one of the first *steps* by which individual property was *carved* out of the property of the community." To say nothing of the jumble of metaphors in this sentence, it is clear that it was not the reversion of a man's property after his death, but the possession of it *until* his death, that constituted the "step" towards private property. The practical part of Mr. Scrutton's book appears to be founded mainly on Mr. Copinger's more exhaustive work, and is carefully done. The

<sup>9</sup> "The Laws of Copyright. An Examination of the Principles which should regulate Literary and Artistic Property in England and other Countries." Being the Yorke Prize Essay of the University of Cambridge for the year 1882, revised and enlarged. By Thomas Edward Scrutton, M.A., LL.B. (Lond.), B.A., LL.B. (Camb.); Barrister-at-Law; Professor of Constitutional Law and History in, and Fellow of, University College, London; Senior Whewell Scholar, 1879; Barstow Scholar, 1882; late Scholar of Trinity College, Cambridge. London: John Murray. 1883.

cases on the subject are brought down to a very recent date. For non-legal readers this part of the book will perhaps meet a want—that of a full and accurate statement of the somewhat confusing rules of copyright.

Dr. Fulton has compressed into a very modest space a stupendous amount of learning on the Ancient and Canon Laws concerning Impediments to, and Dissolution of, Marriage.<sup>10</sup> We dare not venture to criticize a book which shows such a minute acquaintance with “Canons of Councils, Decrees of Popes, and Judgments of Fathers,” written, too, by an ecclesiastic (presumably an American Catholic) for the guidance of the church to which he belongs.

The first feature which must attract the attention of any one glancing into Mr. Kay's work<sup>11</sup> is the abnormal number of quotations in the form of foot-notes. There is hardly a page in which the notes do not take up two or three times as much space as the text does. The author will not feel hurt, we are sure, if we say that we agree with him in considering the notes as the most valuable part of the book. They are in themselves an almost inexhaustible mine of maxims, a dictionary of quotations, on every question that concerns the art of education. We estimate, roughly, that there are about 3,000 of these quotations altogether. When we say that they are on the whole relevant, and judiciously selected from writers of every age and language, from Plato to Herbert Spencer, it will be seen that the work is one of vast learning and labour, the fruit of many years of industry. And yet on such a subject there is really not much to be said. The principles on which true education must be based are not obscure, and have never been hidden from the best minds of any age. There is therefore of necessity much repetition of ideas in this mass of quotations. But although no new principles emerge from age to age, every great mind presents the old ones in a fresh dress. It would be unreasonable to expect Mr. Kay to contribute anything very original to the valuable collection which with surprising industry he has brought together and presented to the public; collectors are not usually creators. The chief value of the text is as forming a string on which to thread the notes. A more distinct recognition of this as the sole function of the text would, in our opinion, greatly increase the value of the book. What good can come of putting into other words a pregnant sentence of Carlyle or Mill? Yet the very completeness and perfection of the annotations reduces the text to this position. One strange omission we feel bound to notice. Although Mr. Kay is fully aware of the influence of heredity, and has actually devoted one long chapter to “the hereditary effects of education,” we have not seen a single reference to Mr. Galton!

---

<sup>10</sup> “The Laws of Marriage; containing the Hebrew Law, the Roman Law, the Law of the New Testament, and the Canon Law of the Universal Church, concerning the Impediments of Marriage and the Dissolution of the Marriage Bond.” Digested and arranged, with Notes and Scholia, by John Fulton, D.D., LL.D., Author of “Index Canonum,” &c. London: Wells Gardner, Darton & Co.

<sup>11</sup> “Education and Educators.” By David Kay, F.R.G.S. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1883.



Signor N. Fornelli's book on "State Education in our Times,"<sup>12</sup> is a useful work, containing, besides a brief historical sketch of the rise and growth of national education, a statement of the actual position with regard to schools of those Governments in Europe and in America which have adopted the compulsory principle. With regard to France he points out that, although the turbulent spirit of the Revolution gave some thought to the important subject of the education of the people, it accomplished nothing. The Constituent Assembly most characteristically decreed the "loss of civil rights to the ignorant;" but it did nothing towards lessening their number. In closing all the then existing schools the Assembly performed the only work with respect to education for which it was fitted. It was impossible for any governing body in such a white-heat of enthusiasm to give the time and calm deliberation necessary for the production of any legislative monument destined to endure. It was left to the Empire and the Restoration to attempt the work of national education in the intervals between wars and revolutions. Very imperfectly did they perform their task, and only within the last few years, in Republican times, was the vital step taken of making the teaching unsectarian. On the subject of religion in public schools Signor Fornelli takes a decided position. It is an evil to be shunned by all those who prize liberty and freedom of thought. To Ireland he grants the palm for her National School system. There, he says, true liberty exists, as the nation provides education and prevents religious interference. The condition of Holland and Belgium furnish striking proofs of the benefits and disadvantages of the rival systems. While in the former education is steadily advancing under the influence of religious freedom, in the latter it was as steadily declining under the incubus of clerical control. In 1879, when a stand was made for liberty by the king and the patriots, M. de Laveleye could say that, owing to the clerical inquisition, only such men were schoolmasters as were too mean-spirited or too ignorant to be anything else. The English public-school system is praised as being particularly admirable because of that "feverish activity" of the School-boards which keeps the national mind from going to sleep over the subject.

The first volume of Professor J. J. Rein's great work on Japan,<sup>13</sup> published at Leipzig in 1881, has now been translated for English readers. The work of translation is excellently done under the supervision of the author, who tells us that we may consider the English edition as a new and revised edition of the original, all the proof-sheets having passed through his hands. The present volume consists of two parts: I. The Physiography of Japan; II. The Japanese People. The first part is based almost exclusively on the

<sup>12</sup> "L'Insegnamento Pubblico ai Tempi Nostri." N. Fornelli. Roma: Forzani e c., Tipographi del Senato. 1881.

<sup>13</sup> "Japan: Travels and Researches undertaken at the Cost of the Prussian Government." By J. J. Rein, Professor of Geogriaphy in Marburg. Translated from the German. With 20 Illustrations and 2 Maps. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1884.

author's own observations during two years of residence and travel in the country, undertaken at the request of the Prussian Minister of Commerce for the purpose of studying and reporting on the trade and industries of Japan. For the second, "all available sources" have been investigated, and the author contributes his own observations and conclusions beside. The present volume may therefore be considered a "by-product" of the Professor's visit to Japan. Nevertheless it is the most important and exhaustive work that has yet appeared on the physiography of that interesting land. Its geological conditions, its orography, hydrography, climate, flora and fauna, are described with scientific precision and accuracy. Occasionally his descriptions—notably those of the rivers and lakes—rise to the picturesque, and we catch glimpses now and then of the author's love of Nature bursting through the cold style of an official report. The flora of Japan have always been a rich field for the botanist, for the two reasons pointed out by Dr. Rein—the great variety and luxuriance of the vegetation, and the fact that the Japanese themselves have for many centuries paid great attention to their herbs, vegetables and flowers. No other people in the world, except the Chinese, have "so old and elaborate a vegetable nomenclature." Dr. Rein, while acknowledging the valuable labours of his predecessors, claims that his own "field of observation and collection was unusually extended, and in particular included the vegetation of the high mountains." Yet it seems we are far from having a complete knowledge of the flora of Japan. "A critical flora of the Islands of Japan has yet to be written. It will discredit many previous calculations." Dr. Rein believes "that the catalogue of the endemic vascular plants of Japan will probably in a few years exhibit nearly 3,000 items." The constitution of the flora coincides with that of the fauna and with the evidence of fossil remains, in pointing to a former connection of Japan with Siberia and Amurland, and Dr. Rein appears to adopt Mr. Wallace's theory that Japan belonged to his Palæoartic region. Animal life, especially in the surrounding seas, appears to be almost as rich in species as is the vegetable kingdom. The second section contains a brief account of the history, civilization, and social condition of the people from the doubtful Mikado Jimmu Tennô (711–585 B.C.) to the present day. The historical portion is, however, too brief to be interesting, and is indeed little more than a synopsis of the principal events. The sub-section, "Ethnography," is perhaps the most interesting part of the volume, and, considering the scientific spirit which pervades it, is not surpassed in value by anything accessible to the English student of Japanese ethnography. On the puzzling question of the origin of the Japanese people Dr. Rein appears to incline to the belief that the chief element (for the Japanese are evidently a mixed race) came from the high Central Asian plateau and was Tartar-Mongolian. We have a concise account, clear and valuable as far as it goes, of the language and literature of the Japanese; their dress, habitations, food; their family and social customs; their education, amusements, festivals and religions. The

sociologist will find almost as rich a field of research in these as the botanist enjoys in the forests and mountains. The final division of Dr. Rein's book, "Topography," gives a detailed account of the provinces. A good table of contents and an index add greatly to the convenience of those who have occasion to consult it for information on any particular point. There are also two excellent maps—one physical, the other political. From this very inadequate sketch of Dr. Rein's book it will at once be evident that it belongs to a totally different category to the works usually included in "Voyages and Travels"—such, for example, as Miss Bird's very interesting "Unbeaten Tracks." It lacks, of course, the element of adventure which these possess and, being wholly impersonal, will not attract many "general readers." But for the student who wishes to have a solid knowledge of "the land of the rising sun," its productions and its people, Dr. Rein's book is a treasury of well-digested, scientifically arranged information. We miss, indeed, all mention of Japanese art, but we assume that that most interesting branch of the national activity will find adequate treatment in the promised volume on the "Industry and Trade of Japan." We can wish the forthcoming volume nothing better than that it may realize as fully as the present does its author's aim—"thorough lucidity and truth."

In the autumn of 1878 Sir James Caird went out to India as a member of the Famine Commission appointed by Lord Salisbury to inquire into the whole circumstances of the recent famine (1876-7), "with a view to the adoption of such means as might enable timely provision to be made to meet the inevitable recurrence of seasons of dearth." The Commission visited every province of India and many of the Native States also. The book<sup>14</sup> now before us is an amplification of the author's note-book, in which, as he informs us, whatever appeared worthy of note was recorded at the time, and no doubt, as he says, "much was seen by a fresh eye accustomed to seek reasons for diversity of systems affecting the prosperity of those engaged in the cultivation of the land." That Sir James Caird speaks with authority on all subjects connected with agricultural economics needs not be said. Perhaps the most attractive portions of his book are those which take us through Native States, for these are the parts of India at once least known and least Anglicized. In them Western civilization, which so quickly overflows and hides the traces of all other civilizations with which it comes in contact, has done least harm and possibly most good. It is curious to read that the Native State of Jeypore, almost in the heart of India, is ruled over by "a little man in spectacles, with a large diamond in his hair on the top of his head, and a pretty posy of flowers in his side hair!" And this little man has absolute power of life and death over all his subjects. Yet they seem happy and well-to-do. Of Native States in general he says: "I have observed little difference in the condition of the people as compared with those under our own rule. On the whole, they seem to have

<sup>14</sup> "India: the Land and the People." By Sir James Caird, K.C.B., F.R.S. With Map of India. London: Cassell & Co. 1883.

more solid and permanently constructed villages." Sir James draws attention to a very serious change for the worse in the functions of the collectors, "who, from the great increase of appeals, are detained in their courts, and are obliged to subordinate the far more important duty of acquiring a personal knowledge of the people themselves to this discharge of judicial functions." The evil has been aggravated by the recent introduction of an elaborate procedure "suited to entirely different circumstances," whereby cases which used to be settled in a few hours now occupy more than an equal number of days. Another evil complained of by the Provincial Governors is "the deadening influence caused by the interference of the Governor-General's Council, each member of which has a special duty confided to him, and thinks it necessary to question all suggestions from the subordinate governments." Those who really know the people of India from having lived among them will endorse the views of "A Rajah and Native Landowner," quoted by Sir James, that "what the people of India desire is not only the protection which our Government gives, but the rest which they find under it. They are . . . very conservative . . . and sadly put out by the constant legislative changes. If the English would do nothing but govern, . . . being content to let civilization gradually grow, they would be very popular." Strikes against rents are not unknown, it seems, in India. The two last chapters deserve to be studied by every one who has a voice in the administration of our Indian Empire. Sir James gives in them a rapid review of all the great famines which have occurred in the present century, showing the areas and populations affected in each case, the means (if any) used to cope with them, the expense incurred, and the number of deaths. From this review he arrives unhesitatingly at conclusions in favour of the system adopted in 1874 in Behar, when relief was given through the head-men of the villages to all who were known by them to require it, without exacting any labour in return. This plan is not only by far the most effective in saving life, but he argues it is also the most economical, as food will go further in sustaining life when the recipient is not expending energy in labour, and when he is at home. It also preserves the village life from disruption, and thereby avoids manifold evils, while the character of the people reduces to an insignificant minimum the one great danger which would at once occur to an Englishman—namely, the risk of permanent pauperization of the people. He recommends the establishment of a famine fund by setting apart about  $1\frac{1}{2}$  millions sterling each year—a sum which he estimates would be sufficient to meet the famines which may be expected to recur at intervals of about eleven years, during which time the population may be expected to increase by no less than 15,000,000! This would not be more than one-fiftieth of the sum per head of the population which is annually devoted in England to poor relief. The two great dangers ahead arise from the rapid increase of population and the extreme poverty of two-thirds of the landholders. The book concludes with some valuable suggestions for meeting these dangers, and a declaration in favour of "honestly carrying out the Queen's proclamation of 1858."

Mr. Carl Bock's extremely interesting and graphically written volume<sup>16</sup> is more than a mere book of travel. It describes what may be fairly called an exploring expedition undertaken by the author—a well-known traveller and naturalist—in Lao and Upper Siam, the land of temples and elephants *par excellence*. Mr. Bock is, with one exception, the only European who has ever penetrated into these regions; and although assisted in every way by the enlightened young king his success was not won without a severe tax upon his patience and perseverance. Obstacles of all kinds were thrown in his way by the local authorities. His natural history specimens, collected with much difficulty, were destroyed through the stupidity or knavishness of his coolies, who, to lighten their burdens, quietly emptied the spirits out of the tins in which the specimens were preserved. No serious dangers, however, were encountered by Mr. Bock in his fourteen months tour. What he saw he claims to have described with fidelity, and what he was told he has recorded as it was stated to him. The book is of popular and general rather than scientific interest. The most valuable portions are those which describe the customs and institutions of the little known Laosians; but the shortness of the author's stay amongst them made it impossible that his observations in such matters should be more than superficial. There are a good many illustrations and two coloured plates—one of a "real white elephant," the other a facsimile of a native picture of a "Theweda," or avenging angel, brilliantly illuminated. A few meagre notes on the geography, climate and population of Siam, and on the Siamese method of reckoning time, bring to a close a book which is, on the whole, rather disappointing when we consider the author's unique advantages.

Miss Gordon Cumming's name is a sufficient guarantee for the interest sure to be found in her bright pages, nor are we disappointed in this her last account of her travels. The "Granite Crags"<sup>17</sup> she describes so faithfully are to be found in the wonderland of the Yosemite Valley. Page after page of glowing description bring before us the magnificent scenery amid which the author passed a three months holiday with sketchbook and pen. The reader cannot choose but share Miss Cumming's regret when the time comes for her to uproot herself from the scenes which have "gladdened her with their beauty for so many weeks." We sympathize with her strong resolve that come what may she will not address her American friends as "Ma'am" and "Sir," although she seems to have so far adapted herself to her environment as to speak of going out for a day's "gunning" with a "smell-dog," and to call the busy bee a "sting-bug!" She describes with great humour the town of San Francisco and its marvels of

<sup>16</sup> "Temples and Elephants: the Narrative of a Journey of Exploration through Upper Siam and Lao." By Carl Bock, Author of "The Head Hunters of Borneo." Map, Coloured Plates, and Illustrations. London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle & Rivington. 1884.

<sup>17</sup> "Granite Crags." By C. F. Gordon Cumming, Author of "At Home in Fiji," "Fire Fountains," "A Lady's Cruise in a French Man-of-War," "In the Hebrides." With Illustrations. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood & Sons. 1884.

material civilization. We recommend her chapter on fire-brigades and the niceties of electricity as a domestic agent to the curious. In a concluding note to this chapter there are some ghastly details of the mode of procedure of undertakers in "the States." The book is illustrated with photo-engravings from the author's sketches.

Colonel Malleon,<sup>17</sup> whose writings on Indian history are deservedly well known, has been induced to give the British public an account of his "Rambles" among the mountains and lakes of Tyrol and the neighbouring regions. These rambles took place nearly twenty years ago, and the journal which records them first saw the light in the pages of the *Calcutta Review*. The special inducement for republishing them consisted in the fact that a friend had recently illustrated some of the places described. This inducement will not, we fear, weigh much with the reading public. Colonel Malleon has an easy narrative style and a warm love of Nature which make his journal very pleasant reading for an idle evening. Most of his hints to anglers and Anglo-Indians are probably out of date now, although there has been very little change in this part of Europe. Incidentally he lectures Anglo-Indian society pretty severely for its arrogance and pettiness, but he admits there has been improvement of late.

Mr. Tangye's *Reminiscences*,<sup>18</sup> cover a period of some years. The author tells us in his preface that the book was written as a means of relieving the monotony of one of the voyages of which we have the description. This may account for the undeniable monotony of a great part of Mr. Tangye's pages. When he describes the passengers and their stale jokes, the newspaper on board, the feeble entertainments of a long sea-voyage, we are inclined to let the book drop in utter weariness. Taking heart of grace, however, we find a few pages further on some rather interesting descriptions of Australian and Tasmanian life. The labour market and social condition of the people are subjects evidently practically understood by the author, and these are treated of in a chapter which may be read with advantage by those who are interested in such questions. Mr. Tangye then proceeds to America, where of course he gives us an account of the Palace Hotel in San Francisco. Finally Egypt comes in for a share of his notice. The book is illustrated.

Why it should have entered into the heart of Captain Thomas Hargreaves, F.A.S., 2nd L.R.V., to write a book<sup>19</sup> will probably remain a mystery until the day of judgment. For a wearisome record of the most trivial occurrences of an uneventful cruise, written in an

<sup>17</sup> "Captain Musafir's Rambles in Alpine Lands." By Colonel G. B. Malleon, C.S.I. Illustrated by G. Strangman Handcock. London: W. H. Allen & Co. 1884.

<sup>18</sup> "Reminiscences of Travel in Australia, America, and Egypt." By Richard Tangye. With Illustrations by E. C. Mountfort. London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle & Rivington. 1883.

<sup>19</sup> "A Voyage Round Great Britain; with Short Views of Aberdeen, Balmoral, Leith, Edinburgh, Kincardine, Stirling, St. Valéry-en-Caux, Fécamp, Havre, and Paris." By Captain Thomas Hargreaves, F.A.S., 2nd L.R.V. London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle & Rivington. 1884.

exasperatingly slipshod style, and unrelieved by a gleam of fancy or originality—commend us to Captain Thomas Hargreaves' "Voyage round Great Britain."

Mr. Little has produced an eminently readable book,<sup>20</sup> written in a bright pleasant style, which will recommend itself to the reading public, even to such as may not be particularly interested in the subject. The author knows his world *jusqu'au bout des ongles*, and throws much light upon the social and political life of the country. He brings an unprejudiced mind to bear upon the problems which have of late years agitated South Africans. Space does not permit us to dwell upon this work as it deserves; suffice it to say that while every page is readable, many are teeming with valuable information. Wit and humour are not wanting in the volume, and if Mr. Little appears to deal severely with certain colonists, his fairness and good-humour are apparent through the censure.

"Antipodes" clever and thoughtful book<sup>21</sup> deals with great questions of faith and social morality in a way which will probably be a revelation to many minds. It is written in the form of dialogues between an individual styling himself "Common Sense" and the Vicar of a country parish. The Vicar, a man of a trusting and kindly nature in spite of the narrow bonds which shackle him, is at first in some doubt whether he ought to converse with so unorthodox a person as Common Sense shows himself to be. Becoming fascinated, however, by the topics which present themselves, he allows himself to be drawn into a discussion of all kinds of unorthodox views of modern questions. The consequence is that the Vicar's orthodoxy becomes troubled, whereupon the worthy man, taking fright, has an interview with his Bishop, with the result that an end is put to conversations the record of which may possibly awaken other vicars to listen to the voice of Common Sense.

From the author of the excellent little book ("The Land and the Labourers") already noticed above, we have a small volume of Sermons and Addresses<sup>22</sup> which we regret we have no space to notice at length. We can, however, recommend it to all social reformers who hold with the author that "of the unsolved problems of society and the individual, Christianity still holds the key." Whether in this view Mr. Stubbs is right or wrong we welcome the noble democratic tone which breathes through his Christianity.

We are glad to be able to announce the publication of an English

<sup>20</sup> "South Africa; a Sketchbook of Men, Manners, and Facts. With an Appendix upon the Present Situation in South Africa, and upon the Affairs of Zululand, the Transvaal, and Bechuanaland, with especial reference to the Boer Mission to England." By James Stanley Little. In 2 vols. London: W. Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1884.

<sup>21</sup> "The Revelations of Common Sense." By Antipodes. London: E. W. Allen. 1884.

<sup>22</sup> "Christ and Democracy." By Wm. Stubbs, M.A., Vicar of Granborough, Author of "Village Politics," "The Land and the Labourers," &c. London: W. Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1884.

version of M. Guyot's valuable work "*La Prostitution*,"<sup>23</sup> which we reviewed at length in our number for April of last year.

We have also received: "A Letter to the Lords Temporal and Spiritual of Her Majesty's Realm, on the Present Relations of Church and State, its Perils and Safeguards," by Rev. Charles Voysey, B.A., St. Edmund's Hall, Oxford, formerly Vicar of Healaugh. (London: 1883); "Iberian Sketches; Travels in Portugal and the North-West of Spain," by Jane Leck, with Illustrations by Robert Gray, F.R.S.E. (Glasgow: Wilson & McCormick, St. Vincent Street, 1884); "A Guide to Degrees in Art, Science, Literature, Law, Music and Divinity, in the United Kingdom, the Colonies, the Continent, and the United States," by Edwin Wooton, Author of "A Guide to the Medical Profession," &c. (London: J. Upcott Gill, 170, Strand, W.C., 1883); "The Free Public Library Question Discussed, with Special Reference to Aberdeen," by Sigma (Aberdeen: G. Cornwall & Sons).

---

#### SCIENCE.

**T**HE Duke of Argyll explains that the "Reign of Law" was intended to conclude with a chapter on law in Christian Theology, and although he did not then feel able to enter on questions so connected with religious controversy, he now thinks that the way for such consideration may be cleared by tracing the connection between the reign of law and those ideas which are at once fundamental to all religions and inseparable from the facts of Nature. The conception which seems to him calculated to solve some of the problems is the doctrine of the Unity of Nature. The book<sup>1</sup> first discusses this conception of the unity of Nature. We cannot say it is made very clear; it is obvious how much such a conception is a reflection of man into the universe, and although our world is part of an astronomical system, it may be doubtful whether such a conception of unity would satisfy one who is familiar with the heavens. The transmutation of energy may seem to bring us nearer to a conception of unity, but at present we know nothing of transmutation of matter; and even the phenomena of life are by no means to be brought into perfect unity with the other forms of force. It is this vagueness of the first chapter, the want of scientific method in demonstrating the idea, that places the book outside the interests of the scientific man. The author passes on to consider man's place in the unity of Nature. The unity of man's body with the rest of Nature is treated as a thing apart from the unity of man's mind. The bodily unity is regarded as a consequence of that higher and general relationship which prevails between all living things and the elementary forces of Nature. This relationship is recognised as constituting life. Sensation is the

<sup>23</sup> "*Prostitution under the Regulation System, French and English.*" By Yves Guyot, Member of the Conseil Municipal of Paris. Translated from the French by E. B. Truman, M.D., F.C.S. London. 1884.

<sup>1</sup> "*The Unity of Nature.*" By the Duke of Argyll, author of "*The Reign of Law*," &c., &c. London: Alexander Strahan, 25, Henrietta Street, Covent Garden. 1884.



characteristic property of animal life, and the phenomena of sensation furnish the first raw materials for the beginnings of the intelligence and will. Animal Instinct in its relation to the mind of man is the subject of another discussion. Man may be admitted to be a reasoning and self-conscious machine, says the author, in the same sense as the lower animals are machines. But when it is suggested that within us there is one being which receives suggestions and responds by impulses, and another being which weighs the suggestions and selects the impulses, and that by our knowledge of the action of these operations we can understand how animal life may be manifested without the animal passing through the processes of argument by which we reach a sense of moral obligation, it seems as though the author were deserting his idea of the unity of Nature. But he boldly recognises all intellectual phenomena as automatic, and urges that the mechanical action of our faculties affords the best reason for reliance upon the conclusions which they formulate. Next comes the Limits of Human Knowledge which only differs from the ordinary estimates of time as everlasting, and space as infinite, by comprising also the ideas of conservation of energy and the nature of knowledge. Then comes the Truthfulness of Human Knowledge, under which the anthropomorphic ideas of a ruling power in Nature are considered. And it is urged that the form of man is not in question, but the reason, intelligence and will of man; but as the result, it is urged that in man elements are added to those manifested by the lower animals which make him almost as a god to them; but he cannot be a god to himself, because he is aware that there is a much wider gulf above him. Yet whatever the gulf between man and the beasts, there is no difference at all between them, in that both are products of the system of Nature. The subsequent chapters relate to the elementary constitution, first of inorganic matter, then of organic matter; man as the representative of the supernatural,—the moral character of man,—the degradation of man,—the nature and origin of religion, and the corruptions of religion. A final chapter is devoted to recapitulation. This arrangement is designed to set forth the idea that the moral character of man is the great exception to the perfect harmony of the order of Nature and its law, and that the corruption of this moral Nature may be regarded as essentially a rebellion against the Authority on which this order rests; and thus it becomes conceivable that inspiration and revelation are to be regarded not as incredible or rare phenomena but as operations which are a part of the natural constitution and order of Nature. There is no doubt that the work is a powerful contribution to the intellectual problem which knowledge has created. It is an attempt to link all mental processes and all the facts of Nature together, and is a means of preserving the possibility of the old religious faith as consonant with the new faith, which is science. Whether mankind will advance thus far to the Duke of Argyll's compromise, or whether the Duke will modify hereafter his conceptions of man's moral nature and its needs, are considerations the issue of which ought not to be in doubt.

In the earlier days of scientific investigation argument concerning the locality of Paradise and the first home of created things was common, but with the enlargement of scientific speculation which has rendered the instability of the earth's axis an article of possible belief, and the acceptance of evolution, which does not necessarily limit us to one line of descent, the basis for such ideas seems to be struck away. Nevertheless, Mr. Hilton Scribner attacks the problem, Where did life begin? He goes back to a time antecedent to the existence of life, and assumes an original molten condition of the globe modified by radiation so that the frigid zone would have been the first to cool and therefore the first to sustain life. And he goes on to indicate that the poles must have passed in succession through all the climatic gradations which the earth presents, having been at first torrid in climate, and subsequently temperate, before they reached the comparatively sterile condition now exhibited. The beds of coal in the Arctic regions, and the other forms of life fossil which occur are appealed to in evidence. Twenty years ago such ideas were current in the University of Cambridge in this country, but the speculations concerning changes in the earth's centre of gravity during long periods of time deprived them of the importance with which the author invests them.

The use of the microscope has probably developed less than any of the other aids to education which characterize the last quarter of a century which might be regarded as an idle period in which readers like to have their work done for them, in which cram has taken the place of knowledge and in which, instead of the old practical familiarity with Nature, we find only pictures of flowers and descriptions of scenery. Mr. Badcock<sup>2</sup> has taken advantage of this general ignorance on the part of the rising generation to publish in the *St. James's Gazette* some papers on the microscopic forms of life, such as vorticella, rotifers, volvox, amœba, hydra, sponges, diatoms, and such like forms. The sixteen papers are illustrated with a few woodcuts. They will probably be welcomed by dwellers in the suburbs of towns, who find leisure to get away to the ponds where such organisms abound. It is certainly to be desired that the beautiful world which the microscope makes so easily accessible should become better known, and the descriptions which the author offers are of a popular kind, making the acquisition of such knowledge easy.

"Tribes on my Frontier"<sup>4</sup> is a contribution to the natural history of India which in literary tone reflects the manner of the land. It is as distinct from ordinary natural histories of the East as are the

<sup>2</sup> "Where did Life Begin? A Brief Inquiry as to the Probable Place of Beginning, and the Natural Courses of Migration therefrom of the Flora and Fauna of the Earth." A Monograph. By G. Hilton Scribner. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. London: Trübner & Co. 1883.

<sup>3</sup> "Vignettes from Invisible Life." By John Badcock, F.R.M.S. Reprinted, with Additions, from the *St. James's Gazette*. London, Paris, New York: Cassell & Company. 1883.

<sup>4</sup> "The Tribes on my Frontier: an Indian Naturalist's Foreign Policy." By E. H. A. With Illustrations by F. C. Macrae. Calcutta: Thacker, Spink & Co. London: W. Thacker & Co., Newgate Street. 1883.

contributions of Bret Harte from the publications of the United States Scientific Surveys. Yet there is a good deal of careful observation and reflection such as become the naturalist, but it is conveyed in language much better calculated to arrest the reader's attention than would ordinary scientific terminology. How it is possible that so much humour could escape evaporation under an Indian climate, or if evaporated condense in so estimable a form, is not the least remarkable of the problems this book suggests. The volume owes something to illustrations by F. C. Macrae which, if not very finished works of art, are often as unconventional and humorous as the text. Month by month the author carries on his studies among rats, mosquitoes, lizards, ants, crows, bats, bees, spiders, butterflies, frogs, bugs, and various other interesting forms of life. It is a book to be read, and has the advantage of needing no preliminary knowledge of natural history for its enjoyment.

The classification of the older rocks of Britain was for a long time matter of controversy between the late Professor Sedgwick and Sir Roderick Murchison, to whose joint labours the first unravelling of order in these strata is due. During his lifetime Sir Roderick Murchison was able to secure a general adoption of his views, but since his death the teachings of Sedgwick have been influencing the younger men, so that they seem likely to be accepted universally in the near future. The Sedgwick Prize Essay in the University of Cambridge was, at its award in 1882, given for the best dissertation on the classification of these strata, and Mr. Marr now publishes his successful memoir in this competition.<sup>5</sup> It is a valuable aid to the palæozoic geologist. It opens with a chronological list of books and papers on the subject; and then an introduction explains the principles by which the physical geologist is influenced in constructing a classification, among which the most important are necessarily want of continuity in the succession of strata and of life. The author next traces the position of the boundary between the Cambrian and Silurian systems, the boundary being drawn, as is well known, between the Bala rocks at the top of the Cambrian, and the May Hill beds at the bottom of the Silurian. If the author had been able to introduce sections which exemplify this unconformity he would have furnished an argument which would have gone far to ensure acceptance for his teaching. The palæontological break on which he insists, and which is well known to exist on this horizon, is likely to be over-estimated. It is easy to take the fauna of the Cambrian rocks as a whole and compare it with that of the Silurian rocks, and then affirm that there is but little in common between them as judged by per-centages of species which survive from one period to the other. But it is an altogether different matter to compare the fauna of the highest beds of the Bala series and the lowest beds of the May Hill series which represent the faunas of the two seas which succeeded each other in the same district, for then the break in

---

<sup>5</sup> "The Classification of the Cambrian and Silurian Rocks; being the Prize Essay for the Year 1882." By John E. Marr, M.A., F.G.S. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell & Co. London: George Bell & Sons. 1883.

time becomes scarcely apparent, and its justification is less palæontological than stratigraphical. We cannot but think that the author over-estimates even the stratigraphical break when he accepts the belief in this discordance extending over much of the explored portion of the globe. A third section of the essay describes the series of Cambrian and Silurian rocks in the British Islands, and presents in concise form their mineral character, thickness, subdivisions, localities for sections and fossils, and lists of fossils in the several beds. This subject is traced out in geographical areas, such as North Wales, the Welsh borders, Central Wales, South Wales, Cornwall, the Lake District, Teesdale, the Isle of Man, Southern Scotland, northern Scotland, and Ireland. The fourth section similarly traces out the succession of these rocks on the European continent, giving the local subdivisions and their fossils. The areas treated of are Scandinavia, the Baltic provinces, France and Belgium, Spain and Portugal, Bavaria, Bohemia, Thuringia, Sardinia, and Podolia. The Cambrian and Silurian Rocks of America are discussed in the same manner, and then in a few pages the author sums up his conclusions. An appendix gives a systematic list of fossils mentioned in the work, with their range through the several strata enumerated. The essay is an excellent example of condensed and systematic statement of scientific fact.

The "Principia" of Newton is so well known and so revered that it is somewhat shocking to find an astronomical book entitled the "New Principia,"<sup>6</sup> of which the distinguishing characteristic is a contempt for Sir Isaac Newton and his teachings. That any one should write about grave scientific questions in a flippant style like the author's is bad enough, but that language of vigorous denunciation should be applied to some of the ablest exponents of astronomical science is indecent; and a book entitled as this is, and merely written to ventilate a crude conception which the author has too little knowledge to handle, is puerile. But a specimen may convey a better idea of the author's arrogant futility than any detailed analysis or discussion. Having explained the Newtonian doctrine of the tides, he continues, in exposition of his own doctrine:—

"What we say is, that the magnetic attraction of the moon, as a magic wand or beam, penetrates the earth from one side to the other—sword-like, it sheathes itself in the diameter of our globe: at the spots where this spiritual and invisible falchcon makes its entrance and exit, the waters rise to meet it in obedience to its mighty beckoning and summons; and as the moon is for ever shifting its position, so the waters are for ever chasing over the surface of the globe the two mundane extremities of the moon's irresistible, triumphant, electrical wand! Have we not here, in a few words, a solution of the whole mystery of the tides?"

Mr. Lant Carpenter's "Energy in Nature"<sup>7</sup> is an attempt to explain

<sup>6</sup> "The New Principia, or the Astronomy of the Future. An Essay explanatory of a Rational System of the Universe." By Newton Crosland. London: Trübner & Co. 1884.

<sup>7</sup> "Energy in Nature: being with some Additions the Substance of a Course of Six Lectures upon the Forces of Nature and their Mutual Relations; delivered under the auspices of the Gilchrist Educational Trust in autumn 1881." By

the various forms of force and their relations to each other, as expressed in the term conservation of energy. It comprises the matter of six lectures written out in a popular form, with a number of useful explanatory illustrations. The chapters are entitled Matter and Motion, Heat, Chemical Attraction, Electricity, Magnetism, and Energy in Organic Nature. The last lecture covers a very wide field and, after explaining the characteristic structures of plants and their functions, passes on to consider the ways in which food is concerned in building up energy in man. It is an excellent popular book well suited to the wants of the intelligent artizan and of all young students.

A small book by Mr. Scott-White<sup>8</sup> on the qualitative chemical analysis of inorganic substances is carefully prepared and likely to be useful to students. The first part gives in tabular form the characteristic reactions of a number of substances under the blowpipe. The second part includes the examination of solutions for bases and the common metals, the method being to explain the characteristics of each group, and then present the directions for analysis in tabular form. The third part treats of the reactions of the acids and the means by which they are detected in solution. The fourth part is devoted to insoluble substances; the fifth part consists of notes on apparatus, where appendices give certain necessary tables and some particulars concerning the Oxford and Cambridge local examinations. The book is brief, clear, excellently arranged, with the paragraphs numbered, and indicates a good standard for practical work in schools.

Mr. Watts's "Manual of Chemistry,"<sup>9</sup> of which the first volume is before us, is founded on that of the late Prof. Fownes. It is not too much to say that no one could have brought better qualifications to the accomplishment of such a work than the author, and we venture to think that so much knowledge has never before been presented in a chemical manual in so clear and concise a form. Yet the mode of treatment offers but little novelty. There is first an introduction giving some elementary exposition of the fundamental conceptions in chemistry. Then succeeds a treatise on physics, setting out so much of the subjects of light, heat, electricity, and magnetism as come under the consideration of the chemist. Then at page 13 $\frac{1}{2}$  the chemistry of the elements commences with hydrogen, and gives a short account of the preparation, reactions, compounds, and other chemical and physical aspects of the several elements. Every sentence is clear and well stored with fact. From time to time special questions, like the diffusion of gases,

---

William Lant Carpenter, B.A., B.Sc. London, Paris, & New York: Cassell & Company, Limited. 1883.

<sup>8</sup> "Chemical Analysis for Schools and Science Classes. Qualitative Inorganic. Adapted to meet the Requirements of the London Preliminary Scientific and Intermediate B.Sc., the Locals, and the South Kensington Practical Chemistry." By A. H. Scott-White, B.Sc., B.A., F.C.S. London: Thomas Laurie. Edinburgh & Glasgow: John Menzies & Co.

<sup>9</sup> "A Manual of Chemistry." Vol. I. Physical and Inorganic Chemistry. By Henry Watts, B.A., F.R.S. London: J. & A. Churchill. 1883.

come under consideration and, after the non-metallic elements are described, sections are devoted to the atomic theory, to crystallization, chemical affinity, and the chemistry of the voltaic pile. The chemistry of the metals follows, with the metals arranged in twelve groups. An appendix gives a few tables useful in chemical calculations. The book is so well written as to be perfectly readable, and so free from technicality as to be suited to young students.

We have received the concluding part of Professor Mousson's "Physics,"<sup>10</sup> which is devoted to some aspects of galvanism, a subject already elaborated at some length in the preceding division of the work. The discussion of the inductive action of the galvanic current is now resumed in relation to the action of one current upon another. Under this title chapters are devoted to the theory of closed conductors, solenoids, and Ampère's theory of the magnet, the action of currents upon magnets, rotation of conductors and magnets, theory of galvanometers, terrestrial magnetism, and electro-magnetic excitation. The second division of the subject discussed is the inductive action of currents, in seven chapters which elucidate galvanic induction, the nature of the induction current, theory of oscillation, methods of induction, characteristics of induction machines, magneto-electric machines, and the theory of induction. The third division treats of diamagnetism; the fourth of the general relations of currents; while the fifth and last section considers the practical applications of the current in telegraphs and telephones. The work concludes with a brief subject-index and an excellent full index of authors quoted. We congratulate Professor Mousson on the completion of this important treatise, which is remarkable for its unity of plan and the high standard of exposition which has never been lost sight of.

We have received the detailed reports of the Indian Meteorological Office from March to July, 1883, giving the observations at intervals every day concerning the temperature of evaporation, computed vapour tension, relative humidity, rainfall, development of cloud, direction and velocity of the wind, temperature of the air, temperature of radiation, and height of the barometer observed at Calcutta, Lucknow, Nagpur, Madras. There are hourly observations made at Calcutta on temperature, rainfall, and velocity of the wind, and hourly observations on the wind at Lucknow and Nagpur.

The mineral wealth of New South Wales<sup>11</sup> continues its course of rapid development, and in the year 1882 applications were made to lease no less than 23,845 acres of land for mining purposes, of which 4,287 acres were for gold, 2,420 acres for coal, 3,044 acres for copper,

<sup>10</sup> "Die Physik auf Grundlage der Erfahrung." Von Dr. Alb. Mousson, Professor an schweizerischen polytechnischen Schule. Dritter Band, zweite Lieferung, zweite Hälfte (Schluss des Werkes). Mit 205 nirgedruckten Figuren. Dritte umgearbeitete und vermehrte Auflage. Zurich, Druck und Verlag von Frederick Schulthess. London: David Nutt. 1884.

<sup>11</sup> "Annual Report of the Department of Mines, New South Wales, for the Year 1882." Printed in accordance with resolutions of both Houses of Parliament. Sydney: T. Richards, Government Printer.

and 11,689 acres for tin. The increase, which is 3,292 acres over the previous year, is chiefly in coal, copper, and tin, while in gold there is a decrease. Coal and tin are rapidly augmenting the aggregate value of the produce. The value of the coal mined in 1882 was £948,965, as against £603,248 in 1881. Tin in 1881 was worth £724,000, as against £833,461 in 1882; while gold, which amounted in 1881 to £566,513, decreased by £40,000. The aggregate value of the mineral produce in 1882 was £2,782,344. The usual detailed reports are given concerning the items of mineral industry, and this is followed by the reports of the wardens and mining registrars of the several geographical districts. The inspector of mines furnishes a valuable account of the progress of mining, and the inspector of collieries gives particulars of the number of miners employed in the several mines in the colony. A page refers to the progress of geological survey, and short appendices give particulars of certain mines. A few geological diagrams illustrate points of detail. A list of donations is appended of contributions of specimens to restore the Mining and Geological Museum which was destroyed by the burning of the Garden Palace in 1883.

The "Alphabet"<sup>12</sup> is an exhaustless subject and has been carefully studied by Dr. Hake. So many letters in our alphabet have different values that the author would increase the number of alphabetic sounds to thirty-nine. He re-arranges the letters in a tonic scale; most of them, besides the singular form, having plurals and being lengthened by the addition of *s* or *z*. The author commences with the mutes *c, g, t, d, p, b*. Then succeed seven other sounds, the plurals of which form dissyllables. They include *x, gz, ch, g* hard and soft, *sh, zh, s* and *z*. Then follow the sharp and flat *f, v, n, w, l, r, y*. Thus there are twenty-five consonant sounds and fourteen vowel sounds, which are grouped into oxytons, having the acute accent only, and barytons, having the grave accent only. It is observed that there are three tones to be considered in speech. First, the long sound in an emphasized monosyllable; secondly, the short sound, which is incapable of emphasis; and thirdly, the middle sound, which carries the accent. These qualities are exemplified in tables. Thus *hymn* is a long sound of the *y*, *hymn-book* a middle sound, and *hymnology* a short sound. The vowel sounds of the oxyton series are short as compared with the baryton series, of which they are harmonics, being separated from them probably by an entire octave. This little pamphlet is a scientific contribution to knowledge of the alphabet deserving the attention of all who appreciate accuracy in sound.

Flower-lore<sup>13</sup> is the subject of an interesting and extended work, in two volumes, by the Rev. Hilderic Friend. The book opens with a considerable bibliography, followed by an introduction which is

<sup>12</sup> "The Powers of the Alphabet: a Tonic Scale of Alphabetic Sounds." By Thomas Gordon Hake, Doctor of Medicine and Member of the Royal College of Physicians. London: Kegan Paul & Co. 1883.

<sup>13</sup> "Flowers and Flower-lore." By the Rev. Hilderic Friend, F.L.S. With Illustrations, Index, and Notes. London: W. Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1884.

more like a sample of the book than anything else. Then the work begins. It is divided into twenty chapters, with continuous pagination through the two volumes. The subject is grouped in accordance with prevalent country associations. Thus the opening chapter, called "The Fairy Garland," deals with those flowers which are associated with fairy life. The stitchwort helps to form the fairy garland, and if you gather it you will be led astray by the pixies. The foxglove, or folk's glove, is a fairy plant; the ground flax is another; and the tulip is used as a cradle in which the elfin babies are rocked to sleep. Any one may become a fairy in China by eating ambrosia, which in Chinese is called "sin." And thus the local traditions which gather round cowslip, rosemary, wood sorrel, &c., are brought together. The next chapter, entitled "From Pixie to Puck," has chiefly to do with the devil, and brings us into contact with the devil's poker (*Tritoma*) and devil's darning-needles (*Scandix*). The puff-ball is the devil's snuff-box, and total abstainers may be glad to hear that there is a devil in every berry of the grape. The number of flowers thus dedicated is considerable, while certain plants, like St. John's wort, are famous for their exorcising powers. On St. John's Day that plant is hung up or burnt as a safeguard against tempest, witchcraft, and other evils. Then follow chapters termed "The Virgin's Bower," "Bridal Wreaths and Bouquets," and "Flowers for Heroes, Saints, and Gods." We now descend to the humbler field of traditions and proverbs that relate to flowers and plants, and then treat of the flowers and the seasons. But we hasten back to the "Magic Wand" and superstitions, and the relations of flowers and showers. The beliefs of the herbalist, and the use of flowers in heraldry, occupy two chapters more. Under the heading "Strange Facts about Plant-Names," there are some historical notes on plants mentioned in the Old Testament, names from foreign languages, like parsley, lily, mandrake, from the Greek: natural history names, like goose-grass, duckweed, coltsfoot, and names that sometimes refer to colour, like crocus, saffron, lilac, rose. Succeeding chapters treat of the language of flowers, rustic flower names, and peculiar uses of flowers; while we conclude with witches and their flower-lore, flowers for the dead, and wreaths and chaplets. Appended are critical notes and bibliographical references to the several chapters. The information has the merit of being gathered to a large extent from the peasantry of several English counties. There are numerous woodcuts, which, however, have a purely botanical interest.

A greater spirit of toleration is characterizing man's relation to the animal world as the purely religious cosmogony disappears, and mental evolution in animals is now investigated with as much confidence that they possess minds as that they possess bodies. Mr. Romanes's book<sup>14</sup> is carefully written and valuable; if any fault is to be found, it lies chiefly in the circumstance that too little use is

<sup>14</sup> "Mental Evolution in Animals." By S. J. Romanes, M.A., LL.D., F.R.S. With a Posthumous Essay on Instinct by Charles Darwin, M.A., LL.D., F.R.S. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1883.



made of the facts collected in his previous volume on animal intelligence; and the first ten chapters might as well have been a portion of a general treatise on psychology. The subjects treated of are the criterion of mind, structure and functions of nerve tissues, physical basis of mind, root principles of mind, consciousness and sensation, pleasures and pains, memory, association of ideas, perception and imagination. All this we take as so much surplusage, which goes to increase the size of the book without materially advancing its argument. At chapter eleven, page 159, commences a valuable discussion of instinct, which extends to page 317. A single chapter is given to reason, and a concluding chapter treats of animal emotions and a summary of the intellectual faculties. Appended is the essay on instinct by Darwin, originally written for the "Origin of Species," but withheld. Mr. Romanes's own essay on instinct treats first of the perfection and then of the imperfection of instinct. The perfection is illustrated from the writings of Mr. Spalding on the behaviour of chickens, which seem to come into possession of intellectual faculties without education through the senses. The imperfection of instinct is shown in the way in which the flesh fly is deceived by smell into depositing its eggs in the carrion plant *Stapelia hirsuta*. Bees and wasps have been seen to visit the flowers on wall-papers of rooms; an Australian parrot has been observed endeavouring to feed on the flowers of a cotton-print dress; while a bee has mistaken a sea anemone for a flower. Having sufficiently illustrated the shortcomings of instinct, the author passes to its origin and development. It is supposed to arise in the first place from natural selection or survival of the fittest—it is then termed primary instinct; and those stereotyped characteristics which originate in the failure of intelligence are termed secondary instincts. Having discussed these phenomena the next chapter concerns plasticity of instinct, by which is understood the ways in which instinct may be modified under the influence of intelligence. Then an attempt is made to trace the modes in which intelligence determines the variation of instinct in definite lines. Among the many curious examples of such variation quoted, is one of a golden eagle hatching the egg of a goose and teaching the gosling to devour the flesh which the eagle gave it. Interesting modifications of instinct are afforded by domestication. Dogs, for instance, brought from countries where no poultry are kept are eager to attack poultry in this country. An examination is then made of the theories of instinct, and finally the difficulties with regard to the theory are discussed. These comprise the existence of useless instincts, detrimental instincts (like the suicide of scorpions, insects flying through flame, &c.), migration, feigning death and feigning injury. Thus we see instinct closely approximating to reason. The work will well repay careful reading, though the treatment is less original than might have been expected, and the cases discussed, though all striking, are perhaps less varied than might have been desired.

## HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

“THE History of Rome,” by M. Duruy,<sup>1</sup> is a work of considerable merit. Mr. Mahaffy observes: “Strange to say, though some of the greatest English historians have devoted themselves to Roman History, there does not exist any standard English work on the whole subject. Portions of it have been thoroughly handled, but a complete survey is not to be found except in little handbooks.” The work of Duruy is intended to supply this want of general readers. Mr. Mahaffy continues: “No doubt the English edition of Mommssen, the large work of Merivale, and the incomparable Gibbon cover the ground but they cover it writing from different standpoints.” Besides this, many of the matters treated of by Mommssen are as yet within the field of controversy, but in a general work of reference it is advisable that facts only should find a place. This also M. Duruy’s history professes to do. The peculiar merit of M. Duruy’s work is undoubtedly to be sought in the maps, plans and illustrations. Great care has been spent in their collection. They are beautifully executed, and include photogravures and chromo-lithographs. An illustration adorns almost every page, and we can understand that there has been some difficulty in always introducing an illustration which is to the point. When mentioning the war of Servius against Caere, it rather distracts the attention than otherwise to make a reference to a vase representing Hercules at a banquet, simply because the vase was found there—especially as the vase is of more interest to the general reader than all the battles of antiquity put together. Again, in speaking of the early fortress-colonies of Latium, it is no illustration to give a plan showing the operations of the *agrimensores* of five centuries later. Illustrations of this kind might be kept in reserve. We must also point out that in the maps, the mountains are so conspicuously marked that little else catches the eye, and the towns and roads appear rather indistinct. With these limitations any one must allow that the illustrations are superb. The best and most recent sources have been utilized. Lamotte’s “Geese of the Capitol,” exhibited in the Academy only last year, is there, as well as his “Hannibal Crossing the Rhone.” As regards the execution of the work itself, let us say that it is eminently French, exhibiting perhaps in greater proportion the faults rather than the merits of the French school. There are the terse, epigrammatic, and antithetic qualities of French style: on the other hand, M. Duruy is unusually fond of sounding platitudes. To begin with, we suspect that M. Duruy’s work was not written for the general reader in France, but for the higher classes in the *lycées*. In our own days (and when was it not the case?) whenever a moral was pointed or a tale adorned after M. Duruy’s fashion, a whispering voice went round, and that whisper was “humbug;” but boys are still supposed

<sup>1</sup> “History of Rome.” By V. Duruy. Edited by Rev. J. P. Mahaffy. Vol. I. Parts I. and II. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1884.

to swallow platitudes with avidity. "If during centuries Rome never knew aught of poetry or art, it had more than any other the sentiment of duty: its citizens knew how to obey; that is why, in later times, they knew how to command." "It is by slow growth that men become strong and greatness durable." "The great preoccupation of modern governments is, or ought to be, to protect the fortune and life of citizens, to develop instruction and commerce, to diminish misery and vice." These phrases smack of the wisdom of Nestor, whose utterances only the Telemachus of fiction treasures up and prizes as golden. There is something drolly French in the following sentence:—

"Instead of the magnificent development of the Greek theodicy and of those great philosophical systems which explained the world we only find at Rome dry rituals. Those living and passionate divinities which round the Ægean Sea shared human love and hate, were replaced about the Apennines by *sober gods, without adventures*, without history, who never cross the azure of the sky to betake themselves to the mountain, bathed in dazzling light, where the Olympians of Homer drink their nectar!"

There is also a frequent straining after effect, an *emphase* which so frequently leads up to an anticlimax in French writing. "But from the smallest countries have come the grandest things: from Attica, the civilization of the world; from Palestine, the religion of Christ, [and from Tyre, Carthage!]" Thus each chapter opens and also closes with remarks having a covert reference to the existing moral, intellectual, or political condition of the supposed reader, which some will regard as the pedagogic observations of a wiseacre. Why does not M. Duruy keep to facts, according to his promise, and leave speculation to the imaginative reader? Mr. Mahaffy deceives himself if he imagines M. Duruy's work is intended for the general reader. Sufficient has been said to show that M. Duruy had in his eye a public much more in a state of tutelage. The introductory chapter on the geography of Italy is brilliant. On the other hand, the legendary history is told in a very flat style. The chapter on the army, including a complete translation of Polybius's remarks, is splendid: the plans of the camp and attacking order add to its lucidity. But after the brilliant pages of Mommssen, the internal and constitutional history is tedious. This work then is of variable merit. On the whole we are not in favour of it. We should still recommend Merivale as a preliminary sketch. He has the advantage of brevity: M. Duruy's work will fill ten volumes or so, Merivale's occupies one; M. Duruy might be utilized solely for illustrations. The intelligent reader will get over any introduction as quickly as possible, in order to attack the work of Mommssen (which in brilliancy of style and depth of research out-distances all competitors), the thorough and lucid Merivale or the incomparable Gibbon. The work of one master-mind, though it may not "cover the whole ground," is worth the attempts, no matter how comprehensive they may be, of a thousand inferior minds. And the best encyclopædia on the subject could not be mentioned in the same breath as the artistic productions of Mommssen and Gibbon.

Within the last year or two several ladies have shown that classical subjects are not a field which they mean to leave entirely to the other sex to cultivate, in spite of the disadvantage under which they must labour from not becoming early familiarized with Greek and Latin, as boys do at school. A remarkable book on Greek myths was recently brought out by a lady, and now another has written a history of sculpture,<sup>2</sup> which will take a high place among the few good English works of its class. To an enthusiastic but discriminating appreciation of the art she adds a rare knowledge of classical literature and a familiarity with the results of modern criticism which make her at the same time a pleasant companion for the *virtuoso* and a safe guide for the learner. She begins with Egypt, that strange country where we fail, after all our discoveries, to get back to the beginning of things. As the earliest historical facts known represent centuries of previous civilization, so the earliest sculpture shows hardly any trace of inexperience. With the exception of a few of the soft limestone figures from Gizeh, the majority of the works from the oldest tombs show singular skill of workmanship and power of portraiture. The stiffness and lack of action may have been in great measure due to the hardness of the stone used, which also accounts for the finish being merely polish and not elaboration of detail. But the mind of the people had perhaps as much to do with the peculiar character of their art as the material had. Egyptian statuary is like Egyptian mythology—deficient in imagination and freshness. The people who invented geometry naturally applied science to their art. The earliest canon of the human form was measured from the length of the middle finger, which was taken as one-nineteenth of the standing body. At a later period this was slightly altered, till the height was taken as eight heads, which agrees with the canon of Vitruvius. In Assyria, sport more than religion was the inspiration of art. No such hounds as those which bayed round Assur-bani-bal's hunting-chariot have ever since been seen in sculpture, and the horses are only equalled, not surpassed, by those of Phidias. The men, on the other hand, are clumsy and conventional. Hair and beard, and even the lines of the muscles, have a tendency to run into ornament. As to the hounds, or rather mastiffs, Mrs. Mitchell says that the footmark of one was found on the clay at Khorsabad, "as large as a man's hand," but she does not quote any authority. Those at Koyunjik were probably about 32 inches or a little more at the shoulder, the size of a large English mastiff, though there is one referred to by "Idstone" as on a tile "from the supposed ruins of Babylon," which he calculated must have been nearly 48 inches—an unheard-of size in modern times. Greek art, unlike Egyptian, was always growing. Some of the archaic examples, especially a bronze relief from Olympia, representing Artemis dangling two lions by the hind legs, is distinctly Assyrian in feeling, and the drawing less sure. The figures of Perseus and Heracles on the *métopes* from Selinus show that peculiar formation of the lower limbs

<sup>2</sup> "History of Ancient Sculpture." By Lucy M. Mitchell. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1883.

which is so characteristic of early Etruscan paintings; but as a rule Greek artists appear to have gone direct to Nature, and not looked at her through the medium of the works of their foreign predecessors. In the Peloponnesus the imitation of Nature was longer subjugated by the severe requirements of architecture than in Attica, and the strictness of the discipline under which the Spartans lived imparted a simplicity and self-restraint to their art which the freer air of Attica disdained. The best known example is the girl athlete in the Vatican, one of the most graceful statues in that wonderful collection, and one which the spectator cannot fail instinctively to associate with the banks of the Eurotas. The peculiar Attic shape of the face, a short oval, with which we are so familiar on the Parthenon frieze, appears in one of the most archaic fragments from the Acropolis, a head of Athene. The lips and cheeks are thick and the eyes large and round, not unlike the recently discovered statuette of Phidias's chryselephantine statue. This earlier head may have been a type which he felt bound to copy, and thus may afford an explanation of the difference between the features of this statue and of the figures on the metopes and frieze. That Phidias understood the necessity of adapting his work to its position is known from the story of his competition with Alcamenes for a statue to be placed on a high pedestal. When side by side on the ground, Phidias's work was disapproved of, by reason of the thick lips and coarse nose, but when raised upon their pedestals the verdict of the judges was reversed. Much of the early Attic sculpture was in relief, and Mrs. Mitchell acutely remarks that the beauty of the profile of the face which marks Attic heads in the round, and the delicate moulding of the chin and cheek, was due to this early practice; while the Argive school, "developing exclusively statuary, seems to have worked more from the front view, and thus came to emphasize the chin too strongly for beauty of profile." Another casual remark which shows the minuteness of her observation, is that the tails of the centaurs on the metopes of the Parthenon are a criterion of the excellence of the work. "Where they are thrown up, the sculpture is lively and excellent; but where they drop to the ground there is much harsh archaism in the forms, calling to mind in many instances the centaur groups of the Olympia pediment, by which the sculptors of these metopes were evidently greatly influenced." As to the frieze of the Parthenon, her description is excellent, but it misses clearness as a whole, from her not adopting Mr. Murray's suggestion that the gods are supposed to be seated in a semicircle at the head of the two lines of the procession, and not "in the midst of the people." On disputed points the authoress is not afraid of holding her own opinion even when it is not in accordance with that of acknowledged authorities. The seated god on the east pediment of the Parthenon, for instance, she decides to be a personification of Olympus, not Dionysus, the last identification; and she argues that the battles on the frieze of the temple of Nike Apteros are historical and not merely symbolical. The knowledge of anatomy displayed is accurate and discriminating. Without such knowledge, indeed, it is impossible to understand or

appreciate sculpture. We have confined our remarks to one or two periods, but the history is carried down to late Roman times, to such works as Marcus Aurelius on his underbred and overfed horse on the Campidoglio, and bas-reliefs on Roman sarcophagi. Few typical works of importance are omitted, and illustrations are drawn from such outlying sources as "island gems" and bronze armour ornaments. And now a word about the illustrations. The old-fashioned engravings of statuary, though clear and well drawn, were apt to bear the impress of the draughtsman more than of the sculptor. To obviate this, new processes of photography have been used, and some of the specimens in Mrs. Mitchell's book are most unfortunate. The figures are on a black background, and in some cases (as on p. 295) it is impossible to see the outline of the figure on the side away from the light. In other cases (p. 342, and elsewhere) the accidental inequalities of the stone are shown so clearly as to hide the marks of the sculptor's chisel, just as in a photographic facsimile of a manuscript some slight discoloration of the parchment often shows as dark as the ink. Would it not be better to have the photographs "doctored" for a book of this kind? A portfolio of "Selections from Ancient Sculpture" has been prepared, to illustrate the subject more thoroughly, but this we have not seen.

Though Dr. Schliemann felt satisfied that his excavations in 1879 had settled the question that the site of the Homeric Troy was on the hill of Hissarlik, further reflection made him doubt whether the circumscribed remains that he discovered could really represent the whole of the city. Accordingly, in 1882, he went there again and spent a few months in further excavations, and "Troja" is the record of his work. The result is that he has proved to his own satisfaction, in which most people will agree with him, that the remains on the hill of Hissarlik are only those of the Acropolis, and that the lower city extended for some distance towards the east, south and west, on the site of the later Ilium. At the same time, he examined the tumuli of Achilles, Patroclus and Antilochus, all which he found to be mere cenotaphs, like the mound at Marathon, having subjected them to a much more rigorous examination than the agent of Count Choiseul Gouffier, who only dug a hole about a yard deep, but asserted that he had found a chamber with a bronze figure in a chariot and a number of other articles. Dealers in antiquities understand the art of "salting" as well as the puffers of mines. Another point which he deduces from his discoveries is that the Trojans were an Aryan race from Thrace, speaking a dialect closely resembling those of Thrace and Phrygia. The objects discovered are much the same as those already known to the public by the doctor's former book and his exhibition at South Kensington. The female idol of bronze, which is supposed to be a copy of the Palladium, bears only the faintest resemblance to the human form. It is pleasanter, at all events, to fancy the Luck of Troy as she is shown on the gems representing her being carried off by Ulysses, though some of these are rude enough.

---

<sup>3</sup> "Troja." By Dr. Hen. Schliemann. London: John Murray. 1884.

In our last issue we noticed a couple of books about the Indian Mutiny, and since then another complete history of this painful episode of our Eastern empire has appeared.<sup>4</sup> Mr. Holmes has not been able to improve upon the works of Sir John Kaye and Colonel Malleon as far as facts are concerned, but he is able, perhaps from viewing the subject from a greater distance of time, to write in a more dispassionate and philosophical spirit. As Professor Seeley says in a recent book on the Colonies, a national rebellion against foreign rule in India would deserve to succeed, and would probably do so; but the more one studies the history of the Indian Mutiny, the more one sees that it was nothing more than a mutiny, though an extensive one, and, as far as the civil population was concerned, was only supported by princes for their own selfish ends. A few more leaders like the heroic Ranee of Jhansi, who met a soldier's death at Kotah-Serai, might have succeeded in rousing popular enthusiasm, but the bulk of the population was indifferent, caring only to be on the victorious side. Nowhere else does a government seem to have been so determined to spoil a brave and devoted army. Originally high-caste men of good family were allowed to enter as officers, and sometimes even to win glory by commanding a detachment in which European soldiers formed a part. But the reorganization of 1796 increased the number of English officers, so that no native could ever hope for any position higher than that of an under-officer, and the glory for which they thirsted

"Got kind o' lodged afore it come as low down as the ranks."

Then pay and pension were interfered with in a way that the Sepoys felt would injure them. The opening of civil employ to military officers produced a constant change in the regiments and loosened the old ties of almost parental affection with which the European colonel regarded his "babalogue;" and the curtailment of the powers of the commanding officers weakened their authority. In the decade preceding the year 1850 several regiments had been the victims of what was almost a breach of faith. Promises made on the occasion of special service, by the governors of the presidencies, were not confirmed. In fact, for more than thirty years the Bengal army had been in a state of quasi-mutiny, for which the Government more than the men themselves were to blame. "It was not the inconsistency of their character that drove the same Sepoys who had risked their lives on the field of battle to protect their officers, and had watched by their bedsides when they were wounded, to murder them when the mutiny broke out. It was the inconsistency with which they were treated." Mr. Holmes exposes also with an unsparing hand the cruelties committed in putting down the rebellion, though his admiration for a vigorous policy leads him sometimes almost to excuse the inexcusable. Shooting 216 prisoners and shutting up sixty more in such close confinement that two-thirds were dead before morning, is euphemistically

<sup>4</sup> "History of the Indian Mutiny." By T. R. Holmes. London: Allen & Co. 1883.

termed "a splendid assumption of responsibility." Such expressions, however, are rare, and the simple narration of the facts about the cruelties exercised on harmless citizens at Delhi, and the indiscriminate execution of natives, guilty and innocent, is more telling than the severest language of reprobation. If English rule in India necessitated the repetition of such scenes, better that we should leave the East for ever.

Sir Richard Temple,<sup>5</sup> however—and no man can speak with more authority about India—looks forward to a distant future when the Indian nation, emancipated from English leading-strings, will govern itself; and he considers that the educated natives hope to win the desired improvement in their status gradually, by no violent or revolutionary means; knowing that a return to the old native system will never give it to them. It is true that now "the blessings of British rule" are not so apparent to the unthinking as they were in the time of their grandfathers, when a comparison between the reign of law and the reign of plunder was obvious to every one. The present population "has not personally tasted the misrule, which their fathers used to compare with the British administration," except for a short time during the mutiny. And then the severity of the punishment, to which we have alluded above, rather dimmed the force of the comparison. But still the steps taken to give the natives, even the class of peasant proprietors, a share in local self-government, and the training of the higher classes to participate in the judicial and administrative service and to hold honorary public offices, show them that we do not wish to hold India only for the English, and will tend to make them more satisfied with our rule as they become better educated. The feeling of the bulk of the people is described in a paragraph which all who take an interest in India should read and remember.

"Probably the sum of their thoughts amounts to this, that they are, by the will of an inscrutable fate, living under foreign rule; that they are mellably better, nicer, pleasanter people than their rulers; that they have a purity of descent, a grandeur of tradition, an antiquity of system with which a European nation has nothing to compare; that despite their union, socially and morally, they cannot hold together politically; that consequently they have fallen under the control, first of Turks or Mongols, who had force alone, and now of the British, who have both force and sagacity; that great care must be taken lest the unavoidable contact with white people in business and in affairs should lead to social intercourse where the gulf of separation ought to be preserved; that British rule cannot last for ever, and meanwhile its advantages must be accepted with scanty thanks or recognition; that doubtless on some great day there will be successors to the heroes of old who may bring back the 'golden age' (in Eastern phrase); that this prospect, however, being wrapt in the haze of sunshine, is too dim to be within the practical domain of hope."

This consciousness of innate superiority, the sense of the defilement of social contact with Europeans (a stronger feeling even than that which would prevent an American from dining with a nigger), are

<sup>5</sup> "Oriental Experience: a Selection of Essays delivered on Various Occasions." By Sir Richard Temple, Bart. London: John Murray. 1883.



facts which few Englishmen who have not been in India realise. They are apt to think that all the world takes superiority in war and in science as meaning superiority in everything. It was a comparatively uneducated Oriental who said to an English traveller who had been showing him his watch and describing steam-engines with the object of making his host feel his inferiority :

“Can you make a watch?” “No, indeed!” “Can you make steam-engines?” “No, that is not my business.” “Well, do you think the men in your country who make these things are better and wiser than you are?” “By no means.” “Then why should we think a nation which makes them better and wiser than ourselves? We acknowledge that you are richer and more powerful, but you have not true wisdom.”

The manners and customs of schools are a curious study,<sup>6</sup> and it would be quite worth while for some one to treat them scientifically by the comparative method. Is it only English boys who are so conservative, in spite of the shortness of the school “generation?” Though fashions change from year to year, customs rarely alter at a school, except by the definite exercise of authority, and then not without some grumbling, though directly a new custom is established it is as firmly rooted as an old one, for new boys who do not know how recent it is, are as attached to it as if it were primæval. Westminster has undergone such changes of late years—and it has perhaps still more to pass through—that a record of usages which will be soon obsolete is most desirable. The old idea of a school was a corporation in which every boy had his place with its appropriate duties and rights; now the public are coming to regard schools merely as teaching shops. The teaching may, perhaps, be better, but it is not all gain. Where the senior boys have no power given them, it is idle to expect them to feel responsible for order and, except with the most conscientious, rising in the school merely means an opportunity for evading discipline. At old Westminster the captain of the school was its official representative and authorized channel of communication with the masters. The monitor of school had to make the return of absentees and was responsible for order in the schoolroom, while the monitor of chamber took his place in college. All sorts of offices were performed by the boys. One had to be always ready to give the time; another to look after the “way” or lavatory; others to supply stationery to the seniors, at their own expense, too, when the senior’s school supply was exhausted. This strange custom, Mr. Forshall says, carried with it no idea of meanness. Then in the morning one junior had to look through a hole in the school-door and signal the head master’s coming; at evening “lockers” another junior stood on the school-steps, calling out “quar, quar,” at intervals of a quarter of a minute, and marking the bill as the boys came in in answer to his call. Besides this there was the usual fagging, as at other schools;—personal services rendered by the younger to the elder. This Mr. Forshall defends on the intelligible ground that a licensed system of fagging disarms and baffles

<sup>6</sup> “Westminster School: Past and Present.” By F. H. Forshall. London: Wyman & Sons. 1884.

the tyrant, to whom not lawful but unlawful exercise of power is sweet. *Laudator temporis acti*, he defends the settlement of quarrels by a recognized system of public fighting under proper arrangements. That this has a tendency to stop bullying is perfectly true, but we cannot agree with him when he says that personal encounters and quarrels are inevitable at school. There was a German who denied that Oxford could be a real University because the men never fought duels, and perhaps Mr Forshall would say that a school without fighting was only half a school; but for all that we believe, from our own experience, that there are schools where it is the rarest thing for one boy to strike another in anger. But to go back to distinctive Westminster usages. New boys were assigned as "Shadow" to an older boy as "Substance." "Substance" was responsible for "Shadow's" knowledge of and compliance with rules, and was punished instead of him for a week. In return, "Shadow" could not take up "Substance" in class, but could answer for him, and save him losing a place. The places on the Foundation were allotted by "challenges," that is, examination of the candidates by each other in Latin and Greek grammar in the presence of the head master and the "helps," the senior boys who had prepared them. The rules of the game were rather complicated, and it must have been a capital exercise for readiness and memory. Another custom peculiar to the school was the giving "principes," unmilled silver coins, to the head boys in each form. These are sometimes seen in collections of coins, the owners knowing nothing of their history. Mr Forshall tells a story of two rather idle boys who once gaining such a prize were rewarded by their father with a sovereign. Soon after they found some "principes" for sale in an old curiosity shop, and buying the lot, would have made a very handsome profit but for their eagerness to realize which led them to produce their "principes" oftener than they could have earned them at school. The result may be imagined. There are plenty of amusing stories in the book, both about masters and boys. Here is one about the Christmas Play:—

"On one occasion a sixth form boy, dressed as a policeman, insisted on examining the tickets of all who came to the archway of Little Dean's Yard. On pretence of finding some informality in the case of two tickets, he consigned the holders of them to the Dean's coal-cellar, pending investigations. Presently a pickpocket caught with his hand in a gentleman's pocket was brought to him. For such a contingency he was quite unprepared but on the spot devised a means of meeting it. He took the offender in hand, and informing him that Dean's Yard and the precincts had a separate and peculiar police jurisdiction, and that as he was very busy he should let him off with summary punishment, handed him over to some of the other boys, with directions to pump well on him and then to let him go with a good kicking."

"The University of Edinburgh," like that of London, has no collegiate life, and no attempts to secure it, except by voluntary associations and clubs, have hitherto succeeded. The Northern University

---

<sup>7</sup> "The Story of the University of Edinburgh." By Sir Alex. Grant, Bart. Two vols. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1884.

is, however, regarded by its *alumni*, past and present, with an affection which its younger sister in the south may envy but will never possess. Age has no doubt something to do with this, but still more, perhaps, the smallness of the city compared to London where students often have no opportunity of seeing each other when once they leave their classes. And this absence of collegiate life seems the more remarkable as, after the "purging" of the old universities by the Reformers, the new scheme for reorganizing education contained in the "Buke of Discipline," drawn up by Knox and others in 1560, placed all the teaching power in the three universities, which it proposed to re-establish, entirely in the hands of college "readers," and university offices properly so-called, though not entirely abolished, were to be used chiefly for maintaining the efficiency of the colleges. At Edinburgh, too, nothing was intended but a college. The idea of increasing the number of universities had not yet occurred. In fact, John Mair, writing in 1522 in a passage which Sir A. Grant does not seem quite to have understood (page 47, note 2), thinks three universities too many, as the number of scholars at each is so few. But the scheme of the "Buke of Discipline," though very practical, was too stringent, almost too tyrannical, to be carried out, and the University of Edinburgh owed its origin solely to the town council and ministers of the city, who obtained a grant of the "Kirk of Field," the place where Darnley was murdered, for the purpose of founding a school for the "good town." The original charter of foundation is supposed to be one granted by James VI., in 1582; but Sir A. Grant, by arguments which cannot be specified here, proves that it is almost certain that there must have been another charter granted a year or two earlier, which has disappeared and left no trace. After considerable pecuniary difficulties and a law-suit with the Duke of Hamilton (of which the result was that Hamilton House was paid for twice over), the College was opened in 1583 under the presidency of Robert Rollock, a scholar of great reputation who, unlike most learned Scotchmen, had never been out of his native country. The method of tuition was collegiate, or even more like that of a school, until 1708, when, under the influence of William Carstairs, the whole system was remodelled on the pattern of the Universities of Utrecht and Leyden, and a new curriculum appointed with appropriate professorships. One of these was of "Pneumatics." What that means in Scotland few Englishmen could guess. No such trivial thing as natural philosophy but "the being and perfections of the one true God, the nature of angels and the soul of man, and the duties of natural religion." Naturally he was "the apex of the whole teaching establishment," considering himself far above those who taught such inferior mundane subjects as classics and mathematics. Sometimes, no doubt, he was dull, but then, according to "Jupiter" Carlyle, dullness in a professor is rather an advantage, as the students are left much more to think for themselves instead of learning simply *jurare in verba magistri*. The town council was very arbitrary sometimes, and there was more than one contest between them and the University, but they did not

look very well after their professors. The first holder of the Chair of Public Law held it for twenty-seven years without doing anything in it, and his example was often followed. Then a system of purchase grew up—purchase not from the Council but from the holder of the Chair—which the Council sanctioned. Dr. John Hill, for instance, Professor of Humanity in 1775, agreed to pay his predecessor the whole of the salary during his life, which lasted for eighteen years—rather a bad bargain. All these abuses were done away with by the Scotch Universities Bill of 1858, by which the course of study is at present regulated. The short biographies of the professors at the end of the second volume include many well-known names, of whom, perhaps, with the exception of Christopher North, the medical professors are the best known in England, and Sir Robert Christison as well known as any of them. For fifty-five years he was Professor of *Materia Medica*, and when near seventy was Captain of the University Rifle Corps. Scotch professional men seem to keep up the athletic habits and amusements of their youth much longer than Englishmen do. We leave off cricket and rackets about forty at latest. A Scotchman plays golf as long as he can walk and see. In Christison's youth Latin was still the ordinary language used in University matters, and the following account of the *viva voce* examination for his degree shows that practical familiarity with the language must have been attained, if not very exact scholarship. The examination was conducted at Dr. Gregory's house. The examinee had been in a street row the day before, and sat up all night trying to reduce a black eye. After an hour's examination about the stomach,

“Dr. Monro chose for his subject concretions in the stomach. Never having heard of such a thing I have never met with a case of the kind, but once saw at a Medico-Chirurgical Society meeting a large ball of human hair which had been taken after death from the stomach of a hysterical girl—my answers were taken from acquaintance with intestinal concretions, a favourite study both of Dr. Monro himself and of his father. The Doctor was satisfied, though assuredly no such concretion has ever been found in the stomach, and as I knew these concretions well my answers were accepted until he arrived at the treatment. This I had to spin out of my own brain, and on being pushed by him for more remedies, I proceeded with the aid of my old engineering propensities to invent an instrument for the extraction of offensive substances. Monro thereupon wound up the dialogue by asking ‘*Vidistine unquam, Domine, tale instrumentum usitatum?*’ To which I replied somewhat coolly and in doubtful Latin, ‘*Nec vidi, nec audivi.*’ And then the next examiner proceeded with questions about calculus.”

Rather a severer ordeal than Lord Eldon's examination for a degree in arts at Oxford about fifty years earlier. ‘What is the Hebrew for the place of a skull?’ I replied ‘Golgotha.’ ‘Who founded University College?’ I replied that King Alfred founded it. ‘Very well, sir. You are competent for your degree.’”

Mr. Wheatley's new edition of Wraxall's *Memoirs*<sup>8</sup> has been printed from an interleaved copy left by the author at his death, and enriched

<sup>8</sup> “The Historical and Posthumous Memoirs of Sir N. W. Wraxall.” Edited by H. B. Wheatley, F.S.A. In Five Volumes. London: Bickers & Son. 1884.

with notes prepared by Dr. Doran, who had intended himself to edit them. Mr. Wheatley has been wisely sparing in his annotations, which consist mainly of the corrections of the many hostile critics who attacked the memoirs on their first publication, and, in some cases, of the author's remarks and justification of himself. The fifth volume contains a few chapters of personal reminiscences, now first published, of royal and noble personages, not very flattering to the subjects, but not containing anything new of importance. If it is true that George III. never learnt to use a razor properly, Dr. Willis's conduct in allowing him to shave himself when insane, is an instance of greater rashness or greater confidence than appears at first sight, and the disapprobation of the House of Commons was quite justified. The care with which these volumes have been produced, the judgment used in annotating them, and last, but not least important, the goodness of the index, will render them the standard edition of a book which is indispensable to all who want to understand the inner political and parliamentary history of the reign of George III.

There is a "coach" who claims to have discovered an original method of cram for history, and has published it to the world.<sup>9</sup> The only way to do it justice is to give a specimen. This is the summing up of the careers of Pitt and Fox:—

PITT *v.* FOX.

A.—*Life.*

1. Pitt's private life was absolutely above reproach.
2. Pitt was a great favourite with the king, with whom he had great influence.
3. Pitt lived rather apart, and had but few friends.
4. Pitt was in power for eighteen years.

B.—*Character.*

5. Pitt was cold and haughty.
6. Pitt was cautious and free from passion.
7. Pitt was so perfect in his character that some regretted that he had not at least one redeeming vice.
8. Men admired Pitt.

A.—*Life.*

1. Fox went about with the Prince of Wales, whom he is said to have first led into mischief.
2. The king could not bear the mention of Fox's name.
3. Fox revelled in society high and low, and made friends everywhere.
4. Fox was in power for three years.

B.—*Character.*

5. Fox was warm-hearted, friendly and appreciated.
6. Fox was reckless, and his passions ruined him.
7. It was sad to think that Fox's character was stained by so many vices.
8. Men loved Fox.

And so on. In the account of military affairs, this arrangement, like the moves in a chess match, is a great help to understanding the strength and movements of each party. The fault of all books of this class is that they aim too much at saving pupils trouble. An abstract made by the pupil, in which each sentence is the sum of several pages

<sup>9</sup> "The History of the Reign of George III. for Army Candidates and Students." By Oxon. London: W. Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1883.

of his own reading, and recalls it at once, is of the highest value to him, but it is a very different thing when it is the sum of some one else's reading. However, while competitive examinations last, such books will be wanted. The language used is at times in the worst literary taste. Such phrases as "tawdry tyrant" and "fustian Cæsar," as applied to Napoleon, might be pardoned in a newspaper article, but are quite out of place in a historical analysis.

The name of Herder<sup>10</sup> invariably calls up in the mind of the reader Lewes's simile: "Goethe is like a bottle of Rhenish, but Herder is like a pot of Bavarian beer." "A gentle and refined Indian," observes Jean Paul Richter, "would think us all offensive animals: Herder had the most delicate sense of smell, but then in everything he was an elephant." If these things are so, what, we may ask, has induced Mr. Nevinson to devote himself to the resuscitation of this Teutonic megatherium? He is, to begin with, of opinion that the above simile is false—Herder was not "a pot of Bavarian beer." To call him so is a "loathsome insult," and, moreover, "the kingdom of heaven is not meat and drink." For us the question arises, How many Englishmen read Herder? Some know that he wrote a version of the "Cid," in which everything Spanish is passed through Herder's Teutonic alembic, and comes out a pure strain of Germanic ideas. If the fact is worth knowing, the reader will learn that Herder did not even use the Spanish ballads themselves, but produced this model poem (of schoolgirls, at least) by the versification of a French prose translation. But who, except the encyclopaedic-minded of mankind, are acquainted with the "Ideen," the ideas for the philosophy of the history of mankind? The author observes: "In an attempt to give an account of Herder's work *in this world (sic)*, or of his position in the history of thought, the great difficulty is to draw sharp lines, to make any distinctions that will allow the reader a breathing-space, and to avoid repeating the same truth without end." Mr. Nevinson forces our unwilling concurrence with this remark. Besides this, however, he may be judged to have anticipated any interest which the world might take in the subject to which he has devoted his labours; and we doubt if his work is of sufficient merit to awaken an interest that does not exist. Any one that chooses may learn from Nevinson how Herder was born; how he lived—apparently for the most part in debt; how he married, and finally, how he died. The tender reader may be touched, in spite of incongruous combinations of ideas, on reading how Herder never forgot "his father's earnest, silent face and bald crown." He will go through the history of Herder's courtship—*naso adunco* if he is a novice, but if already a student of German literature, with a mind resigned to the most atrocious incongruities. Remembering how Faust demands from Mephistopheles "ein Halstuch, einen Strumpfband"—a neckerchief, a garter—of his Gretchen, he will not be surprised that Herder, on parting from his love Caroline, should snatch

---

<sup>10</sup> "Herder and his Times." By Henry Nevinson. One vol. London: Chapman & Hall. 1884.

“from her beautiful foot a ribbon as a keepsake.” Remembering how Gretchen gives her mother a potion in order that Faust and she may meet with security in her mother’s bedroom, the reader will find nothing “tactless” in Herder’s announcing to his Caroline that “he has to leave Riga to tear himself from the arms of an unhappy lady.” “How shall I,” replies his Caroline, “come to your arms when another unhappy lady has been there before me?” Caroline, however, afterwards makes reprisals: shortly afterwards, in a letter to Herder, she describes to him how “Merck, Leuchsenring, and I curled ourselves up in a corner round the good, gentle, cheerful, noble, old father Gleim, and abandoned ourselves to the uncontrolled sentiment of tenderest friendship. Would that you had seen the gentle and cheerful face of the good old man! (‘long-suffering turkey-hen,’ is Goethe’s name for him. A fat old man truly, though fat, yet old; though old, yet good, albeit much given to embracing of maidens or apple-trees as substitutes.) He wept a tear of joy, and I—I lay with my head in Merck’s bosom. He was exceedingly moved, and wept too. (‘Yes; tears from those tiger eyes’ [Nevinson, *sic!*]) And—I don’t know all we did.” Pleasant for the lover to learn. Then naturally follow recriminations from Herder, but finally there is a *redintegratio amoris*, and in the course of a year Caroline sweetly writes to Herder that he may come for her: “By Christmas she would have her clothes ready, and would promise to be a good wife and mother (!)” The latter promise she kept; she presented her poor husband with seven children in as many years. Marriage at least did these sickly people some good: it cleared them of this painful sentimentality characteristic of the age. After it is all over: “I live now,” writes Herder, “with more feeling of hope, aim, and firm trust in creation.”

We will repeat no more of these futilities. “The time of vanity and inanity is gone,” says Herder of himself; “I long to live in Nature, reality, and truth.” There is a tragic side to every life, even the most commonplace.

“Sorrow is hard to bear, and doubt is hard to clear,  
Each sufferer says his say, his scheme of woe or weal.”

If Herder wrote a vast mass that deserves to die, he wrote a little that should live. His separate works are but parts of one greater work which may be called a criticism of history, and the key to this criticism may be called the unity of Nature in her infinite development, the continuity of phenomena, or the necessary self-existence of God, not so much revealed in His works as indwelling under the form of the universe. It will thus be seen that Herder was a follower of Spinoza, and one of the fathers of what has been called Pantheism. In his capacity as minister of religion his opinions aroused certain opposition, and called forth amongst his brethren a clerical enmity which embittered a great part of his life. It will be seen that in his writings he attempted a tremendous work, and yet he attains the rank neither of philosopher, theologian, nor poet. Mr. Nevinson quotes very aptly of him Browning’s verses on a “Grammarians’ Funeral”:—

“That low man adding one to one  
His hundred's soon hit :  
This high man aiming at a million  
Misses a unit,”

and so failed. People have often asked themselves why did Carlyle write the life of John Sterling? Because it was a typical life of a commonplace man not devoid of aspirations; it therefore served the purpose he had in view, which was to give a philosophy of life in general. Mr. Nevinson has no intention of this kind; he writes, he says, merely to supplement Carlyle's essays on German literature. We wish biographers would pass over the external lives of their heroes with brevity. Even in the case of the greatest men, the interest given to the petty details of life (amongst which let us include courtship) is a mark rather of idle curiosity than of rational sympathy. Mr. Nevinson has been at some pains to unearth these details in the case of a second-rate man, but he should not therefore inflict them upon the reader. Only what is of permanent influence need be brought forward. True, we are knit together in the woof of time; let then no single thread, however colourless, be lost sight of, still less any one of the subtle motives of the pattern. But we can dispense with the refuse of the carding. Had Mr. Nevinson followed this rule he would not have appeared to us in the light of a barren follower of Duntzer. There are some good chapters on the state of thought in Germany at the time of the French Revolution. They are to the purpose. As regards the greater part of the rest, we may be permitted to say of Mr. Nevinson's book what Goethe said of a work of his hero: “In this account there is such an incredible sufferance towards mediocrity, such a rhetorical confusion of the good and the insignificant, such a reverence for the dead and buried, that we must lament the condition of the author from whom so mournful a composition could spring.”

It must be about a year since the second volume of Mr. Stallybrass's translation of Grimm's “*Teutonic Mythology*” appeared. The present volume<sup>11</sup> treats of such subjects as the devil, magic, sicknesses and wonder-working herbs. It is not surprising, considering the Teutonic element in our nation, how many of the stories and beliefs have their counterparts here. But we do not mean to analyze the book, but simply to give some of the best and most characteristic stories. Perchtha is the goddess or spirit who rules over unbaptized children, and they form her train in her midnight rumbles.

“A young woman had lost her only child; she wept continually, and could not be comforted. She ran out to the grave every night and wailed so that the stones might have pitied her. The night before Twelfth Day she saw Perchtha sweep past not far off. Behind all the other children she noticed a little one with its shirt soaked quite through, carrying a jug of water in its hand, and so weary that it could not keep up with the rest; it stood still in trouble before a fence, over which Perchtha strode and the children scrambled. At that moment the mother recognized her own child, came running up and

---

<sup>11</sup> “*Teutonic Mythology of Jacob Grimm.*” Translated by Jas. Steven Stallybrass. Vol. III. London: George Bell & Sons. 1883.



lifted it over the fence. When she had it in her arms, the child spoke: 'O how warm a mother's hands are! But do not cry so much, else you cry my jug too full and heavy; see, I have already spilt it all over my shirt!' From that night the mother ceased to weep."

The following is a wonderfully fine variation of the theme of which Holger the Dane and Frederick Barbarossa are examples:—

"A ship's crew, driven out of their course to an out-of-the-way coast, see a fire burning at night, and go on shore. By the fire sits only one old man, who asks a sailor: 'Whence be ye?' 'From Hisingen in Salve pastorate.' 'Ken ye Thorsby too?' 'Ay, that I do.' 'Wot ye the whereabouts of Ulfveberg?' 'Ay, it's many a time I've passed it, going from Gotheborg to Marstrand by way of Hisingen.' 'Stand the great stones and barrows there yet unremoved?' 'Ay, but one stone leans and is like to fall.' 'Wot ye where Glosshed altar is, and whether it be well kept up?' 'I know nothing about that.' 'Say to the folk that dwelleth now at Thorsby and Thorsbracka, that they destroy not the stones and mounds on Ulfveberg, and that they keep in good condition Glosshed altar, so shalt thou have fair weather for thy home return.' The sailor promised, but asked the old man his name. 'My name is Thore Brack, and there dwelt I of yore, till I was made to flee: in the great mounds of Ulfveberg lie all my kin, at Glosshed altar did we sacrifice and serve our gods.'"

The Teutonic devil is a descendant of the giant, and is credited with all his predecessor's stupidity. Many are the ways in which he has been deceived by wily man, and this is how he met his end:—

"The Esthonians call a farm servant who has charge of the barns and grains, 'riegenkerl.' Once a riegenkerl sat casting metal buttons, when the Devil walked up to him, said good day, and asked: 'What are you doing there?' 'I am casting eyes.' 'Eyes? could you cast me a new pair?' 'Oh yes, but I've no more left just now.' 'But will you another time?' 'Yes, I can,' said the riegenkerl. 'When shall I come again?' 'When you please.' So the Devil came next day to have eyes cast for him. The riegenkerl said, 'Do you want them large or small?' 'Very large indeed.' Then the man put plenty of lead over the fire to melt and said, 'I can't put them in as you are, you must let me tie you down.' He told him to lie down on his back on the bench, took some stout cords, and bound him very tight. Then the Devil asked 'What name do you go by?' '*Issi* [self] is my name.' 'A good name that, I never heard a better.' By this time the lead was melted, and the Devil opened his eyes wide, waiting for the new ones. 'Now for it,' said the riegenkerl, and poured the hot lead into the Devil's eyes. The Devil sprang up with the bench on his back and ran away. He was runuing past some ploughmen in the fields, who asked him 'Who's done that to you?' He answered, '*Issi teggi*' [self did it]. The men laughed and said 'Self done, self have.' But he died of his new eyes, and nobody has ever seen the Devil since."

The Plague is usually a female, who induces some one to carry her into a town or house, but in one case, when the personification was male, the apparition gave good sound sanitary advice. This happened in the seventeenth century, as narrated by a Wendish peasant:—

"So it came to pass that a man that was Niebuhr by name, where now Kuffalen dwell, as he rideth home from town, there comes a man alongside, and begs that he may ride a little in the cart, for that he was right weary. This Hans Niebuhr asks him in Wendish, as that tongue was then commonly used, 'Whence and whither away?' and takes him up on the cart. At first he

will not declare himself, but this Niebuhr, being somewhat drunken, begins to question more sharply. Then he declared himself, saying, 'I will to the village with thee, where I have not yet been; for I am *der Pest*.' Then did Niebuhr intreat for his life, and the Plague gave him this lesson, that he should leave him in the cart outside the village, and strip naked, and have no clothing at all on his body, but take his pot-hook, and coming out before his house, run all round his homestead with the sun, and then bury it under the doorstep; '*If one but carry me not in,*' quoth the Pest, '*in the smell that hangs about the clothes.*' Now this Niebuhr leaves him in the cart a good piece from the village, for it was night; takes the pothanger, runs naked out of the village and all round it, then sticks the iron under the bridge, which iron I myself saw in the year 1690, when the bridge was mended, but nigh eaten away with rust. When this Niebuhr came back for his horse and cart, quoth the Plague: 'Had I known this, I had not declared myself to thee this device whereby thou hast locked me out of the whole village.' When they were come up to the village Niebuhr takes his horses out of the cart and leaves him sitting thereon. Neither was any sickness from pestilence perceived in that village; but in all the villages around the plague did mightily rage."

There is a collection of legends about burying human beings alive in the foundations of buildings, from the mythical tower of Merlin to the actual castles at Liebenstein and Reichenfels and Copenhagen. The persistence of the superstition is extraordinary, for Grimm says that when a new bridge was built at Halle, about forty years ago, the common people thought a child was wanted to ensure its stability.

The author of these studies<sup>12</sup> could scarcely have selected two more interesting groups of writers: G. Sand, G. Eliot, Charlotte Brontë, Harriet Martineau, Taine, De Musset, Buckle, Bradlaugh, and Hans Andersen. Most readers will first turn to the sketch of the man upon whom "it is not too much to say that all England's eyes are at present fixed—Charles Bradlaugh." It is usual for Germans to get up the facts of any case they may begin to take interest in; hence the popularity of their Conversations-Lexicons; but it would be vain to search for Mr. Bradlaugh's name there. Herr Katscher, therefore, gives a brief sketch of his life, rendered lively by anecdotes which are to the point. He finds no difficulty in coming to a distinct opinion of the whole matter in controversy, and bluntly describes the opposition to Bradlaugh to "bigoted fanaticism." There is, however, a kernel of truth in things erroneous; the difficulty is to sift the one from the other. Herr Katscher goes as far as to assert that Mr. Bradlaugh reckons the patience, humility and gentleness of the founder of Christianity as weaknesses of character. On the other hand, he endorses the opinion of Mr. Davidson Morrison that "Mr. Bradlaugh has by his example filled thousands of the down-trodden classes with newborn feelings of self-reliance and hope, and has taught them self-help." If this is a fair treatment of one side, we should prefer a less summary treatment of the other. We look to the ingenuity of one who has made a special study of the subject to bring to light the secret virtues of those feelings which, in the eyes of the generality of people, appear to be purely and simply those of "bigoted

<sup>12</sup> "Character-Bilder." By Leopold Katscher. One vol. London: Trübner & Co. 1884.

fanaticism." On the question of the oath and the constitutional question involved in it, few will now refuse to agree with Herr Katscher that "the throwing out of the Bill of Affirmation in spite of all the appeals to freedom of thought and religion, and to the dignity of Parliament, was a disgrace to England in the eyes of intelligent Europe, which was made all the more shameful after the splendid dialectic of the Premier and the brilliant and altogether marvellous speech of Mr. Bradlaugh in his own defence." In a series of sketches of a number of eminent men and women, who may be regarded as types of their different nationalities, readers will not fail to take an interest in the comparison of morals, as well as in the analysis of conduct which each case offers. The restless, irregular life of George Sand demands the largest amount of space, even in the brief style of treatment of Herr Katscher. The disfavour with which she was formerly regarded in Great Britain, Herr Katscher thinks, may be attributed not so much to her theoretical attacks on the conventions of society or the holy truths of religion, as to the fact of her having occasionally worn trousers. Although none of her characters approach the "puritanismus" of Adam Bede, and although her own life was far removed from any puritanic ideal, it is strange that her favourite type of heroine is a woman of peculiar modesty, in whom, although she may (and usually does) "fall into human errors, yet the soul ever gains the victory over the body, and the loss of modesty is made out to be neither an indifferent nor a praiseworthy thing." Surely rather faint praise! "True, she is inclined to make society responsible for too much, but the high value she places upon purity, and the high standard by which she tests the value of love, far outweigh that disadvantage. For a Frenchwoman, her standpoint is an astonishingly high one." Fainter praise still; indeed almost sarcasm! "The blasé, gloomy, whining Parisian, the heroes to whom French novelists usually make their heroines sacrifice their easy virtue, G. Sand represents as the pests of women. Though she may love to select immoral situations and incidents, her treatment of them is not immoral; and to the wise there is much strengthening of the soul to be derived from her novels, while the days have gone by when the example of any of her characters might lead away the foolish to the commission of any indiscretion." This we think is a very just appreciation. One question always remains: What is to be the relation between art and morality.

"George Eliot has done for English provincial life what Scott did for Scotch Romanticism. In treatment and construction of plot she may be surpassed by Scott and many others. But no one surpasses her in moral height, in the portrayal of character, in psychological analysis. As regards her poetry, she possessed in a high degree all the qualities proper to a poet; only she lacked the gift of song—*i.e.*, the power of giving rhythm and harmony to her poetic utterances. . . . 'She was an example of the fact that a great genius is not always a caprice of Nature, but at times a product of industry, careful cultivation and development of natural gifts.'"

To a critic the study of a master-critic like Taine is naturally most attractive. Taine applied the evolution theory to literary criticism.

Given, or discovered, the "race, period, and environment" of any particular writer, there can be deduced with certainty his "faculté maitresse;" as, for instance, the "faculté maitresse" of Milton is "the sense of the sublime," and so on. Criticism therefore, although it has to do with such indefinite factors as the true and the beautiful, may nevertheless rank as one of the exact sciences. If this is really so, whence arise differences of opinion? Herr Katscher thinks Taine's theory is wrong. Though his principles are good as guides, they cannot be erected into hard and fast rules. A critic must have ideals, each man his own; tastes also differ; in short, the objectivity of Taine's method cannot take into account the subjectivity of the critic, from which escape is impossible. It is in spite of his method that Taine succeeds in fascinating us. His philosophy is only the frame in which his life-like pictures of times and men are contained. It is a pity that in the eyes of the author the frame should be worth more than the picture. Herr Katscher seems, however, to place too little value on the method of Taine. Taine is a master of style. But we have further praise for him too: his rules still remain the canons of modern criticism. Concerning the terrible enigma of Alfred de Musset's life, Herr Katscher has nothing new to offer. It will be seen from these observations that Herr Katscher's short volume is well worth perusal. It is condensed and free from the fault of over-illustration. Few sources have escaped the writer's attention. "The Eminent Women" series is favourably mentioned. We have only observed one mistake. Buckle, as a boy, read a certain "Fairy Queen" by Spenser, "a poem that no one ever dreams of reading in England." What boy has not read the "Fairy Queen," or at least parts of it? We think these sketches almost equal to Sainte-Beuve's "Lundis," and, of course, there is no reason why they should not be equally extended. Though there is nothing remarkably new in the method of treatment, as in Taine's "History of English Literature," still their brevity, condensation, and pithiness make them remarkable.

Mrs. Lucas's translation of Dr. Cassel's short Jewish History<sup>13</sup> is evidently intended for the use of children of that race, but there is no reason why it should be confined to them. Christian children suffer intellectually from the arbitrary division of history into sacred and profane, more than from the division into ancient and modern, against which there have been such vigorous protests of late years. Many a child feels a distinct shock to his sense of the fitness of things when he first hears that Alexander the Great visited Jerusalem, and a book like this, treating of the Jews in their connection with other countries, will do a great deal to destroy the superstitious idea that the history of one nation is more "sacred" than that of another. The translator has added a chapter on the Jews in England—that is, the history of the present settlement—but there is very little said about their position in these islands before the expulsion. Though neither Sephardim nor Ashkenazim claim descent from those who worshipped in the Old

<sup>13</sup> "Manual of Jewish History and Literature." By Dr. D. Cassel. Translated by Mrs. Hen. Lucas. London: Macmillan & Co. 1883.

Jewry, it would have been quite worth while, as the book is for English Jews, to have given a sketch of the condition of their predecessors here, if only as a contrast to the freedom they now enjoy. As to persecution, it is hardly just to put it all down to religious intolerance excited by the clergy, for a comparison between the ecclesiastical laws and the civil laws will show that the latter were much the harsher. In one of the numerous cases of false accusation for outrages on Christian children, the Black Friars exerted themselves to procure the acquittal of the Jews. And what was the result? The lay folk of London were so horrified at their conduct that they refused to give them alms. Then again the Sovereigns of Europe confiscated the property of converted Jews, an extortion which the Lateran Council strictly forbade. The remarks on Jewish literature are useful, but there is no mention among historical authors of Joseph Ben Joshua Ben Meir, whose chronicle is a respectable authority for his own period, the sixteenth century, and very amusing withal.

The "New Plutarch"<sup>14</sup> is the title of a series which we think has not been yet noticed in these pages. Nearly all the colours of the rainbow have been already taken up by these publications, so the last candidate for popular favour has adopted a colour not in the rainbow—but tasteful enough—a bluish grey. To suit the classical name, the cover is adorned with a wreath of laurels and a kind of Greek fret, in the middle of which sits a figure in flowing drapery. He looks as if he were engaged in punching holes in a board, but he is probably meant for a historian, writing. The subjects are very various, ranging from Judas Maccabæus and Haroun Alraschid in the old world to Abraham Lincoln and Victor Emmanuel in the new. Joan of Arc and Marie Antoinette are the only women hitherto included, two out of ten; the balance ought to be kept more equal. Every one who knows Miss Tytler's books, and that means every one who reads, will know what to expect—pleasant style, sympathy with misfortune, and the charity which prefers to dwell upon the good rather than the evil. And in Marie Antoinette's case this is possible, for the evil which she represented was more that of the society into which she was thrust than her own.

The French Court of the *ancien régime* was a strange contrast of exclusiveness and publicity. It appeared to be almost entirely removed from the work of the world, even in politics. Louis XVI.'s life was idleness, for instance, compared to that of Maria Theresa, his mother-in-law; but side by side with this, the daily life of the king and queen were public to an extent which we can hardly realise now. The Court of France has always been less ceremonious and more familiar than that of England. We know from Pepys's and Evelyn's diaries how ordinary gentlemen could stroll into Whitehall and see the Merry Monarch playing cards with the Duchess of Portsmouth; but in Paris every meal of the royal family was open to be seen by all respectable people who sent in their cards to the chamberlain. Country people

<sup>14</sup> "Marie Antoinette." By Sarah Tytler. London: Marcus Ward & Co. 1883.

“who were zealous in the pursuit of this branch of knowledge, would rush from the Dauphin and Dauphiness at their soup to the Comte and Comtesse de Provence at their fricassée, and wind up with Mesdames at their dessert;” and later in the evening the royal card-tables were surrounded by spectators, who had the right of betting on the players. At the accouchement of a queen any one was allowed to come into the room, and the heat and nervousness produced by the crowd nearly cost Marie Antoinette her life, as other ceremonials at a similar time killed Queen Jane Seymour.

At the same time a new translation of the real Plutarch has come out, especially for children.<sup>15</sup> It is an attractive book, with a spirited frontispiece of Alexander taming Bucephalus, a hog-maned charger, up to any weight, but evidently rather awkward on his feet. The lives are slightly condensed, and this has been judiciously done. The book will be a suitable present for any boy or girl who has a taste for the classics.

“Aunt Charlotte’s Stories of American History”<sup>16</sup> are not quite as much “stories” as they might have been. When the whole history of the continent from Columbus to President Garfield is compressed into a small book of four hundred pages, and hardly anything of importance omitted, no incidents can be told at sufficient length to merit the name of “stories.” However, the authors have cleverly managed to introduce sufficient life and detail into their narrative to make it interesting. It would be a good book for reading in the lower forms at school, especially as the tone is on the whole impartial. The barbarities of the Indians in their wars are indeed too much dwelt upon, considering that the repeated breaches of faith on the part of the Americans which provoked them are almost passed over in silence. The causes that led to the Civil War are clearly stated. People now are not afraid to confess that the abolition of slavery was not a primary object of the war, and that the emancipation of the slaves was an afterthought, with a military purpose. Is it not rather hyperbolic to say that there never was a war marked by so little wanton cruelty? Surely the massacre at Fort Pillow on one side, and Sherman’s ravages during his “march to the sea” on the other, were worse than anything that happened in the Crimean War, or perhaps even in more recent European wars.

There is nothing funnier than the unconscious adoration of rank by those people who think they are far too sensible to have such feelings. Here is an American lady who talks of “personal loyalty” as “a false unwholesome sentiment, quite incomprehensible to nineteenth-century Americans,” who has written a short biography of the Queen<sup>17</sup> in the

<sup>15</sup> “Our Young Folk’s Plutarch.” Edited by Rosalie Kaufman. London: Allen & Co. 1884.

<sup>16</sup> “Aunt Charlotte’s Stories of American History.” By Charlotte M. Yonge and Hastings Weld, D.D. London: Marcus Ward & Co. 1883.

<sup>17</sup> “Victoria, Queen of England.” By Grace Greenwood. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1884.

style of a provincial newspaper, when "royalty" is going to pay a visit to a country town. No doubt, she would have claimed her share of the celebrated cherry stones.

However, the children for whom the book is intended will not object to this tone, and will be delighted with the stories of the Princess Victoria carrying home a hat from the milliner's ("I should like to see a little Miss Vanderbilt do a thing of that kind"), and riding donkey races on Ramsgate sands. They will be amused too with the story of the "Boy Jones" who lived for some days hidden in Buckingham Palace, sleeping in the chimneys and dining in the kitchen when every one was gone to bed.

Here and there a want of acquaintance with English ways is shown. It may be true that Prince Albert made the Prince of Wales acknowledge a toll-keeper's salute, and it will be a good lesson in politeness to young Americans; but royal folk do not pay toll in England, not even the Queen's coachmen, when exercising the horses under their charge. Mrs. Greenwood must remember too, when comparing the Civil List with the President's salary, that the Parliament takes the Crown Lands in return and ought not to be much the worse off for the arrangement.

Professor Villari completes in four volumes his life of Macchiavelli.<sup>18</sup> He has thought it necessary to combat the various perverse theories which, by some ingenious explanation or other, would have us regard Macchiavelli as not meaning what he said. Any other view than the plain straightforward one that Macchiavelli is throughout in sober earnest Professor Villari shows to be no longer tenable. There is one phrase constantly recurring in Macchiavelli's writings which may support Professor Villari's and the common-sense view—viz., "inasmuch as it is necessary to reason about everything." And this phrase generally occurs after the enunciation of some proposition which shocks one's ordinary sense of right. Macchiavelli had firmly made up his mind that the ordinary rules of morality which govern private life do not apply to public action—statecraft is regardless of morality; expediency is the only principle which should guide statesmen. This was a generalization which Macchiavelli had deduced from innumerable examples in history. And whatever the professions of princes may have been, we cannot but allow that Macchiavelli's deduction was "reasonably" drawn from the evidence. The mistake Macchiavelli made was in extending the proposition, and maintaining not only that expediency (in this narrow sense) was and always had been the rule of conduct in statecraft, but that it *ought* to be. Macchiavelli did not pretend to be a moral philosopher, but simply a writer on statecraft; and he simply expressed with unmistakable clearness the theory and principle which guided his contemporaries in all their negotiations—and particularly the Italians among whom he lived. Guicciardini rather severely criticized Macchiavelli's "Discourses," but he himself observes "that States cannot be maintained according to conscience,

<sup>18</sup> "Macchiavelli and his Times." By Professor Villari. Four vols. London. Kegan Paul & Co. 1883.

because all Governments are violent." Ferdinand and Richard III., Henry VII. and Louis XI., would stick at no crime which appeared to them to conduce to the benefit of their respective States. The Borgias merely did the same things for more contemptible ends. Statecraft then was Macchiavelli's sole thought. Like the ancients, he sacrifices the individual to the State, but, further, in his opinion the State should be indifferent to every activity save the political and military. From statecraft was derived the motive power of every community; people were always what their Governments made them; and this view he illustrates by endless examples taken from antiquity. Whatever appears to be for the good of the Government, he enthusiastically approves; what appears to hamper or weaken it he cordially detests. Hence his genuine rejection of Christianity, "which preaches endurance rather than bold deeds, whence the world has fallen a prey to scoundrels." Rome, on the other hand, throve by her piety, which regarded only "virtus" and exalted patriotism. Again, honesty and plainness are childish in a Government; hypocrisy and deceit have always been practised with success; therefore they *ought* to be practised. Many will no doubt be found to maintain that Macchiavellism is still the rule of statecraft; only Macchiavelli's coarse vocabulary has been slightly accommodated to modern squeamishness: "hypocrisy" is called "not showing your hand," "deceit" is called "diplomacy," and so on. The opponents of the late Lord Beaconsfield were fond of drawing attention to this mild form of Macchiavellian statecraft; it is strange to find the opponents of the present Prime Minister, instead of retorting in the same way, pointing the finger of scorn at the new-fangled political morality, which is for ever hesitating to do a little violence or wrong for a great good. To one side firmness is violence, to the other regard for right is vacillation. As long as these differences of view are possible, Macchiavelli will be read; and, inasmuch as Macchiavelli convicts both sides, he will be disowned and maligned by both. Possibly new ideas on government are beginning to spread, ideas which would have startled Macchiavelli, as much as they do modern Conservatives—Mr. Spencer's theory, that motive power is not derived from the governors but from the governed; or Mr. Ruskin's, that there are not two rules of conduct, one for private, the other for public morality, but that there can only be one. Macchiavelli's system may be founded on a marvellously simple idea—that all men are bad; it is at least less morbid than that of the "contrat social," that, all restraints removed, men at once become angels. What we admire in the man is the cynicism which is superior to the shams of conventionality, his show of logic and self-reliant pride. In a horribly corrupt age he reconciled himself to a number of unpalatable truths (as he thought them), but these once accepted, he honestly framed what he considered the best plan for remedying the existing state of things. His remedies only show how excessively corrupt the society of his day was. Professor Villari has treated his subject with a fulness which is equivalent to saying the last word on the subject. There is only one thing we would say. His analyses of Macchiavelli's



works are perhaps superfluous, especially as they are all so concise, and are now all translated. On the whole, Professor Villari displays great sobriety of judgment, although he is too fond of scornfully repeating "and this is the man who has been called a monster." Perhaps, too, it is overrating the influence of an undoubtedly important book to say that the effect of "The Prince" was of the nature of a historical event, and that "it is beyond doubt that it had a more direct influence upon real life than any other book in the world, and a larger share in emancipating Europe from the Middle Ages." Madame Villari's rendering is fairly satisfactory, although a comparison of parallel passages with Mr. N. H. Thomson's version of the "Discourses" is not in her favour, and shows how different it is possible to make translations.

It is more profitable to read Mr. N. H. Thomson's easy rendering of the "Discourses"<sup>19</sup> than Professor Villari's analysis. Mr. Thomson has followed the golden rule of seldom translating an Italian into the English word of the same form. He has allowed himself considerable freedom in translation with, we think, the advantage of preserving the style of the original. On the whole, it is an excellent translation.

---

#### BELLES LETTRES.

IT is seldom that a new edition of a poet long since dead at once takes its place as indisputably the finest, and becomes the standard by which to measure all editions for the future. But we venture to predict that Mr. Buxton Forman's four-volume edition of the poems and writings of Keats<sup>1</sup> will remain *facile princeps* for many "hungry generations" to come. We confess that we approached this work with a certain amount of prejudice and misgiving. The attitude of mind in which some modern critics regard the poet of their adoration is always strained and often foolish and contemptible. The solemn parading of minutiae, the tedious accuracy as to unimportant dates, the intellectual contortions and genuflexions, provoke the uninitiated to wrath and inspire an unreasoning aversion to the poet himself. If there are traces here and there of this spirit of morbid admiration, we are compelled to forgive them out of gratitude for the beauty of the volumes themselves, for the abundance of matter in prose and verse gathered together for the first time, and for the zeal and industry of the compiler. We propose to give a brief outline of the contents of the four volumes. There is of course an editor's preface, written for the most part with becoming moderation. This is followed by a note on the various portraits—of which more hereafter—of the

<sup>19</sup> "Machiavelli's Discourses on the First Decade of Titus Livius. "Translated by N. H. Thomson. One vol. London: Kegan Paul & Co. 1883.

<sup>1</sup> "The Poetical Works and other Writings of John Keats. Including Poems and Numerous Letters not before published." Edited with Notes and Appendices by Harry Buxton Forman. In Four Volumes. London: Reeves & Turner, 196, Strand, 1883.

author. The poems which form the bulk of the first two volumes are arranged according to the dates of their original publication, and printed with the original title-pages of the successive volumes which were brought out in Keats's lifetime. Then follow the posthumous and fugitive pieces, most of which were published in Lord Houghton's "Life and Letters," but some are here printed for the first time. Last of all are the dramas and "The Cap and Bells." At the end of Volume I. are Leigh Hunt's review of the 1817 volume, the notorious review of "Endymion" in the *Quarterly*, and the *Edinburgh* review of the "Endymion" and "Lamia." At the end of the second volume Leigh Hunt's review of "Lamia" and later remarks on Keats are also given. Volume III. consists of miscellaneous letters, and amongst other matter we find the review of "The Cockney School" from *Blackwood*. Volume IV. contains the letters to Fanny Brawne and a General Appendix, consisting of Severne's Journal of Keats's Last Illness, Recollections of Cowden Clarke, Recollections of Haydon, Leigh Hunt's Memoir of Keats, and other interesting and appropriate documents. Of the various portraits it will be difficult to speak too highly. Each volume has for its frontispiece a portrait of Keats, three of which are photo-intaglios from drawings of Severne, and the fourth a print of a drawing by Hilton. There are also some highly interesting photo-intaglios from the pages of Haydon's journal. Type, paper, and binding are all in excellent taste. If whom the gods love die young, surely Keats was *felix etiam opportunitate mortis*. He said his *Nunc dimittis* before there was time to fall from his high estate and pass into the light of common day. And there are others who lived to grow old, and left romance far behind them in their youth—Wordsworth and Coleridge for instance, who dying young would have shared with Keats the *ah! nimium breves* of an immortal regret.

"Lay Canticles and Other Poems," by F. Wyville Home, are of finer quality than their somewhat inappropriate title led us to expect. For what is a lay canticle? If, as we suppose, Mr. Home intends to imply that his canticles are different from those in the Prayer-book, he should have qualified them as secular or non-ecclesiastical. A canticle is not necessarily composed or sung by a cleric. Perhaps the title was suggested by Coleridge's "Lay Sermons." Be that as it may, and for fear of a further digression into the question, Why give a collection of poems a jocose or pithy title at all? we hasten to say that the larger portion of the volume before us is full of interest and beauty. Mr. Home has not indeed as yet formed a style for himself but many of his verses give a promise of original work to be accomplished hereafter. The subject of "The Hither Side of Death," which is the longest of the "Lay Canticles," is the failure of Art and Nature to fill the empty soul, and the power of successful Love to feed the hungry soul with goodness. We quote the following stanza as an instance of something more than metrical skill:—

---

<sup>2</sup> "Lay Canticles and other Poems." By F. Wyville Home, Author of "Songs of a Wayfarer." London: Pickering & Co., 66, Haymarket. 1883.

“ So does Sorrow, tired of day,  
 Pine and pray for dark and night ;  
 But when day is passed away  
 Sorrow sets not with the light :  
 So does Sorrow, tired of night,  
 Pine and pray for light and day ;  
 But when night has taken flight  
 Sorrow dies not with the grey.”

There are many beautiful stanzas in “*Brier-blossom*,” but from first to last we are reminded of half a score of modern poets. “*Buffalmacco’s Stratagem*” is by far the cleverest and, in spite of one or two daring plagiarisms of style, the most original poem in the whole volume. The “*Stanzas to Sleep*” are indeed beautiful, but who will fail to recognise Browning’s influence in the following jerky lines :—

“ Day God’s time ; night the Devil’s ! So ;  
 Softly. A truth lies there intact ;  
 A bare truth meanly said : but lo !  
 I look beyond ; look past the fact,  
 To the fact’s application : backed  
 With wit ’twill serve me for more bed.  
 Andrea Tafo, you are sped.”

The association of Browning and Byron reminds us of *Madame Phœbus* by whom Jerusalem and Torquay were alike unvisited ; but in stanza xxvii. there is the memorable lilt of *Don Juan*—

“ Expectance wakes him. The watch-knell  
 Tells five. He starts up at the call.  
 O what a fall from heaven to—well,  
 If Vulcan took all day to fall  
 From heaven to earth, how should so small  
 An interval of time suffice,  
 This fall being deeper, twice or thrice ?

Now a young writer who has so just a sense of humour and so much command of melodious verse as Mr. Home ought to be on his guard against the temptation to glide into familiar and imitable strains. Nevertheless, “*Buffalmacco’s Stratagem*” is well worth reading a second time.

“ Set it apart, and it seems a thing self-generated, self-sustinent, individually whole,” in short, take a verse which will stand alone, and you have, according to Mr. W. Watson, an epigram<sup>3</sup>. He gives us a hundred “individual wholes,” some of which are worth preserving, and others are at once pretentious and commonplace. This is perhaps the best of Mr. Watson’s epigrams—

“ The beasts in field are glad, and have not wit  
 To know why leap’d their hearts when springtime shone.  
 Man looks at his own bliss, considers it,  
 Weighs it with curious fingers ; and ’tis gone.”

The first two lines are imperfectly expressed, the two last are

<sup>3</sup> “*Epigrams of Art, Life, and Nature.*” By William Watson. Liverpool : Gilbert G. Walmesley, 50. Lord Street. 1884.

excellent. Epigrams xxvi. and xxxi. are also good of their kind; but epigram xxxii., "To Edward Dowden on learning that he was about to be engaged on the *Life of Shelley*"—

"Thy task will yield thee much sad happiness  
With the sea-amorous Ariel, sea-betray'd.  
Thyself I gratulate; and him not less,  
The swift wild sprite, who such a friend hath made!"

has every note of every affectation in vogue. Of a "Voice from the Nile, and other Poems," by James Thomson it is impossible to speak otherwise than with respect, not only because the writer is beyond the reach of criticism, but because he has left behind him substantial proofs of power and originality. We cannot agree with the Rev. J. Ebsworth, whose opinion Mr. Dobell quotes in the opening memoir (an interesting though painful narrative), to the effect that Mr. Thomson was second only to Browning. Exaggerated statements of this kind repel interest and win sympathy only from the infatuated. Mr. Thomson was possessed by an imagination naturally strong and fruitful which an early sorrow and its consequences inspired with an ever gloomier despair. His finest poems, the "Doom of a City," "The City of Awful Night," "The Deliverer," and, most of all, the terrible but splendid "Insomnia," bear witness to this overpowering gloom. In the latter poem the command of language is extraordinary. He was a bold and outspoken radical and freethinker, but we do not think that the specimens of political verse, with the exception of "Despotism Tempered by Dynamite," merit approval. Nor did Mr. Thomson succeed as a writer of playful verse. That, at least, is our "obscure" and "anonymous" opinion, and in the face of Mr. Dobell's fine scorn we are prepared to stand by it.

"Two Gallian Laments and some Verses"<sup>5</sup> by St. John-Brenon are bound in white and gold cloth. To extol the memory of the late Emperor of the French, and to abuse the present Republican Government are the objects which Mr. E. St. John-Brenon has set himself to accomplish. He finds that florid verse modelled on that of Mr. Swinburne, is conducive to his purpose. We quote the opening lines:—

"An Emperor smitten, not slain,  
Smitten sore by the treason of knaves,  
Thou shalt rise, O Napoleon, to crush  
'Neath thy heel those abortions of slaves!"

"Stray Chords"<sup>6</sup> by Julia R. Anagnos are much better worth reading. The following lines on the "Opal" are especially happy:—

"Sad the opal is to me,  
With its glow of dusk and dawn,

<sup>4</sup> "A Voice from the Nile and other Poems." By the late James Thomson ("B. V."). With a Memoir of the Author, by Bertram Dobell. London: Reeves & Turner, 196, Strand. 1884.

<sup>5</sup> "Two Gallian Laments and some Verses." By Edward St. John-Brenon. London: Reeves & Turner, 196, Strand. 1884.

<sup>6</sup> "Stray Chords." By Julia R. Anagnos. Boston: Cupples, Upham & Co., Old Corner Bookstore. 1883. London: Trübner & Co.

Veil of milk drawn fitfully,  
 Fires as shy as eye of fawn.  
 Sad to me that jewel fair;  
 Lost one's smiles are gleaming there!"

The frontispiece is a charming blue electrotype portrait, we presume of Miss Anagnos, sitting on a table and playing a guitar. In her Latin hymns Miss Anagnos has let her chords stray too far. That and that alone *Crimen illæ erat*, and of them may we say indeed—

"Meus admirat  
 Vane perimus dolentes."

We cannot accuse Mr. Mackenzie Bell of not giving us due warning as to what we may expect from his new volume of verse. A selection of "Old Year Leaves"<sup>7</sup> has come under our notice already, and we seem to have read all about the "Strong River of Thought" and Edgar Vanning in a previous state of existence. Mr. Bell's new poems are every whit as dull as the old ones, and except in a sonnet at the beginning and in another on the grave of Dante Rossetti quite at the end of this stout volume, we can trace no glimmer of poetic feeling whatever.

"Flowers: a Fantasy,"<sup>8</sup> by Cornelia Wallace, is an unassuming little volume of verse. Miss Wallace finds in the world of flowers types of womanhood. Here is a pretty couplet—

"Crocuses, pupils orderly and trim,  
 Who, looking upward, say their morning hymn."

Zinnias and Canary tropæolum might be left unsung except perhaps by seed merchants.

The "Book of Psalms in Metre"<sup>9</sup> is a reprint of what we can only describe as the Scottish Tate and Brady:—

"The Lord's my Shepherd, I'll not want,  
 He makes me down to lie  
 In pastures green; he leadeth me  
 The quiet waters by."

Doubtless to Scotchmen this sacred doggrel has a thousand things to say and sounds in their ears beautiful with old memories.

"Leisure Hours in Russia,"<sup>10</sup> by Wickham Hoffman, gives short but lively sketches of St. Petersburg, Russian superstition, and of Finland. We read the account of Finland with the liveliest interest. When we came across the following sentence:—"The Russian trotter is not to be compared with ours in speed; 2·30 is the very best he can do," we were not surprised to find that the author belonged to the American legation. Mr. Hoffman's successful little volume also contains a

<sup>7</sup> "Old Year Leaves, being Old Verses Revived." By H. T. Mackenzie Bell. London: Elliot Stock, 62, Paternoster Row. 1883.

<sup>8</sup> "Flowers: a Fantasy." By Cornelia Wallace. London: W. Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1884.

<sup>9</sup> "The Book of Psalms in Metre, according to the Version approved by the Church of Scotland." Revised by David M'Laren, Minister of Humber. Edinburgh: David Douglas. 1883.

<sup>10</sup> "Leisure Hours in Russia." By Wickham Hoffman, late Secretary United States Legation, St. Petersburg. London: George Bell & Sons. 1883.

translation of Nadescha, from the Swedish of the Finnish poet Runeberg, which is well worth reading for the sake of the story and the evident beauties of the original; translations of other poems of Runeberg, and an account of the Kalewala interspersed with translations.

"A Sequence of Songs,"<sup>11</sup> by an anonymous writer, is a series of patriotic odes from the point of view of an American of the Southern States. However, little we may sympathize with that view, we are ready to express admiration for the noble and chivalric sentiments which have inspired the writer. Apart from the fervour of the sentiment, the verse itself is not remarkable. With the exception of some stanzas on the Southern Cross the language of the odes is stilted and laboured. There is, however, in spite of the display of passionate regret, a dignity and a reserve of feeling which leads us to respect the unknown author and his lost cause.

Of "Rigmarole Charades in Doggrel Rhymes,"<sup>12</sup> by Stephen Pye, we will only say that the contents do not contradict the title.

"Cædmon's Exodus and Daniel,"<sup>13</sup> edited from Grien by Dr. Theodore W. Hunt, forms the second volume of the library of Anglo-Saxon poetry which is being published for the benefit of American students. There is an exhaustive vocabulary and the notes are clear and to the point. But we doubt if students in college classes are really benefited by homœopathic doses of erudition. But your modern scholar descends from the closet into the market-place with a light heart and eager to jostle the other hucksters for the right of displaying his wares. Will familiarity breed contempt? We mean, of course, no disrespect to Dr. Theodore W. Hunt, whose excellent little manual has set us thinking.

Mr. W. Gibson, in his preface to a translation of "The Poems of Goethe,"<sup>14</sup> tells us that in the opinion of the late Bayard Taylor, these renderings "do not read like a translation." We are tempted to ask, then, What do they read like? For though written in the English language they are not of it; they are well enough in their way; the hands are the hands of Esau, but there is no attempt to disguise the voice. No doubt to many who cannot read the original this volume of translation will give both instruction and pleasure, but Mr. Gibson must not delude himself with the idea that he has accomplished a literary task which is, we fear, beyond achievement. For Carlyle succeeded in translating Goethe, but not in translating him into English.

<sup>11</sup> "A Sequence of Songs." By the Author of "The Golden Fence." W. J. Duffie, Columbia, S.C. London: Trubner & Co. 1882.

<sup>12</sup> "Rigmarole Charades in Doggrel Rhymes." By Stephen Pye. Paris: E. Tellier, 8, Rue Chabanais.

<sup>13</sup> "Cædmon's Exodus and Daniel." Edited from Grien by Theodore W. Hunt, Ph. D., Professor of Rhetoric in Princeton College. Boston: Ginn, Heath & Co. 1883. London: Trubner & Co.

<sup>14</sup> "The Poems of Goethe, done into English Verse." By William Gibson, Commander U.S. Navy. London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co., 4, Stationers' Hall Court. 1883.

Neither by his preface nor by his translation will Mr. Green<sup>15</sup> put an end to the question as to whether Homer should be rendered in metre or in prose. Mr. Green has decided in favour of blank verse, and although on a comparison of some important passages, we prefer Lord Derby's version to Mr. Green's, we can readily imagine that many readers would think otherwise. We prefer the freer and less pedantic rendering of the older translator. As a specimen of Mr. Green's skill, and as a measure of success, we refer our readers to the Catalogue of the Ships. Throughout this difficult passage he strikes us as having reproduced not a little of the music and dignity of the original. As a schoolmaster, Mr. Green objects to prose translations, but he prints the Greek text opposite to the English. That is a great convenience to the general reader, but is it likely to be regarded as a "boon and a blessing" to the belated school-boy?

In "Poetry as a Fine Art,"<sup>16</sup> a lecture delivered at McGill College, Montreal, Mr. Charles Moyses endeavours to show that poetry does not spring altogether from a divine accident, but obeys more or less definite laws. There is some good sense and much fine writing between the limp parchment covers of this little work. The truth is surely this, and here we are reminded of Themistocles and how he snubbed a Seriphian, that not without labour and in obedience to law does the poet become such, nor by law and with labour does the verse-monger become a poet.

It would be the merest pretence within the space at our disposal to do more than mention the splendid edition of the "Phædo of Plato,"<sup>17</sup> by Mr. R. D. Archer-Hind. In addition to critical notes at the foot of the text there is an introduction which mainly consists of an examination of the scope of the dialogue, two appendices, and a Greek and English index. Nowhere, so far as we could find, in introduction or foot-note, is there a single mention of the work of the Master of Balliol.

Not less deserving of ample notice and scholarly criticism is an edition of the First Six Books of the "Annals of Tacitus,"<sup>18</sup> by Mr. Henry Furneaux. A lengthy introduction contains essays on the genuineness of the Annals, on the Syntax and Style of Tacitus, on the Genealogy of the Family of Augustus, and other subjects germane to the work. The text is based on the edition of Orelli, 1859. There is a Latin index.

<sup>15</sup> "The Iliad of Homer, with a Verse Translation." By W. C. Green, M.A., Rector of Hepworth, Suffolk. Vol. I. Books i.-xii. London: Longmans & Co. 1884.

<sup>16</sup> "Poetry as a Fine Art. A University Lecture delivered in McGill College, Montreal." By Charles E. Moyses, B.A. (Lond.) London: Elliot Stock, 62, Paternoster Row, E.C. 1883.

<sup>17</sup> "The Phædo of Plato." Edited with Introduction, Notes and Appendices, by R. D. Archer-Hind, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. London: Macmillan & Co. 1883.

<sup>18</sup> "The Annals of Tacitus." Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by Henry Furneaux, M.A., formerly Fellow and Tutor of Corpus Christi College, Oxford. Vol. I. Books i.-vi. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1884.

The translation of the "Anabasis of Alexander,"<sup>10</sup> from the Greek of Arrian, by Mr. E. J. Chinnock; will be of value not only to the historical student, but will be found interesting and entertaining by the general reader. To quote Mr. Chinnock's preface: "This is one of the most authentic and accurate of historical works. Though inspired with admiration for his hero, the author evinces impartiality and freedom from hero-worship. He exhibits great literary acuteness in the choice of his authorities and in sifting evidence." The style is lucid and even, and the book reads as little like a translation as can be expected.

Mr. R. Shindler<sup>20</sup> tells us that "he undertook the editing of the "Hiero" because there was no English edition of it as a separate work, and none with English notes." This is no longer the case, for we noticed Mr. Holden's excellent edition of the "Hiero" in THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW for October, 1883. Mr. Shindler's work, which is interleaved for the use of students, contains an able introduction and some brief critical notes.

Messrs. Macmillan add to their excellent Classical Series the "Satires of Juvenal,"<sup>21</sup> by Mr. E. G. Hardy, and the Second Book of the "Odes of Horace,"<sup>22</sup> by Mr. T. E. Page.

For the Elementary Series, Mr. Page has simplified and abridged his notes to the First Book of the Odes, which have been published in the Classical Series.<sup>23</sup> The notes are excellent, but we do not approve of vocabularies except for very young beginners.

A work covering so vast a field of research as Mr. Sayce's "Introduction to the Science of Language"<sup>24</sup> must necessarily be to a great extent a work of compilation. As he himself remarks, even the memory of a Mezzofanti has limits, and if a philologist has a profound knowledge of one, or at most two languages besides his own, it is all that can be expected. Still, deducting the largest discount for the help derived from the previous labours of numerous specialists in the various languages and dialects brought under discussion, Mr. Sayce's own part is both important and arduous, and is on the whole ably and soberly carried out. Nevertheless there are here and there discrepancies and other slight flaws, betokening haste or carelessness in composition

<sup>10</sup> "The Anabasis of Alexander. Literally translated, with a Commentary from the Greek of Arrian, the Nicomedian." By E. J. Chinnock, M.A., LL.B., London, Rector of Dumfries Academy. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 27, Paternoster Row. 1884.

<sup>20</sup> "The Hiero of Xenophon." Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by R. Shindler, M.A. (Lond.) London: W. Swan Sonnenschein & Co., Paternoster Row. 1884.

<sup>21</sup> "The Satires of Juvenal." With Notes, Introduction and Appendices, by E. G. Hardy, M.A., Head Master of Grantham Grammar School. London: Macmillan & Co. 1883.

<sup>22</sup> "Q. Horatii Flacci Carminum," Liber II. Edited, with Notes, by T. E. Page, M.A., Assistant Master of Charterhouse. London: Macmillan & Co. 1883.

<sup>23</sup> "Elementary Classics—Q. Horatii Flacci Carminum," Liber I. For the Use of Schools. By T. E. Page, M.A., Assistant Master of Charterhouse. New Edition, with Vocabulary. London: Macmillan & Co. 1884.

<sup>24</sup> "Introduction to the Science of Language." By A. H. Sayce, Deputy-Professor of Comparative Philology, Oxford. Two vols. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., Paternoster Square. 1883.



some of which we shall point out as we discuss the book in greater detail. As for the technical portion of the work—that which deals with the grammar and structure of something like a hundred entirely separate modes of speech, of which a vast majority are as a matter of course entirely unknown to us—it would be idle to offer any remarks, critical or other. We shall confine ourselves to giving our readers an *aperçu* of the leading features of Mr. Sayce's volumes, and to noticing, in passing, such points as are likely to be of general interest. Mr. Sayce opens his subject with a review of all the "Theories of Language" which, so far as we know, have ever been attempted: beginning with the lexicons and syllabaries preserved in the clay tablets of Nineveh, he passes with a brief mention the grammarians of India, who are fully treated of further on, and comes to the Greek and Roman grammarians, whose unscientific and fantastic etymologies still disfigure our dictionaries. Among Roman grammarians it is not a little curious to find the name of Julius Cæsar, who invented the term "ablative." The middle of the seventh century saw the compilation of the first Syriac grammar, and towards the end of the same century zeal for the preservation of the Koran led to the real foundation of Arabic grammar. The close connection of the Semitic idioms was now perceived, but to the Jews must be ascribed the merit of formulating, in the tenth century, the first comparative grammar. A somewhat later school of Hebrew philology became the instructor of the Christian scholars of the Renaissance. When the Reformation turned the minds of German and English scholars to the study of Semitic philology, the result, as far as linguistic science is concerned, was the introduction into our lexicons of a new set of false etymologies, whereby every word was derived from the Hebrew!

"What has been termed," says Mr. Sayce, "the discovery of Sanskrit by Western scholars put an end to all this fanciful playing with words, and created the science of language. The native grammarians of India had at an early period analyzed both the phonetic sounds and the vocabulary of Sanskrit with astonishing precision, and drawn up a far more scientific system of grammar than the philologists of Alexandria or Rome had been able to attain."

"In 1786, Sir William Jones, addressing the Asiatic Society at Calcutta, stated that 'no philologer could examine the Sanskrit, Greek, and Latin without believing them to have sprung from a common source, which perhaps no longer existed. There is a similar reason, he goes on to say, 'though not quite so forcible, for supposing that both the Gothic and Celtic had the same origin with the Sanskrit. The old Persian may be added to the same family.' Here then was the great discovery made." It was, however, "reserved for Germany to accomplish what England had begun;" "to the work of F. Schlegel on 'The Language and Wisdom of the Indians,' published in 1808, may be traced the foundation of the science of language. All that was now required was some master-scholar who should continue the work begun by Schlegel." This master-scholar was found in Francis Bopp. In 1833 was published the first volume of his "Comparative Grammar of Sanskrit, Zend, Greek, Latin, Lithuanian, Slavonic, Gothic and German;" the final volume not appearing till 1852. Mean-

while, Wilhelm von Humboldt, "starting with the new method of Bopp, revised the old endeavours to found a philosophy of speech, and extended the results obtained by Bopp to all the manifold languages of the world." But perhaps no one man has done more for the science of language than Jacob Grimm, who applied "the method of Bopp in another and more special direction," devoting himself to the minute and scientific study of one branch of the great Aryan group; his "*Deutsche Grammatik*" (1819-1837) "ushered in a new epoch in the history of comparative philology," and his name will for ever be associated with that regular law of interchange of sounds in the Indo-European family of speech, which he was the first to formulate, and which, in the hands of his successors, has been so powerful an instrument in enlarging the boundaries of philological science. The chapter on "The nature and science of language" is interesting, but we can only give a few of the results arrived at. Language is significant sound, the outward embodiment and expression, however imperfect, of thought. Its "origin is to be sought in gestures, onomatopoeia, and, to a limited extent, interjectional cries." Language, we may lay down, "begins with sentences, not with single words. The latter exist only for the lexicographer." "The sentence consists of two factors, one the external sound, the other the internal thought, and neither of these factors can be disregarded by a true science of language." Thus linguistic science, or glottology, has two divisions: phonology, the science of linguistic sound, and sematology, the science of meanings. "Glottology has to investigate the origin of language so far as it really is language, but no further." "Two new sciences, those of comparative mythology and comparative religion, have grown up under the shelter of glottology, and form subordinate sciences dependent on it." Mr. Sayce claims for glottology the rank of a historical science because, though its method is that of physical science, and the laws of phonology purely physical and physiological laws, the meaning rather than the sound constitutes the essence of speech. "Language and languages are in a constant state of change." The three main causes of change are given as (1) imitation or analogy; (2) a wish to be clear and emphatic, and (3) laziness. It is by love of imitation that one language influences another, or that a whole community is led to adopt a tongue not its own. Such has been the case with the Kelts of Cornwall, the Wends of Prussia, and the Huns of Bulgaria. Indeed, Mr. Sayce emphatically insists that language is not a matter of race, but of community.

Among examples of the effects of laziness on grammar are classed the loss in modern English of all the inflexions of Anglo-Saxon, and the gradual disuse of the subjunctive mood which is observable at the present time. The conclusion drawn by Mr. Sayce from the facts he has brought together on the changes of language is that dialects precede languages. "Language begins with multiplicity and disunion, but its end is unity. The theory which would derive the idioms of the world from three or four principal centres, or even from a single centre, is contrary to the facts. In the very act of being formed, a language necessarily splits itself into dialectic variety." It is in

recurring to this topic that Mr. Sayce (vol. ii. p. 31), gives utterance to the following bewildering imbroglia: "Here, as elsewhere in Nature, the complex precedes the simple, the embryonic jelly-fish is older than man." In language the complex no doubt does precede the simple, but not in Nature—i.e., in the evolution of plants and animals. Anyhow "the embryonic jelly-fish" is not a happy example of superior complexity as compared with man. We should not have noticed this strangely dislocated illustration if it had been a solitary instance. "As in phonology we have the growth or decay of sounds, so in sematology we have the growth or decay of ideas." The metaphorical sense of words supersedes the original meaning. "The Latin who spoke of his soul or mind as *animus* had altogether forgotten that at the outset *animus* was merely the "wind" or "breath." *Divus, deus, dieu* was once "the bright sky," *soul* was nothing but the "heaving" sea. In illustration of the novel sense acquired by words from narrowing or widening their meaning, Mr. Sayce adduces *caballus*, a nag, which in the Romance languages has taken the wider meaning of "horse," as *cheval* and *caballo*. He even states (vol. ii. p. 116) that *caballus* has entirely ousted *equus* from the languages which boast their descent from Latin." This is hardly accurate, since in Spanish the classical Latin *equus* is preserved in *yegua*, a mare. A similar inaccuracy is to be found in the assertion (on the same page) that *cambiare* and *andare* have taken the place of *mutare* and *ire*. In Spanish "to change" is *mudar*; *cambiar* meaning rather "to exchange." "To go" is quite as often *ir* as *andar*, each has a distinct shade of meaning. In French, too, *aller* is made up from both *ire* and *andare*, the present agreeing, in the singular and the third person of the plural, with the present of the Spanish *ir*, and the whole of the future being from *ire*. A familiar case of a word whose signification has been narrowed is our *deer*, which once meant wild animals, as in "Lear," act 3, Scene 4: "Mice and rats and such small deer." In an appendix to Chapter IV. is a comparative examination of the vocal organs of animals, followed by plates giving views of the human trachea and larynx, and followed by diagrams showing the position of the tongue, lips, &c., in the production of various sounds. In a second appendix will be found the alphabet of Prince L. L. Bonaparte, as edited by Mr. Ellis, and the alphabet of Mr. Sweet. The chapter on "The Morphology of Speech" turns too much on technical points of comparative grammar to lay before our readers, even in briefest résumé, but we must notice a slight discrepancy. At p. 417, vol. i. we read: "We are told that a school inspector plucked some children a short time ago, for saying that *cannon* in *cannon ball* was a noun instead of an adjective; the pedantry of the act was only equal to the ignorance it displays," &c. At p. 332 of vol. ii. we find "In *cannon ball*, *cannon* is as much an adjective as *black*," &c. Mr. Sayce's second volume begins with the consideration of roots, and we must find room to quote *in extenso* a really eloquent and luminous passage: "Roots are the barrier that divides language from the inarticulate cries of the brute beast; they are the last result of linguistic analysis, the elements out of which the material of speech is formed, like the

elementary substances of the chemist. But we must be careful not to fall into the mistake of the Indian grammarians and their modern followers, and confound those roots with verbs or any of the other constituents of living speech. The roots of language are like the roots of the tree with its stem and branches: the one implies the other, but all alike spring from the seed, which in language is the undeveloped sentence of primitive man, the aboriginal monad of speech" (vol. ii. p. 3). "Roots differ as the languages to which they belong differ." "They are one of the instruments with which the comparative philologist determines and classifies his families of speech." "Languages may be arranged morphologically, as polysynthetic, incorporating, isolating, agglutinative, inflectional, and analytic. Resemblances between a certain number of words in two distinct languages must not lead us to infer relationship between such languages, for accidental resemblances of sound and sense between words are to be found all the world over." The true "test of linguistic kinship is agreement in structure, grammar and roots. Judged by this test, the languages at present spoken in the world probably fall, as Professor Friederich Müller observes, into about a hundred different families, between which science can discover no connection or relationship." From p. 33 to p. 64 will be found the list of linguistic families taken from Dr. Friederich Müller's "Grundriss der Sprachwissenschaft." In discussing the "inflectional families of speech," Mr. Sayce combats the deeply rooted idea that "makes the European scholar see in an inflected language the normal type of a perfect and cultivated tongue." Comparative philology teaches that "whatever may be its form, that language is best which best expresses the thoughts of its speakers." "The number of known inflectional families of speech is not large, though the literary and historical importance of two of them—the Aryan and the Semitic—far exceeds that of any other group of languages. The Aryan or Indo-European group has been baptized with a variety of names. It is interesting to know that the term Aryan, the shortest and perhaps the best, originated with Professor Max Müller. Referring to the genealogical table in the last chapter, Mr. Sayce then enumerates the principal languages and dialects falling respectively under the two great divisions of the Aryan group, giving a short sketch of the linguistic history of each member of the western, or European division. But our space, already exceeded, forbids us to follow him through the remainder of the chapter, nor, indeed, is there much temptation to do so, for apart from matter too purely technical to be quoted here, the greater portion of it is devoted to reconstructing, by the light of comparative philology, the ancient civilization of the primitive Aryans, the position of their first Asiatic home, and the time of their western emigration; and this, which would otherwise be one of the most interesting parts of the book, is rendered obsolete by the announcement made in the preface to the second edition, that the Indo-European languages did not, as heretofore believed, originate in India, but in the North of Europe. It seems to us that everything relating to this discovery should have been re-written. Want of space alone restrains us from giving at least a hasty outline of the chapter

on "The Agglutinative and other Languages." It contains a most interesting account of the Ural-Altai or Turanian group, and of the important part played in history by many of the races speaking one or other of its various dialects, as for instance, the Finns and Lapps of the North, the Magyars of Hungary, the Osmanlis of Turkey, the Tatars, the Mantchus, &c., as also the Accadians of primæval Babylon, the inventors of the cuneiform system of writing, the builders of the great cities of the country, the first students of mathematics and astronomy, and, in short, the originators of the culture and civilization handed on to the Semites by whom they were afterwards conquered and dispossessed. The chapters on "Comparative Mythology," and "Comparative Religion" are, in our opinion, deserving of the highest praise. With the concluding remarks on the errors and absurdities of our present system of teaching languages, both ancient and modern, we cordially agree. On the other hand, we are not absolutely convinced of the causative relation which Mr. Sayce perceives between the phonetic spelling of Cymric and the industry and good conduct of the Welsh, as contrasted with the "inadequate" spelling of Irish and Scotch Gaelic, and its bearing upon the Irish and Scotch Gaels. If Mr. Sayce's idea is correct, the true remedy for Ireland would seem to be phonetic spelling.

In "The Folk-lore of Shakspeare"<sup>25</sup> Mr. Dyer has filled a goodly volume with old customs, superstitions, and sayings, which from time to time throw light on an obscure passage of Shakspeare, but to which, more frequently, some passing mention or allusion, real or imagined, by Shakspeare, serves as an introduction. As an instance of the illustration of a passage hitherto obscure, we may adduce (p. 275), under the head of "Folk Medicine," the former use of the word "cisel" for vinegar, which completely elucidates the passage—

"Like a willing patient, I will drink

Potions of cysell, 'gainst my strong infection."—CXI. Sonnet.

And perhaps, though less certainly, the passage where Hamlet says to Laertes,—

"Come, show me what thou'lt do:

Woo't weep? Woo't fight? Woo't fast?

Woo't tear thyself? Woo't drink up eysell?

Eat a crocodile? I'll do 't."—Hamlet, v. 1.

The explanation offered (p. 75) of the somewhat obscure expression, "A sop of the moonshine" ("Lear," ii. 2) is not so satisfactory. To turn a man into a sippet of a recondite and strangely compounded salad is (*pace Douce*) rather far-fetched and improbable, besides being what the French call "furiously" prosaic. The truth is, we think, simpler and not so far to seek. In the North of England a "sop" is still used in the sense of a lump or a patch. Thus a gardener speaks of planting out certain spring flowers in "sops," or little clumps. Detached masses of mist which ascend the mountain sides are called "sops," whence the saying,—

---

<sup>25</sup> "Folk-lore of Shakspeare." By the Rev. T. F. Thiselton Dyer, M.A., Oxford. London: Griffith & Farran, St. Paul's Churchyard.

“What gangs oop i’ sops  
Coomes doon i’ dhrops.”

So, when Kent says to the steward, “Draw, you rogue, for though it be night, yet the moon shines: I’ll make a sop o’ the moonshine of you” (“Lear,” ii. 2), the meaning seems to be, “I’ll make you a part and parcel of the moonshine,” “Turn you into moonshine.” The pleasantest chapter is that on fairies, and certainly the most poetic. The work throughout is carefully and skilfully arranged, and has the advantage of a very complete index.

Every reader of Shakspeare owes a debt of gratitude to Mr. Ashe for having collected and published all the extant criticism of Samuel Taylor Coleridge on Shakspeare and other English Dramatists.<sup>26</sup> It is true that the volume contains little that was not already in print; still to such as are not familiar with “The Literary Remains,” or even the “*Biographia Litteraria*,” and we suspect their number is not small, the greater part of the mass of criticism now for the first time brought together will be entirely new, whilst to many it will be little less than a revelation; for though we have nowadays no lack of commentaries on Shakspeare, many of them characterized by much acuteness and erudition (the latter quality especially abounding), it is with the letter of Shakspeare that our modern commentators mostly deal, whereas Coleridge deals with the spirit. After his, other criticism seems lifeless and mechanical. It was well remarked by an anonymous writer who reported a course of lectures on Shakspeare delivered by Mr. Coleridge at Bristol in 1813, “He seemed to have been admitted into the closet of Shakspeare’s mind, to have shared his secret thoughts, and been familiarized with his most hidden motives.” The Bristol reporter here expresses, as it seems to us, the essential quality of Coleridge’s Shakspeare criticism—that wherein it differs from all others. It is in the analysis of “Hamlet” that this wonderful insight is most completely manifested. Coleridge himself tells us (p. 392), “Hamlet was the play, or rather Hamlet himself was the character, in the intuition and exposition of which I first made my turn for philosophical criticism, and especially for insight into the genius of Shakspeare, noticed.” But if the criticisms on Hamlet are the supreme expression of Coleridge’s genius in philosophic criticism, as Hamlet itself is doubtless the culmination of the dramatic genius of Shakspeare, the criticisms on Lear, on Macbeth, Othello, &c., are but little inferior in interest. The analysis of Hamlet, no doubt, stands out in transcendent perfectness, but the same spirit runs through the whole body of Coleridge’s Shakspeare writings; there is the same sureness of judgment, the same philosophic method, the same reverential admiration for every genuine word of the “myriad-minded man.” The volume contains many valuable notes on some others of our great poets and dramatists—on Chaucer, on Spenser, on Beaumont and Fletcher, whom Coleridge persists in regarding as a literary unity, “one poet with two names, leaving un-

<sup>26</sup> “Lectures and Notes on Shakspeare and other English Poets.” By Samuel Taylor Coleridge. Now first collected by T. Ashe, B.A. George Bell & Sons, York Street, Covent Garden. 1883.

divided what a rare love and rarer congeniality have united" (p. 399), on Jonson, of whom he says, "He, no less than Shakespeare, stands on the summit of his hill, and looks round him as a master, though his be Lattrig and Shakespeare's Skiddaw" (p. 417). The relative heights of Skiddaw and Lattrig are more commonly known now than when those words were penned, still it may not be amiss to explain that Lattrig is a hill at the foot of Skiddaw. We have too in Mr. Ashe's *recueil* all that is extant of Coleridge's remarks on Milton; unhappily some lectures on this subject have been irrecoverably lost. There is besides, scattered throughout the volume, what may almost be called a code of poetical law—only it is uncodified, and must be arranged and classified by the reader himself. Many of the lectures are in a great degree repetitions of preceding ones, and digressions of the most unlooked-for kind beset one like pitfalls; but with all these drawbacks, which were perhaps unavoidable, it is a memorable and delightful volume.

In the collection of "Essays by George Eliot,"<sup>27</sup> which has just been published by Messrs. Blackwood is one on Lecky's "History of Rationalism," which opens with the following passage: "There is a valuable class of books on great subjects which have something of the character and functions of good popular lecturing. They are not original, not subtle, not of close logical texture, not exquisite either in thought or style; but by virtue of these negatives they are all the more fit to act on the average intelligence." Now cut out the negatives, and you have the exact description of the essays of George Eliot; they are original, subtle, of close logical texture, exquisite in thought and style, but, by reason of their rare excellence, they are, perhaps, all the less fit to "act on the average intelligence." They are exhaustive in their treatment, whereas the "general reader" likes to skim the surface of many subjects, without sounding the depths of any. Again, their "close logical texture" makes them hard of digestion to many readers; there is no froth, no empty words; every sentence, and indeed each word in it, has a predetermined purpose, and subserves the general design which would be impaired or altered by any substitution or omission. And then the thoughts are often subtle and highly complex, and, though expressed with a mastery over words which is in itself genius, they demand for their full comprehension a power of attention and an amount of practised intelligence which not every reader has at command. But above all, the opinions advocated, without being narrow or unduly trenchant, are perfectly well-defined; and definite opinions are "caviare to the general," more so even nowadays than when George Eliot wrote in 1865, "His (the general reader's) only bigotry is a bigotry against any clearly defined opinion; not in the least based on a scientific scepticism, but belonging to a lack of coherent thought—a spongy texture of mind that gravitates strongly to nothing. The one thing he is staunch for is the utmost liberty of private haziness." The consequence that we deduce from all this is that the volume of essays which has just been brought

<sup>27</sup> "Essays and Leaves from a Note Book." By George Eliot. Edinburgh and London: Blackwood & Sons. 1884.

out by Mr. Lewis may very probably not be greeted with the widespread and unqualified admiration which it assuredly merits, nor attain that pitch of popularity which is reserved for writers whose thoughts are more highly diluted and more undefined. The volume consists of four essays from the WESTMINSTER REVIEW from 1855 to 1857; one from the *Fortnightly Review*, 1865; "Three Months in Weimar," from *Fraser's Magazine*, 1855; and the "Address to Working Men by Felix Holt," from *Blackwood's Magazine*, 1868; all of which were carefully revised for the press by the author within a few years of her death. To these Mr. Lewis has added, under the title "Leaves from a Notebook," some notes by George Eliot which belong to a much later period than the essays.

In the late Mr. Dutton Cook's "On the Stage"<sup>28</sup> an attractive subject is rendered doubly agreeable and entertaining by the admirable manner in which it is treated. The book is a perfect mine of interesting and varied information on theatrical topics, while on all disputed points the author's opinions are expressed without dogmatism, yet with the air of one who speaks from the fulness of knowledge. Indeed, in the perusal of these charming volumes our pleasure has but one drawback—that we can never receive another work from the same hand.

In giving to the English public his "Readings in Rabelais"<sup>29</sup> Mr. Besant tells us that his aim is not to make "Rabelais" popular, which he seems to regard as hopeless, but "that Rabelais should be recognized, and that people who ought to know better should leave off talking nonsense about him . . . that the wisest and kindest of Frenchmen should at length cease to be regarded and spoken of as a buffoon with a foul mouth and mind." Towards the fulfilment of this modest and reasonable wish the selection laid before us by Mr. Besant may fairly be expected to be instrumental. For our own part we desire nothing better than to see Rabelais "recognised" and even rehabilitated so far as is possible. We have the tenderest and most friendly indulgence for him, were it for nothing else than the esteem and admiration in which he seems to have been held by Sterne, and the evident impress of his spirit and manner traceable in "Tristram Shandy." But besides this, every lover of French literature must be interested on wider grounds in Rabelais, as the founder and inspirer of a comic vein which is almost exclusively French. How many of the ordinary stock jokes and pithy sayings that have become proverbial originated with Rabelais. Still, when we read Mr. Besant's exposition of Rabelais' opinions and sentiments, we cannot associate these edifying and enlightened, but essentially modern, views with Rabelais in whom they existed only in the germ, but with Mr. Besant himself, of whose writings they form the moral keynote.

"Such tricks hath strong imagination."

<sup>28</sup> "On the Stage: Studies of Theatrical History and the Actor's Art." By Dutton Cook. Two Vols. London: Sampson Low, 188, Fleet Street, 1883.

<sup>29</sup> "Readings in Rabelais." By Walter Besant. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood & Sons. 1883.



Our old friend "The Vicar of Wakefield"<sup>20</sup> comes to us "immortal and unchanged," except that fine type and paper and a parchment binding have done all they can to embellish the delightful old story. Mr. Austin Dobson has added a preface and some very good notes, and there is an extremely pretty frontispiece by Caldicott which seems exactly to represent the simple family. But there are two things essential to a book: first, that it shall open well, and secondly, that it shall shut. Unfortunately the pretty volumes of the Parchment Library will do neither. If we are to return to this old-world binding we shall also have to return to the clasps.

"Klytia: a Story of Heidelberg Castle,"<sup>21</sup> from the German of Mr. G. Taylor, is a work of considerable power. The story opens in 1570 and the picture it presents to us of the state of Germany three centuries ago is not calculated to inspire regret for the departure of the "good old times." We see a society torn and distracted by religious dissensions; freedom of speech and of action alike denied; property, personal liberty, and even life itself, at the mercy of spies in the employ of one or other of the contending sects, each of whom, whether Catholic, Lutheran, or Calvinist, strives for supremacy by the same base and unscrupulous means, and is sunk in the same slough of ignorance, fanaticism, and cruelty. Yet even here, for systematically organized rascality, the palm must be awarded to the *Pères Jésuites*, who play off the rival sects one against another, making capital out of the evil passions of each, to obtain the mastery over all. The story woven by Mr. Taylor from these repulsive materials is both interesting and pathetic; we will not do it the injustice of giving its leading incidents *en résumé*: indeed, such abridgments are, to our mind, hardly more amusing reading than inventories. We will content ourselves with quoting the moral propounded in the last chapter by one of the principal characters. He says: "The Spirit exists not outwardly in dogma and cultus, but only in the life. . . . We know more certainly the right that should be done than the right that should be taught. Therefore true belief is this, that you do the will of God, not that you revolve principles of dogma, concerning things invisible which are not of man but of God." We have heard somewhat similar sentiments pithily summed up in the saying: "La seule religion qui vaille est celle d'être honnête homme."

Mr. Besant's "All in a Garden Fair"<sup>22</sup> is a charming novel, but why it received its title is more than we can guess. A more appropriate name for it would be "The Forest of Hainault," for in that *terra incognita* of which Mr. Besant is the Columbus, all the most dramatic scenes of his story are laid. The book has many kinds of merit; there

<sup>20</sup> "The Vicar of Wakefield." By Oliver Goldsmith. With a Preface and Notes by Austin Dobson. Parchment Library. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1888.

<sup>21</sup> "Klytia: a Story of Heidelberg Castle." By George Taylor. From the German by Sutton Fraser Corkran. Two vols. Leipzig: Bernhard Tauchnitz. London: Sampson Low. 1883.

<sup>22</sup> "All in a Garden Fair. The Simple Story of Three Boys and a Girl." By Walter Besant. Three vols. Chatto & Windus, Piccadilly. 1883.]

is the charm of Mr. Besant's style—that gay, bantering way of narrating, which cannot be called satirical, for it has none of the bitterness of satire. Thackeray's fun had always the sting which made it satire. Mr. Besant's is good-humoured mockery; bright, *spirituel* "chaff" (if we may be allowed the word). Whatever it is, it is of the very finest quality, and gives great gaiety to his books. Another excellence is the portrayal, grouping, and contrasting of the characters. In this respect it seems to us that there is finer work in "All in a Garden Fair" than in any of Mr. Besant's previous works. "All Sorts and Conditions of Men" was more striking, but it was coarser; the lights and shadows were more violently accentuated; in short, compared with his present novel, it was in some degree what scene-painting is to landscape-painting. In both works the leading motive, the pervading spirit, is the same—love of mankind and yearning to ameliorate the hapless lot of the majority. To what precise and practical issue Mr. Besant's philanthropic aspirations point it is hard to say, but it is easy enough to see that it is not in legislation that he trusts. He clearly recognizes that Acts of Parliament cannot work the blessed change which, like most things worth having, must be wrought out by each man for himself. More sane and wholesome teaching than Mr. Besant's is not to be found in the whole realm of fiction.

"The Foreigners,"<sup>33</sup> by Eleanor C. Price, is certainly above the average run of novels. The first volume is especially bright and attractive; the scene is laid in France, and nothing could be better done than the descriptions both of the country and the people. The knowledge displayed is not that of the mere tourist, often enough possessed by English writers, but an intimate acquaintance with the life and manners of that most exclusive of castes—the French provincial noblesse. Nothing but long residence, and unusual opportunities of observation, could have furnished materials for a picture at once so truthful and so spirited. The story turns upon the contrast which exists between the French method of arranging marriages, and the English plan of letting them as much as possible arrange themselves. The *dénouement* is unexpectedly and, as it seems, needlessly sad; but, perhaps after all a happier ending would have been less artistic. Be that as it may, "The Foreigners" is pleasant reading, and contains much clever and discriminating delineation of character, both French and English.

If the same qualities which serve to turn out a smart newspaper article sufficed for writing a good novel, "Gladys Fane"<sup>34</sup> would merit higher praise than, as it is, can fairly be accorded to it. Mr. Wemyss Reid possesses in no small degree the art of expanding into a page or two of more or less agreeable and readable "copy" what might easily be expressed in a few lines. He has, too, that preternaturally well-informed and widely-travelled manner which so well becomes the Special Correspondent; but unhappily something more than all this—

<sup>33</sup> "The Foreigners." A Novel. By Eleanor C. Price. Three vols. Chatto & Windus, Piccadilly. 1833.

<sup>34</sup> "Gladys Fane. A Story of Two Lives." By T. Wemyss Reid. Two vols. London: T. Fisher Unwin, Paternoster Square.

something, in fact, altogether different from this—is necessary to make a successful novelist. We by no means wish to imply that “Gladys Fane” is a failure; it is very readable, and to some extent interesting, but though it has but two volumes it is still too long, and might with advantage have been compressed into one. The truth is that Mr. Reid has a gift of words—a *facon de*, as the French call it—which is a snare to him as a novelist, though it might stand him in good stead as a journalist. To give but one instance. At page 181, vol. i., the not very new or startling remark, that the reckless gossip of “Society papers” sometimes does incalculable mischief, is enlarged into a neat little article on the history of explosives, beginning with the inevitable “villanous saltpetre,” coming “down the ringing grooves of change” to dynamite, &c., and thence, by an easy and obvious transition, to the subject in hand.

Among the most hungry readers of fiction we should say that there will probably be none to praise yet very few to blame Miss Eleanor Holmes's novel, “In Time to Come.”<sup>35</sup> Where there are a hundred better stories, there are certainly a hundred worse. It is fairly well written, and is not without some originality. Although we do not sympathize with the author as regards her pet character, the French dressmaker, we are ready to give unqualified praise to the very pleasant creation of what we must call her second heroine—“the plain girl with the shrewish tongue”—in whom the chief if not the only interest of the story centres.

Mrs. Lynn Linton ranks deservedly high among contemporary English novelists. Her work<sup>36</sup> is at all times characterized by more than average power and vigour, and her opinions, always boldly expressed, bear the stamp of independent thought. Perhaps her peculiar excellences were never so admirably displayed as in “Joshua Davidson;” yet “Lizzie Lorton,” in altogether a different manner, was hardly inferior in merit. None of Mrs. Lynn Linton's stories can be said to be cheerful or exhilarating reading, their prevailing atmosphere is for the most part painful, lurid, and threatening; life is taken by the tragic side even when the *dénouement* is not tragic. Then, too, the characters she loves to paint are for the most part not types of ordinary humanity, but exceptions—what are called on the stage “character parts.” In the two works we have cited as her *chef-d'œuvre*, these blemishes are less perceptible. In “Joshua Davidson,” because it is an allegory rather than a story, and, from the nature of the case, the atmosphere could not be too deeply charged with sorrow; nor could the hero of that solemn and fateful story be other than an exception from the ordinary types of humanity. In “Lizzie Lorton,” though the catastrophe is tragic, the general tone is far less sad than in most of Mrs. Linton's creations, and though some of the most prominent figures may to many readers seem eccentric, they are in reality profoundly typical of a very interesting race, the Dalesfolk of

<sup>35</sup> “In Time to Come.” A Novel. By Eleanor Holmes. Two vols. Marcus Ward & Co., Chandos Street and Belfast and New York.

<sup>36</sup> “Ione.” By Mrs. Lynn Linton. Three vols. Chatto & Windus, Piccadilly. 1883.

Cumberland and Westmoreland, of whom this is by far the most vivid and accurate presentment in English fiction. In "Ione," the immediate subject of this notice, we find all the peculiarities of Mrs. Linton's manner more accentuated than heretofore, and what we have ventured to characterize as faults more strongly marked. The atmosphere of the book is to the last degree painful and dreary, and the leading characters, if not unnatural, are, to say the least, entirely exceptional. The hero is so weak as to be an object of pity rather than of sympathy; and the heroine, Ione, is so evil and violent in disposition that one wonders that even her strange and baleful beauty could have rendered her attractive. The incidents from first to last are hopelessly disastrous and culminate in the murder of the feeble and helpless hero by Ione who, in a fit of jealous rage, smashes his skull with a heavy glass dessert dish! No doubt the story is powerfully told; it is *saisissant*, but it altogether lacks charm and pleasantness.

After a careful perusal of "A Hero's Last Days, or Nepenthe"<sup>37</sup>—the distinguishing features of which are the lengthy conversations between an old Confederate cavalry officer and his young kinsman—one is apt to exclaim, *cui bono*? Both take an equally high and patriotic standpoint. The old blind hero regards his country, "the Carolina of the past," as lying dead—hopeless of resurrection—blotted out of existence; while the younger man, full of fervour and enthusiasm, insists that with hope and faith and patience the Southern States will rise once more to their proper place among the nations. Both men are strongly imbued with Christian dogma, and their arguments can therefore only be understood on that ground. We accede all praise to the manner in which their discussions are set forth. They are interesting if not convincing, and many well-chosen extracts from Milton, Coleridge, Wordsworth, and Tennyson, help to adorn the little work. The second name "Nepenthe" refers to the slight love romance which is rather touched-in than told and which, while not obliterating in the mind of the young man the sad memories of the past, brings to him, in Spenser's words, "sweet peace and quietage."

It is pleasant to open a book with the assurance that we shall like what the author says and his manner of saying it. Such agreeable anticipations are always evoked by seeing on the cover the name of John Burroughs: it calls to mind "Winter Sunshine" and similar charming volumes, and one opens the book with confident alacrity. In "Locusts and Wild Honey"<sup>38</sup> Mr. Burroughs has fully realized the expectations raised by his previous performances. It is delightful reading from the first page to the last. Whether he discourses on strawberry-picking, on *la pluie et le beau temps*, on bird-nesting, or on trout-fishing, he invests them all with the same charm—the charm of his own thoughtful, simple, and subtly whimsical personality.

Mr. David Douglas has also added to his charming pocket edition

<sup>37</sup> "A Hero's Last Days, or Nepenthe." By the Author of "A Sequence of Songs." W. J. Duffie, Columbia, So. Ca.; and Trübner & Co., London. 1883.

<sup>38</sup> "Locusts and Wild Honey." By John Burroughs. Edinburgh: David Douglas. 1884.

of American authors "The Poet at the Breakfast Table,"<sup>39</sup> thus completing Mr. Oliver Wendell Holmes's Breakfast Table Series. The conversations in the volumes before us or, to speak more accurately, the monologues, are of much the same style and texture as those which delighted so many readers in the "Autocrat" and the "Professor," and will doubtless become equally popular.

"Dr. Heidenhoff's Process"<sup>40</sup> is the embodiment in narrative of an idea which seems to have taken a profound hold on the author's mind—viz., that to one who truly and deeply repents of any grave offence, forgiveness, whether human or divine, is of no avail, brings no relief because, though forgiven by others, the repentant offender cannot forgive himself; the deeper the repentance, the more impossible is self-pardon. Consequently, argues Mr. Bellamy, the measure of punishment is in inverse proportion to the degree of guilt, falling most heavily on those who are most purified and regenerated by penitence and contrition. But the punishment is not only unjust but injurious to its recipient, the one bar to his restoration to the self-respect and serenity which are essential to usefulness in the world being the shameful and degrading memory of past misdeeds. The only availing remedy is not forgiveness but oblivion. If the repentant man could forget that he had ever needed to repent, *faute table rase* and start afresh, all, in Mr. Bellamy's opinion, would be well. The outcome of these ideas is the fabled "Process" of Dr. Heidenhoff which by an application of electricity destroys those portions of the brain-tissue which have become morbid from the prolonged action of painful memories. It is needless to say anything of the story which, except inasmuch as it is the vehicle of the foregoing ideas, is much like many others; the ideas themselves are perhaps worth noticing, as though crude and under some aspects obviously fallacious, they are an advance in ethics on the usually accepted doctrine that pardon wipes out sin.

None but an American could have conceived so daring a plot as that of "Beatrice Randolph,"<sup>41</sup> or, having conceived it, could have carried it out so triumphantly as has Mr. Julian Hawthorne, who, though the mantle of his father may not have descended upon him, has deservedly won a high place among the novelists. A speculating Jew impresario has built a grand new theatre at New York, and has engaged the services of a Russian Diva of world-wide celebrity, whom he expects to take the city by storm. At the eleventh hour she breaks her contract and leaves him in the lurch. So far all is perfectly natural and matter of fact; not so what follows. An American young lady, possessing a magnificent voice and great personal charms but a mere amateur, who has never sung on any stage or even at a concert, consents to personate the missing prima donna and is crowned with

<sup>39</sup> "The Poet at the Breakfast Table." By Oliver Wendell Holmes. Two vols. Edinburgh: David Douglas. 1884.

<sup>40</sup> "Dr. Heidenhoff's Process." By Edward Bellamy. One vol. Edinburgh: David Douglas. 1884.

<sup>41</sup> "Beatrice Randolph." A Novel. By Julian Hawthorne. Two vols. Chatto & Windus, Piccadilly. 1884.

the most entire and rapturous success. In real life this is no doubt impossible and in fiction it is only admissible when carried out, as in the present instance, with such boldness and skill that the reader is too much amused and interested to think of the improbability of the story.

Mr. Louis Jennings's "Millionaire"<sup>42</sup> comes to us with all the *prestige* of having been first published in *Blackwood's Magazine*. We cannot help thinking however that some of the monthly instalments must have been a trifle dull. The plot is by no means bad though somewhat inartistically conducted. But all the best of the story—certainly all the interest of it—is squeezed into the third volume; the first and second being chiefly taken up with a phantasmagoric jumble of American speculations, English politics, cabinet ministers, and journalists, which has hardly any bearing on the story, and is by no means so well done as to excuse its irrelevancy.

If the second and third volumes of "Agnes Moran"<sup>43</sup> had been equal to the first, we should have had to announce that rare event—the appearance of a novel really *hors ligne*. The story is divided into "Books." Book I., which treats of the childhood of the *dramatis personæ*, is quite admirable; intensely real, full of shrewd insight, and of keen and delicate observation. The second book, in which the history of the same group of persons is continued or, rather, resumed after an interval of fourteen years, is hardly if at all inferior. It is from the moment when the hero contracts a marriage which too closely resembles, on his part, a bargain—an event which occurs towards the close of the third book and of the second volume—that both the tale and its hero begin to show sensible deterioration. In the case of the hero the process is rapid and complete, so much so that early in the third volume he loses all interest for the reader, and becomes a distasteful object, whose tragic end in the last chapter excites neither regret nor commiseration. As regards the story, the falling off is not so complete; it simply descends to the level of average three-volume novels, and thenceforth holds "the even tenor of its way" in unbroken mediocrity.

In "Tay,"<sup>44</sup> by the Rev. W. O. Peile, we have an unusually excellent novel, well written and entertaining from first to last. Written in the first person, it bears a semblance of truth which is intensified by the vivid description of those awful days of 1857 during the siege of Lucknow. The life of the sufferers in the residency is simply and charmingly narrated. We have seldom read a story in which the grave and the gay are so well and evenly balanced and which is so totally devoid of effort or affectation of any kind.

The "Jewel in the Lotus"<sup>45</sup> is a graceful picture of Italian life but,

<sup>42</sup> "The Millionaire." By Louis J. Jennings. Three vols. Edinburgh and London: Blackwood & Sons. 1884.

<sup>43</sup> "Agnes Moran. A Story of Innocence and Experience." By Thomas A. Pinkerton. Three vols. London: W. H. Allen & Co., Waterloo Place, Pall Mall. 1883.

<sup>44</sup> "Tay. A Novel." By the Rev. W. O. Peile. One vol. Allen & Co., Waterloo Place, Pall Mall. 1883.

<sup>45</sup> "The Jewel in the Lotus. A Novel." By Mary Agnes Tincker. One vol. Allen & Co., Waterloo Place, Pall Mall. 1884.

as the name denotes, it is too vague to give much pleasure in the reading. The author is evidently imbued with the poetry of her surroundings, but her strivings after poetic inspirations are forced and often obscure. Poetry itself she says, is "the honey of all the fields, and when at its best is religion at its best." We do not think either the one or the other "at its best" in the "Jewel in the Lotus." The author possesses, as is not uncommon with ladies of cultivation, more poetic taste than faculty.

Notwithstanding the well-known assimilative qualities of the general novel-reader, Mr. G. MacDonald has given in "Donal Grant"<sup>46</sup> a story which will test these powers to the utmost. There is a certain attractiveness in the broad Scottish dialect in which a great part of the book is written, but the wild extravagance, the weird improbabilities, the "awsome" details too often bordering on the absurd, and above and beyond all, the extraordinary creed which pervades this "thrilling romance," are all mixed up together and form an unusual and, we must add, a most unwholesome compound.

The too "oft-told tale," where a heroine with a patriotic craze is willing to sacrifice herself and her lovers to the fancied wrongs of some petty state, finds expression once again in Mr. Justin McCarthy's "Maid of Athens."<sup>47</sup> We cannot say much for the plot which is confused and unsatisfactory, but several of the actors are life-like, and some of the incidents are effective, though there is too much discursiveness and repetition in the manner of their narration.

Taking for her theme "Colston's Days,"<sup>48</sup> Mrs. Marshall has produced a beautiful and tender story which, if not true, is at any rate *ben trovato* and will, no doubt, draw tears from many youthful readers. The description of old Bristol in the troublous time of the Rebellion is admirably done, and both the spirit and the letter of the period are strictly adhered to. The figure of Edward Colston, the great philanthropist is, no doubt, faithfully represented in these pages. That the work of his hands has prospered is proved at the present day by the reverent care given to the Colston schools, and the yearly celebration held at Bristol in his memory. The book is embellished by several delicate etchings of the old buildings of the city.

Among a thoughtful few of the young readers to whom it is addressed, the story called "Latimer's Candle,"<sup>49</sup> by Frances E. Cooke, will be welcomed as a short and easy way of getting at the truth about the noble group of martyrs whose lives from youth to age, even at this distance of time, must excite our most reverent admiration. Perhaps the life of Latimer was the best and purest, because

<sup>46</sup> "Donal Grant." By George MacDonald, LL.D. Three vols. Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., Paternoster Square. 1883.

<sup>47</sup> "Maid of Athens." By Justin McCarthy, M.P. Three vols. Chatto & Windus, Piccadilly. 1883.

<sup>48</sup> "In Colston's Days. A Story of Old Bristol." By Emma Marshall. London: Seeley, Jackson & Halliday, Fleet Street.

<sup>49</sup> "Latimer's Candle. The Story of a Great Life." By Frances E. Cooke. W. Swan Sonnenschein & Co., Paternoster Row. 1883.

the freest from ambition, among them all. His courageous acts and fearless death are the key to his prophetic words when led to the stake: "We shall light this day, by God's grace, such a candle in England as I trust shall never be put out."

We hardly know what to say of Mr. Howard Pyle's "Merry Adventures of Robin Hood,"<sup>50</sup> nor how to classify it. It is not apparently one of the boys' books, so many of which are produced nowadays, nor is it a critical historical study. However, without further attempt at classification, we will say that we have read it with considerable pleasure. We do not assert that Robin Hood and his band derive from Mr. Pyle's treatment the same romantic glamour with which they are invested in "Ivanhoe;" we even take leave to suggest to Mr. Pyle that it is possible to overdo such adjectives as "gentle," "fair," "merry," &c.; nevertheless Mr. Howard Pyle's Robin Hood is an honest, manly, sympathetic personage; the adventures are generally entertaining, and there is a pleasant out-door atmosphere about the book. The songs and ballads with which it is interspersed deserve especial mention; they are skilful imitations of ancient ballads, and have, besides, considerable independent merit.

"The Wigwam and the War-path"<sup>51</sup> is a capital book for boys. The tales—authentic narratives of American frontier adventure—are well chosen and told in simple straightforward language, with few comments or reflections, but those few always sensible and to the point.

We have received Parts III., IV., and V. of the Rev. James Stormonth's English Dictionary,<sup>52</sup> which confirm and strengthen the favourable opinion of the work expressed in our last issue. The "grouping" arrangement is excellent and the Dictionary when complete will fulfil the conditions so difficult to unite—accuracy and trustworthiness as a book of reference, within a reasonable and convenient compass.

We have much pleasure in announcing that "Le Livre," hitherto published only in Paris by M. Quantin, is now published also in London, by Mr. Fisher Unwin. "Le Livre"<sup>53</sup> is a purely literary review devoted exclusively to bibliography. The editor is M. Octave Uzanne. The first part is headed "Bibliographie Ancienne;" the second, "Bibliographie Moderne." The former, which is printed in large and beautifully clear type on extra thick paper, consists usually of not more than four or five articles, all signed with well-known names. The February number, among other articles of great ability, contains an interesting paper by M. Chantelauze, on a letter which he has discovered, purporting to have been written by Jean Jacques Rousseau to a Lady Cecile Hobart, and which is pronounced by experts to be probably authentic. Another still more interesting contribution is "Les Etapes

<sup>50</sup> "The Merry Adventures of Robin Hood." By Howard Pyle. Sampson Low & Co., Fleet Street. 1883.

<sup>51</sup> "The Wigwam and the War Path; or, Tales of the Red Indians." By Ascott R. Hope. London: Blackie & Sons, Old Bailey. 1884.

<sup>52</sup> "A Dictionary of the English Language." By the Rev. J. Stormonth. Parts iii. iv. and v. Edinburgh and London: Blackwood & Sons.

<sup>53</sup> "Le Livre, Revue du Monde Littéraire." Paris: A. Quantin, Imprimeur Editeur. Octave Uzanne, Rédacteur en Chef, Rue Saint Benoît, 7.



de la Revue des deux Mondes," by M. Adolphe Racot. In it we follow the world-famed "Revue" from its foundation in 1831 by *Buloz père*, when it occupied a modest *entresol* in the *Rue des Beaux Arts*, to its recent installation under M. Charles Buloz (*Buloz fils*) at the magnificent *Hotel Beauharnais, rue de l'Université*. The second part of "Le Livre," printed on thinner paper, slightly tinted, opens with a charming *causerie anecdotique* by the editor, M. Uzanne—the first time since the establishment of the review that he has contributed to it otherwise than in his editorial capacity: "Ne me montrant nulle part," as he wittily puts it, "afin de me trouver plus sûrement partout." Next comes "Le mouvement Littéraire—chronique du mois," by M. E. Drumont; followed by the "Correspondances Etrangères," which in the February number are limited to German literature. Then we come to one of the most valuable features of the review—the "Critique littéraire du mois," which is divided into sections on much the same plan as in THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW, and contains some admirable criticisms. Another most useful division of "Le Livre" is the "Gazette Bibliographique," which gives all sorts of book news and literary gossip, not only relating to France but to the whole of Europe. We must not fail to mention that "Le Livre" has some most graceful vignettes and initial letters, and that each number we have seen has contained one or two finely executed full-page etchings.

---

## INDIA AND OUR COLONIAL EMPIRE.

---

**I**NDIA.—The practical annexation of Merv by Russia seems once more to remind England that the Central Asian question is gradually advancing from the middle distance of conjectures, doubts and fears, into the foreground of closely impending actualities. The debate in the House of Lords has, in a measure, given expression to the public anxiety which this fresh forward move of Russia has occasioned, though the feeling can in no way be allayed until we are made aware of the Government measures hinted at by Lord Kimberley, and are satisfied of their sufficiency. In one respect the debate was fruitful. The Duke of Argyll's eloquent speech, couched in that sonorous tone of lofty earnestness which so often characterizes his more important utterances, tended to raise the discussion from the petty level of party recrimination, which Lord Lytton's able but somewhat petulant remarks had first established. And the Duke, who, as he himself reminded his hearers, was one of the few surviving members of the Cabinet which had fought Russia, and so could hardly be regarded as a Russophil, was careful to record his distinct opinion that in no single instance had Russia's advances in Central Asia been at variance with her promises and engagements. This is a significant statement, over which glib but loosely informed leader-writers would do well to ponder. And it is no doubt due to this important fact that the English press at large have contemplated the annexation of Merv with more calmness than might have been expected.

The main facts of the present position may be shortly set forth. Merv is an oasis surrounded, not exactly on *all* sides (as the Duke of Argyll remarked), but, say on three sides, by a desert which for practical strategic purposes may be taken as impassable. On the south Merv is connected by an easy route with northern Afghanistan, from the boundary of which it is distant about a hundred miles. The population of Merv is fixed by the best authorities at about a quarter of a million, a far larger number, it may be remarked, than the figure mentioned by the Duke of Argyll in his speech, though it is possible that when he spoke of only ten thousand, he may have meant to indicate the number of fighting men which the oasis could turn out. Even then the estimate would be a good deal below the mark, Colonel Stewart having placed this total at between fifty and sixty thousand.

It must be remembered that the strategic importance with which Merv has been generally credited, was first attributed to it at a time when the Central Asian question presented an altogether different aspect from that which it does now. A dozen years ago Russia's advance was from the side of Khokand and Bokhara, and Merv was a *tête-de-pont*, the first defensible outwork on the road to Herat and Western Afghanistan after the transit of the formidable intervening desert had been accomplished. Had Russia since occupied herself in perfecting her communications between Merv and Tashkend, the annexation of the former place would have surmounted the most important physical obstacle in the way of her descent upon Afghan territory. But with the construction of the Trans-Caspian Railway the aspect of the whole question has been changed. Tiflis in the Caucasus, instead of Tashkend in Central Asia, becomes the base, and Merv is actually out of the way of the Russian advance. It is this change in the development of the question which was not clearly recognized in the Lords debate, though the Duke of Argyll laid stress on its corollary, that any future hostile move would probably be made in that direction, and have to be made with the acquiescence if not with the active support of Persia. Herein lies the real key to the Central Asian problem. It is Persia and not Afghanistan which is destined to play the really weighty part in the game. Afghanistan is recognized as wholly within the sphere of British and beyond the scope of Russian influence. Persia is in a different position, and supposed to be equally amenable to both nations. Russia has already annexed a large extent of territory abutting on northern Persia and Afghanistan. She is unable however to do much harm to the latter country except with the active co-operation of the former. But if she makes full use of her present position and advantages, her influence in both countries cannot but be sensibly increased, and we may possibly find ourselves hereafter in the position of endeavouring to expel her from territory which is nominally responsible to us, but wherein her footing is in reality more powerful than ours.

And this brings us to a vital point in the consideration of the matter—*i.e.*, our agency in dealing with Persia. A Russian advance would be a menace to India; but Persia, through whom that advance can alone be formidable, is under the Foreign Office and not under the Indian Government. It has often been urged, not without reason, that our Minister at Teheran should be responsible to Calcutta rather than Downing Street; but the argument derives especial force at the present juncture when the danger of Russian aggression, if it do exist, is one which the Indian Foreign Office could far better realize, and so avert, than the distant Department at Whitehall which is, so to

speak, not directly concerned. Add to this the fact that an Asiatic power like Persia would be better understood and handled by a Department accustomed to deal with Orientals than one whose diplomatic experience lies chiefly with Europe, and we may see the necessity for creating a recognized agency in Western Afghanistan, responsible to Simla but co-operating with Teheran in the task of enlarging British influence in that quarter. The demarcation of the northern frontier of Afghanistan, a measure pressed upon the Government by authoritative exponents of Indian feeling, and half hinted at in Lord Kimberley's speech, may form a convenient base for starting such an agency, and we trust it will.

Opportunity has been taken of the quiet which has prevailed in Beluchistan since the termination of the Afghan hostilities to despatch an important expedition under Sir Robert Sandeman to visit Kharan, Panjgur, and Kej, where long-standing frontier quarrels had for years been waiting for settlement. The Sirdar Azad Khan, the chief of Kharan, is now very old and feeble, but as a proof of his great bodily strength, when a young man, it is stated that he could take one of his tribesmen's shields and tear it in two like a piece of paper, and rub out with his fingers the letters impressed on a Cabuli rupee. Occupying as he does an isolated oasis in the middle of the Beluch desert, he has long resented the claims to exercise supremacy over him put forth by the Khan of Khelat. Through the tact of Sir R. Sandeman, this and some minor differences have been happily composed, and the general result of his mission has been to strengthen the bonds between these semi-independent chiefs and the British Government, and to follow out the policy of Lord Northbrook of making a strong bulwark of our empire out of the somewhat heterogeneous elements which go to make up the region extending from Khelat to the sea.

Among the principal events which have occurred in India proper during the past quarter, the Budget naturally claims foremost notice. Notwithstanding the difficulties which Sir Auckland Colvin, the Finance Minister, has had to encounter in assuming charge of the finances at a time when half the year had expired, and in having to face a serious deficiency in the opium crop, a surplus of £319,300 is exhibited, which gives ground for great satisfaction, indicating as it does a far larger probable surplus on the realized accounts. The Indian financial review, it will be remembered, includes within its scope a survey of the accounts of three complete years, which may be shortly described as the past, the present, and the future years. The surplus mentioned above refers to the financial year 1884-85, on which we have already entered, and which is the last of the three. As far as the accounts of the other years are concerned, there is also ground for

satisfaction. The surplus on the completed accounts of 1882-83 turns out to be £706,633 instead of £285,000 as originally anticipated, and in the revised estimates for 1883-84 there is still a surplus of £271,500, though owing to loss by exchange and payment of arrears to the Imperial Government on account of non-effective charges connected with Her Majesty's forces in India, this is far less than what would have been realized had not these unforeseen demands arisen. Without entering into detailed statistics, it may be noted that the consumption of salt during the year 1883 increased 10 per cent. as compared with the figures for the previous year—a result which indicates not only increased consumption of an essential and vital article of food, but also a large access of revenue, and that the exports of wheat during 1883-84 bid fair to *double* the exceptionally large figures attained in the year 1882-83. This last fact is one of the highest moment, both to England and India, in proving that the latter country is gradually taking the place of the United States in supplying the wants of the home market. We hope to revert to the subject of wheat production, its carriage and export when fuller figures are available.

The important subject of the promotion of Indian art, with which Sir G. Birdwood's name has been chiefly associated, has of late years occupied the closer attention of the Government. In March 1883, the Government invited the opinions of the local administrations on a draft scheme for the better organization of museums, with a view to the promotion of the trade and artistic industries of the country. At the same time, a committee representing the provincial authorities and the schools of art was convened in Calcutta, to meet during the progress of the Exhibition, and the proceedings of this committee have recently been under the consideration of the Government. As to commercial products, the proposal that a complete collection should be maintained in the three presidential capitals, Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay, appears to have met with general approval, and the complete collection made for the Exhibition will now be permanently placed in Calcutta, while a descriptive dictionary, written by Dr. George Watt, will serve as a guide in the organization of future collections.

But as regards artistic industries indigenous to the country, the committee have foreseen obstacles in the way of the adoption of the proposals formulated—viz., that an art committee should be formed in every locality where an art industry exists, and a committee in connection with the provincial museum and school of art in every province. These committees were to endeavour to guide and aid the workmen, by means of schools, standard designs, and exhibitions; the local museum was to be the repository of the best types of the art o

the locality, and duplicates were to be deposited in the provincial museum. The committee have decided to omit from the scheme the duties of the local committees, but they agree that each province should contain a museum in which every industrial art of the province should be worthily represented, and that the best examples of oriental designs and processes should be stored up. The publication of an art journal was another proposal which met with their cordial approval, and a specimen number, containing an article on the brass and copper work of the Punjab, was considered so satisfactory that they recommended its being experimentally continued by Government as a quarterly periodical, if funds should be available. The officers in charge of the provincial museums are to travel far and wide, and visit local manufactories and workshops, select specimens, discover the best workmen, and arrange for future communication with them. This is a most important proviso; in fact, it may be said to form the soul of the scheme, and if competent and energetic men are employed on these duties, there can be little doubt that the measure will greatly help to develop the artistic industries of the country.

The installation, in February last, of the young Nizam, the ruler of the native State of Hyderabad, with full powers of administration, was an imposing and brilliant ceremony. The Viceroy, the Governor of Madras, and numerous high officials were present, and in an impressive and eloquent speech Lord Ripon congratulated the Nizam on his assumption of rule, and exhorted him to administer justice with integrity, and cultivate the strictest regard for economy. An address from the Mahomedan community afforded opportunity to the Viceroy to exhort them to do their utmost to promote education among their co-religionists on a basis suitable to their faith and social feelings.

Among the most pressing Indian questions of the hour is that of railways. It has for some time been felt that the rate of construction of railways in India is far below what the wealth and development of the country demand. The late Famine Commission in their exhaustive and extensive report recommended specially the increased construction of railways, and from their point of view they were mainly concerned with the negative and somewhat restricted object of preventing famine and its direful consequences. They looked forward to the construction of an additional 10,000 miles of railway (9,000 miles being at that time already completed) in the course of twenty-five years, at a cost of some sixty millions sterling. But this rate of progress was and is generally felt to be far below what is requisite for the due development of the national resources of an important empire like India.

Cheap inland transit is the chief thing which India needs to enable her to compete with the markets of America, England, and of the whole world. As the case stands at present, the whole Indian railway system is just equal in mileage to that of the single State of Illinois, where the population is not much more than a hundredth part of that of India. The two principal Chambers of Commerce in India, those at Bombay and Calcutta, have been at pains to lay their views before the Government. The former urge that railway extension should be prosecuted at the rate of 2,000 or 3,000 miles annually for the next ten years, at a cost of twenty millions sterling per annum, the money to be raised by starting loans in London at a guaranteed interest of  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. in perpetuity. The Bengal Chamber of Commerce, though they have submitted a less ambitious programme than their Bombay brethren, lay stress on the necessity of extending the existing system, pointing out that there is on the map of India a single block as large as France, within which there is not a single mile of railway. They strongly insist on uniformity of gauge throughout trunk lines, and while abstaining from making suggestions as to the way in which capital should be raised, they stipulate that the Government should retain the right to fix the *maximum* rates for the carriage of cheap staples and the right of sharing the surplus profits of the company. Finally, they advise that the Government should be entrusted with enlarged powers of dealing with railway projects within certain limits, and should have the assistance of a consultative council of mercantile and financial experts.

These and other important expressions of local opinion will, no doubt, receive careful consideration from the hands of the Select Committee of the House of Commons which is now investigating the general subject. The great difficulty in the way of the extension of railway development in India is obviously the financial one, but it cannot be said that the wants of the people and the country, which must be clearly ascertained before any great impulse is given to railway enterprise, are as yet thoroughly known. In this and in deciding on the best means of providing the necessary capital, the Committee will have a difficult and perhaps extended field of inquiry.

---

## THE COLONIES.

THE CANADIAN DOMINION.—On his first visit to the city of Toronto, the Marquis of Lansdowne stated that it was a subject of congratulation that he had entered upon the duties of Governor-General at a moment when there was absolutely no cloud on the political horizon to darken the relations subsisting between the Dominion and the old country. The Marquis was perfectly right in his statement, and he gave the right reason for so happy a state of affairs when he said that there never was a time when we in England and his fellow-subjects in Canada understood each other so well. We understand each other so well because we know each other so well; and an event that creates conversation in Canada is discussed in Great Britain by as many people as it is in the land of its birth. In view of remarks that were published in certain American journals and elsewhere respecting the continued loyalty of the farmers of the Canadian North-West to the British Crown, one of the leading local journals sent an inquiry on the point to the farmers in all parts of the province. Replies were very generally received, and were, with few exceptions, strongly in favour of the continuation of Confederation, and of a British connection, and were equally strong in their denunciation of annexation to the United States. The few farmers who were in favour of joining the States deemed it generally advisable not to attach their names and addresses, an evidence of their knowledge of the unpopularity of their opinions; though, had a process of exhaustive analysis been indulged in, it would have little availed them in their attempt to conceal their identity.

It has been determined to increase the vote for militia by 140,000 dollars and that for the mounted police by 54,000 dollars. The active militia now consists of 37,000 men, divided into twelve districts. A marked improvement is reported in the general bearing of the force, and a great improvement is expected to result from the schools of instruction for officers now being formed. The passage by the Dominion Parliament of the resolutions authorizing a loan of 22½ million dollars to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has been received with satisfaction in the press and elsewhere in the Dominion. This is especially the case in Manitoba, where it is strongly felt that the future growth and prosperity of the province is largely dependent upon the direct railway communication with Eastern Canada and Europe, which will be afforded by the speedy completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The North-West territories will shortly be invited to send representatives to the Dominion Parliament. Their population is rapidly increasing and the proposed step is universally approved.

The commerce of Canada during the past fiscal year is shown by returns presented to the Canadian Parliament to be the largest ever transacted by the Dominion. The aggregate imports and exports were 230,340,000 dollars, against 221,560,000 dollars in the previous



year, and an average of 182,260,000 dollars for the sixteen years since the Confederation. The chief increase has been in the imports, which have risen from 105,300,000 dollars in 1881, and 119,400,000 dollars in 1882, to 132,300,000 dollars in 1883.

A representative of the Government has been engaged in laying out a National Canadian park in the neighbourhood of the Rocky Mountains. The site chosen is about sixty-four miles beyond Calgary, the present terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and is in the first range of mountains. It covers an area of 1,200 acres, and is described as rivalling in beauty the scenery of Yellowstone Park.

**THE WEST INDIES.**—The Commissioners appointed to inquire into the public revenues, expenditure, debts, and liabilities of the Islands of Jamaica, Grenada, St. Vincent, Tobago, and St. Lucia, and the Leeward Islands, have decided to issue their report in three parts. The first part has been published, and the relative importance of the three parts is seen from the following table:—

	PART I. Jamaica.	PART II. Grenada, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, Tobago.	PART III. The Leeward Islands.
Area in square miles . . . . .	4,193	631	668
Population . . . . .	580,804	139,550	119,830
Exports . . . . .	£1,550,000	£411,133	£526,000
Imports . . . . .	1,322,000	447,900	450,000
Expenditure . . . . .	569,000	110,000	117,900
Public Debt . . . . .	1,352,726	44,100	66,070

In dealing with the civil establishments of Jamaica, the Commissioners state at the outset that, having specially inquired into the strong complaints as to the preponderance of "imported officials," they cannot consider the grievance well-founded; it is kept alive more by personal disappointments than by anything else; and the cry is often taken advantage of by the local press to endeavour to embitter the feelings of the people against the Crown Government. Nevertheless, since there is such a demand for employment, it would be well to adopt the principle of open competition for posts in the public service, and it should not be confined to Jamaicans alone, but should be extended to the whole of the West Indies. Whilst the Commissioners are persuaded that a more efficient Civil Service can be obtained by giving generally more work, more responsibility, and better pay to fewer persons, they are of opinion that, considering the financial condition of the colony, and comparing its revenue, population, and financial position with those of other colonies, a salary of £5,000 a year is sufficient for the Governor, instead of £7,000, which he at present receives. In considering the appointment of the Government Reporter, it is stated that the press of Jamaica possesses no machinery for correct reporting, and but little reliance can in consequence be placed on newspaper accounts. The Post-office is one of the best managed departments although it does not pay its way, a fact due to the postal system as at present administered having

preceded instead of following the wants of the people. The same remark applies to the telegraph department, but the recent great extension of the fruit trade is said to be largely due to the existence of the telegraph.

The ecclesiastical establishment cannot be further touched. The Church was disestablished in Jamaica in 1870, but without prejudice to the rights of the then existing incumbents. The grant, which in 1881-2 amounted to £7,800, is gradually decreasing as those rights expire, and the colony may expect to be freed from the payment of any sum on this account before many years have passed. The medical staff cannot be reduced; indeed, if the means of the colony would admit of an increase of the staff, the Commissioners would strongly recommend it, in order to extend the benefits to the poor and the labourers in every district. The constabulary, a semi-military body drilled and armed as soldiers, is well spoken of, and no reduction is advised in its strength or cost of maintenance. Much good work has been done by convict labour, and it was observed with satisfaction that the convicts were employed in the useful task of constructing the new fortifications at Port Royal. Referring to education, a most discreditable and unsatisfactory state of affairs is disclosed. In 1881 the expenditure was six times as great as in 1861; but the number of children attending school, and the number of those able to read and write, had only doubled. It appears that only 22,000 out of 250,000 adult negroes are able to write. It is urged with much wisdom by the Commissioners that great good would be done by the establishment of Government industrial schools in which children of the non-criminal order could be thoroughly trained for a series of years in the various trades which in after-life they are to follow. To these schools should be drafted all "indigent" children, and any others who are not under the control of their parents. The cost of the schools should be small; well-selected Government sites should yield a large supply of food by the labour of the children, and the workshops would in time supply a great proportion of the furniture, fittings, and repairs. Popular education would be materially advanced by the establishment in the various centres of population of small libraries and reading-rooms, open to all comers. So convinced are the Commissioners that the moral and material progress of Jamaica depends upon the moral and industrial condition of the black population, that they do not hesitate to recommend increased expenditure for the purpose of providing and maintaining some practically efficient system of education which will raise the negro from his present pitiable state of ignorance. The Department of Public Gardens and Plantations, under the able direction of Mr. Morris, is specially praised for the good work it has done, and is said to be invaluable to a purely agricultural country like Jamaica; but strict forest regulations are recommended to be forthwith established, with a view to the amelioration of droughts and floods, and the better production of a variety of dyewood and other valuable forest trees. Planting, as of the fast-growing and fertilizing mango tree, should go hand in hand with clearing, which should be

under strict supervision. On the question of immigration, it is stated that in eleven out of the thirteen parishes into which Jamaica is divided there is urgent need for the immigration of coolies. The negro population, which numbers 350,000 out of the total of 580,000, is said, on medical evidence, to be showing undoubted signs of decreasing vitality. Soil and climate in Jamaica enable man to live with the least possible exertion. It is said that thirty days' labour on an acre of good soil will, in addition to providing a family with necessary food for the year, yield a surplus saleable in the market for from £10 to £30. It is to the possession of "provision grounds" that the industrious negro turns with the greatest liking, and there now exists in Jamaica a substantial and happily numerous negro population of the peasant proprietor class, which easily obtains a livelihood by the growth of the minor tropical products of fruit and spices, cocoa and coffee, and so contributes materially to the general prosperity. Public works also largely attract the negroes, whether they be the railways in Jamaica, or the Panama Canal, or the Costa Rica railway. In Trinidad and British Guiana the labour difficulty has been solved by the introduction in large numbers of coolies from India; in Trinidad there are 48,000 coolies in a population of 153,000; in British Guiana, 65,000 in a population of 250,000; while in Jamaica there are only 14,000 coolies in a population of 580,000. This immigration is largely to the benefit of the coolies themselves. They leave India because they are paupers, and return in large numbers, comparatively wealthy. In the decade 1871 to 1881, 3,700 returned to India from Jamaica taking with them £40,000 in money and a large amount, probably nearly as much again, in jewellery. The presence of coolies greatly benefits Jamaica; the fact of their being indentured secures their labouring on the estates all the year round; full crops are brought to maturity, and at harvest time employment is afforded for negro labour. As consumers, also, coolies stimulate trade, shopkeepers thrive on their purchases, and the demand for imported goods increases. The introduction of more coolies into Jamaica would cause an appreciable addition to the revenue and to the general prosperity. Had they been introduced in numbers proportionate to those imported into Trinidad or British Guiana, the population of Jamaica would have been increased by a hundred thousand, and the revenue would have benefited in a corresponding degree. The general prosperity of Trinidad and British Guiana has increased in direct proportion to the number of immigrants. The same would be the case if Jamaica followed their example. Looking to the practical success of the systems at work in the two colonies referred to, it appears that the total cost of the increased coolie immigration necessary for Jamaica should be borne in the proportion of one-third by the general revenue and two-thirds by the planters. But the exigency of space forbids our further following out this most interesting and valuable report of the Commissioners (which extends to ninety folio pages, exclusive of voluminous appendices). We hope to revert to the subject in the next number of this REVIEW.

**SOUTH AFRICA.**—The Transvaal Convention has been signed, and Sir Hercules Robinson has returned to South Africa. In these two events lies the brief chronicle of the past three months—so far as the relation of the English and Dutch races is concerned. If the Volksraad ratify the Convention, it is possible it may turn out as satisfactory a settlement as was permitted by circumstances. Remembering that the Convention of Pretoria has become waste paper simply and solely because one of the high contracting parties never intended to pay any attention to its provisions, it would be unwise to be too sanguine of the success likely to wait upon this new departure.

Experience has shown that no trust can be placed in the promises of the Boer delegates as binding on their fellow-countrymen, save in so far as fear or self-interest may make in favour of their preservation. We do not therefore anticipate any change in the conduct of the Boers within their own territories. But outside the limits of the South African Republic we do believe, though perhaps our faith is rash, that the relation of the Dutch to the black races will be materially altered to the benefit of the latter. The independence of Swaziland has been recognised, and the south-western frontier line has been clearly defined. In this direction much has been done (on paper) to curb the restless spirit of the Boers from encroaching on the territories still remaining to the native tribes. A small force of mounted police is to be provided, and specially charged with the duty of protecting the new frontier. This force is to be maintained at the joint expense of the Imperial Government and of the Cape Colony. Zululand and Swaziland are presumed to be strong enough to maintain inviolate their own domains. We trust they may prove equal to the expectation cherished at the Colonial Office, but already disturbing rumours reach us that the border Boers have instigated the Zulus to cross the frontier, so as to justify interference by them in Zululand. That unhappy land, used as it has been to shocking scenes of slaughter, has probably never witnessed such wasteful effusion of blood as resulted from the feebly futile attempt to restore the late chief Cetewayo. Now that he is dead, it surely behoves the authorities in Downing Street to take instant and effectual steps to pacify his much-divided, wretched country.

Before Sir Hercules Robinson left London he was entertained at a farewell banquet given in his honour at the Empire Club, on the 3rd of March. The speech then made by the greatest of our Colonial Pro-Consuls is perhaps the most remarkable manifesto on South African policy ever put forth by one who has authority to carry out his views. The figures of population in the settled districts given by the High Commissioner are somewhat different from what we believed them to be. Cape Colony, Natal, the Orange Free State, and the Transvaal, he stated to be inhabited by 170,000 English, 280,000 persons of Dutch or French extraction, and about 2,000,000 natives. In the Cape and its dependencies, the English bear to the Dutch the proportion of about 9 to 11, whilst both together bear to the natives the proportion of only 1 to 3. In Natal the English and Dutch are about

equal, whilst both together bear to the natives the proportion of 1 to 15. In the Orange Free State the Dutch outnumber the English by 9 to 1, and the whites and blacks are about equal. In the Transvaal the Dutch are to the English as 7 to 1, and together are outnumbered by the natives by 20 to 1. Moreover, the natives increase and multiply with amazing rapidity. Bordering on the settled districts there is a fringe of independent native tribes stretching from the Atlantic on one side to the Indian Ocean on the other, and said to number from five to seven millions. The main objects to be kept in view in dealing with the varied conditions of South Africa are succinctly expressed by Sir Hercules as (1) to bring about between the European communities something approaching to uniformity of system and action upon matters of common concern; (2) to allay and eventually extinguish race animosities between the two European sections; and (3) to provide for the protection and elevation of the natives in the scale of civilization, whilst arranging for that expansion of the white race which is inevitable, and which, if properly regulated, would prove a great advantage to all concerned. It is currently believed that a Native Department with a Permanent Native Secretary and Accountant is to be established as an indispensable adjunct to the High Commissionership, and through this department the Commissioner will watch over the native frontiers, establishing police where necessary, and appointing wardens of the marches, or residents on the borders, alike among the Bechuanas, Zulus, and Swazics. In closing our notice of South Africa we cannot do better than quote the terms in which Sir Hercules referred to the new Convention.

“It must be considered as most liberal to the Transvaal. It gives to that State as much of Bechuanaland as could be handed over without abandoning our allies, or sacrificing the trade road from the Cape to the interior of Africa. It gives to the Transvaal, within clearly defined boundaries, as complete internal independence as is enjoyed by the Free State. It remits one-third of the debt, and it surrenders to the Transvaal Government the conduct and control of diplomatic intercourse with foreign powers.”

To this last remark Lord Derby added: “Subject to veto:” and if the Colonial Secretary is as prompt to support Mr. Mackenzie in his new post of Resident in Bechuanaland, as he was to supplement the statement of the High Commissioner at the Empire Club, we may with reasonable confidence look forward to a new era of peace and progress in our great South African Dominion.

**AUSTRALASIA.**—Much disappointment was expressed in colonial circles at the omission of all reference to the Colonies in the Queen’s Speech. As a slight salve to Australian sentiment we may mention that the Agents-General were for the first time invited to be present at the opening of Parliament on an ambassadorial footing, and not only were they marshalled to their places by the Serjeant-at-Arms himself, with due state and ceremony, but they have now each a permanent seat as often as they like to occupy it in the gallery of the House of Commons.

The offer to place the two Victorian gun-boats, *Victoria* and *Albert*,

at the disposal of Her Majesty's Government was fully appreciated by the Home authorities, and most favourably commented on in Parliament and by the press. Rumour has it that a substantial sum will shortly be expended in placing our principal sea-ports and coaling stations, at home and in the colonies, in a better state of defence. If, however, the other Australian colonies follow in the steps of Victoria in providing themselves with gun-boats and torpedo-boats, and in establishing a militia, the safety of the ports and stations in the southern hemisphere will soon be completely assured. In a very few years the colonies of Australasia will surpass in population, wealth, commerce, and in all that goes to make *power*, the majority of European nations, and will prove a source of material strength to the mother country in the development of her foreign policy. Last year the number of persons of British origin emigrating to Australasia rose to 71,264, an increase of 34,000 upon the number emigrating in 1882. The three million square miles of Australasian territory contain a population of over three million souls, nearly all of British descent, and a majority of them Australian-born. As Mr. Murray Smith stated, in his admirable paper read before the Fellows of the Royal Colonial Institute on the 12th of February, they regard a public debt of over £100,000,000 with a light heart, for they have expended the loans amounting to so huge a total in works of peace, and they know that their Government railways alone are valued at a considerably higher sum. The wisdom of the expenditure in railways is never more manifest than when, as in the present year, the Australian wheat harvest is more than usually abundant. Without the railways the produce could not be brought to the ports; and, on the other hand, had the railways not been constructed, the lands thrown open by their means would have remained uncultivated.

No further step in connection with the Sydney Convention appears as yet to have been taken. It remains for the respective legislatures to confirm the action of their representatives at the Convention, and as it was arranged that *New South Wales*, as the mother colony, should take the lead in adopting the federal resolutions, it is to that colony that we must look with what patience we may possess. Meanwhile the question of the transportation by France to the South Pacific of the worst of her convicts grows more urgent, and should be dealt with at once, lest unfortunately it be neglected until it becomes a question of the gravest moment, not between Australia and New Caledonia but between England and France.

The Statistical Blue-Book for *New Zealand* for the year 1882 has been published, and has evidently been prepared with the usual care and completeness we are accustomed to look for in this compilation. The estimated population at the close of the year is given as 517,707 persons, showing an increase during the year of 16,797. The death-rate is stated to have been 11·19 per 1,000, showing *New Zealand* to have been the most healthy of the Australasian colonies; the death-rates for the other colonies having been—*New South Wales*, 15·12; *Victoria*, 14·16; *South Australia*, 13·97; *Western Australia*, 13·24;

*Queensland*, 17.99; and *Tasmania*, 14.77. The total value of the imports was £8,609,270 against £7,457,045 in 1881—being an increase of £1,152,225. The total value of the exports was £6,658,008, against £6,060,866 in 1881, an increase of £597,142. The total trade of the colony, as represented by imports and exports, amounted to £29 19s. 6¼*d.* per head of the mean population, exclusive of the Maoris. The revenue shows a continued expansion; the post-office becomes more busy; the number of volunteers increases; and almost the only decrease chronicled is in the aggregate number of electors, who are now slightly under 120,000, being 1,400 fewer than in 1881. The Registrar-General, Mr. W. R. E. Brown, may be congratulated upon having added another valuable volume to his already well-known series of statistical Blue-Books.

CEYLON, the largest, most populous, and most important of the dependencies directly administered under the control of the Colonial Office, has recently acquired special interest in the eyes of Englishmen as being the enforced abode of Arabi the Egyptian and his fellow-exiles. The tradition, still reverently regarded by the Mohammedan world at large, that Ceylon is the Elysium provided for Adam and Eve to console them for the loss of Paradise, has served to solace the hours of exile of the deported soldier, and has more deeply affected the minds of Mussulmans than may appear reasonable to Christians. Be the earliest history of Ceylon what it may, it is beyond dispute that the island was known to ancient voyagers in the time of Solomon, and that no land can tell more of its past history in songs and legends and in records which have been verified by monuments, inscriptions, and coins. Some of the fragmentary structures in and around the ancient capitals of the Sinhalese are between 2,000 and 3,000 years old, and rival in extent and interest the ruins of Egypt. The Portuguese, in 1505, were the first European nation to effect a settlement in Ceylon. Little was done by them however, in the course of their 150 years occupation of the maritime districts, to develop the resources of the island; and the chief benefit resulting from the rule of the Dutch who superseded the Portuguese in 1656, sprang from the improved means of communication afforded by the canals they constructed. From 1797 to 1802 Ceylon was under the rule of the East India Company, but in the latter year it was made a Crown Colony. In 1815 the subjugation of the Kandyan King was effected, and for the first time in its history the whole island became subject to an alien power. It is interesting to note that so great was the value attached to Ceylon as the "key of India," that at the general peace Britain preferred resigning Java to the Dutch and retaining the "pearl-drop on the brow of India," with its inferior area, population, and natural wealth. Under the rule of the English the progress made by Ceylon in all the main elements of prosperity has been so rapid that we venture to reproduce the following extract from a table published by Mr. John Ferguson (editor of the *Ceylon Observer*), in his interesting and most ably compiled volume, "Ceylon in 1883:"

	In 1796-1815.	In 1883.
Population . . . . .	From $\frac{3}{4}$ to 1 million.	2,850,000
Population of Colombo . . . . .	28,000	120,000
Military Force . . . . .	6,000	1,250
Cost of ditto . . . . .	£160,000	£116,000
Imperial share . . . . .	£80,000	nil.
Revenue . . . . .	£226,000	£1,280,000
Expenditure . . . . .	£320,000	£1,260,000
Trade:—		
Imports—value . . . . .	£266,790	£4,700,000
Exports . . . . .	£206,583	£3,700,000
Tonnage of Shipping entered and cleared . . . . .	75,000 tons.	3,100,000 tons.
Roads . . . . .	Sand and gravel tracks	{ Metalled, 1,301 miles. Gravelled, 855 ” Natural, 622 ”
Live Stock . . . . .	250,000	1,500,000
Carts and Carriages . . . . .	50	20,000

In addition to the improvement shown in the above table, the colony now possesses 178 miles of railways, 167 miles of canals, 1,092 miles of telegraph wires, and bridges too numerous to mention. There are 128 post offices, and 9,330 depositors own £210,000 in the Government Savings Banks. Finally, the educational expenditure has risen from £3,000 to £48,000, and the number of scholars from 2,000 to 105,000. With such a record of progress, Ceylon well boasts to be

“The best and brightest gem  
In Britain’s orient diadem.”

In 1865 it was decided that the whole cost of the military force maintained within its limits should be borne by the island. Now the people of Ceylon are perhaps the least warlike of any nation under the rule of Great Britain, not a soldier having been wounded since 1837. On the other hand however it is instructive to observe how frequently its central position has enabled the Imperial Government to make use of the British regiment stationed in Ceylon when there has been urgent need of assistance in other parts of our Colonial Empire. In 1857 Sir Henry Ward sent the 37th Regiment at a day’s notice to Calcutta to the aid of Lord Canning. In 1863 the 50th Regiment was despatched with all haste to aid in suppressing the Maori rising in New Zealand. In 1879 the 57th Regiment was sent to Natal, and in 1881 the 102nd Regiment was sent to the same colony with equal despatch. A review of these facts shows how fair it would be to transfer to the Imperial exchequer at least a considerable share of the military expenditure which weighs unduly on the tax-paying Sinhalese. Before leaving Ceylon our readers will perhaps pardon a few



words on the question of its staple products. It appears an open question whether the leaf disease, which appeared in 1869 when coffee had attained its highest development, should be regarded as having done more good or evil to the island. It is true that the result of the disease is seen in a total shipment last year of only one-fourth the quantity of coffee exported fourteen years ago, but on the other hand, now that "King coffee" has fallen from his high estate, the care and attention formerly devoted to the cultivation of the berry has been applied to the even more congenial products of tea and cinchona. In 1872 only 500 acres of cinchona had been planted, and 11,547lbs. of bark were exported. Now the area under cultivation is estimated at 40,000 acres, and the export of bark last season amounted to 3,000,000lbs., and is expected to reach double that immense quantity during the present year. Less progress has been made with tea-planting, though it is the conviction of many who have studied the climate and the character of Ceylon soils, that the colony is far more fitted to become a great tea producer than ever it was to grow coffee. Beginning from 1873 with 250 acres of tea-plantations, resulting in an export of 23lbs. of tea in 1876, the area under cultivation had risen to about 20,000 acres last year, and the export was expected to show the high figure of 1,500,000lbs. Cocoa cultivation is also expected largely to take the place of the coffee industry, and when we remember that it is by no means unlikely that the malignant fungus that has worked such havoc may disappear, we think our readers will agree with us in hopeful anticipation of renewed prosperity for this island gem of the southern seas.

CYPRUS.—At the close of the year 1882 an Order in Council was issued altering the constitution of the Legislative Council of what may be termed our youngest Crown Colony, although it is in strictness a Turkish province administered by Great Britain. Cyprus was endowed with representative institutions. The Council as now constituted consists of eighteen members, six of whom are public officers appointed by the Crown, and twelve are elected by the people. Of the twelve elective members, three are elected by the Mahometans and nine by the non-Mahometan inhabitants, these numbers being allotted in proportion to the mixed population as shown by the census taken in 1881. Had it not been for the action of Her Majesty's late Government in 1878, Cyprus would have remained for an indefinite time burdened with heavy payments to the Turkish Government, and would have fallen more and more into decay. For the islanders themselves the British intervention in their affairs has been a fortunate event. Their payments to Constantinople remain as they were, but within the first five years of the British occupation a sum exceeding £200,000 has been voted by Parliament in aid of their revenue, and nearly £40,000 additional has been supplied to provide them with improved mail communication with the outside world. But of the local revenue, aided as above described, over £120,000 has been spent

upon public works, and about £45,000 upon keeping down the plague of locusts. So largely has this insect-pest diminished under the operations that there appears a reasonable hope of ultimately exterminating them, or at all events of so reducing their numbers that the injury they may do shall be comparatively insignificant. Remembering that Cyprus was acquired chiefly from its favourable position as a *place d'armes*, it is not surprising to find that over £300,000 has been spent from Imperial Army Funds upon military forces maintained in the island. In many cases this expenditure has permanently benefited the inhabitants, as in the case of the Platris military road from Limassol to Troodos, which has opened out some of the great districts of vine cultivation by allowing the mules to traverse the country in the darkest nights, thus insuring that the wine escapes exposure to the sun. Notwithstanding that the quantity of wine made in 1882 was in excess of that made in 1881, the value of the exports fell from £56,569 to £38,827, a fact due to the high prices prevailing in the island, and to the objection of wine merchants in France to the peculiar flavour so much of the Cyprus wine acquires from being brought to market in tarred skins. Considering how much we have heard of the unhealthiness of Cyprus, it is satisfactory to read in Sir R. Biddulph's latest report that the general health of the island was exceedingly good during 1882, and that there was little of the fever that prevails throughout the coasts of the Mediterranean during the summer. The Chief Medical Officer has further been able to fix approximately the death-rate for the year at 17·3, and the birth-rate at 28·2, per 1,000. When these rates, which must be regarded as subject to verification, are considered in view of the large infant mortality amongst the natives, it will be seen that the High Commissioner has grounds for his favourable report. The health of the troops also was especially good, although the depôts made their stay during the hottest period of the year. Only a small number of sick and wounded were received from Egypt, but they all became speedily convalescent, no death occurring amongst them. The beneficial results of British rule are seen everywhere in the improved appearance of the towns and villages and of the people themselves, and in the more extended cultivation of the land. In Turkish times the volume of foreign trade was under 30s. a head, but Turkish statistics deserve no confidence. It has continuously increased, and last year it amounted to about 70s. a head. The most remarkable feature perhaps in the Customs administration is the increased revenue derived from tobacco. In 1877 it brought in to the Turkish authorities £8,375. During the financial year 1882-3, the British officers collected £16,317 from the same tax, an increase of nearly a hundred per cent., due partly to the increased prosperity causing a larger consumption, and chiefly to an honest administration. The spirit of self-help has been developed on the part of the Cypriotes, as is witnessed amongst other instances in the voluntary aid they have given the authorities in the construction of roads and bridges. Education is making progress both in Moslem

and Christian schools. The Post-office shows an increasing number of letters, cards and packets passing through its custody. The Courts of Law have been reformed, and over each court an Englishman presides, thus securing uniformity of procedure and administration. The foreign trade is expanding, property is so widely distributed in the island that pauperism can hardly be said to exist, while the general condition of the people shows such steadily advancing prosperity as fully to justify the most sanguine hopes.

---

# INDEX.

\* \* \* *All Books must be looked for under the Author's name.*

- ABBOTT, T. K., translated by, "Kant's Critique of Practical Reason," and other works on the Theory of Ethics, 209
- Africa, South*, 298, 629
- Allen, Grant, "Flowers and their Pedigrees," 233
- Amos, Sheldon, M. A., "The History and Principles of the Civil Law of Rome," 216
- Anagnos, Julia R., "Stray Chords," 597
- "Antipodes," by, "The Revelations of Common Sense," 560
- Archer-Hind, R. D., M. A., edited by, "The Phædo of Plato," 600
- Argyll, Duke of, "The Unity of Nature," 561
- Arnold, Matthew, "Literature and Dogma," 529
- Ashton, John, "Humour, Wit, and Satire of the Seventeenth Century," 232
- Australasia*, 300, 630
- BADCOCK, J., "Vignettes from Invisible Life," 563
- Bagehot, the late W., M. A., "Essays on Parliamentary Reform," 542
- Bardsley, Rev. J. W., "Glimpses through the Veil," 537
- Bartram, R., "Heroes of Israel," 279
- Bayley, W., "Bouquet," 265
- Bell, H. T. Mackenzie, "Old Year Leaves, being Old Verses Revived," 598
- Bellamy, E., "Dr. Heidenhoff's Process," 614
- Bence-Jones, A. B., M. A., "The New Law of Bankruptcy," 220
- Bersier, Rev. E., D. D., "The Gospel in Paris," 536
- Besant, Walter, "Readings in Rabelais," 609
- "All in a Garden Fair," 610
- Blanford, H. F., F. R. S., "Report on the Meteorology of India for 1881," 236
- Blunt, W. S., "The Wind and the Whirlwind," 266
- Bock, Carl, "Temples and Elephants the Narrative of a Journey of Exploration through Upper Siam and Lao," 558
- Bodichon, le Dr., "Le Vade-Mecum de la Politique Française," 216
- Boussenard, Louis, "The Crusoes of Guiana," 277
- British Guiana*, 297
- Bronkhurst, Rev. H. V. P., "The Colony of British Guyana," 248
- Brosch, Moritz, "Lord Bolingbroke und die Whigs und Tories seiner Zeit," 252
- Brown, J. C., LL.D., "Finland: its Forests and Forest Management," 261
- Brown, R., jun., F. S. A., "The Myth of Kirke," 268
- Burroughs, J., "Locusts and Wild Honey," 613
- Butler, Samuel, "Hudibras," Parts II., III., edited by A. Milnes, M. A., 268
- CAINE, T. HALL, "Cobwebs of Criticism," 280
- Caird, Sir James, K. C. B., F. R. S., "India: the Land and the People," 566
- Canada*, 293, 625
- Candlish, Rev. R. S., "The Book of Genesis Expounded," 537
- Cape Colony*, 299
- Carman Sylva (Queen Elizabeth of Roumania), "Pilgrim Sorrow: a Cycle of Tales," translated by Helen Zimmern, 278
- Carpenter, W. Lant, B. A., "Energy in Nature," 565
- Carruthers, G. T., M. A., "The Units in Exchange, and a Free Currency," 222
- Cassell, Dr. D., "Manual of Jewish History and Literature," 589
- CENSORSHIP (THE) OF THE STAGE, 328-354; censorship intermittent and capricious under Elizabeth and her successors, 329; Master of the Revels appointed by Charles I., 330-1; Jeremy Collier's attack on the stage in 1698

- caused censorship to become vigilant, 332; Gay's plays and Fielding's satires led to censorship in its present form, 334; protest of Lord Chesterfield, 335; Colman the younger a model censor, 337; main object of committee of 1832, to consider the licensing not of plays but of theatres, 339; Report of Select Committee of 1866, 340; evidence tendered by Mr. Donne, 341; other witnesses before the Committee, 342, 343; the censor and "The Happy Land" in 1873, 344; the French drama, 345, 346; review of the censorship, 347; abolition of censorship discussed, 348-350; and decided to be advisable in the interests alike of morality, the public, and the stage, 352, 354
- Ceylon*, 632
- Chinnoek, E. J., M.A., "The Anabasis of Alexander, literally translated, with a Commentary from the Greek of Arrian, the Nicomedian," 601
- Church, Rev. A. J., M.A., "Roman Life in the days of Cicero," 251
- CODIFICATION OF ENGLISH LAW: A RETROSPECT AND A PROSPECT," 451-495; earliest treatise on English law composed by Glanville in reign of Henry II., 452; followed by Bracton's treatise in reign of Henry III., 453; Edward I., "the English Justinian," 457; James I. and Bacon as law reformers, 458-463; from middle of seventeenth century to early part of nineteenth the judges are again the principal condensers and codifiers, 464; Chief Justice Rolfe's "Abridgment," and Matthew Hale's "Common Place Book," 468; Chief Justice Holt, 471; "a distinct decline in power of systematizing," 472; Blackstone's "Commentaries," 473; various commissions appointed early in nineteenth century in connection with codification, 477; Lord Cranworth, 478; Sir Fitzroy Kelly and Sir R. Bethel, 479; appearance of "Revised Edition" of Statutes in 1870; success of the "subject by subject" method of consolidation, 480; net result of what has been done in the interests of common law codification since 1830, 482-3; Bentham's "General View of a Complete Code of Laws," 484; Humphrey's draft code of Real Property Law, 485; Criminal Code Bill, 1879, drafted by Sir James Stephen, 487; the Bills of Exchange Act, 488-9; "Digests" of Sir J. Stephen and Mr. F. Pollock, 490; successful codification in India, 491-2; largely due to Bentham, James Mill, Macaulay, Sir B. Peacock, and Mr. W. Stokes, 493
- Coleridge, Samuel T., "Lectures and Notes on Shakespeare and other English Poets," 607
- Collett, J., "The Story of St. Stephen, and other Poems," 266
- Collins, J. C., edited by, "Milton's Samson Agonistes," 268
- Colonies, The*, 293, 625
- Cooke, F. E., "Latimer's Candle. The Story of a Great Life," 616
- CO-OPERATION OR SPOLIATION, 430-450
- Coppinger, R. W., M.D., "Cruise of the *Alert*. Four Years in Patagonian, Polynesian, and Mascarene Waters (1878-82)," 225
- Cornish, F. W., M.A., edited by, "Scenes from the 'Andria' of Terence," 270
- Craik, G. L., LL.D., "A Manual of English Literature," 280
- Crosland, N., "The New Principia, or the Astronomy of the Future," 265
- Cross, L., "Hesperides," 283
- Cumming, C. F. Gordon, "Granite Crags," 558
- Curtis, G. W., "Prue and I," 273
- Cyprus*, 631
- DAVIES, G. C., "Norfolk Broads and Rivers," 226
- Delierre, A., "The Fables of La Fontaine," translated, 270
- De Long, Emma, edited by, "The Voyage of the *Jeanette*. The Ship and Ice Journals of George W. De Long, U.S.N.," 222
- Dickson, W. P., D.D., "St. Paul's Use of the Terms Flesh and Spirit," 537
- Donisthorpe, W., "Socialism at St. Stephen's in 1883," 549
- Duffield, *see* Welch.
- Duke, Joshua, "Recollections of the Cabul Campaign, 1879 and 1880," 243.
- Duntzer, Heinrich, "Life of Goethe," translated by T. W. Lyster, 254
- Duruy, V., "History of Rome," edited by Rev. J. P. Mahaffy, 571
- Dutton Cook, "On the Stage: Studies of Theatrical History," 609
- Dyer, Rev. T. F. T., M.A., "Folk-lore of Shakespeare," 606
- DWELLINGS (THE) OF THE POOR, 137-151; no less than six Acts directly bearing on the question, 138; "Torrens's Act," 1868, 139; its two amending Acts, 140; Sir R. Cross's Act, 1876, 141-2; in any case of

- clearing away dwellings, at least half the population displaced must be provided with suitable dwellings; expense of clearing to be borne by the rates, 143; under Torrens's Acts *four* ratepayers, under Cross's Acts *twelve* ratepayers, can set the machinery in action, 144; Public Health Act, 1875, 145; provision of dwellings discussed, 146-8
- EDERSHEIM, A., M.A., "The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah," 240
- Eliot, George, "Essays and Leaves from a Note-Book," 608
- "Encyclopædia (The) Britannica," ninth edition, vol. xvi., 284
- England, E. B., M.A., "Euripides' 'Iphigenia in Tauris,'" 269
- "English Lyrics," 267
- ENGLAND IN EGYPT, 115-137; Soudan revolt hindered the withdrawal from Cairo, 116; Gladstone Cabinet always forced into the right path, 117; evil influence of a section of the Liberal party, 119; continued occupation of Egypt absolutely necessary, 120; why we are in Egypt, 121-2; Palmerston's objection to construction of Canal, 123; Lord Dufferin's Report quoted, 124; the real wealth of Egypt, 125; supreme importance of irrigation, 126; which can only be effected by foreign capital, 127; indebtedness of the fellahen, 128; a review of recent events, 129-131; proves urgent need of continued occupation, 133-6
- Ewald, H., Prof., "History of Israel," vol. vi., translated by J. F. Smith, 208
- FISKE, JOHN, "Excursions of an Evolutionist," 550
- Fornelli, N., "L'Insegnamento Pubblico ai Tempi Nostri," 554
- Forshall, F. H., "Westminster School: Past and Present," 578
- Fortescue, Earl, "Our Next Leap in the Dark; with Postscript on the Corrupt Practices Bill," 544
- Friend, Rev. H., F.L.S., "Flowers and Flower-lore," 568
- Fulton, J., D.D., "The Laws of Marriage; containing the Hebrew Law, the Roman Law, the Law of the New Testament, and the Canon Law," 553
- Fourneaux, H., M.A., edited, with Introduction and Notes by, "The Annals of Tacitus," 600
- GIBSON, W., "The Poems of Goethe, 'dope into English Verse,'" 599
- Goldsmith, Oliver, "The Vicar of Wakefield;" with a Preface and Notes by Austin Dobson, 610
- Gomme, G. L., F.S.A., edited by, "The Gentleman's Magazine Library," 285
- Goschen, the Rt. Hon. G. J., "Address to the Members of the Philosophical Institution at Edinburgh on Laissez-faire and Government Interference," 213
- Gosse, E. W., "Seventeenth Century Studies. A Contribution to the History of English Poetry," 281
- Gould, G., "Corrigenda and Explanations of the Text of Shakespeare," 282
- Grant, Sir A., Bart., "The Story of the University of Edinburgh," 579
- GREATER (THE) BRITAIN TO COME, 175-197
- Green, W. C., M.A., "The Iliad of Homer, with a Verse Translation," 600
- Greenough, J. B., edited by, "The Greater Poems of Virgil," vol. ii., 269
- Greenwood, Grace, "Victoria, Queen of England," 591
- Greg, Percy, "Without God: Negative Science and Natural Ethics," 212
- Ground, Rev. W. D., "An Examination of the Structural Principles of Mr. Herbert Spencer's Philosophy," 212
- Guyot, Yves, "La Police," 215
- Prostitution under the Regulation System, French and English." Translated by E. B. Truman, M.D., F.C.S., 561
- HAKE, T. G., M.D., "The Powers of the Alphabet: a Tonic Scale of Alphabetic Sounds," 568
- "Hannah Tarne. A Story for Children," 279
- Hardinge, W. M., "Eugenia: an Episode," 276
- Hardy, E. G., M.A., "The Satires of Juvenal," with Notes, 601
- Hargreaves, Capt. T., F.A.S., "A Voyage round Great Britain," 559
- Harris, R., "Mr. Bumpkin's Law Suit," 278
- Hart, Mary H., "Poverty and its Remedy," 549
- Hâte, Gopinath Sadashivji, "Regeneration of India," 220
- Hawthorne, Julian, "Beatrix Randolph," 614
- Hinton, J., "Love's Offering," 264
- Hittell, J. S., "St. Peter's Catechism," 208

- Hoffmann, W., "Leisure Hours in Russia," 598
- Hofmann, Dr. A. W., "The Question of a Division of the Philosophical Faculty," 540
- Holden, Rev. H., M.A., "The Hieron of Xenophon," 269
- Holmes, Eleanor, "In Time to Come," 612
- Holmes, O. W., "The Autocrat of the Breakfast Table," and "The Professor at the Breakfast Table," 272
- "The Poet at the Breakfast Table," 612
- Holmes, T. R., "History of the Indian Mutiny," 576
- Home, F. W., "Lay Canticles, and other Poems," 595
- Hope, Ascott R., "The Wigwam and the War-path," 617
- Horstmann, C., "S. Editha sive Chronicon Vilodunense," 268
- Hospitalier, G., "The Modern Applications of Electricity;" translated and enlarged by Julius Maier, Ph.D.; second edition, revised, 234
- Howells, W. D., "A Woman's Reason," 273
- Hueffer, Francis, "Italian and other Studies," 283
- Hunt, T. W., edited from Grein by, "Cædmon's Exodus and Daniel," 599
- India*, 287, 619
- INDIA: LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT IN, 63-83; in some 800 towns in British India a certain amount of local self-government has for many years obtained, 67; Sir D. McLeod and Sir G. Campbell quoted in favour of extending self-government, 69; Mr. A. O. Hume, C.B., quoted, 70; Lord Ripon's address at Lahore in Nov. 1882, 71; his Resolution of May, 1882, 74; Sir J. Strachey on municipal institutions in India, 75; Lord Ripon's speech to the Delhi Municipality in Nov. 1883, quoted, 76; *three* general principles advocated by Government of India in connection with local self-government, 77; precise amount of control exercised by district boards must vary in different districts, 78; necessity of delegating certain duties of district officers to non-officials grows daily, 81
- Indies, West*, 296, 626
- "In the Company's Service. A Reminiscence," 245
- Italian Parliamentary Papers, 228, 229
- "Ithuriel"—"Poems," 207
- Jamaica*, 296, 626
- Jamieson, J. H., "The Laird's Secret," 276
- Jefferies, R., "The Story of my Heart," 277
- Jennings, Louis J., "The Millionaire," 615
- KATCHER, L., "Charakter-Bilder," 587
- Kaufman, Rosalie, edited by, "Our Young Folk's Plutarch," 591
- Kay, C. de, edited by, with an Introduction, "The Love Poems of Louis Barnaval," 265
- Kay, David, F.R.G.S., "Education and Educators," 553
- "Keats, the Poetical Works and other Writings of John;" edited by H. B. Forman, with Notes and Appendices, 594
- Keene, H. G., C.I.E., "Fifty-seven: Some account of the Administration of Indian Districts during the Revolt of the Bengal Army," 244
- Keynes, J. N., M.A., "Studies and Exercises in Formal Logic," 539
- Kostlin, Julius, "Life of Luther," translated from the German, 253
- LACY, W. M., "An Examination of the Philosophy of the Unknowable," 541
- Lanza, Clara, "A Righteous Apostate," 274
- Lara, "Poems; General, Secular, and Satirical," 267
- Leathes, Stanley, D.D., "Characteristics of Christianity," 536
- Lee, *see* Vernon
- Lillie, A., "The Popular Life of Buddha," 242
- Lisle, Madame F. D. de, "Etude sur la Prononciation Française," 284
- Little, J. Stanley, "South Africa; a Sketchbook of Men, Manners, and Facts," 560
- Local Self-Government, *see* India
- Lowe, W. H., M.A., "The Mishnah," edited from the unique Manuscript in the University Library of Cambridge," 534
- Lussy, Mathias, "Traité du Rythme Musicale," 285
- LUTHER (MARTIN): HIS INFLUENCE ON THE MATERIAL AND INTELLECTUAL WELFARE OF GERMANY, 1-41; mythical aspect of the Reformation, 2; position of affairs in the Catholic Church towards the close of the fifteenth century, and beginning of the sixteenth, 4-8; a comparison of the standpoints of Luther and Erasmus, 11-13; the

- doctrine of devils, and witchcraft, 14, 15; views of Luther and his disciples with regard to toleration, 17-20; loss of art treasures in the iconoclastic storms of the sixteenth century, 21; all thought directed into theological channels, 22; the Humanists and education, 23; reason trammelled by the Reformation, 24; Humanism rejected by the church on the outbreak of Luther, 27; Humanists compelled to part from Luther, 29; Luther and the peasant rebellion, 31; Luther and the doctrine of justification by faith, 33: state of the Saxon Church in 1528, 34, 35; general decay of social purity in Germany attributed to doctrine of redemption, 37; Luther's sermons on marriage, 38, 39, what have we to thank Luther for? 40; the German Reformation, a moral catastrophe, 41
- LYNDHURST, LORD, 354-391  
Lynn Linton, Mrs., "Ione," 612
- MACAULAY, G. C., M.A., "Francis Beaumont, a Critical Study," 282  
MacDonald, G., LL.D., "Donal Grant," 616  
Malleon, Col. G.B., "Captain Musafir's Rambles in Alpine Lands," 559  
Marr, J. E., M.A., "The Classification of the Cambrian and Silurian Rocks," 564  
Marshall, Emma, "In Colston's Days. A Story of Old Bristol," 616  
Martin, Mrs. Herbert, edited by, "Memories of Seventy Years," 257  
Massey, Gerald, "The Natural Genesis," 241  
McCarthy, J., M.P., "A Short History of Our Own Times," 243  
"Maid of Athens," 616  
Meiklejohn, J. M. D., edited by, "Life and Letters of W. B. Hodgson, LL.D.," 259  
Mew, J., "Types from Spanish Story," 270  
Meyer, G. H., Von, "The Organs of Speech and their Application in the Formation of Articulate Sounds," 238  
Mitchell, Lucy M., "History of Ancient Sculpture," 573  
M'Laren, D., revised by, "The Book of Psalms in Metre," 598  
Moncel, Count du, "Electricity as a Motive Power," 235  
Morris, Lewis, "Songs Unsong," 263  
Mousson, Dr. Albert, "Die Physik auf Grundlage der Erfahrung," Dritter Band, zweite Lieferung, zweite Halfte, 567  
Moyse, C. E., B.A., "Poetry as a Fine Art," 600  
NEVINSON, H., "Herder and his Times," 583  
*New South Wales*, 567  
*New Zealand*, 631  
Nordenskiöld, A. E., "The Voyage of the *Vega* round Asia and Europe," translated by A. Leslie, 226  
OLIPHANT, MRS., Introduction by, "Selections from Cowper's Poems," 267  
Omond, G. W. T., "The Lord Advocates of Scotland," 251  
Oxon, "History of the Reign of George III.," 582  
PAGE, T. E., edited by, with Notes, "Horace's Odes, Books I., II.," 601  
Palmer, W., "Narrative of Events connected with the Tracts for the Times," 198  
PARLIAMENTARY REFORM. MINORITY REPRESENTATION, 163-175; opinions adverse to representation of minorities quoted, 164; and considered, 165; a new scheme of minority representation set forth and explained, 166-8; arguments in favour of the scheme, 169, 171; a set of rules for regulating the scheme suggested, 172-3; examples of working the scheme, 174; Peile, Rev. W. O., "Tay: a Novel," 615  
Phipson, Emma, "The Animal-lore of Shakspeare's Time," 232  
Pinkerton, T. A., "Agnes Moran," 615  
Pollock, F., M.A., LL.D., "The Land Laws," 219  
Porter, Whitworth, Major-Gen., R.E., "A History of the Knights of Malta," 250  
Pressense, E. de, D.D., "The Early Years of Christianity," translated by Annie Harwood-Holmden, vol. ii., fourth edition, 536  
Price, Eleanor C., "The Foreigners," 611  
"Pulpit (The) Commentary," 1 Corinthians, 538  
Pye, Stephen, "Rigmarole Charades in Doggrel Rhymes," 599  
Pyle, Howard, "The Merry Adventure of Robin Hood," 617  
QUARITCH, BERNARD, "Catalogue of Works on the Fine Arts," Parts VI., VII., 262  
QUEEN'S (THE) LATEST BOOK, 420-429; motives which lead to publication,



- 421; no mention of political questions, 422; character sketch of the late John Brown, 423; Sir T. Biddulph and Norman Macleod, 425-8; publication regretted, 429
- RACINE**, 42-62; accorded the highest place by the best French critics, 43; Corneille more admired by foreigners, 44; success slowly acquired and long doubtful, 45; educated at Port Royal and intended for the Church, 46; Racine and Louis XIV., 47; and the Court of Louis, 48; "Iphigénie" considered by Voltaire the finest work of the French stage, 49; analysis of the drama as treated by Racine, 49-53; introduction of the Lesbian slave, Eriphile, excellent in effect, 50; Iphigénie and Eriphile, 52; disappointing climax which occurs too soon, 53; the "Phèdre" distinguished by the same incomparable ease and harmony of verse, 53; difference between Racine and Euripides in treatment of CEnone, 54; rumour of the death of Theseus, a stroke due solely to the invention of Racine, 55; the Roman plays of "Britannicus" and "Berenice," 57; and religious dramas, 59; general criticism, 60, 61
- Reid, T. Wemyss, edited by, "A Memoir of J. D. Heaton, M.D., of Leeds," 258  
"Gladys Fane: a Story of Two Lives," 611
- Rein, Prof. J. J., "Japan: Travels and Researches undertaken at the cost of the Prussian Government," translated from the German, 554
- Renan, Ernest, "Philosophical Dialogues and Fragments," 211
- REPRESENTATION AND MISREPRESENTATION**, 392-420
- Robertson, J. Le Gay B.-G., "The Goal of Time: a Poem," 266
- Rogers, T. W. F., "Grammar and Logic in the Nineteenth Century, as seen in a Syntactical Analysis of the English Language," 213
- Romanes, S. J., M.A., F.R.S., "Mental Evolution in Animals," with a posthumous Essay on Instinct, by Charles Darwin, 569
- Rosmini Serbati, Antonio, "The Origin of Ideas," vol. ii., translated from the fifth Italian edition of the *Nuovo Saggio*, 541
- Ross, Denman W., Ph.D., "The Early History of Landholding among the Germans," 239
- "SACRED BOOKS OF THE EAST," edited by Prof. Max Müller, vols. xvii., xix., xxii., 207
- SAMSON-SAGA (THE) AND THE MYTH OF HERAKLES**, 305-328
- Sayce, A. H., "The Ancient Empires of the East, Herodotus I.-III., with Notes, Introductions, and Appendices," 269  
"Introduction to the Science of Language," 601
- Schaff, Philip, D.D., LL.D., "History of the Church," 208
- Schermerhorn, Rev. M. K., M.A., "Sacred Scriptures of the World," 207
- Schliemann, Dr. Heinrich, "Troja," 575
- Scott-White, A. H., B.Sc., "Chemical Analysis for Schools and Science Classes," 566
- Scribner, G. Hilton, "Where did Life Begin?" 563
- Scrutton, T. R., M.A., LL.B., "The Laws of Copyright," 552
- Seeley, J. R., M.A., "The Expansion of England," 246
- Shindler, R., M.A., edited by, "The Hiero of Xenophon," 601
- Shorthouse, J. H., "The Little Schoolmaster Mark. A Spiritual Romance," 279
- Shuckburgh, E. S., M.A., edited by, with Notes and Vocabulary for the use of Schools, "Selections from Virgil," 270
- Sidgwick, A., "Fallacies: A View of Logic from the Practical Side," 210
- Smith, A. M., "A System of Subjective Political Economy," 221  
J. H., M.A., "An Introduction to the Study of Heat," 236
- Spencer, J., B.Sc., "Elementary Practical Chemistry and Laboratory Practice," Part I., 238
- Stadler, August, "Kant's Theorie der Materie," 538
- Stallybrass, J. S., translated by, "Teutonic Mythology of Jacob Grimm, vol. iii., 585
- Stewart, Rev. A., "Nether Lochaber: the Natural History, Legends, and Folklore of the West Highlands," 232
- St. John-Brenon, E., "Two Gallian Laments and some Verses," 597
- Stormonth, Rev. James, "A Dictionary of the English Language," Library Edition, Parts I., II., 283  
"A Dictionary of the English Language," Parts III., IV., V., 617
- Stubbs, Rev. C. W., M.A., "The Land and the Labourers," 547
- "SACRED BOOKS OF THE EAST," edited by

- Stubbs, Rev. C. W., M.A., "Christ and Democracy," 560
- , "The Influence of Egypt in Australia, America, and Egypt," 559
- Taylor, G., "Klytia: A Story of Heidelberg Castle," 610
- Taylor, Sedley, M.A., "Profit-Sharing between Capital and Labour," 548
- Temple, Sir Richard, Bart., "Oriental Experience: A Selection of Essays delivered on various occasions," 577
- Thackeray, W. M., "An Essay on the Genius of George Cruikshank," 279
- Thiisen, Ismar, "The Diothas: or, a Far Look Ahead," 274
- Thomson, the late James, "A Voice from the Nile, and other Poems," 597
- N. H., translated by, "Machiavelli's Discourses on the First Decade of Titus Livius," 594
- Thurm, E. F. im, M.A., "Among the Indians of Guiana," 230
- Tincker, M.A., "The Jewel in the Lotus: a Novel," 615
- Tobago*, 296
- "Tribes (The) on my Frontier," by E. H. A., 563
- Trollope, A., "The Land-Leaguers," 276
- TROLLOPE, ANTHONY, 83-115; born in 1815 in London; his parents, 84, 85; "The Domestic Manners of the Americans," published by Mrs. Trollope in 1832, 86; boyhood of Anthony, 87-91; enters the Post Office, 92; Colonel Maberley, 93; an Irish appointment, 94; life in Ireland, 95; in the south-west of England, 96; in Scotland, and thence to the West Indies; Rowland Hill, 97; Trollope and the Post Office officials, 98; visit to the United States, 99; thoughts of Parliament, 100; contests Beverley, 102; his literary career, 103, 104; criticisms on Trollope, 105, 106; his character, 107; literary habits, 108, 109; Trollope's view of the work of a novelist, 111, 112; his literary earnings, 113; death in Dec. 1882, 115
- Tyler, Sarah, "Marie Antoinette," 590
- UZANNE, OCTAVE, "The Fan," illustrated by Paul Avril, 270
- "Le Livre. Revue du Monde Littéraire," 617
- VACCINATION, COMPULSORY, 496-528
- "Vambéry, Arminius, His Life and Adventures;" written by Himself, 246
- Verne, Jules, "The Green Ray;" translated from the French by Mary de Hauteville, 271
- Vernon Lee, "Ottolie: an Eighteenth Century Idyll," 277
- Villari, Prof., "Machiavelli and his Times," 592
- WALFORD, E., M.A., "Greater London," 260
- Wallace, Cornelia, "Flowers: a Fantasy," 598
- Waterman, L. D., "Phantoms of Life," 266
- Watts, H., B.A., "A Manual of Chemistry," vol. i., 566
- Webb, Rev. T. W., M.A., "Optics without Mathematics," 236
- Welch, W., M.A., and C. G. Duffield, "Eutropius, adapted for the Use of Beginners, with Notes and Vocabulary," 270
- Wheatley, H. B., edited by, "The Historical and Posthumous Memoirs of Sir N. W. Wraxall," 581
- White, R. G., "Mr. Washington Adams in England," 272
- Williams, Monier, M.A., D.C.L., "Religious Thought and Life in India," 531
- Wilson, Mrs. R. F., "The Christian Brothers; their Origin and Work," 249
- WOMEN, THE FUTURE OF SINGLE, 151-162
- Wood, Rev. Henry, "A Season among the Wild Flowers," 234
- Wright, W. A., M.A., LL.D., "The Bible Word-Book. A Glossary of Archaic Words," 535
- Wylie, Rev. J. A., LL.D., "Over the Holy Land," 227
- YONGE, C. M., and Hastings Weld, D.D., "Aunt Charlotte's Stories of American History," 591
- Young, Robert, "Light in Lands of Darkness," 228
- ZELLER, E., "A History of Eclecticism in Greek Philosophy," translated by S. F. Alleyne, 211

END OF VOL. LXV.







