













THE  
WESTMINSTER  
REVIEW.

JULY AND OCTOBER,  
1886.

"Truth can never be confirmed enough,  
though doubts did ever sleep  
SHAKESPEARE

Wahrheitsliebe zeigt sich dem, der in unvollständigem Gute zu finden und zu schaffen liebt  
~~~~~  
GUTL

NEW SERIES

VOL. LXX

LONDON  
TRUBNER & CO., LUDGATE HILL  
MDCCLXXXVI.

552 WE S (A) c. (69)  
Vol. 125

**Callantyne Press**  
BALI ANTYNE, HANSON AND CO, EDINBURGH  
CHANDOS STREET, LONDON

**George Washington Public Library**  
Acq. No. Date

# INDEX.

---

\*.\* *All Books must be looked for under the Author's name.*

- ABBEY, HENRY, "The Poems of," new enlarged edition, 556
- Ainslie, A. D., "Reynard the Fox," after the German version of Goethe, 285
- Aldrich, T. B., "The Stillwater Tragedy," 567
- Allen, Grant, "Charles Darwin," 551
- , Phoebe, "Old Iniquity," 565
- AMERICAN RESOURCES AND THE AMERICAN EXHIBITION, 305-330; American manufactures compared to whole exports, 306; their value for 1870 and 1885, 306; countries receiving them, 308; industrial development, 309; natural resources and mechanical contrivances, 310; cost of wheat-producing, 312-3; the tariff, 314; imports and exports, 315; manufacturing establishments, 316; principal industries, 318; minerals, 319; currency, 320; property, 321; accumulated wealth, 322; indebtedness, 323; shipping, 324; cost of shipbuilding, 325; forthcoming Exhibition in London, 326-8; its purpose and objects, 329-30
- Amherst, W. J., "The History of Catholic Emancipation and the Progress of the Catholic Church in the British Isles from 1771 to 1820," 274
- Anderson, Joseph, LL.D., "Scotland in Pagan Times: the Bronze and Stone Ages," 271
- Anstey, F., "A Fallen Idol," 566
- Aramis, "Monkraven: the Story of his Betrayal," 563
- Arpold, the late Thomas, D.D., "The Second Punic War;" edited by W. T. Arnold, M.A., 268
- , Edwin, M.A., C.S.I., "India Revisited," 538
- Ashton, John, "The Dawn of the Nineteenth Century in England," 541
- BAGNAL, J. E., "Handbook of Mosses," 549
- Baldwin, James, Ph.D., "The Book-Lover: a Guide to the Best Reading," 298
- Bascom, J., "Problems in Philosophy," 247
- Bassanio, "Edward the Confessor: a Drama," 557
- Bax, E. Belfort, "A Handbook of the History of Philosophy," 244
- "Beaconsfield's (Lord) Correspondence with his Sister, 1832-1852," 279
- Beard, W. H., "Humour in Animals," 303
- Bendall, C., M.A., "A Journey of Literary and Archaeological Research in Nepal and Northern India, during the Winter of 1884-5," 539
- Beringer, Mrs. Oscar, "A Left-handed Marriage," 297
- Besant, Annie, "Autobiographical Sketches," 275
- Bettany, G. T., M.A., "Eminent Doctors: their Lives and their Work," 281
- Birch, W. De G., "Biographical Notices of Dr. Samuel Birch," 279
- Biroat, Jacques, "The Eucharistic Life of Jesus Christ;" translated by Edward Varnish, 524
- Blind, Mathilde, "Madame Roland," 272
- Brown, G. B., M.A., "From Schola to Cathedral," 269
- Buller, E. A., B.A., "Pond-Life: Insects," 548
- CANINI, M. A., "Il Libro dell' Amore," 289
- Carew, Laura S., "My Destiny; or, Lady Musgrave," 300
- Carnegie, Andrew, "Triumphant Democracy," 253
- Carpenter, E., "Towards Democracy," 283
- Cazenove, J. G., D.D., "Historic Aspects of the *a priori* Argument concerning the Being and Attributes of God," 240
- Chatfield, A. W., translated by, "Litany and Hymns in Greek Verse," 287
- Chesneau, E., translated by Clara Bell, "The Education of the Artist," 291
- "Christian Theocracy and the Dynamics of Modern Government," 235
- CHRISTIAN THOUGHT TESTED BY MODERN IDEAS, 447-482
- Church, B. W., "Advent Sermons, 1885," 239

- CHURCH OF ENGLAND, THE ENDOWMENTS OF THE**, 1-15; Mr. Freeman's use of the term "right," 2-4; is Church property *national* property? 5-7; for whom do the parochial endowments exist? 8-9; what are public trusts? 9-11; tithes, 12; the early English Church, 13; inherent right of the State to deal with public trusts, 15
- Clarke, C. B., F.R.S., "Speculations from Political Economy," 533
- COLONIAL (THE) AND INDIAN EXHIBITION**, 29-59; India and its courts, 30-3; its commerce, 34; products, 35; Burmah, 36; Ceylon, 87; Canada, 38-9; Newfoundland, 39; New South Wales, 40-1; Victoria, 41-2; South Australia, 42-3; West Australia, 44; New Zealand, 45; Fiji, 45; Cape Colony, 46-7; Natal, 48; West African colonies, 49; West Indies, Bahamas, Bermudas, 50-1; British Guiana, 51; British Honduras, British North Borneo, Straits Settlements, Mauritius, 52; Aden, Cyprus, Malta, Gibraltar, and the Falkland Islands, 53; general statistics, 54-5; federation, 56-7; *colonial* federation, 58
- Colonial England, *see* Growth
- Conway, Hugh, "Living or Dead," 298
- Cook, Keningle, M.A., LL.D., "The Fathers of Jesus: a Study of the Lineage of the Christian Doctrine and Traditions," 232
- Copeman, S. S., edited by, "Thoughts on Life, from Modern Writers," 293
- Corbett, Julian, "The Fall of Asgard: a Tale of St. Olaf's Days," 302
- Courtney, Cecil, "Link by Link," 301
- , W. L., M.A., LL.D., "Constructive Ethics," 243
- "Court Royal: a Story of Cross Currents," 299
- Cowan, Frank, "The Terraces of Rotomahana," "Australia: a Charcoal Sketch," "The City of the Royal Palm, and other Poems," "A Visit in Verse to Hate-naumanu," 557
- Crawford, F. Marion, "A Tale of a Lonely Parish," 296
- Crookshank, Edgar M., "An Introduction to Practical Bacteriology, based upon the Methods of Koch," 553
- Cross, Mrs. J. Taylor, "Waifs and Strays, and other Lays," 286
- "Cruise (The) of H.M.S. *Bacchante*, 1879-1882," compiled from the Private Journals, Letters, and Note-Books of Prince Albert Victor and Prince George of Wales, with Additions, by John N. Dalton, 259
- Cunningham, John, D.D., "The Growth of the Church in its Organization and Institutions," 237
- "DAGONET THE JESTER," 294
- Dalla-Torre, Prof. K. W. v., "The Tourist's Guide to the Flora of the Alps;" translated and edited by A. W. Bennett, M.A., 550
- Dalton, *see* Cruise
- Danson, "The Wealth of Households," 255
- Dawson, W. J., "Quest and Vision," 286
- De Greef, G., "Introduction à la Sociologie," 530
- "Demos: a Story of English Socialism," 296
- Dent, H. C., "A Year in Brazil, with Notes on the Abolition of Slavery, the Finances of the Empire, &c.," 540
- "Divyavadāna (The)," edited by E. B. Cowell, M.A., and B. A. Neill, M.A., 240
- Dobbs, A. E., M.A., "Home Rule," 532
- Dodd, J. T., M.A., "Church Reform," 524
- Don, Isabel, "The Story of Holland," 273
- Dostoieffsky, F., "Crime and Punishment: a Russian Realistic Novel," 298
- Duruy, Victor, edited by the Rev. J. P. Mahaffy, "History of Rome and the Roman People," vol. v., parts i., ii., 267
- EBBUTT, PERCY G., "Emigrant Life in Kansas," 263
- Eclaw, Ary, "Roland; or, the Expiation of a Sin," and "The Romance of a German Court," 293
- , "Le Roi de Thessalie," 303
- EDUCATION (NATIONAL) IN ENGLAND, FIFTEEN YEARS OF**, 499-519
- Emra, Rev. W. H. A., "The Jubilee Ode, 1886," 558
- Endowments, *see* Church
- ENGLAND'S SUPREMACY**, 381-400; agricultural status, 384; commerce, 385; competition, 386-7; woollen manufactures, 388; employment and wages, 389; coal production, 390; doubtful supremacy, 391; the question of a peasant proprietary, 392-4; colonial and municipal borrowings, 395; Ireland, 398-9
- Evans, H. H., B.A., "St. Paul, the Author of the Acts of the Apostles and of the Third Gospel," 239
- FARINI, G. A., "Through the Kalahari Desert," 540
- Farrar, F. W., D.D., "History of Interpretation," 236
- Flaubert, Gustave, "Salammbô," Englished by M. French Sheldon, 560

- Flaubert, Gustave, "Salammbô," translated from the French *édition définitive* by J. S. Chartres, 564
- Fleay, F. G., "A Chronicle History of the Life and Work of William Shakespeare, Player, Poet, and Playmaker," 303, 558
- FOOD REFORM, 483-499
- FREEMAN (PROFESSOR) ON THE METHODS OF HISTORICAL STUDY, 367-81; testimony to Dr. Arnold, 368; tribute to Goldwin Smith, 369; the true end of History, 370-1; Historical Geography, 372; Dr. Freeman's criticism on Gibbon, 373; Macaulay, Carlyle, 374; Froude, Mitford, 375; J. R. Green, Palgrave, Hallam, 376; Dean Milman, 377; Mommsen, 378; Niebuhr, 379
- Froude, J. A., "Oceana; or, England and her Colonies," 256
- Fuller, Rev. M., M.A., "The Life, Times, and Writings of Thomas Fuller, D.D., the Church Historian," second edition, 277
- GEARY, GRATTAN, "Burma after the Conquest," 265
- Geikie, A., LL.D., "Class-book of Geology," 545
- Genone, Hudor, "Inquirendo Island," 294
- George, Henry, "Protection, or Free Trade," 251
- GLADSTONE'S (MR.) IRISH POLICY, 194-211; his Land Acts of 1870 and 1881, failures—by his own account, 195, opinions against "Home Rule" in 1871, 1874, 1877, 1880, 186; sudden conversion to "Home Rule," 198; his Bill—"about the worst kind of Bill," 200; "a Constitution mainly composed of restrictive clauses," 201; Separation, or Union? 202; the Irish have never realized the meaning of "Home Rule," 203; objections to Home Rule for Scotland, 204; agrarian problem never to be solved by any number of Land Acts, 205; the root of the Irish difficulty, 205; suggested changes in the form of government, 206-7; the question at issue must not be mixed up with past controversies and blunders, 208
- Gordon, Lord Granville, "Notes from another World," 295
- Graham, W., M.A., "The Social Problem in its Economical, Moral, and Political Aspects," 248
- Gray, James, "Ancient Proverbs and Maxims from Burmese Sources," 291
- , Peter, and B. B. Woodward, "Seaweeds, Shells, and Fossils," 548
- "Green, Thomas Hill, Works of;" edited by R. L. Nettleship, vol. ii., 241
- GROWTH (THE) OF COLONIAL ENGLAND—BRITISH SOUTH AFRICA, 157-93; early history and discovery, 159-60; the Cape taken possession of in name of England, 1620, 161; settlement by Van Riebeck, 1652, in name of Dutch E.I. Company, 162; Dutch rule, 163-6; capture by British, 1795, and final cession in 1815, 167; British rule, 168; founding of Port Elizabeth, 1820, 169; Lord Somerset and the Albany settlers, 170; Kafir wars, 171; "great Boer trek," 1835, 172; Boers and Zulus, 173; Natal declared a British colony, 1843, 174; incident of *Neptune*, convict ship, 175; "representative government," 175; progress under Sir G. Grey, 176; "responsible government" in 1872, 177; the Basutos, 178; recent policy, 179; Orange Free State, 180; statistics, 181; products, industries, 182-3; population, 184; Natal, 185-6; Bechuanaland, 187; why has not Cape Colony advanced more rapidly? 188-9; the Boer character, 189-90; future prospects, 193
- HABICH, G. E., "Vade-mecum pour la Peinture italienne des anciens Maitres," 567
- HADLEY, A. T., "Railroad Transportation: its History and Laws," 254
- HANOVER—ERNEST, KING OF, 59-75
- Hardy, A. S., "The Wind of Destiny," 564
- , T., "The Mayor of Casterbridge," 300
- Hartmann, R., "Anthropoid Apes," 542
- , E. von, "The Religion of the Future;" translated by Edward Dare, 231
- Harvey, Rev. M., "Whence are we, and Whither Tending," 247
- Hastie, W., B.D., translated by, "The Philosophy of Art," by Hegel and C. L. Michelet, 291
- Heath, F. G., "Sylvan Winter," 549
- Hennell, S. S., "Comparative Ethics: III. —Moral Principle in Regard to Parenthood," 247
- Heraud, J. A., "The Sybil among the Tombs," 557
- Herrford, C. H., M.A., "Studies in the Literary Relations of England and Germany in the Sixteenth Century," 560
- Hernaman, C. F., "The Crown of Life: Verses for Holy Seasons," 557
- Hodgson, S. H., "Philosophy and Experience," 247



- Holmes, E. M., and Peter Gray, "The Young Collector: British Fungi, Lichens, &c.," 549
- Hood, Rev. A., "The Prophet of Nazareth and His Message," 240
- Howard, W., "Spell-bound," 565
- Howells, W. D., "Indian Summer: a Novel," 295
- Howson, J. S., D.D., "The Diaconate of Women in the Christian Church," 240
- Hulme, F. E., and S. Hibberd, "Familiar Garden Flowers," 549
- Hunter, W. W., "The Indian Empire: its People, History, and Products," 535
- "INDIA'S NEEDS: MATERIAL, POLITICAL, SOCIAL, MORAL, AND RELIGIOUS," 537
- INDIVIDUALISM, THE BASIS OF, 118-57
- "Innominatus," "In the Light of the Twentieth Century," 293
- JACOB, T. EVAN, "The Bliss of Revenge," 300
- Jay, John, "American Intervention in British Politics," 533
- Jebb, R. C., "Sophocles: the Plays and Fragments," Part II.—"The *Œdipus Rex*," 288
- Jerningham, H. E. H., "Reminiscences of an Attaché," 271
- Jevons, F. B., M.A., "A History of Greek Literature, from the Earliest Period to the Death of Demosthenes," 558
- Johnson, H. M., "The Story of Jeremiah and his Times," 240
- KATSCHER, L., "Nebelland und Themsestrand," 263
- Kitton, F. G., compiled by, "Dickensiana," 292
- Klein, E., M.D., "Micro-organisms and Disease," third edition, 552
- Knighton, W., LL.D., "Struggles for Life," 265
- Koegel, F., "Lotze's *Ästhetik*," 247
- Kuenen, Prof. A., "An Historical-Critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch," 235
- LAMB, THE GENIUS AND CHARACTER OF CHARLES, 16-29
- Land, *see* Registration
- "Land Transfer," published by order of the Bar Committee, 255
- "Landed Property in Egypt, The Right of," by Yacoub Artin Bey, 255
- Leaf, W., edited by, with English Notes and Introduction, "The *Iliad*," vol. i, books i.-xii., 288
- "Letters from Donegal in 1886," by a Lady "Felton;" edited by Colonel Maurice, 531
- Lilly, W. S., "Chapters in European History," 273
- Lingston, R., "Verses of Country and Town," 556
- Lloyd, Rev. J., M.A., "The Book of Joshua," 523
- Lubbock, Sir John, "Flowers, Fruits, and Leaves," 550
- MABELAN, D., "Home Rule and Imperial Unity," 530
- Macleod, H. D., M.A., "The Theory and Practice of Banking," fourth edition, vol. ii., 255
- Macmillan, H., D.D., "The Olive Leaf," 524
- Magoun, G. F., D.D., "Are the Natural and Spiritual Worlds one in Law?" 247
- Mauss, "The Young Marquise," 565
- Maurice, *see* Letters
- Max Muller, *see* Sacred
- McCarthy, Justin, M.P., "Camiola: a Girl with a Fortune," 301
- , J. H., M.P., "Doom: an Atlantic Episode," 301
- McCosh, J., D.D., "Psychology: the Cognitive Powers," 527
- Merrill, G., "Studies in Comparative Jurisprudence and the Conflict of Laws," 541
- MICKIEWICZ, ADAM, 400-23
- Miller, A. P., "Consolation, and other Poems," 284
- Milligan, W., D.D., "The Revelation of St. John," 238
- Milne, J., "Earthquakes and other Earth Movements," 546
- Minto, W., M.A., edited, with Preface and Notes, "Scott's Lay of the Last Minstrel," 287
- Minto, W., "The Crack of Doom: a Novel," 566
- Miraglia, L., "Filosofia del Diritto," 243
- MONEY (THE FUNCTIONS OF)—BIMETALLISM, 424-447
- Moon, G. Washington, "Ecclesiastical English," 290
- Moore, G., "Literature at Nurse; or, Circulating Morals," 559
- Morgan, C. Lloyd, "The Springs of Conduct: an Essay in Evolution," 245
- "Mrs. Peter Ho . . .," 296
- Muir, M., M.B., . . ., "The Elements of Thermal Chemistry," 547
- Murray, D. C., " . . . t Rachel," 297

- NAPOLEON'S EARLY MANHOOD, 331-67; controversy as to exact date of his birth, 333-6; his education, 338; 13th Vendémiaire, 340; marriage with Joséphine, 342; Italian campaign, 345-9; quarrel with the Directory, 352-3; projected invasion of England, 354; Egypt, 355-7; supreme power, 359; Joséphine, 360; her divorce, 363-4; marriage with Marie Louise, 365.
- Noel, Hon. R., "Essays on Poetry and Poets," 287
- Novicow, J., "La Politique Internationale," 528
- O'CONNOR, W. D., "Hamlet's Note Book," 303
- Oliphant, Laurence, "Masollam: a Problem of the Period," 563
- , Mrs., "A Country Gentleman and his Family," 295
- PALMER, THE LATE W., M.A., "An Introduction to Early Christian Symbolism," edited, with Notes, by the Revs. J. Spencer Northcote, D.D., and W. R. Brownlow, M.A., 289
- Panton, J. E., "The Curate's Wife," 298
- Patmore, Coventry, "Poems," second collective edition, 554
- Payn, James, "The Heir of the Ages," 564
- Pelleschi, G., "Eight Months on the Gran Chaco of the Argentine Republic," 265
- Pennington, A. S., "British Zoophytes," 548
- Penny, A. J., "An Introduction to the Study of Boehme's Writings," 240
- Piatt, Sarah M. B., "Mrs. Piatt's Poems," 282
- Porter, C. T., "Mechanics and Faith," 233
- Pratt, H., M.D., "New Aspects of Life and Religion," 523
- Prestwich, J., M.A., "Geology: Chemical, Physical, and Stratigraphical," 544
- Pringle, M. A., "A Journey in East Africa," new edition, 539
- Proctor, R. A., "Strength and Happiness," 552
- "Pulpit Commentary (The)," by the Rev. J. Barmby and Rev. E. C. S. Gibson, 522
- READ—WHAT AND HOW? 99-118
- Reade, Amos, "Norah's Martyr," 562
- REGISTRATION OF TITHE LAND, A NEW VIEW OF, 76-98
- Rendall, F., "Theology of the Hebrew Christians," 240
- "Repeal (The) of the Union Conspiracy," 532
- Reusch, Dr. Fr. H., "Nature and the Bible: Lectures on the Mosaic History of Creation in its Relation to Natural Science," translated by K. Lyttleton from the fourth edition, 234
- Richards, Laura E., "The Joyous Story of Toto," 303
- Roberts, C., arranged and edited by, "The Naturalist's Diary," 551
- Robertson, C. F., D.D., "Papers of the American Historical Association," vol. i. No. 4, 275
- Romilly, H. H., "The Western Pacific and New Guinea," 260
- Round, J. H., "The Early Life of Anne Boleyn," 270
- Rowell, M. C., "The Silver Dial," 300
- "SACRED BOOKS OF THE EAST," edited by F. Max Müller, vols. xxvi., xxvii., xxviii., 520
- Sala, G. A., "Under the Sun: Essays mainly written in Hot Countries," new edition, 265
- Schmidt, Oscar, "The Mammalia, in Relation to Primeval Times," 513
- "Schofield, Memorials of R. H. A., M.A.," compiled from his Letters and Diaries by his brother, A. T. Schofield, M.D., 276
- Schopenhauer, Arthur, "The World as Will and Idea," translated from the German by R. B. Haldane, M.A., and J. Kemp, M.A., vols. ii., iii, 525
- Scott, J. G. (Shway Yoe), "Burma: as It Was, as It Is, and as It Will Be," 264
- Shand, A. I., "Fortune's Wheel: a Novel," 297
- Sidgwick, Henry, "Outlines of the History of Ethics, for English Readers," 526
- Sinnett, A. P., "United: a Novel," 566
- SOCIALIST (THE) MOVEMENT, 212-30
- Soetbeer, H., Dr. Phil., "Die Stellung der Sozialisten zur Malthus'schen Bevölkerungslehre," 535
- Stanford, Hope, "The Otway's Child," 564
- Stephens, H. Morse, "A History of the French Revolution," 270
- , H. P., and W. St. Leger, "The Basilisk: a Story of To-day," 565
- Stepniak, "The Russian Storm Cloud," 250
- "Sweet Briar: Songs and Sketches from 'Quiz,'" 556

- TAYLOR, G., "Jetta; or, Heidelberg under the Romans," translated from the German by Sutton Corke, 562
- , W. A., "The Wayfarers," 302
- Temple, Sir Richard, "Cosmopolitan Essays," 263
- Tregear, E., "The Aryan Maori," 539
- Tucker, W. J., "Life and Society in Eastern Europe," 262
- Tuckerman, C. K., "The Greeks of Today," 540
- "Two Tramps," "Low Down: Wayside Thoughts in Ballad and other Verse," 556
- Tyrrell, R. Y., "The Correspondence of M. Tullius Cicero," vol. ii., 288
- Tytler, Sarah, "Buried Diamonds," 298
- VINES, S. H., M.A., "Lectures on the Physiology of Plants," 550
- YONGE, C. M., "Chantry House," 298
- Yorke, C., "That Little Girl," 565
- ZOLA, E., "His Masterpiece (l'Œuvre or, De Lantier's Struggle for Fame," 561

END OF VOL. LXX.



ALL  
who suffer from.  
INDIGESTION.  
General Debility.  
LOSS OF APPETITE.  
Dyspepsia.  
LIVER COMPLAINT.  
Nervous Headaches.  
BILIOUSNESS.  
Costiveness.

Should use Camomile in its most convenient form.

viz

**NORTON'S · CAMOMILE · PILLS**

REGISTERED.

TRADE

**NORTON'S**

MARK.

FOR TESTIMONIALS & OBSERVATIONS ON INDIGESTION, P. T. O.

## OBSERVATIONS ON INDIGESTION.

**I**NDIGESTION is a weakness or want of power of the digestive juices in the stomach to convert what we eat and drink into healthy matter, for the proper nourishment of the whole system. It is caused by everything which weakens the system in general, or the stomach in particular. From it proceed nearly all the diseases to which we are liable; for it is very certain, that if we could always keep the stomach right we should only die by old age or accident.

It is almost impossible to enumerate all the symptoms of this first invader upon the constitution, as in a hundred cases of *Indigestion* there will probably be something peculiar to each; but, be they what they may, they are all occasioned by the food becoming a burden rather than a support to the stomach; and in all its stages the medicine most wanted is that which will afford speedy and effectual assistance to the digestive organs, and give energy to the nervous and muscular systems. Nothing can more speedily, or with more certainty, effect so desirable an object than *Norton's Camomile Pills*. Experience has afforded the most ample proof that they possess all the fine aromatic and stomachic properties for which the herb has been esteemed; and, as they are taken into the stomach unencumbered by any diluting or indigestible substance, in the same degree has their benefit been more immediate and decided. Mild in their operation and pleasant in their effect, they may be taken at any age, and under any circumstances, without danger or inconvenience. A person exposed to cold and wet a whole day or night could not possibly receive any injury from taking them, but, on the contrary, they would effectually prevent a cold being taken.

Females at that particular period of life when nature, under certain changes, wants assistance and support, will find them invaluable, taken in doses of four or six Pills every night at bed-time, more or less as required. To youth they will afford the

requisite assistance; and, in doses of two, once or twice in a day, will give to age the necessary support.

After a long acquaintance with and strict observance of the medicinal properties of *Norton's Camomile Pills*, it is only doing them justice to say, that they are really the most valuable of all TONIC MEDICINES. By the word tonic is meant a medicine which gives strength to the stomach sufficient to digest in proper quantities all wholesome food, which increases the power of every nerve and muscle of the human body, or, in other words, invigorates the nervous and muscular systems.

Nothing can be more clear than that those articles which are agreeable to the taste were by nature intended for our food and sustenance, whether liquid or solid, foreign or of native production. If they are pure and unadulterated, no harm need be dreaded by their use; they will only injure by abuse. Consequently, whatever the palate approves, eat and drink always in moderation, but never in excess; keeping in mind that the first process of digestion is performed in the mouth, the second in the stomach; and that, in order that the stomach may be able to do its work properly, it is requisite the first process should be well performed. This consists in masticating or chewing the solid food, so as to break down and separate the fibres and small substances of meat and vegetable, mixing them well, and blending the whole together before they are swallowed; and it is particularly urged upon all to take plenty of time to their meals and never eat in haste. If you conform to this short and simple, but comprehensive advice, and find that there are various things which others eat and drink with pleasure and without inconvenience, and which would be pleasant to yourself only that they disagree, you may at once conclude that the fault is in the stomach, that it does not possess the power which it ought to do, that it wants assistance, and the sooner that assistance is afforded the better.

## NORTON'S CAMOMILE PILLS

ARE THE MOST CERTAIN PRESERVERS OF HEALTH,

A MILD, YET SPEEDY, SAFE, AND

EFFECTUAL AID in CASES of INDIGESTION & ALL STOMACH COMPLAINTS

AND, AS A NATURAL CONSEQUENCE, A

PURIFIER OF THE BLOOD AND SWEETENER OF THE WHOLE SYSTEM.

Sold Everywhere, Price 13 $\frac{1}{2}$ d., 2/6, and 1/1.

# TESTIMONIALS.

ALNWICK, NORTHUMBERLAND,

13th October, 1885.

To the Proprietors of

NORTON'S CAMOMILE PILLS,

London, E.C.

GENTLEMEN,—Having taken your valuable family medicine almost exclusively for over 20 years, during which time I have been engaged in a sedentary and trying business without a week's absence on account of illness, I have great pleasure in testifying to its efficiency in all cases of indigestion, headache, and their attendant evils, and I fully believe if kept in the house and taken in time they rectify the system, and, with ordinary care, ensure good health.

Yours truly,

A DOCTORLESS MAN.

I enclose you my card.

WORMLEY, HERTS,

November 19th, 1886.

GENTLEMEN,—Having for some time suffered greatly from indigestion, I was persuaded to try a bottle of "Norton's Camomile Pills," and am pleased to say I have derived the greatest benefit from them.

Yours faithfully,

ADA P. MILLER.

CROYDON,

16th September, 1886.

GENTLEMEN,—I have great pleasure in testifying to the efficacy of your Pills (having taken them for a number of years) as a safe family medicine, which taken regularly keeps the system in a healthy state, and acts as a preventive to a great many internal disorders, in addition to which they have the great advantage which many other Pills do not possess, viz., they are not purgative and do not cause any inconvenience.

I enclose my card, and beg to remain,

Gentlemen,

Yours obediently,

PATER FAMILIAS.

To the Proprietors of

NORTON'S CAMOMILE PILLS,

London.

NAZING, ESSEX.

GENTLEMEN,—Please to send me a large bottle of "Norton's Camomile Pills." For how many years we have taken them I cannot remember, but hope never again to be without them in the house. My husband is never really well without an occasional dose, his digestion not being very strong, or sometimes when the weather is very bad a dose will certainly prevent catching cold after great exposure. For myself, suffering as I used from violent headache for days together, I dare not be without them, and I can never be grateful enough for the benefit derived from their use. We have for years given them to the children when out of sorts, and, in fact, seldom, if ever, want a doctor, a consideration in these bad times.—Yours sincerely,

M. TAYLOR.

To the Proprietors of

NORTON'S CAMOMILE PILLS,

London.

ST. PAUL'S VICARAGE, MORLEY, LEEDS,

June 14th, 1883.

GENTLEMEN,—I have lately been taking "Norton's Camomile Pills," and have found so much benefit from their use that I would like to make them well known among my parishioners. If, therefore, you care to send me, carriage paid, a parcel of 500 or 1,000 four-page circulars, such as you wrap round the bottles, I will insert them in the July number of my Parish Magazine, free of charge. I send you by this same post a copy of my Magazine with one of your circulars enclosed, so that you may see what I mean. The parcel of circulars might be sent per Great Northern Railway, or London and North Western Railway, and should come to hand early next week, as our next number will be published, Saturday, June 23rd. If you accept my offer let me know soon, that I may give the necessary instructions to my publisher.—Yours very truly,

JAMES CROOK,

Vicar of St. Paul's, Morley, Leeds.

BERKELEY, September, 1869.

GENTLEMEN,—I feel it a duty I owe to you to express my gratitude for the great benefit I have derived by taking "Norton's Camomile Pills." I applied to your Agent, Mr. Bell, Berkeley, for the above-named Pills, for wind in the stomach, from which I suffered excruciating pain for a length of time, having tried nearly every remedy prescribed, but without deriving any benefit at all. After taking two bottles of your valuable Pills I was quite restored to my usual state of health. Please give this publicity for the benefit of those who may thus be afflicted.

I am, Sir, yours truly,

HENRY ALLPASS.

The Proprietors of NORTON'S PILLS.

GODFREY'S  
EXTRACT OF

ELDER FLOWERS



HAS BEEN FOUND to have a surprising effect in softening, improving, and preserving the skin and in rendering the **COMPLEXION** clear and beautiful

|              |         |            |           |
|--------------|---------|------------|-----------|
| It removes { | TAN     | It Cures { | PIMPLES   |
|              | SUNBURN |            | HUMOURS,  |
|              | REDNESS |            | ERUPTIONS |

**AS A TOILET REQUISITE** it is unsurpassed  
**IN THE NURSERY** it is indispensable giving immediate relief to infants bitten by insects  
**GENTLEMEN** will find it delightfully soothing after shaving

Sold Everywhere, price 2s 9d

**STEEDMAN'S SOOTHING POWDERS**  
FOR CHILDREN CUTTING TEETH.

**T**HE value of this Medicine has been largely tested in all parts of the world and by all grades of society for upwards of 50 years

Its extensive sale has induced **spurious imitations**, in some of which the **outside Label** and the **coloured Paper** enclosing the Packet of Powders, so closely resemble the Original as to have deceived many Purchasers. The Proprietor therefore feels it due to the Public to give a **special caution** against such imitations

All purchasers are therefore requested carefully to observe that the words "**JOHN STEEDMAN, Chemist, Walworth, Surrey,**" are engraved on the Government Stamp affixed to each Packet, in **White Letters on a Red Ground**, without which none are genuine. The name STEEDMAN is spelt with *two EEs*

Prepared **ONLY** at Walworth, Surrey, and Sold by all Chemists and Medicine Vendors in Packets, 1s. 1½d. and 2s. 9d. each.

# CONTENTS.

| ART.                                                                        |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              | PAGE |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| <b>I. <i>Socialism and Legislation.</i></b>                                 |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |      |
| 1.                                                                          | Socialism at St. Stephen's, 1869-1885. A Speech delivered in the House of Lords, with Preface, by the Earl of WEMYSS. London: Published by the Liberty and Property Defence League.                                                                                                                          |      |
| 2.                                                                          | Self Help or State Help. Speeches delivered at the Third Annual Meeting of the Liberty and Property Defence League.                                                                                                                                                                                          |      |
| 3.                                                                          | The Historical Basis of Socialism in England. By H. M. HYNDMAN. London: Kegan Paul & Co. 1883.                                                                                                                                                                                                               |      |
| 4.                                                                          | The Co-operative Commonwealth: an exposition of Modern Socialism. By LAURENCE GROLUND. English Edition by George Bernard Shaw. London, 1885.                                                                                                                                                                 |      |
| 5.                                                                          | Social Problems. By HENRY GEORGE. London: Kegan Paul & Co. 1884.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |      |
| 6.                                                                          | Property and Progress; or, a Brief Enquiry into Contemporary Social Agitation in England. By W. H. MALLOCK. London: John Murray. 1884.                                                                                                                                                                       | 1 -  |
| <b>II. <i>The Influence of the Roman Empire on the Catholic Church.</i></b> |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |      |
|                                                                             | The Hibbert Lectures, 1880. Lectures on the Influence of the Institutions, Thought, and Culture of Rome on Christianity and the Development of the Catholic Church. By ERNEST RENAN, of the French Academy. Translated by CHARLES BEARD, B.A. Third Edition. London and Edinburgh: Williams & Norgate. 1885. | 32   |
| <b>III. <i>Representative Government in our Colonies.</i></b>               |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |      |
| 1.                                                                          | Parliamentary Government in the British Colonies. By ALPHÆUS TODD. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 1880.                                                                                                                                                                                                         |      |
| 2.                                                                          | Review of the Colonial Policy of Lord John Russell's Administration by Earl Grey. 1853. By the Right Hon. Sir C. B. ADDERLEY, K.C.M.G., M.P. London: Edward Stanford, Charing Cross. 1869.                                                                                                                   |      |
| 3.                                                                          | Parliamentary Procedure and Practice. By JOHN GEORGE BOUBINOT, Clerk of the House of Commons, Canada. Montreal: Dawson Brothers. 1884.                                                                                                                                                                       | 50   |
| <b>IV. <i>The Works of Bret Harte.</i></b> . . . . .                        |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |      |
|                                                                             |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              | 71   |



| ART.                                                                                                                                                                                       | PAGE |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| V. <i>Henry Fawcett.</i>                                                                                                                                                                   |      |
| Life of Henry Fawcett. By LESLIE STEPHEN. London: Smith,<br>Elder & Co. 1885.                                                                                                              | 83   |
| VI. <i>The Greville Memoirs. Part II.</i>                                                                                                                                                  |      |
| A Journal of the Reign of Queen Victoria from 1837 to 1852.<br>By the late CHARLES C. F. GREVILLE, Esq., Clerk of the<br>Council. In Three Volumes. London: Longmans, Green<br>& Co. 1885. | 93   |
| VII. <i>Mr. Gladstone and Genesis</i> . . . . .                                                                                                                                            | 119  |
| VIII. <i>Missions to the Jews.</i>                                                                                                                                                         |      |
| 1. <i>Anglia Judaica.</i> By DE BLOSSIERES TOBEY. Oxford: 1738.                                                                                                                            |      |
| 2. <i>Essays addressed to the Jews.</i> By GREVILLE EWING. London:<br>1809.                                                                                                                |      |
| 3. <i>Narrative of J. C. S. F. Frey, Minister of the Gospel to the<br/>    Jews.</i> London: 1809                                                                                          |      |
| 4. <i>History of the Jews in Great Britain.</i> By MOSES MARGO-<br>LIOUTH. London. 1851.                                                                                                   |      |
| 5. <i>Sketches of Anglo-Jewish History.</i> By JAMES PICCIOTTO.<br>London: 1875.                                                                                                           |      |
| 6. <i>Biography of Bishop Barclay.</i> London: 1883.                                                                                                                                       |      |
| 7. <i>Reports of the London Society for Promoting Christianity<br/>    among the Jews, from 1809 to 1885.</i>                                                                              | 136  |
| <i>Independent Section:</i>                                                                                                                                                                |      |
| GRATTAN, AND THE IRISH PARLIAMENT . . . . .                                                                                                                                                | 179  |
| THE WOMAN QUESTION: FROM A SOCIALIST POINT OF VIEW . . . . .                                                                                                                               | 207  |
| <i>Contemporary Literature.</i>                                                                                                                                                            |      |
| Theology . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                         | 223  |
| Philosophy . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                       | 232  |
| Politics, Sociology, Voyages and Travels . . . . .                                                                                                                                         | 237  |
| Science . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                          | 258  |
| History and Biography . . . . .                                                                                                                                                            | 268  |
| Belles Lettres . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                   | 289  |

Uttara Para Jai Krishna Public Library  
Access No. 7839 Date: 21/1/1954

THE

# WESTMINSTER

AND

## FOREIGN QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1886.

### ART. I—SOCIALISM AND LEGISLATION.

1. *Socialism at St. Stephen's*, 1869—1885. A Speech delivered in the House of Lords, with Preface, by the Earl of WEMYSS. London: Published by the Liberty and Property Defence League.
2. *Self Help or State Help*. Speeches delivered at the Third Annual Meeting of the Liberty and Property Defence League.
3. *The Historical Basis of Socialism in England*. By H. M. HYNDMAN. London: Kegan Paul & Co. 1883.
4. *The Co-operative Commonwealth: an exposition of Modern Socialism*. By LAURENCE GRONLUND. English Edition by George Bernard Shaw. London, 1845.
5. *Social Problems*. By HENRY GEORGE. London: Kegan Paul & Co. 1884.
6. *Property and Progress: or, a Brief Enquiry into Contemporary Social Agitation in England*. By W. H. MALLOCK. London: John Murray. 1884.

**J**UST as individual life is subject to constant changes, which may result either in its development or decay, so is the social life liable to changes, and these changes, incident both to the co-ordinating development of a body politic and to the disintegration of that body, may result in the development, disease, or death of a nation. There have been two

theories with regard to national life which have been favourites with different classes of theoretical politicians. One of these has ascribed the duration of the life of a nation to the soul of that nation—its great men; another has ascribed the growth and health of the whole to the organic life of the masses. No doubt there is truth in both these views. Great men have not been impotent in the affairs of nations, but the affairs of nations have had vital force apart from the fine exemplar which has been set by heroes. No doubt in small communities the personal influence of individuals was predominant, and hence we had kings and aristocracies; but as nations became larger the personal influence of individual men became less, and the organizing influence of "the million" became greater. Given great men and the masses, the former have hitherto been able to find a way to dominate the latter. That the way is often found by the wit of one man is true, but that it is very often found by the wit of the many is equally evident to any close student of history. We err in losing sight of either of these facts. To think, as Carlyle did, that all the good has been produced by, and that it is still to be maintained by, heroes, is, in our opinion, a fallacy. To suppose that because men have been governed well by individuals, and because very often masses have made terrible messes when they have got sceptres into their million hands, does not seem to us to found the argument that the only course in politics is to look out for inspired rulers, or to allow inspired rulers to look out for thrones. But at the same time it would be foolish to deny the influence of great men in the past, or to ignore their uses in the future. To many these kings and heroes seem nothing but the figure-heads of the centuries which may ornament the high prow of the times, but which are powerless to direct the course of the vessel. It seems to us that great men are more like the rudder of a ship: important in setting and keeping it before the wind, but impotent against a contrary breeze. Now, in considering certain questions in relation to the politics of our own days, and the days which are going to spring upon us, we should like to recognize both those influences in the events which have taken place in the recent past, and which are imminent in the near future.

Certain statesmen, as we shall show, have adopted Socialism as a political creed, and the fact that they have opened their mouths to preach this new crusade into the Holy Land of wealth may, no doubt, be a means of expediting certain important changes, but at the same time it would be wrong to say that these statesmen will be the means of bringing these changes about. They have adopted the cause at the right moment, but the movement existed before. It is because this is so that it has been adopted

now by certain prominent statesmen. All its truths, or half truths or falsehoods, have been in writing and in print for years ; now they are getting upon their legs, upon the platforms. Socialism has, as Lord Wemyss showed in his speech in the House of Lords, made its mark in every department of legislation. But we shall show that if it has whipped us with whips in the past, it will whip us with scorpions in the future.

On the eve of this great change in the political life of this country, at a moment when the power which has hitherto been in the hands of the owners of property is about to be placed unreservedly in those hands which are empty, it is not unimportant that we should consider what will be the probable course of legislation, and to inquire what use the people will make of their power.

Lord Wemyss was right in saying that it was his duty to direct the attention of the country to the Socialistic tendency and effect of recent legislation, and we shall have some occasion to refer again to his historical account of the legislation of the last fifteen years. His Lordship, who had, we suspect, drawn, to some extent, his information as to Socialism from the writings of M. Emile de Laveleye, commenced his speech by assuming that every one understands what Socialism is. But the fact is that most of us have little meanings of our own which we attach to words, and these meanings very often differ widely from those which properly attach to them by current use. Many of us still associate Socialism with dynamite, and then get confused as to its connection with German politics, with Russian Nihilism, and Irish agrarian crime ; but few of us take the trouble to have the word clearly defined or to use it in its correct connotation.

A few years ago it would have surprised the people of this country to be told that Socialism was within the sphere of practical politics. To-day Socialism has got a hold, not only of the professors of certain German and Italian universities, not only of the revolutionists of France and the Nihilists of Russia, but it is a strong directing force in our political life. It finds a place on many platforms, and Louise Michel was right when she said that " while in France Socialism stands in the dock, in England it sits in the House of Commons."

Most doctrines have several phases, and it is true, as Lord Wemyss pointed out, that there is a Socialism of the streets, a Socialism of the study, and a Socialism of the senate. The Socialism of the streets is violent, but we cannot think that it is dangerous. It is well illustrated by the action of the Paris Commune of 1871 ; it is nearer our own doors, breaking our own windows in connection with the agrarian movement in Ireland, which has sought to find an eloquent tongue in dynamite and

flames, and in the crofters' violent agitation in Skye, which has argued with sticks and stones. There is a wanton recklessness about such a movement which condemns it in the eyes of most people. The ridiculous violence of Bakunin, who has been called such handsome names as the "lost spirit of the International," and the "hell hound," has been repudiated by most of the sober Socialists who are prepared to carry socialistic doctrines to a real issue, by means of arguments, if possible, but by means of force, if necessary. The Socialism of the streets then, is, we think, doomed to be a failure. The Socialism of the study has found numerous and able exponents. After all, the study of to-day is the platform of to-morrow. The egg contains the chicken. Hatching may be a quiet process, but it leads to no end of cackling hereafter. It is quite true that there were able socialistic writers who could not catch the ear of the populace in the past, but the writings of Marx, of Rodbertus, of Engels, are being spoken to-day, and the people are eagerly listening to the evangel. There is a beautiful truth in Socialism, a truth well suited to become the subject of experiment by the wise and philanthropic, but which cannot, we believe, be applied practically in political life. The monastery has through all the ages been at its best a private commune, carrying down a primitive custom by means of a religious enthusiasm; and a condition of society which might bear upon a larger scale the fruits which were garnered within the close walls of the convent, has been the dream of the poets and philosophers from the time of Plato down to our own day. These dreams have resulted in eloquent hopes that a State might be organized in which men might have equal rights, equal duties, and equal privileges, and yet be stimulated to exertion, to enterprise, and to research and invention by motives higher and nobler than those of greed and need. It is not to be doubted that certain high minds are, and always will be, influenced in their actions by considerations of charity, of honour, of sympathy with, and possibly love for, others; but those sentiments are not the main forces which determine the conduct of mankind. We have selfishness as the prime motive of all men to deal with. The legislator who makes his laws to hit him who considers others more than himself fires his weapon in the air. The communism of the early Christian community, of the convent, cannot become the rule of the market place, and practical writers who say that "each member" of the "Co-operative Commonwealth" "must postpone his own advantage to the common good, and each must yield his individual crotchets to the collective judgment,"\* may

---

\* Gronlund's "Co-operative Commonwealth," p. 188.

no doubt be writing poetry, or prophesying for some remote contingencies, but cannot be regarded as imminently practical in that connection. It would be foolish and ungenerous to deny that men may rise from their present grovelling lives to lives of more unselfish action in the future, but, while we may indulge in hopes respecting the far future, it would be madness to make the most remote object of them the foundation for our present political action. No one will deny that the best writers of all times have been on the side of noble hope, and it is true that certain practical teachers have endeavoured through their ministry to found and inaugurate such a kingdom of God upon earth. By far the most practical of these was the founder of the Christian religion, and if we may class Christianity with the Socialism of the study, we may say that it is the only system of Socialism which commends itself as possessing a rational basis. The aim of all Socialism is the securing of equality in the social condition of mankind, and if equality is to be secured at all it will be secured only by changing the hearts of men, and never by setting to work in the first instance upon the conditions. The Socialism of Christianity has been peculiarly beneficent in modifying the savage struggle for existence amongst mankind, and while it has failed utterly to establish an ideal commonwealth, because it has failed to touch and influence in any great degree the hearts of the masses, it has produced many men who were fit to be citizens of that ideal community. But though Christianity has failed in that direction, it has undoubtedly prepared the way for a Socialism of quite another type, a Socialism which will put an end to Christianity. Not only are the words of Christ, not only are the works of the Fathers, full of denunciations of the inequalities of this world, but the modern pulpit is never tired of declaring that wealth is a snare, and that those who have the good things of this life owe innumerable duties to those who are deprived of them. The young man who had great possessions found it a hard saying that he "must go and sell all and give to the poor." Surely it was another hard saying that it was as difficult for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven as for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle. And Ananias found practical Communism a hard thing. But, as has been more than once pointed out, the primitive Church carried such socialistic teaching even further: St. Basil declared, very much in the words which are to be found in quite modern mouths, that the rich are thieves; St. Chrysostom denounced them as brigands, and he added, "some sort of equality must be established by their distributing to the poor of their abundance, but it would be preferable if everything were in common;" and the well-known saying

of Proudhon, "that property is theft," is little more than a plagiarism from St. Jerome.\*

Christianity had, however, two, possibly a little incompatible, aspects. It taught equality as a doctrine, and said that equality would be the measure of social relations in the Kingdom of God. That Kingdom of God was, however, to be brought upon earth by righteousness. It was something which was to spring from the heart, and not from imposed rules. But, at the same time, it taught submission to the powers that be, and recognized the inevitability of inequalities in this life, which were to be made up to the sufferers hereafter. In relation to modern Socialism this correction no longer exists. Most of those who have embraced Socialism have repudiated Christianity, and the masses having no real belief in a future state where the inequalities of this life can be compensated, naturally want their pleasures "down," and not in drafts upon the future which will be dishonoured.†

---

\* "The Pulpit and the Press," said Emerson wisely, "have many common-places denouncing the thirst for wealth, but if men should take these moralists at their word and leave off aiming to be rich, the moralists would rush to re-ignite at all hazards the love of power in the people lest civilization should be undone." Now, that is precisely the problem of to-day—Whether the greed and self-interest is or is not essential to the civilization of the world, and whether man can continue to advance if you take from him all the meaner motives which have led him to his present position.

† It may be worth while to emphasize this difference. The fact that Christianity held that accounts were to be balanced in heaven, and that those who had good things here were to have evil things hereafter, that those who were full of sores at the rich man's gate were to be in "clover," and the rich man was to be in torture, made it possible for Christian Socialism to exist side by side with institutions which furthered these social inequalities which have been incident to every state of society. The Socialist of our day, however, seems to have turned his back on Christianity, and to have made a serious misalliance in espousing science. This separation has had two effects: it has relieved the thinker from any sense of authority, and it has made him demand an immediate balance of accounts between himself—poor, and his neighbour—rich. He naturally wants not merely to have the pleasure of seeing Dives thirsty hereafter, while he himself is in the consoling bosom of Abraham, but he wants to have some of the good things Dives has. Unwise Socialists talk about confiscating what Dives has; wise ones shudder at the word "confiscation," but say, "Come, let us 'tax' Dives." The adoption of science as a creed is a curious feature of Socialism, for science is not, we think, on the side of Socialism. The scientific doctrine of to-day is that progress has been effected, not through equality, but by means of inequality. It is not by "taxing" those who have, for the benefit of those who have not, that evolution goes on, but by oppressing the weak and the poor, and by bestowing the five talents upon him who has five. Darwinism is in favour of a fair field and no favour, on which the best pigeon, the best stag, and the best man may win and abolish the vanquished. Socialism is desirous of putting an end to this strife, of abolishing

But it is not necessary to go back to the writings of the Fathers for illustrations. Innumerable precepts of a precisely similar nature are fulminated from our pulpits and written large in our literature of to-day. It would be easy to gather from popular pages and from many of the pulpit orations of our own time passages which, without any twisting, would suit socialistic purposes. But it would be altogether a mistake to suppose that the Socialism of to-day is anything like the Socialism which is embodied in Christianity. We shall see how it differs hereafter, but, at the same time, it is well to recognize the fact that it was preparing the way for the doctrines which have found such wide acceptance in our days.

The third kind of Socialism is the Socialism of the Senate. It, in common with every other kind of Socialism, seeks to equalize the conditions of men in society. But it seeks to effect this purpose by means of law, by means of State interference. In some of our neighbour countries revolution shows itself in barricades—at the cannon's mouth—here we revolutionize by Act of Parliament. Its argument, like that of all Socialisms, begins with the contrast of the abundance of the wealthy and the want of the poor; it insists on the duty of the rich to assist their poorer brothers; it claims equality for all men before the law, equality before God, and, as a consequence, equality in their social rights, enjoyments, and privileges. But it is not content to mention and inculcate these as duties, it insists upon setting right the anomalies by statute. For a long time people only laughed at the idea that social rights could be equalized. It seemed to unthinking persons almost as absurd to suppose that that could be done by Act of Parliament as that an Act of Parliament could equalize physical stature. It was often said: "If you make all men equal to-day, they will be all unequal again to-morrow." But this new growth is not to be brushed away by a phrase. It is so serious and genuine a matter that it deserves careful consideration. It would be foolish either to ignore it or to suppose that all that is necessary has been done when it has been laughed at. Indeed, the able men who have adopted this creed look with such genuine hope to the realization of socialistic principles that it would be foolish, for our own sakes, to shut our eyes to anything that can be said in

---

end may be a possibility. It purposes, in effect, to punish the capable and the strong for the benefit of the incapable and the weak—for there shall, in spite of Nature, be equal social conditions. Under these circumstances it would be interesting to inquire what would be the effect upon evolution of the successful establishment of a thorough Socialism. That Nature would have her way in the long run, nay, in the short run, we are inclined to believe, and that she would drive her coach-and-six through this new statute book is more than probable.



favour of it. The plight of our times is not so excellent that we can afford to disregard the promises of hope from any quarter. We propose, therefore, to examine this matter as dispassionately as may be. We think that it will turn out that Socialism would fail to bring about the happiness which is hoped from it; that, on the other hand, the appropriation of all the means of production and transportation by the State, while it might make a holiday among the masses for a little while, would lead to inevitable and speedy misery among those same masses at no distant date. We believe that the amount of human happiness and comfort would be diminished, and not increased, by these great changes, and that the country would be again in a dejected and miserable condition at the feet of some one man who was strong enough to lead them back from these pleasant pastures in which they were disporting themselves into the older paths of slavery.

Under these circumstances, it may be asked, if all that is so evident, how do you account for the fact that any responsible statesman can give in his adherence to such a cause? Well, there are, it seems to us, several reasons why a statesman may be led astray into these devious paths. In the first instance, let us point to the fact that the country is betrayed into Socialism. English politicians are generally hand-to-mouth gentlemen. They rarely care to inquire into the remote consequences of their legislative acts. A politician who looks beyond his nose is dubbed "a doctrinaire." And, consequently, this hand-to-mouth legislation has produced a large amount of Socialistic legislation in the past. Many of the measures which are mooted now only seem the natural development of the measures which were passed yesterday. That is one reason. But there is another. There is a great deal of Socialistic opinion in men's minds at the present time. There never was an age with less firmness of purpose and more frailty of belief. Many doctrines which used to be thought of as founded upon rocks are now thought to be on sand. "Freedom of Trade" used to be regarded as almost a sacred Liberal doctrine. No hand is now thought impious that is laid upon this old corner-stone. The conditions of the poor, as compared with the wealth and luxury of the rich, are not more deplorable than they used to be: as a fact, they are less so; but the contrast is better seen and more thoroughly appreciated. All these things have led to the founding of much popular hope upon State help, and may well account for the adoption of Socialism as a creed even by ex-Cabinet Ministers.

It will be worth while, in the first instance, to see whether there is any truth in the statement that the legislation of the last fifteen years bears unmistakable traces of a Socialistic tendency. All legislation which is not in repression of crime,

and which has for its effect the obliteration of social inequality, seems to us to be distinctly Socialistic in its tendency. It is true that a good many measures which have been passed and which have had the effect of equalizing social conditions, have not been undertaken with that view; but all Acts of Parliament which lay taxes on the rich for the benefit, not of those who so contribute to the State purse, but for the benefit of the poor, seem to us to merit the term "Socialistic." It is true none of these are founded upon the thorough-going principles of such writers as Mr. Hyndman and Mr. Gronlund, but they are, as these gentlemen themselves see and admit, steps in their direction.\* To us it seems certain that much of the proximate social advance will be carried out under the name of "taxation," and a good many of the most Socialistic proposals of our own day proceed under that decent mask. But murder is none the less murder, although the Quaker preferred to speak of it as making it impossible for a man to live. And all taxation which is for purposes beyond the legitimate sphere of State interference is, in our view, robbery. That the making of the condition of the poor, the vicious, the infirm, and the unfortunate, more equal to the condition of the wealthy, the prosperous, the capable, the healthy, is distinctly beyond that sphere, we hope to be able to show. That such action upon the part of a State is unjustifiable by any sound system of Statecraft, we shall attempt to prove, and in that case, we shall infer that all such taxation is nothing more or less than spoliation.

Now, in treating of recent legislation which has been in the direction of producing, by State means, a greater amount of social equality, one is always met with that old instance of Socialistic legislation which got on the Statute Book in the

---

\* One or two quotations will prove this. "This freedom of contract is still accepted as an economical gospel," says Mr. Hyndman, "by the leaders of our political parties and our principal political economists, though all can see that the tendency of modern legislation carried out by these very statesmen and economists is in direct opposition to their own theories." ("The Historical Basis of Socialism," p. 137.) "The interference of the State in sanitary matters, which, if the law were fully observed, would be very stringent indeed; the rules with respect to adulteration and the appointment of public analysts; the interference with shipping, so as to prevent the monstrous overloading which used to go on, leading to the loss of thousands of seamen's lives; the Employers' Liability Bill already referred to; the Nine Hours' Bill of 1874, which raised such a storm of indignation among the straighter sect of Pharaonic economists; all these measures, and others which will occur to the reader, prove, beyond a doubt, that the illusory personal freedom is being gradually checked in the interest of the collective freedom, and in spite of all bourgeois theories." (*Ibid.* pp. 291, 292, and see also p. 455. See also "The Co-operative Commonwealth," pp. 71, 76).

time of Elizabeth—the Poor Law. Lord Salisbury was accused the other day of having adopted a plank from the Socialistic platform when he introduced his Bill for providing homes for the working classes—and the accusation was only too well founded: he defended himself by pointing out that this Bill was a kind of extension of the Poor Law, which no one proposed to repeal. Well, in a sense, the Bill in question was an extension of the old Act—the 43rd of Eliz.—and a Bill to endow every poor man with an adequate salary of, say, £500 a year, would also be an extension of the principle which was the foundation of that measure. It is not to be denied that our Poor Law is a Socialistic measure; and we think that Lord Bramwell's defence of that enactment, in antagonism to the Bill for providing houses for the working classes, was a weak one. The only argument he urged in favour of the Poor Law was that it was an inevitable exception to the principle, and that it was impossible for the State to allow people to starve for the want of means to keep them alive. This seems to us to be an altogether inadequate reason for the existence of the measures for the relief of the poor, or to be an adequate reason for the existence of an indefinite amount of State philanthropy. If the humanitarian argument is introduced at all, we could understand a person of a softer disposition than his Lordship saying that it was impossible for the State to allow children to go bare-footed, as thousands do in Scotland at the present time, for the want of means to provide shoes. Besides, it is not true that the State cannot see people starve. The State has no right to be shocked at such a sight. Individuals may feel their best instincts outraged by such a spectacle, but the State has no right to these fine feelings, and, as a fact, it has not got them; for thousands of persons might die of starvation in another country without wringing one tear or one copper out of our Government, although they might expect some help from the active philanthropy of a Lord Mayor. No! The Poor Law was not a charitable measure; it was in the nature of police legislation. It was because, after the suppression of the monasteries, when the country was overrun by sturdy beggars, who threatened the peaceful possession of property, it became necessary to do something to provide for them out of the rates. In truth, then, it was really a measure for the protection of property. Persons with hen roosts were directly benefited by the funds which were raised from capable persons within the parish to put the poor to work. Whether it was a wise measure or not may still be doubtful. We are far from thinking it a wise measure. The principle that we are to bribe men who are poor to respect the rights and property of those who are rich,

seems to us to be a fatal principle; for it must leave the amount of the bribe to be determined by the ability of the poor to extort what they want. No doubt it is only an extension of the principle to say that the poor shall be well housed, that they shall be amused, that they shall be instructed out of the pockets of the wealthy, who want to keep what they have got; but it is an extension of a principle which will not end there, which must go on holding the rich to ransom until they have nothing worth ransoming, and then the system will break down. We can imagine times when the only safety for man's property is to be purchased by giving up the half of it. No doubt force is the highest law, although it is not a good argument. But where is this to stop? We have given the working classes the instrument of exaction: will they be moderate and let our capitalists keep the half of what they may possess? A demand has already been made on them for the whole. Socialists see distinctly that the political power is with the people, and they intend to use that power to carry out a few extensions of the principle of the Poor Law.\*

The whole difficulty in connection with this very difficult question is to determine, now that we have Socialistic measures on our Statute Book, how far along that perilous road we are to go. The people have the power, and they are being taught to use it to make the conditions of life better for themselves. It is a lesson which it is not hard to learn. Every man has that desire. And if the workers of this country listen to the Socialists in high places, as they cannot fail to listen, they will, we are convinced, attempt the easy road of State-help, instead of the difficult road of self-help, with the inevitable result of taking short cuts, and of failing to secure these happier conditions which they desire.

Lord Pembroke says that he does not think "that there is any simple principle that will tell us in all cases alike where

---

\* This is obvious from innumerable passages in their best writings. We will only refer to one or two. "Hence," says Mr. Hyndman in one place, "the object of the workers in every country must be to obtain peaceably, if possible, forcibly, if necessary, the complete control of political power in order to turn it to account in social reconstruction" (p. 413). And in another place: "It will be observed that in all such proposals it is taken for granted that as the producers obtain the power, they will use it to secure good conditions of life for themselves" (p. 454). Engels had already said much the same thing. "From this record of the past," he wrote, "we can foresee the revolution of the wage-earners who will lay hold of the political power, and, by means of this power, transform into public property the social means of production which slip from the hands of the *bourgeoisie*." See also Gronlund in "The Co-operative Commonwealth" (pp. 64, 94).

the State ought to interfere and where it ought not.\* But we resist the belief that there is no principle which will enable us to determine what are and what are not the legitimate limits of State interference. It is true that if we look at the past action of Parliament we shall find no trace of an understanding as to the limits of State meddling. Let us try. Take, for instance, the Sanitary Acts. It is no doubt true that the sanitary rates fall principally upon the owners of property, and it is also true that it is the lower members of society who are the principal beneficiaries from the carrying out of general sanitary regulations and precautions. Now, according to the earlier doctrines which confined the action of the State merely to securing the safety of life and property—merely to the keeping of the peace—these Acts seem to be an unwarrantable deviation from the straight course. Then it would have been said that the law which enabled a man to bring an action against his neighbour for any neglect of proper precautions which might result in loss or damage, was sufficient to meet the case, and that that was as far as the State ought to go in matters of public health. Well, even for this view there is something to be said. It did not require that the State should bring about the necessary co-operation between the citizens for sewage purposes. Before the State thought of providing gas and water to towns these commodities were supplied by private enterprise; and we cannot see that anything is at present done, under any of the Public Health Acts, or any of the Local and Police Acts, which make the Statute Book plethoric, which could not have been as well done by voluntary association. What the State can do, private enterprise is, for the most part, capable of; but hundreds of things which private enterprise can accomplish the State would fail to perform. Of course, if there is a small end to the social wedge, the Sanitary Acts form that end. It seems such a beneficial thing to all classes of the community that nuisances should be removed, that causes of disease should be inquired into, and that the health of the community should be preserved, that many people concede at once that the powers which have been conferred upon Municipal Corporations and Local Boards under these Acts have been wisely given. It might at first sight seem foolish to protect a man from a footpad and allow him to go on breathing sewer-gas, which will inevitably kill him. But those who think that the State is to be the guardian of the health of the citizens concede too much. We do not know one function in that regard which is performed by any Municipal

---

\* "Liberty or Socialism?" by the Earl of Pembroke, second edition, p. 10.

Corporation which could not have been performed as well by the people for themselves. But the evil is always in the first step on a wrong road. A step seems such a little thing; but see where these little steps have brought us to. Corporations, by a very little extension of the principle of the Sanitary Acts, have, in many instances, become the owners of the means of water supply. We do not gather that water is supplied better or more cheaply in the hands of corporations than in the hands of companies. Indeed, in recent years, there have been three or four instances of corporations, being the owners of waterwork undertakings, applying to Parliament for Acts of Parliament to raise the rates paid by the consumers of water. From water to gas is another little step. And, while some corporations are very proud to relieve their rates out of the profits of their gas undertaking, others go on making gas and deficits which the ratepayers have to bear. Again, another little step was to secure that electric lighting should get into those corporate hands which had already secured the gas and water and markets of their towns. With what result? Electric lighting has been stopped by the Electric Lighting Act, which provides that the public shall have the right of taking over the property of any electric lighting company at the end of twenty-one years at the then value of the plant. The companies, you see, were to take all the risk of failure, and, in the event of success, were to be deprived of their profits in favour of the public. Of course, there has been no progress made in relation to electric lighting, for progress in these matters is to be made only by private enterprise. The Corporations and Local Boards had the right to adventure for themselves in this matter, but of course they did nothing. There is no more instructive history than that of the results of the Electric Lighting Act. That the State should teach people to read and write has no doubt had the indirect but inevitable effect of teaching parents that moral obligations are trivial matters. It is certain that there are many duties which are best left to the dictates of a man's own conscience. Politeness is a comely virtue, but if you make impoliteness an act punishable by law, you do so at the risk of weakening the sense of moral obligation. So the obligation of the human duty of doing the best we can for our children has by admission been sensibly weakened by making education a legal obligation. Now, however, as we shall see, the State proposes to go further in this wrong direction: it struck corporations that it was anomalous to teach men to read, without supplying them with books, and so we have another Socialistic advance in connection with Free Libraries. We note with especial satisfaction every increase in the appreciation of books. But we would have their contents honestly come

by, and we would also have them carefully digested. There is, we think, too much reading and far too little understanding. It is not in the number of books read that the virtue lies. But whether there is good done by giving the working man access to libraries or not, we object to giving them access at the expense of persons who can make no use of the opportunities which are thus provided for the poor. We do not believe it is the duty of the rich to supply the poor with education. Here, of course, certain writers find an excuse for the Education Act in the fact, which they allege, that education diminishes crimes, and that it is better to pay the schoolmaster than the policeman. This is the invariable excuse for every departure from sound economical principles. Every measure, which is socialistic in its tendency, is defended on the ground that it is in its nature a police measure, an indirect means of preventing crime. The difficulty is to say what amount of Socialism cannot be so defended. But politicians shut their eyes to the logical consequences of their own arguments. What have they to do with logical consequences?—they have to do justice and other fine things of that sort, or so they say. But are we prepared to say that a hot public ordinary served punctually at one o'clock every day would not diminish crime? And if so, do we think the diminution of crime a sufficient reason for the establishment of the public ordinary? We see that certain Socialists say that the State should supply fuel in winter and ice in summer, and that these things are just as essential to the public health as water.\* Well, we do not know but that we should diminish crime by these means. Will the apologists of State education push their argument thus far? The principle goes the whole length. And now, as we saw, the advanced thinkers are not content that the parent should be relieved of a great proportion of the cost of education, they must be relieved of the whole cost. That is to say, the whole of the cost is to fall on the rich. Of course these gentlemen do not see, or shut their eyes to, the legitimate outcome of their own theories. But "ill weeds grow apace," and when once you are embarked on a wrong principle the descent to further errors in legislation is remarkably easy. We find that to-day certain gentlemen go about saying that reading comes after eating,† and that it would become the State more if it provided the poor starving children in Board Schools with food rather than

---

\* Gronlund's "Co-operative Commonwealth," p. 93.

† This was one of the phrases in Dr. Crichton Brown's report on "Over-pressure in Elementary Schools," reviewed in a recent number of this REVIEW; and Mr. Hyndman says: "Good food in childhood is the basis of all good education." See p. 456.

the standards of the code. That, too, would, no doubt, lead to a diminution of crime.

But we have not ended our catalogue. Government a considerable time ago took upon itself the duty of letter carrier. No doubt the carriage of mails upon a large scale requires considerable organization ; not an organization which at all transcends the power of private enterprise ; indeed, private enterprise does much more difficult things every day. The feeding of an army is one of the most difficult matters that falls to the lot of a general, and it is in the commissariat that the most deplorable failures in connection with army organization occur. Yet private enterprise supplies London with four or more meals a day, and does not boast about it. Still, as we say, Government assumed the duty of carrying and distributing letters. That action has been defended, but principally upon what was thought to be the solid ground that it made it pay. But whenever a department of Government is established, its whole efforts are directed in the first instance to prove how useful it is, and in the second, to secure for itself more and more extended functions. One of the evils of creating any office, any commission, any department is, that you at once set a-going a machinery the object of which is to show the necessity for its existence, and it does so by aggregating to itself more functions and further powers. Ask any one under Government to report, and the report will suggest a dozen ways in which importance should be added to the office of the reporter. So the Post Office became in time the Telegraph Office, although it was doubtful whether telegraphs would pay or not. But worse still, the Post Office, by means of a quibble, secured to itself the right of all inventions which bore any resemblance to telegraphy. It laid its monopolizing hand upon the telephone, and the spread of that useful instrument was prevented. A blight fell upon that in the same way that it fell upon the development of electric lighting. But the Department is a cormorant. It not only carries our messages, it banks our halfpence, it insures lives, and issues postal orders, which is paper money ; and quite recently it has taken to carrying our parcels. It has more than once been argued that the State should own the railways. That is one of the favourite views of the Social creed. We presume that the Post Office is quite ready to undertake the duties of Traffic Manager General. But that is Socialism only in one corner of the Statute Book. Indeed, the law is more far-reaching than we could have supposed. It feels for the feelings of cats, and passes an Act in restraint of scientific research by means of experiments upon living animals. There are Medical Acts, Solicitors' Remuneration Acts, Pedlars Acts, Canal Boat Acts,

Uttarpara Vaidikshna Public Library,

Accn. No.

7839

Date

31.7.75



Veterinary Surgeons Acts. Legislation has come between employers and their workmen, between shipowners and seamen, and between the workers in mines and the owners of them. Nothing is now left to the free action of economical forces, but every relation in life, in trade, in employment, and in contract must be regulated by some Court, Commission, Inspector, or Department appointed by the State. It would take too long to point out how all these measures are socialistic in tendency, and how they will be made the stepping-stones, not to higher, but to lower things in legislation. We refer the reader to Lord Wemyss's speech in the House of Lords for any further proof that may be necessary that Socialism pervades recent legislation, but what we particularly desire to do in this place is to point the moral by means of Mr. Chamberlain's recent utterances at Hull and other places, and then to examine shortly, but with the necessary minuteness, the modern creed of Socialism, and to see how far our political leaders are pledged to carry it out.

Mr. Chamberlain began his argument by pointing to the striking contrast between the poor and the rich. "I do not want you to think," he said to his Hull listeners, "that I suggest to you that legislation alone can accomplish all we desire, and above all, I would not lead you into wild and revolutionary projects to upset unnecessarily the existing order of things. But on the other hand, I want you not to accept as final or as perfect, arrangements under which hundreds of thousands—nay millions—of your fellow countrymen are subjected to untold privations and miseries with the evidence all around them of accumulated wealth and unexampled luxury." "I believe the great evil with which we have to deal is the excess, the inequality in the distribution of riches. Ignorance, intemperance, and immorality and disease, these things are all interdependent and closely connected, and although they are often the cause of poverty, they are a still more frequent consequence of destitution. If," he went on, "we could do anything to raise the general condition of the poor of this country, and give them new means of enjoyment and recreation, and offer to them opportunities of improvement, we should do more for the prosperity, ay, and for the morality, of the country than anything we can do by laws, however stringent, for the prevention of excess and for the repression of crime. Now I want you to make this the first object in the Liberal programme for the reformed Parliament." Here, then, we have a pretty plain statement in general outline of the Socialist creed. The evil to be dealt with is the unequal distribution of wealth. What has to be secured is the improvement of the condition of the poor, the elevation of the masses, and the supply to them of new means of recreation and enjoyment, and this is to be done

by means of legislation in the new Parliament. But Mr. Chamberlain does not content himself with generalities. He points out by what means these bright hopes are to be realized. He makes three practical suggestions. First, we must develop our local governments. They have already in many towns supplied us, at the expense of the ratepayers, with hospitals, museums, free libraries, art galleries, baths, and parks, and we must endeavour to extend the functions and increase the powers of these authorities who have already done so much for us. What further work they are to do he does not suggest, but it is not difficult to imagine, for his words have pointed the direction. One thing he says distinctly—education is to be free.

His second suggestion is that taxation must be graduated. He seems to found his argument for a graduated taxation upon the fact that at present the incidence of taxation throws the burden upon the poor. He tried to show that it is so, and a political satellite endeavoured to do the same thing more thoroughly at the British Association Meeting in Aberdeen. There, however, answer was possible, and answer was on the spot made by Professor Leone Levi, who showed that local and imperial taxation, taken together, was fairly balanced as between the poorer and wealthier classes.

We have now pointed out some of the proposals recently announced by Mr. Chamberlain without interpolating the description with comments; for it is, in our opinion, important to understand the real position of such advanced Liberals in relation to Socialism, and we could not find a clearer exponent of that creed than Mr. Chamberlain. It will, we think, be worth while to examine his various proposals in some detail, and to endeavour to find out what would be the legitimate outcome of conceding his principles.

First, then, let us see how he would bestow increased powers and new functions upon municipal and other local authorities, with the view of increasing the enjoyment and raising the morals of the people. He points to the fact, as we have seen, that these authorities have already given to the people parks and art galleries and museums out of the pockets of the wealthy. Why, we may well ask, are they to stop there? Personally, we may care very little for fossils and may care a great deal for Shakespeare and the *opera bouffe*. It is a considerable check upon my indulgence in these intellectual pastimes that I have to pay for them out of my own pocket; but why, we should like to know, should the man who wants to look at fossils, or some modern *genre* picture, be gratified at the public expense, while another has to pay for his seat in the theatre? If the persons who have the levying of the taxes are not to pay them, but are to benefit by

[Vol. CXXV. No. CCXLIX.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. LXIX. No. I. B

the money when it is paid, we see no limit to the amount of recreation and enjoyment which may be provided by means of taxation for the poor of this country—except the bottom of the purse of the rich man. No doubt we all desire to see the lives of the poor enhanced in the way Mr. Chamberlain indicates, and no one desires it more than the poor man himself, and we can understand that having amusement provided at the public cost is a taste which grows by what it feeds on. It is said that a man who had been shipwrecked, who had lived upon the hardest of boots and shoes and upon a very exposed raft, for we do not know how many weeks, and who was ultimately rescued, was brought to London, and introduced to some feeling journalist who, when he had got his story out of the man, asked him if he could do anything for him. Whereupon the man, who had nothing in the world, for he had, as we said earlier, eaten his boots, asked for “an order for the play.” We expect to hear a good many more demands made, following Mr. Chamberlain’s lead, for recreation at the expense of the rich. That the national resources which are necessary “to put the poor to work” should be frittered away in attempting to raise by indulgence, by amusement, by recreation, the lives of those whose first necessity is discipline, is, we think, a very questionable proposal. That a statesman, with a due sense of his responsibility, should so far mislead the people by promises which can only, in the long run, lead to disappointment, is a bad sign of our times. Surely he must know that if the people once taste the sweets of plunder, if they begin to enjoy the unearned increment, there will be larger demands made, and that the only end to those demands will be the end of that useful milk-cow, the capitalist class. Having recreation at the expense of another can only be a temporary, a very temporary, expedient. In the first place the wealth of this country is not, by any means, so great as to enable the whole of the inhabitants to enjoy life in the way suggested, and even if it were, a time would very soon come when the person who supplied the recreation would have no more to “pay the piper” with, and then, we fear, the dancing must cease, or go on without music. But will it last even so long? An American candidate said “Capital is sensitive; it shrinks from the very appearance of danger.” We think that it is shrinking in this country, and if capital goes beyond the seas, if it is taken to other and safer countries, we shall have the poor of this country dancing to quite other tunes than those which are being composed by their over-sanguine guides for their delectation. We shall have the poor of this country condemned to misery and starvation. They themselves cannot see this, but it behoves those who

would constitute themselves the leaders of the people to take heed lest they mislead them into such "sloughs of despond."

We do not wish to criticize Mr. Chamberlain's desire for free education, or his argument, that those who say it should be paid for are dishonest or illogical if they have themselves had a bursary or a fellowship. We note, however, that Mr. Chamberlain is not only content to borrow his creed from the Socialists, but that he draws even for his arguments and illustrations on the same source. For this argument he is, we see, indebted to Mr. Hyndman.\* But we have incidentally said enough upon this matter. We believe that we have already gone too far in this direction, and we find further excursions planned for us by philanthropic people, who think that it is "overpressure" to teach a hungry child, and would have State breakfasts for the children who are to have their spelling from the State. The subject has, however, been recently considered in this Review.

We come next to Mr. Chamberlain's scheme for graduated taxation. The rich, it seems, are to bleed at every pore. Mr. Chamberlain thinks it wise to impose a tax which strikes directly at, and will be a direct means of, discouraging acquisition. Indeed, Mr. Chamberlain lets fall some socialistic words which seem to hint that in his opinion capital is not necessary to production, and that labour is not only the sole cause of wealth, but could get on very well without capital. "I do not think," he says, "an excessive aggregation of wealth in a few hands is of any advantage to anybody." We should have thought that Mr. Chamberlain was not one of those who held that in a state of civilization capital is not a necessity of all labour, for in another place he says that he is "opposed to confiscation in any shape or form, because he believes it would destroy the security and lessen the stimulus." As a fact, we cannot rely upon any other motive as strong enough to produce capital, except the personal enjoyment which is to come from the saving. No doubt, ideally, a man might be supposed to save in order that he might be robbed for the benefit of his poorer neighbours; but, as a fact, that class of man is not large. How, then, does Mr. Chamberlain propose to encourage the accumulation of wealth which he says is the only stimulus to exertion? How does he propose to make wealth secure in a man's hands when he has acquired it? By imposing taxes which are to take it to a large extent away from him. You make the proportion greater the more the man acquires. Is that the encouragement of acquisition? He quotes great authorities as

---

\* "Historical Basis of Socialism," p. 459, *note*.

approving of a graduated system of taxation ; but it is in our experience that mostly when facts hold their peace these dead authorities are asked to open their mouths. Again, we think Mr. Chamberlain is playing to the gods. His proposal, that the subjects should contribute to the support of the Government in proportion to their respective abilities—"that is, in proportion to the revenue which they respectively enjoy under the protection of the State"—violates the first canon which Adam Smith laid down as to taxation, and every canon of wise legislation. That it would have a disastrous effect upon any State that adopted it as a principle of legislation is indubitable. But, as Lord Pembroke pointed out, "it is quite possible—I even fancy that I see signs of it already—that we may find national enterprise decaying and other nations passing us in the race of progress before we have realized the cause of our atrophy."\* We are convinced that any laws which would have the effect of making capital shy of our home industries, which would direct capital from the home enterprises which are waiting for it, would be calamitous to the country. One of the best arguments against the existing land laws is that they have the effect of keeping capital away from the land of this country, and we are constantly assured, and with some truth, by most competent authorities, that our fields might produce twice as much as they do, that we might be much less dependent upon foreign production, if only more capital were wisely applied to the wants of agriculture. Surely, then, the worst thing that could happen to this country would be the starving, not only of our fields, but of our looms and spindles. But that the effect of the scheme we have been discussing would be to drive capitalists out of the country few can doubt.

It is true that certain forms of Socialism have not struck such deep roots in this country as they have elsewhere, and many writers congratulate themselves upon the fact, and account for it by saying that here we have a poor law, that private charity has done much to ameliorate the condition of those whose discontent would have turned in the direction of revolution, that we have had an unlimited right of holding public meetings, a free press, a possibility for those who were born in the lowest social circles to clamber up on to higher rungs of the social ladder, that military enlistments have been voluntary, that the six millions of persons who are members of Friendly or Building Societies, or of Trades Unions, are the owners of something like £68,000,000 ; all these facts, and others which we might

---

\* "Self Help v. State Help," p. 15.

mention, no doubt account for the slow advance of Socialism in this country. We know that besides these owners of property who belong to the hated middle class, there is still a large and powerful residuum, who now have votes, who own nothing, and that the other advantages of the free press and right to hold meetings will be as much in favour of the propagation of this new gospel. In the past, the press and the platform have been in favour of free trade, in favour of the view of Adam Smith, that the advantage of society was to be secured by every individual member of society, whether capitalist or worker, doing the best he could to gain his own advantage. But is it to be expected, when we find a kind of watery Socialism in the mouths of ex-cabinet Ministers, that the press and the meetings will remain true to what we still venture to think great economic truths? The press will "swim with the stream," whatever men like Mr. Goschen may do; and this race will go on at an accelerated pace. That a doctrine is unsound is not a reason why it should be rejected by the masses. When Mr. Chamberlain tells the people that there is no longer anything to fear from State interference because they themselves have become the State, he tells them what is obviously not true.

Mr. Henry George, in his "Progress and Poverty," starts, as Mr. Chamberlain does, with the proposition that the rich of this country are becoming richer and the poor poorer. "Material progress," he says, "not only fails to relieve poverty, it actually produces it." This, we need scarcely say, is not true.\* Mr. Chamberlain might have shown from the labours of his friend, Mr. Giffin, that the workman is much better off than he used to be, that he receives from 50 per cent. to 100 per cent. more money for 20 per cent. less work, and that at the same time the price of nearly all the articles he has to buy or consume, including bread, has been diminished. But we have no desire to discuss the fallacies contained in Mr. George's book. We mention it and its fallacies to show that the latter are no hindrance to the eager acceptance of a palatable doctrine by the masses. It is not often that a book receives such a reception as that which was accorded in our by-ways and slums to Henry George's work. That we think is a significant sign of the times. That the far more cogent and thorough views of Marx, Rod-becker, and Engels, now that they are being popularized by such writers as Hyndman and Gronland, will meet with as complete a welcome from the new voters, in whose hands are the issues of

---

\* Mr. Mallock has set himself, and, we think, successfully, to show how untrue that proposition is. See "Progress and Poverty" at p. 197, *et seq.*

life and death for this nation, cannot, we think, be doubted. It is because we think it important that the new voters should at least have the means of understanding to what they are being asked to subscribe that we have thought it well to dwell at length upon Mr. Chamberlain's utterances.

The principles of modern Socialism are not at all difficult to understand, and it may be worth while to state them in a single paragraph. The basis of the creed is the proposition that all value is produced by labour, or that the measure of value is the amount of labour which is necessary to produce the article. From this value has, of course, to come the cost of production—that is, the money spent upon raw materials and the wear and tear of machinery. The remainder, after these deductions have been made, is at present divided between the real producers and the capitalist. The portion which goes to the workers is called wages, the portion which goes to the capitalist is called "surplus," "profits," or, as certain Socialists prefer to call it, "fleecings." It is because under the industrial system the means of production are owned by capitalists, that they (capitalists) are enabled to levy this black-mail upon labour. The social product is appropriated by the individual capitalist, to the injury and loss of the labourer, whose work produced the value that is thus stolen from him. Under this system the labourer is a wage slave. The remuneration he receives is determined by the minimum of subsistence, and thus it comes that he who in the sweat of his brow showers gold upon the capitalist is himself a slave and a pauper. This subject lends itself to a good deal of strong writing. No doubt it must flatter the ploughman and the harvester to be told that he feeds the world; that it is the spinner and the weaver that clothes all the naked; and that the capitalists and their retainers, the lawyers, the railway shareholders and other parasitic classes are the vampires who fatten upon the very remains of the class which has endowed the world, must be reassuring doctrine to the "minders" of mules. The remedy, too, is one which recommends the creed. Capital must exist, they say, but it must not be in private hands. The means of production are useful, but they must be owned by the producers. The revolution which will make everybody happy and comfortable, is to be effected by means of the organization of the labouring classes, and by the expropriation, not of the landlords—that is a fleabite—but of all those bloodsucking classes who live upon rents, profits, or interest, without compensation. We will admit at once that there is a great deal to be said in favour of the position which these gentlemen take up, and that much has by the writers we have mentioned been cogently said upon these and cognate points. But because there is much to be

said for these doctrines, it does not follow that there is nothing to be said against them. Let us see what can be said.

Socialist writers, then, are never tired of declaring that all wealth is created by labour, and it is an easy deduction, and looks an honest one, to infer that all wealth belongs to labour. Here, for instance, is a definition of value. "It is the quantity of common human labour measured by time, which on an average is requisite to produce a given commodity by means of the implements generally used."\* That is not so clear as it might be, but the meaning of the Socialist crops out on every page. Value, wealth, is due to labour, and therefore the appropriation of profits by capitalists is in the nature of robbery.† The writings of the socialists bristle with strong language against the industrial system which allows capitalists to take from the labourer the wealth they have produced. Now, if they are right in their theory that it is labour alone which produces wealth, it would follow that they would also be correct in arguing that capitalists were improperly appropriating the surplus which in reality belonged to the workers; or, in Mr. Hyndman's words, "the labourer only gets back a small fraction of the value he produces in the shape of the money wages he receives."‡ As elsewhere he says: "The capitalist has used a certain amount of another man's labour, under free contract, for his own behoof, without paying for it, and the trick is done at that man's expense."§ And it is calculated by the same and other authors that the labourer "gets from one-third to one-half at the outside of the labour value he produces returned to him in the form of wages;" or, that he works from three to four hours for himself and from six to seven for other people, who divide his extra unpaid-for work among them.|| Now, we say at once, that if capital and capitalists do not assist in the production of value, the system which allows them to levy these taxes upon labour deserves all the bad names which the Socialists fling at it. But is this fundamental proposition true? Is all value due solely to the bounty of the soil and to the labourer who produces the commodity. No, it is not true. The value of commodities depends upon other factors as well as upon labour. Socialists admit at once that the value of an article includes the cost of the raw material which is necessary to produce it, and of the amount necessary to make good the wear and tear of the machinery

---

\* Gronlund's "Co-operative Commonwealth," p. 15. See also Hyndman's "Basis," p. 102 and p. 108.

† See Hyndman's "Basis," p. 81 and p. 129.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 125.

§ *Ibid.* p. 125.

|| *Ibid.* p. 128. See also Carl Marx "On Capital," p. 100.



which has been worked out in its production ; but they assert that when the machinery has been so replaced, the capitalist, the owner of the machinery, has got all he had before, and has no right to claim anything beyond. Now, it is obvious that if some portion of the value is due to the machinery which the capitalist has provided, he would then be entitled to more than the mere replacement of the plant ; he would be entitled to retain the value so created. It is because that is an obvious truth that the proposition "that all value is due to labour alone" is so constantly insisted on. Whether the labourer gets a due proportion of the value which is the result of the whole process is quite another question. Here we are concerned to see whether any portion of the value is due to something other than labour, and if that is so, then it is evident that that portion of the net value or wealth, not being due to labour, does not belong to the producers, but does belong to him who added that element of value to the article in question.

In the first place one thing is very obvious, and that is that if capitalists were only to have their capital returned to them without increase and with no reward but the satisfaction of feeling that they had supplied work for a number of labourers, very few capitalists would put their money into machinery. If there is to be no interest on accumulations, why should not every man spend ? It is the fact that he is to have remuneration for his capital that induces him to build his mill and put machines in it. But, further, no man in any trade is guaranteed the return even of his capital. True, if there is a surplus, he will take the wear and tear of his machinery out of that ; but, if there is a loss, the wear and tear will not be recovered and the capital he has sunk to produce value may be lost to him. This risk is a matter in connection with which the capitalist may fairly look for some recompense. But one other of these elements strikes at the root of Socialism. Does machinery increase the value of the products of industry ? The Socialists, for another purpose, no doubt, tell us that the wealth of England has increased from one thousand eight hundred millions sterling in 1800 to eight thousand seven hundred and twenty millions sterling in 1880, and by implication they one and all again admit that this immense increase of wealth is due partly to the labour-saving machines which have been the products of this industrial age. The number of labourers has not nearly increased in the same ratio, and consequently some of the value must be due to these labour-saving machines. But there is a tacit admission of this view in many of their pages. Thus we read :—" Now, when a labour-saving machine is first introduced

in regard to any article which is in common use, its effect is to depreciate the value of the force of labour, both directly and indirectly, inasmuch as less wages are needed to maintain the same standard of life, thus giving a larger surplus to the capitalist. The labour employed also produces articles of a higher value in the social exchange of the day than the actual quantity of human labour embodied in them.\* But, apart from admissions, who can for an instant doubt that, although there may be a decrease in the value of the commodities in consequence of the introduction of the labour-saving machines, there is in the aggregate an immense increase of wealth in consequence of these inventions which have changed the face of the earth during the century? Indeed, we cannot but think that Socialists feel that far more of the wealth of the world is due to the genius of a few remarkable men than to the unintelligent labour of the masses. The steam-engine was not the result of the working of an organized humanity, but of the brain-work of one or two able men. We learn what is the attitude of Socialists in relation to this aspect of the case from the way in which they try, because certain inventors have been lost sight of, to claim for the race what has been done by the genius of a few. Thus Mr. Hyndman says, "So with the great industrial inventions and machines, simple or complicated. Who can fix upon the actual discoverers of the application of wool or flax, silk or cotton, hemp or jute, madder or indigo to human use, or adornment, or luxury? Their names are legion, doubtless, but all have been swept away as time has slowly passed its effacing finger over the records of the past. With machines the same is true, from the simple wheel, the pump, the forge, the stencil plate and the potter's wheel onwards to printing, steam, electricity, and the great machine-making machines. Each owes all to the others. . . . Great discoveries and inventions are worked up to by the efforts of myriads ere the goal is reached."† So Mr. Gronlund says: "To whom does the telegraph belong? To society. Neither Professor Morse nor any other inventor can lay sole claim to it. It grew little by little."‡ The latter writer, however, seems more willing to make admissions, for he says that private enterprise, with the steam-engine and other inventions, did increase the productive capacity of man tenfold.

Well, then, have we not arrived at another element which produces value—viz., the inventors of machines and the

---

\* Hyndman's "Basis," pp. 236-7. † *Ibid.* p. 100.

‡ Gronlund, p. 65.

machines which assist and increase the labour force which is used in production? But, further, have not capitalists a right to be paid for organizing and for directing labour? The labour of the mule that brings vegetables to market is in the cabbage when sold, but is not the labour of the driver who sat on the cart and drove him also in the cabbage? It is an easy thing to drive a mule to market; but it is a difficult thing to set hundreds of hands at work. Great industrial undertakings have not grown like mushrooms from the bounty of the soil. There is another bounty which Socialists do not wish to recognize, and that is the bounty of the brain. It is that bounty that we must thank for the enterprise which has ransacked the world for markets, which has made pathways for commerce, which has organized our industries, and which, in that way, has added to the value of the articles in exchange. The value of an article is nothing unless the purchaser can be found. It is that magic discovery which gives the produce the benefit of its dormant value. Surely the Socialists should be the last persons to deny that organization of labour is an important element in the value of an article. Mr. Hyndman himself says that "Social labour is essential to all productions upon a large scale"\* Who has brought about these associations which have done such immense things in the past? The capitalists. It is impossible to ignore the capitalist as an instrument in production, as a value-giving element in the processes of manufacture and distribution. The carrier or the shopman is recognized as a labourer giving value to the article which he carries or distributes, but is not the man who has made production possible to receive some part of the credit of production? is he to be credited with producing no part of the value, which would not have been produced without him? Mr. Gronlund admits much, too much we think, in this connection, for he admits "they direct all these enterprises, a work of considerable importance. Granted. They do direct, or see that somebody directs. But is half the cake not a pretty high price for overseeing its baking? Could not that work be done in some other way just as well and somewhat cheaper?"† And again, on page 42, in speaking of Private Enterprise, he says, "We heartily admit that it has performed wonders. It has built monuments greater than the Pyramids. Its Universal Expositions have moved greater masses of men than the Crusades did. It has rendered mankind an immense service in proving by hard facts that wholesale manufacture is the most sensible

---

\* Hyndman, p. 56, and see pp. 334-5.

† "The Co-operative Commonwealth," p. 26.

form of labour."\* And on another page he admits that "Labour indeed could not get along very well without capital. But there is a difference between capital and individual capitalists." But in the first place let us say we are not here speaking of the quantum of the remuneration which must go to capital. It is possible that capitalists may have taken too much. It seems almost a horrible thing, but it is an inevitable thing, that the rate of wages is to be determined by the amount which is necessary to keep the soul and body of the labourer together. But in principle, we are arguing that the sole value of the article is not due to the labourer, but some to the inventor, some to the owner of machines, and some to the director and organizer of labour and to the conductors of commerce. If we have made good that proposition, and Mr. Gronlund's admissions go that length, as we understand them, we have undermined the foundation of Socialism. Let us follow one of these admissions, however, a little further. Of course there is a difference between capital and capitalists, and the country might, no doubt, now take and keep under the collective control all the means of production and transportation. Not only mills and machinery, but railways and ships, and wheelbarrows and carts might, for a time, dispense with the services of the individual capitalists. But how? By living on the capital that private enterprise had been a means of producing, on the capital which individual capitalists had been the means of accumulating. We, no doubt, could lay our hands—the hands of the State, of the collective control—upon the capital of this country, but how does it come to be where it is? By the guarantee of the society which is now to turn robber. Had the owner of the money understood that he might spend it all, if he chose, in champagne and in riotous living, had he understood that by not spending it, but by putting it in a mill, say, and machinery, and by finding labour for his poorer neighbours, and looking for a profit from his enterprise, he was really only fleecing the labourer, and that the labourers might lay their hands upon the whole of his undertaking for the benefit of the nation,—he would, we suspect, have preferred the champagne. But had all the individual capitalists preferred the same courses, what would have become of all these means of production and transportation which form by far the greatest portion of the wealth of this country upon which we ask the State now to lay violent hands? Though that question is somewhat unimportant, as it has only to do with the past, if we

---

\* "The Co-operative Commonwealth," p. 42.

ask a similar question as to the future, it becomes all-important. When further capital will be required in increasing amounts as our civilization advances, where is that capital to come from, if profits are to cease, if interest is to be heard of no more, and if the total amount of the value of the production is to be divided amongst the workers? Where, too, are we to find that enterprise which has done so much for us in the past? Certainly not in the bureaux of the State. That is the very last place to look for it. But while enterprise will cease to be at the service of the public in this country, it will find ample opportunities and sufficient remuneration in other States. It is because we are convinced that capital, that invention, that genius and skill would all leave us under the reign of the collective control, that we say that the nation that adopts these perilous tenets is entering upon a slow but sure course of suicide.

We have felt bound to show that the whole theory of the Socialists, who seek to found a Co-operative Commonwealth upon the ruins of an industrial system which they condemn as robbery, is founded upon a fallacy. But at the same time we gladly recognize that there is much in the works we have been criticizing worthy of careful consideration, although, in our opinion, the whole of the socialistic system is founded on a serious economic fallacy.

The Duke of Argyll, recently, in answer to an inquisitive person who asked him and other statesmen, "What are the fundamental principles of Liberalism?" wrote that "he held that liberty (Liberalism) consists in a hatred of tyranny in all its forms, and especially in those particular forms which may be most dangerous in our time." "By tyranny," he went on, "I mean all restraint to individual freedom in the disposal of everything that belongs to man, whether mental faculties or material possessions which are the fruits of mind, beyond those restraints which are absolutely essential for the maintenance of order and of law, and of such other fundamental conditions of organized societies as may from time to time emerge."\* Although the last few

---

\* There are some other words in the Duke's letter which are worth quoting in this connection:—"We must remember that the plea of necessity, or of the will of majorities or of ruling powers, has been the plea of all tyrannies in all ages of the world and under all forms of government. It is a plea which ought to be regarded by all Liberals with the utmost jealousy. A supreme presumption must always be in favour of individual liberty. Negatively, let me say that liberality does not consist in following blindly the leadership of individual men, however eminent. Still less does it consist in timid acquiescence in mere popular opinions, however prevalent. On the contrary, a generous admiration and respect for individual minds which resist such opinions is, in my judgment, one of the surest indications of a genuine

words of those just cited have a dubious sound, they are very wholesome in these days. It is necessary to recall attention to these fundamental doctrines of Liberalism, which were at one time universally accepted. We have had a long and arduous course to travel, and it is only recently that we have succeeded in establishing freedom in this country, in putting an end to privilege, and the restrictions which were at every turn put upon men's actions by law, by convention, by custom, in favour of certain privileged persons and classes in the community. Even yet there is something more to be done in this direction. Mr. Hyndman in his work, to which we have already referred, shows how unjust were the laws which were made by the capitalist class against the labourers of England. He has traced with minuteness the history of the horrible laws against valiant vagrants, which disfigure our Statute Book of what was in one sense the Golden Age, but which he prefers to call the Iron Age. He points out how capitalists set aside the doctrines of freedom of contract, and induced the legislature to lengthen the hours of work and to cut down the rate of wages. But he does not seem to see that precisely similar injustice will be done if legislation is to be worked in favour of labour and against capital. He himself denies the sacredness of the doctrine of freedom of contract. That legislation should be at the beck of the capitalist class was an undoubted evil which true Liberalism has been attempting to remedy. That the laws should be made by landowners in their own interests is equally an evil which calls for cure, but that the strong hand of the law should be used by the workpeople of this country in favour of themselves, and to the punishment of those who are the owners of capital or of land, would, in the long run, prove an even more pernicious principle of legislation. It was a great advantage when tyranny had one head and one neck. But what axe will relieve us from the tyranny of the majority? Now it seems that, like persons who have in the past got liberty, we do not know how to use it; for instead of determining to remain free we are as rapidly as we can

---

liberality. A servile spirit is gone for the most part from those who serve kings. It is rife among those who seek the favour of the multitude. A constant recollection of the corruption of mankind may sound like a theological requirement. But it is not. The inherent tendency of all human institutions to become corrupt is a fact, and not a dogma. It points to publicity as one safeguard, and to division of power as another. Publicity prevents corruption from hiding in concealment; division of power hinders it from being easily triumphant. These are generally indications. The wise application of them to the transactions of our own day needs the best exercise of all the highest powers we have. The good government of mankind is the most difficult of all problems, and there is no short cut by general definitions to the attainment of wisdom in respect to it."

setting up another tyrant. It is true that it is no longer a king or an aristocracy. But to us it seems no more satisfactory to have our freedom curtailed by an army of people with votes, than by an army of people with broadswords. It is a very strange reversion to an absolute type of government to go back to a form which was adopted long ago, and which in its new form is not a bit more prepossessing than the tyranny of old times. It is true that this new compulsion has been founded upon a liberal foundation, and it is argued that any amount of State interference now can do no harm because the State is the people. But we do not agree with gentlemen who tell us that the virtue of the people is greater than that of any person, that their judgment is more accurate than that of any private person who may be one of the people. And we are not a bit better satisfied that this new State can do no wrong. There must be some arithmetic with which we are unacquainted, which will make ten fools wiser than a wise man. But, further, we have no satisfaction in feeling that the act of the State is not tyranny because we have voted for members of Parliament: though we have one vote in a constituency of 20,000, and thus have our say in the government of this country, we are not reconciled to it if we find its laws pinch us.\* Such sayings are only attempts to delude us with words. If I am restricted and thwarted by the laws which have been made by a Parliament for one of whose representatives I may have voted, or more probably voted against, it is tyranny, by whatever name you call it. This new departure, then, in State policy, is a distinct departure from the established lines of Liberalism. Liberty is, and always has been, the cry of the capable, the clever, the brave, of the men who were destined to be prosperous. Equality is the demand of the ignorant, the incapable, the foolish, and the cowardly. Those who cannot deal with the conditions of the times so as to raise themselves above their fellows, desire, and naturally desire, to have the con-

---

\* The Socialists themselves assert that the system of representation is unfit for higher civilization, and quote Carlyle's saying, "Behold! Now I, too, have my twenty-thousandth part of a Talker in our National Palaver. What a notion of Liberty," with approval. See Gronlund's "Co-operative Commonwealth," p. 120. Indeed, there is a good deal in Socialism which sounds to our ears very like old-fashioned Toryism; and perhaps that is why there is the new-fangled bastard creed of "Tory Democracy." Here, for instance, is a sentence or two from advanced Socialistic writing:—"The majority are always ignorant, always indolent. You cannot expect them to be anything else with their present social surroundings. They have never brought about, consciously and deliberately, any great social change. They have always permitted an energetic minority to accomplish that for them, and then they have always sanctioned the accomplished fact," &c. "The Co-operative Commonwealth," pp. 183, 184. See also Henry George's "Social Problems," p. 230.

ditions of the time shaped and modified to their incapacities. The experiment has been tried in the trades unions, where, of course, the foolish were in the majority, and it was resisted as an injury to the many that the few should profit by their skill. We are all familiar with the action which has been taken in that regard. There is one fatal aspect of the question to which reference must be made, and that is the way in which Socialists and Radicals lose sight of the real facts of human nature. Because certain of our best men can be unselfish in a low sense and selfish only in a high one, it is assumed that altruism or self-sacrifice may be made a basis of social relations.\* Because in the old days art flourished and trade advanced without competition, and because competition nowadays reduces the wages of the labourer to a minimum, the Socialists are opposed to competition, and wish to see an end put to the rivalry which has been the means of bringing about the industrial and commercial prosperity which it is admitted we enjoy. But they lose sight of the fact, that the competition has not only reduced wages, it has reduced the price of commodities, and in that way has compensated for the very reduction complained of. Those persons who, like Mr. Morris, would put an end to competition, and who look for better days for art and manufactures when the base rivalry has ceased, ignore, as we have said, the fact that human nature is selfish, and that it is only one man in a hundred who is stimulated to exertion by the higher motives of self-culture, of duty, of honour, and that these themselves are, after all, only a higher form of the same ambition which in lower quarters we call "greed," or "selfishness." They forget, too, that the workmen owe as much to competition as they suffer from it, and that, as competition amongst labourers lowers, competition amongst capitalists raises, wages. That capital in a country where capital is safe accumulates more rapidly than the means of production, makes capitalists compete with one another and so raises the price of labour, is a very well-known economical law.

At the present juncture, power having passed into the hands of a much larger number of persons than has hitherto exercised it, it behoves every responsible person to do his or her best to propagate the truth as to these important economical questions. It is not only the immediate comfort and happiness of the people of this country that are at stake. The future is in our hands to make or to mar for our successors. There are, as we have seen, many spurious Socialistic views in vogue to a certain extent at the present time. We look upon them, however humane

---

\* Gronlund's "Co-operative Commonwealth," p. 188.



they seem, as in the highest degree pernicious to the State. We have tried to show that their foundations are not sound, and that misery, national decay and disintegration will be the result of practical experiments in the direction of Socialism.

---

ART. II.—THE INFLUENCE OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE  
ON THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

*The Hibbert Lectures, 1880. Lectures on the Influence of the Institutions, Thought, and Culture of Rome on Christianity and the Development of the Catholic Church.* By ERNEST RENAN, of the French Academy. Translated by CHARLES BEARD, B.A. Third edition. London and Edinburgh: Williams & Norgate. 1885.

ACCORDING to Lord Macaulay, "There is not, and never was, on this earth, a work of human policy so well deserving examination as the Roman Catholic Church."\* In the like spirit the most philosophic of the Protestant dissenting ministers of our day has said that "no instructed man can deny that the Roman Catholic Church presents one of the most solemn and majestic spectacles in history;" † and in the pages of the WILMINGTON REVIEW ‡ the same learned and venerable person describes the Church of Rome as "of all institutions the most august and durable which crosses the chasm between ancient and modern times and the ocean between the new and old world; which has cost mankind more thought and treasure and given them a more wonderful guidance than any earlier or later agency." Most fitting and appropriate, therefore, was the selection, by the Hibbert Trustees, of Dr. Martineau as their organ to express at the close of M. Renan's Lectures their thanks to him for this "series of historical sketches, at once constituted into a whole by a tissue of philosophical conceptions and separately rich in picturesque colouring and dramatic situations, and presented with that marvellous charm of literary form in the command of which the French are the first among European nations, and may I not

---

\* Essay on Ranke's "History of the Popes."

† Dr. Martineau's "Rationale of Religious Inquiry," p. 49 (third edition).

‡ WILMINGTON REVIEW for January, 1851. Art. "The Battle of the Churches."

add," continues Dr. Martineau, "M. Renan among the French."\*

Assenting to the opinions of Lord Macaulay and Dr Martineau, we propose briefly to review these remarkable lectures. By whom and under what circumstances and influences was founded the august and most durable of all institutions? To this question many answers are given. Let us first hear that of the Roman Catholic Church itself, as expressed by its most eminent English representative, Cardinal Newman:—

In such a time as this did the prince of the apostles, the first pope, advance towards the heathen city, where under a divine guidance he was to fix his seat. He toiled along the stately road which led him straight towards the capital of the world. He met throngs of the idle and the busy, of strangers and natives, who peopled the interminable suburb. He passed under the high gate and wandered on amid marble palaces and columned temples; he met processions of heathen priests and ministers in honour of their idols; he met the wealthy lady, borne on her litter by her slaves; he met the stern legionaries who had been the "massive iron hammers" of the whole earth; he met the anxious politician with his ready man of business at his side to prompt him on his canvass for popularity; he met the orator returning home from successful pleading, with his young admirers and his grateful or hopeful clients. He saw about him nothing but tokens of a vigorous power, grown up into a definite establishment formed and matured in its religion, its laws, its civil traditions, its imperial extension through the history of many centuries, and what was he but a poor feeble aged stranger, in nothing different from the multitude of men?—an Egyptian or a Chaldean, or perhaps a Jew, some Eastern or other, as passers-by would guess according to their knowledge of human kind, carelessly looking at him (as we might turn our eyes upon Hindoo or gipsy as they met us), without the shadow of a thought that such a man was then destined to commence an age of religious sovereignty, in which they might spend their own heathen times twice over and not see its end. †

To our mind this piece of enamelled rhetoric illustrates and adorns, but assumes, the proposition that Peter ever came to Rome, which, according to M. Renan, is what no one has yet been able to prove. ‡ One of the most learned and candid of the dignitaries of the Established Church, who devoted himself to the study and elucidation of "The History of Latin Christianity," holds that

It is quite clear that, *strictly* speaking, the Church of Rome was not founded by either of these apostles [SS. Peter and Paul]. St. Paul's

\* Dr. Martineau's Address, printed in the "Lectures," p. 210.

† "Sermons to Mixed Congregations," p. 243.

‡ "Lectures," p. 66.

Epistle to the Romans proves undeniably the flourishing state of the Church before his visit to that city; and many Roman Catholic writers have given up the impracticable task of reconciling with chronology any visit of St. Peter to Rome before the end of the reign of Claudius or the beginning of the reign of Nero.\*

Dr. Martineau regards it as "altogether doubtful whether Peter ever was in Rome except to undergo imprisonment," but he regards it as altogether certain that "he was no more Bishop of Rome (*i.e.*, president over its church) than he was of Antioch or Damascus."†

Another English divine of the Liberal school, Dean Stanley, is equally clear with Dr. Martineau, "That St. Peter died at Rome is probable. But it is certain that he was not the founder of the Church of Rome."‡ And elsewhere he says, "No saying of ecclesiastical history is more pregnant than that in which Hobbes declares that "the Pope is the ghost of the deceased Roman empire, sitting crowned upon the grave thereof." This "is the true original basis of his dignity and power, and it appears even in the minutest details."§

M. Renan's lectures illustrate and elucidate the pregnant saying of Hobbes.

The Church [in M. Renan's view] became completely Roman, and has remained up to our own day. as it were, a remnant of the empire. Throughout all the Middle Ages the Church is no other than the old Rome. Regaining its authority over the barbarians who have conquered it, imposing upon them its decretals, as it formerly imposed its laws, governing them by its cardinals, as it once governed them by its imperial legates and its proconsuls (p. 19).

The spirit of historical criticism, by which, and not by scholasticism or philosophy, M. Renan's faith in revealed religion was destroyed,|| leads him to make short work with the papal claim to be Christ's vicar on earth.

We have not the slightest belief that Jesus intended to set a chief of any kind over His Church. To begin at the beginning, it is doubtful whether the idea of the Church, as it was developed at a later time, ever existed in the mind of the Founder of Christianity. The word *ecclesia* occurs only in the Gospel of Matthew. What, at all events, is quite certain, is that the idea of the *episcopos*, in the form which it took in the second century, was no part of the thought of

\* Note on chapter xv. of Gibbon's "Decline and Fall." It will be found in vol. i. p. 326, of the edition lately published by Messrs. Ward, Lock & Co.

† "Rationale of Religious Inquiry," p. 29.

‡ "Christian Institutions" (Essays on Ecclesiastical Subjects), p. 211.

§ *Ibid.* p. 206.

|| See Renan's "Recollections of my Youth," pp. 220, 223, and notes, and see WESTMINSTER REVIEW, N.S., cxxviii., October 1883, p. 458.

Jesus. It is himself who, during his brief Galilean apparition, is the living *episcopos*: afterwards the Spirit will inspire each individual soul until the Master's return. Even if any idea of an *ecclesia* and an *episcopos* can be ascribed to Jesus, it is absolutely indubitable that he never dreamed of the future *episcopos* of the city of Rome, that impious city, that centre of all the earth's impurity, of whose existence he was possibly hardly aware, and which he looked upon in the same sombre light as did all other Jews. If there is anything in the world which Jesus did not institute it is the papacy—that is, the idea that the Church is a monarchy.\*

M. Renan agrees with Dean Milman that the Church of Rome was not founded either by Peter or by Paul. Like Christianity itself, it came out of the heart of Judaism.

We are [according to M. Renan] altogether ignorant of religious history if we do not lay it down as a fundamental principle that Christianity at its origin is no other than Judaism, with its fertile principles of almsgiving and charity, with its absolute faith in the future of humanity, with that joy of heart of which Judaism has always held the secret, and denuded only of the distinctive observances and features which had been invented to give a character of its own to the peculiar religion of the children of Israel (p. 17).

We condense M. Renan's admirable sketch of the rise of the Church out of the Jewish synagogue. The establishment of the Jews in Rome dates from about 60 B.C. The first nucleus of the Jewish population of Rome consisted of freedmen, for the most part descendants of prisoners whom Pompey brought thither. They had passed through a period of slavery without any change in their religious habits. This first colony was reinforced by crowds of emigrants. The Roman Jews dwelt by themselves in the Trastevere, an abject quarter, in which no Roman who respected himself ever set foot. "They acted as porters, huckstering, bartering tapers for broken glass, and offering to the proud Italian population a type which at a later period must have become too familiar to them—that of an accomplished mendicant." In this state of social degradation, the Roman Jews, "despised and rejected of men," as their national poet foretold,† lived a very active social and religious life. Their four synagogues were completely organized and in constant communication with Jerusalem; nowhere was the ritual and ceremonial part of the law more scrupulously observed, and not only was their worship celebrated without interruption, but the work of conversion went on easily.‡

---

\* "Lectures," pp. 63, 64.

† The Jews then and now apply Isaiah liii. to Israel as a nation, not to the Messiah according to the Christian interpretation.

‡ *Vide* pp. 43 to 49.

Rich female converts took Biblical names—they carried over their slaves to Judaism with them; they listened to expositions of Scripture by the doctors, built houses of prayer, and showed themselves proud of the consideration which was shown to them in this little society. The poor Jew, as he asked an alms with a trembling voice, found the opportunity of insinuating into the ear of the great Roman lady a word or two of the law, and often gained the matron, who opened to him a handful of small coin. To keep the Sabbath and the Jewish festivals is, with Horace, a trait which marks a man of feeble mind—that is to say, puts him among the crowd *unus multorum* (p. 57).

Rome was the meeting-place of all Oriental worships, the point upon the shores of the Mediterranean with which Syrians stood in the closest relation. They came thither in crowds. They all spoke Greek. "The old Roman citizens attached to the ancestral manners, were overwhelmed by this flood of foreigners, and lost ground every day" (p. 55).

About the year 50 of our era certain Syrian Jews, who had become disciples of Jesus, came to Rome and told their brethren there of the new faith which they had embraced, and of the happiness it imparted to them. Others soon followed, and letters from Syria spoke of the movement as one that was constantly gaining strength. We transcribe M. Renan's vivid but not flattering sketch of the earliest members of the Church of Rome. "All these people smelt of garlic. These ancestors of Roman prelates were poor dirty *proletaires*, without distinction, without manners, clad in filthy gaberdines, having the bad breath of men whose food is insufficient. Their haunts exhaled that odour of wretchedness which arises from human beings who are coarsely clothed, badly fed, closely crowded" (p. 57) \* Here again M. Renan agrees with the eminent Nonconformist from whom we have before quoted. "Christianity," says Dr. Martineau, "without a favouring alliance in the present or the past, rude in utterance, provincial in garb, inexpert in thought, passes from city to city, noiselessly lifting the latch of private life, and after a word or two entertained as an angel that had entered unawares." † It is not Paul, but Aquila and Priscilla, Paul's "helpers who for his life laid down their own necks," ‡ who are to be regarded as the founders of the Roman Church. Paul had no intercourse, either personally or by letter, with the Roman Christians, until § after Claudius had commanded the Jews to

---

\* "Christianity . . . the religion of outcasts and exiles, of fugitives and prisoners."—Canon Farrar in the preface to his "Life of Christ."

† "Address at the opening of the Session of Manchester New College," October 15, 1860, p. 9. Conf. Farrar, *ubi supra*.

‡ Romans xvi. 2.

§ Also Acts xviii. 2.

depart from Rome. Banished from Rome, Aquila and Priscilla sought refuge in Corinth, where Paul on arriving from Athens fell in with them.

We know [to resume our quotations from M. Renan] the names of the two Jews who had most to do with this movement. They were a pious couple, Aquila, a Jew of Pontus, practising the same handicraft of tent-making as Paul, and Priscilla his wife. Driven from Rome, they took refuge at Corinth, where they soon became the intimate friends and zealous fellow workers of St. Paul. Aquila and Priscilla are thus the two oldest members of the Church of Rome, who are known to us. There they are hardly remembered. Legend, always unjust, because always moulded by reasons of policy, has expelled from the Christian Pantheon these two obscure artisans to award the honour of founding the Church of Rome to a name more fully answering to its proud pretensions. We, however, may discern the true starting-point of Western Christianity, not in the pompous basilica which has been dedicated to St. Peter, but in the ancient Ghetto of the Porta Portese. It is the trace of these poor wandering Jews, bringing with them from Syria the religion of the world, these labouring men; dreaming in their wretchedness of the Kingdom of God, that we must try to recover. We do not deny to Rome her essential pre-eminence; she was probably the first city of the Western world, and even of Europe, where Christianity established itself. But in place of these proud basilicas, with their insolent motto, *Christus vincit, Christus regnat, Christus imperat*, she would do well to build a humble chapel in memory of the two good Jews who first uttered upon her quays the name of Jesus (pp. 56-7).

The Church of Rome, therefore, unlike the Churches of Asia Minor, of Macedonia, and of Greece, was not a Pauline foundation, but a Jewish Christian product. As Milman and Stanley have pointed out, it was not a Latin, but an Eastern community, speaking Greek, and following the usages of Syria, a community to which, as being Greek and oriental, St. Paul wrote his great Epistle, not in Latin, but in Greek, a community of which the first teachers, Clement and Hermas also wrote, not in Latin, but in Greek, and the original chief of which was not an "Italian Prince," but an alien, a Greek in language, an oriental in race.\*

According to M. Renan the coming of Paul to Rome was "an event of capital importance in the history of the world; whether Peter was at Rome or not is a matter which has neither moral nor political interest for us." It is merely a curious historical question, and as to the Catholic theory which brings Peter to Rome in the year 42 and makes his pontificate endure for twenty-two or three years, it cannot now boast a

---

\* Vide Stanley's "Christian Institutions," pp. 204, 247.

single rational advocate, and it would therefore be a work of supererogation to controvert it.

We may indeed [continues M. Renan] go further, and affirm that Peter had not yet arrived in Rome when Paul was brought there, that is to say, in the year 61. The Epistle of Paul to the Romans written about the year 58, or which could not have been written, at most, more than two years and a half before Paul's arrival at Rome, is an important branch of the evidence: it is impossible to imagine that St. Paul could have written to the disciples, of whom Peter was the head, without making the least mention of him. The last chapter of the Acts of the Apostles is still more decisive. This chapter, and especially verses 17 to 29, are unintelligible if Peter was at Rome when Paul came there. We may take it, then, as absolutely certain that Peter did not come to Rome before Paul—that is to say, before the year 61, as nearly as we can fix it (p. 65).

We may add that it is evident from this passage in the Acts that when Paul arrived in Rome the organization of the Christians there was in a very inchoate state. That Peter came to Rome after Paul's arrival is what, according to M. Renan, "no one has yet been able to prove." But in his judgment it is not an impossible event and there are strong reasons for believing it to be historical. Besides the evidence of the Fathers of the second and third centuries, which he allows is not without weight, there are three other not contemptible arguments in favour of the tradition. Of these the first is, that it cannot be denied that Peter died a martyr's death, and it is not to be supposed he suffered martyrdom elsewhere than in Rome. The second is derived from the well-known passage in the first of the Epistles attributed to Peter (v. 13). "The Church that is at Babylon, elected together with you, saluteth you" on which one of our old Puritan controversialists makes this comment—"You (the Romanists) will agree to it that Babylon here is Rome, so that you may get Peter in Rome." It is plain to M. Renan "that Babylon in this passage means Rome. If the Epistle is authentic, the passage is decisive; if it is apocryphal the inference which we may draw from it is not less convincing." The fact that the author of the Epistle dated it from Rome shows "that when it was written, the received opinion was that Peter had been there." The third argument is derived from the scheme which lies at the basis of the Ebionite acts of Peter, which brings Peter to Rome in order that he may overcome Paul at the very centre of his influence, and having brought to confusion the father of all error, may die there. It is probable therefore that Peter came to Rome and suffered martyrdom soon after his arrival in the Eternal City, but mystery enshrouds those events of the primitive history of

Christianity which we would willingly know in exactest outline (pp. 66, 69).

The deaths of the Apostles Peter and Paul are covered by a veil which will never be penetrated. The most probable supposition is that both disappeared in the great massacre of the Christians which was ordered by Nero. As to this last fact, the doubt which so often attends our investigations into the history of Christianity is absolutely impossible, for the monstrous story is told us by Tacitus, in a passage the authority of which cannot be disputed. (p. 74).

The story of this massacre is fully related by M. Renan in one of those brilliant sketches which Dr. Martineau commends (pp. 70-94). The accretions on the legend of Peter and Paul M. Renan thus describes—

True or not, the legend became an article of faith. At the beginning of the third century were already to be seen, not far from Rome, two monuments to which the names of the Apostles Peter and Paul were attached. One, that of St. Peter, was situated at the foot of the Vatican Hill; the other, that of St. Paul, on the way to Ostia. They were called in oratorical phrase the "trophies" of the Apostles. They were probably *cellæ* or *memoriæ* dedicated to the two Saints. Similar monuments existed and were publicly recognized before the time of Constantine, but we are to suppose that these "trophies" were known only to the faithful. At a later period these trophies became the tombs of the Apostles. About the middle of the third century two bodies, which universal veneration holds to be those of the Apostles, actually make their appearance, brought most likely from the Appian Way, where there was more than one Jewish Cemetery. In the fourth century, those bodies repose where the two trophies stood. Above the trophies are then raised two basilicas; one of which has become the Basilica of St. Peter, while the other, that of St. Paul without the walls, has preserved its main features down to our own day (pp. 96-8).

Inconsistently with the theory that an impenetrable veil covers the deaths of Peter and Paul, M. Renan—if we understand him aright—thinks it not impossible that the "trophies" which the Christians venerated in the second century really designate the places at which the two Apostles suffered (pp. 98-9).

The primitive Church of Rome, in M. Renan's view, bore strong marks of its Jewish origin. It attached itself directly to the Church of Jerusalem. It was given to circumcision and to external observances, Ebionite both in its love of abstinences and in its doctrine, more Jewish than Christian in its conception of the person and death of Jesus, and strongly attached to millenarianism.



The legitimate daughter of Jerusalem, the Roman Church will always have a certain ascetic and sacerdotal character opposed to the Protestant tendency of Paul. Peter will be her real head; afterwards, as the political and hierarchical spirit of old Rome penetrates her, she will truly become the New Jerusalem, the City of the Pontificate, of a hieratic and solemn religion, of material sacraments alone sufficient for justification, the City of Ascetics after the manner of James Obliam, with his hardened knees, and the plate of gold on his forehead. She will be the church of authority. . . . In vain will Paul address to Her his noble Epistle, expounding the mystery of the cross of Christ and salvation by faith alone. She will hardly understand it. But Luther fourteen centuries and a half later will understand it, and will open a new era in the secular series of the alternate triumphs of Peter and Paul (pp. 59-60).

In the second century Rome exercised a decisive influence on the Church of Jesus adverse to its primitive Judaic spirit. It was the Roman magistrates who prevented the Pharisees from killing Christianity (pp. 9, 22).

In M. Renan's judgment, to which we assent, in the first age of Christianity "the disciples of Jesus were parted by divisions so profound, that none of the differences which now separate the orthodox from the heretics and schismatics of the whole world are to be compared with the disagreement between Peter and Paul."\* The question in dispute was nothing less than this, whether Christianity should remain a Jewish sect or develop into the Catholic Church. It is the policy of orthodox Divines, by whatever name they may be called, to cover up this division between Paul and Peter; nevertheless it is apparent to all who read their New Testament otherwise than, as do most of its readers, mechanically. This dispute appears even in the Acts of the Apostles,† constructed though it is on "the principle of balancing and harmonizing the rival claims of Peter and Paul."‡ It is plainly revealed by Paul himself in the Epistle to the Galatians, it permeates the Epistle of James, but it is chiefly shown in that intensely Jewish Book "The Revelation." The denunciation in the message to the Church of Smyrna "of the blasphemy of them which say, they are [not Christians it will be observed] but Jews and are not, but are the synagogue of Satan," (ii. 9) and a like denunciation in the message to the Church of Sardis "of them of the synagogue of Satan which say they are Jews and are not, but do lie" (iii. 9) are evidently aimed at Paul. In the description

\* "Lectures," p. 61.

† *Vide*, especially, chapter xv.

‡ See John James Taylor's "Character of the Fourth Gospel," p. 18, *note*.

of the New Jerusalem Paul's apostleship is impliedly denied. "The wall of the city"—it is said—"had twelve foundations, and in them the names of the twelve Apostles of the Lamb" (xxi.). Clearly the twelve foundations consist of the eleven survivors of the original twelve and of Matthias who was elected to fill the place "from which Judas by transgression fell." There is therefore no place for Paul, who was the thirteenth.\* Titus is reported to have imagined that the destruction of the Temple would be the ruin of Christianity as well as of Judaism. There never was, in M. Renan's judgment, a greater mistake.†

If the Temple had remained [he continues], Christianity would certainly have been arrested in its development. The Temple, still standing, would have been the centre of all Jewish activities. They would never have ceased to look upon it as earth's most sacred spot; to resort to it in pilgrimage; to bring thither their tribute. The Church of Jerusalem, assembled about the sacred enclosure, would have continued, in virtue of its primacy, to receive the homage of the whole world, to persecute the Christians of the Pauline Churches, to exact circumcision and the practice of the Mosaic Law from all who desired to call themselves disciples of Jesus. All faithful missionary effort would have been forbidden, letters of obedience signed at Jerusalem would have been exacted from all wandering preachers.‡

A centre of infallible authority, a patriarchate, residing in a kind of college of cardinals under the presidency of such persons as James, pure Jews, men belonging to the family of Jesus, would have been established, and would have become an immense danger to the nascent Church: the very fact that Paul, after so much ill-usage, always remains in connection with the Church of Jerusalem, shows what difficulties would have attended a rupture with those holy personages. Such a schism would have been thought an enormity. Separation from Judaism would have been impossible, and yet that separation was the necessary condition of the existence of the new religion, as the cutting of the umbilical cord is the condition of the existence of a new being. The mother would have killed the child. On the other hand, the Temple once destroyed, the Christians no longer bear it in mind; before long they will look upon it as a profane spot. Jesus will be all in all to them. By the same blow the Christian Church at Jerusalem was reduced to a secondary importance. It is seen to form itself anew round the centre from which its strength proceeds, the *desposyni*, the members of the family of Jesus, the sons of Cleopas, but its day of royalty is past. This focus of hatred and exclusiveness once

---

\* These remarks on the Book of the Revelation are drawn from the writer's memory of some unpublished lectures on that book by Dr. Martineau.

† "Lectures," p. 115 and note.

‡ "See the letters at the head of the pseudo-Clementine Homilies."—(Author's note at p. 116.)

destroyed, the mutual approach of opposing parties in the Church of Jesus will become easy. Peter and Paul will be reconciled of their own accord, and the terrible duality of nascent Christianity will cease to be a mortal wound. Lost in the depths of Batanea, of the Huran, the little group which attached itself to the kinsmen of Jesus, to James, to Cleopas, becomes the Ebionite sect and slowly disappears.\*

It, however, reappears towards the close of the eighteenth century in the teaching of Theophilus Lindsey, of Priestley and of Belsham. We resume our quotation from M. Renan :—

“In proportion as the Church of Jerusalem falls, the Church of Rome rises, or to put the fact in a better way, a phenomenon that plainly shows itself in the years that follow the victory of Titus, is that the Church of Rome becomes more and more the heir of the Church of Jerusalem and takes its place. The spirit of the two Churches is the same, but what was a danger at Jerusalem becomes an advantage at Rome. The taste for tradition and hierarchy, the respect for authority, are in some sort translated from the courts of the Temple to the West. James, the brother of the Lord, had been a quasi Pope at Jerusalem. Rome is about to take up the part of James. We are to have the Pope of Rome. Without Titus we should have had the Pope of Jerusalem. But there is this great difference between them, that while the Pope of Jerusalem would have smothered Christianity at the end of a century or two, the Pope of Rome has made it the religion of the world.†

We regret we have not space to dwell on M. Renan's sketch of Clement of Rome. He agrees with Bishop Lightfoot in regarding him as one of the “great figures of a nascent Christianity,” enveloped in half shadow, and, as it were, lost in the luminous dust of a fine historic distance. He is the first type of Pope which history presents to us, and already the idea of a certain primacy belonging to his Church was beginning to make its way to the light. The earliest Pope, if so we may call him, was born at Rome, but was of Jewish origin; without having any decisive proof of the fact we may, M. Renan thinks, admit that he had been at an early period in relation with the apostles, and especially with Peter, though elsewhere he says, “Clement had probably seen neither Peter nor Paul.”‡ It is probable he was one of the chief actors in the great work accomplished by

---

\* “Lectures,” pp. 115 to 118. As to the Ebionites, Conf. Gibbon, cxv., vol. i. 299, 520; cxlvii., vol. ii. 283. Note, the references are to Ward, Lock & Co.'s edition. The kinsmen of Jesus are thus described by Canon Farrar :—“There seemed to be in them a certain strong opinionativeness, a Judaic obstinacy, a lack of sympathy, a deficiency in the elements of tenderness and reverence.” —“Life of Christ,” vol. i. p. 99.

† “Lectures,” pp. 121, 122.

‡ Conf. pp. 129–132.

Rome—the posthumous reconciliation of Peter and Paul, and the fusion of the Petrine and Pauline parties, a fusion without which the work of Christ must have perished. The Church at Corinth was, as in the time of Paul, rent by internal divisions.

This led to the first manifesto of the principle of authority within the Christian Church and of the Primacy of Rome. “The Church of Rome, consulted as to these troubles, replied in a letter which is still extant. It is anonymous, but a very ancient tradition assigns the composition of it to Clement. The Roman Church was henceforth the church of order, of rule, of subordination. Its fundamental principle was, that humility and submission were of more account than the sublimest gifts.”

The question now arose, What is the essential element of the Church? The people? The clergy? The inspired soul? Clement, or whoever wrote the epistle attributed to him, solved it in the sense of pure Catholicism—“The apostolic credential is everything, the right of the people is reduced to nothing. We may well say, therefore, that Catholicism had its origin in Rome, for it was the Roman Church that first formulated its law. Men felt that the free Church such as Jesus conceived it (Matthew xviii. 20), such as Paul understood it to be, was an anarchic Utopia, holding no promise of the future. With evangelical liberty disorder went hand in hand. They did not see that in the long run hierarchy meant uniformity and death.”\*

M. Renan, of course, rejects as unhistorical the proposition in the English Prayer Book, than which there is none more false :

It is evident unto all men diligently reading the Holy Scripture and ancient authors that from the Apostles' time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church—Bishops, Priests, and Deacons.†

M. Renan's views substantially agree with those of Gibbon, but it is remarkable that Gibbon is not among the many authorities to whom M. Renan refers in his notes.

The history of the ecclesiastical hierarchy is one of a threefold abdication—first, the community of the faithful abandoning all power to the elders or *presbyteri*; the presbyteral body then concentrating itself in a single person, who is the *episcopos*; finally, the *Episcopi* of the Latin Church recognizing one among themselves, the Pope, as chief. This last stage of progress, if progress it can be called, has been reached only in our day. The creation of the Episcopate is the work of the second century.‡ The absorption of the Church by the

\* Condensed from pp. 122 to 131. † Preface to the Ordination Service.

‡ Gibbon thinks that Episcopacy “was introduced before the end of the first century,” chap. xv. vol. i. p. 323, Ward, Lock & Co.'s edition.

Presbytery was an accomplished fact before the end of the first. In the epistle of Clement of Rome, it is not the Episcopate but the Presbyteral body which is in question. We find no trace as yet of a Presbyter superior to and about to dethrone the rest. But the author loudly proclaims that the presbyters, the clergy, are anterior to the people. The apostles in founding churches have chosen by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost "the Bishops and Deacons of the believers that are to be." The powers proceeding from the apostles have been transmitted by a regular succession. No church, therefore, has the right of depriving its elders. In the church the rich have no privilege. In like manner those who have been favoured with mysterious gifts, far from thinking themselves above the hierarchy, ought to be most submissive." \*

If we may venture to suggest a correction in this statement, it would be that the development of the hierarchy consists, not of a threefold abdication on the part of the people, but of a threefold usurpation on the part of the clergy. In a note the author points out that the writer of the epistle of Clement uses presbyter and bishop as synonyms. There is no mention of an order of priests; that was a later development, or rather a corruption of primitive usage.

M. Renan having in his first three lectures traced the history of Rome till it became "the centre of growing ecclesiastical authority," in his fourth and last lecture exhibits her as "the capital of Catholicism." In the primitive Christian community the importance of churches was in proportion to their apostolic nobility. \*

What shall we say of a Church founded both by Peter and by Paul? It is clear that such a Church would be regarded as having a real superiority over all others. To have succeeded in establishing this belief was the masterpiece of that cleverness which characterized the Church of Rome. By the time of Antoninus Pius almost everybody had come to believe that Peter and Paul had in perfect agreement founded Christianity at Rome, and had sealed the work with their blood. The ecclesiastical destiny of Rome was thenceforth fixed when her part in the profane world was played out; this extraordinary city was destined to play another and a second part like that of Jerusalem. †

Rome was then at the epoch of her highest greatness. The importance of the Church of Rome was measured by that of the city itself. The organization of the Christian society, and especially the creation of the Episcopate, was the chief work pursued at Rome. "If men had continued" (we quote M. Renan) "to look upon ecclesiastical powers as emanating from the Church

itself, the Church would have lost all its hieratic and theocratic character. On the contrary, it was decreed that the clergy should seize upon the Church and take its place."\*

In the second half of the second century throughout Christendom the change was all but accomplished. "The Bishop alone was regarded as the successor of the apostles, the faithful have entirely disappeared. The apostolic authority believed to be transmitted by the imposition of hands has destroyed the authority of the community. The Bishops of the different churches will afterwards enter into communication with one another, and will shape the universal Church into a species of oligarchy, which will hold meetings, will censure its own members, will decide questions of faith, and will in and by itself constitute a true sovereign power."†

More and more every day Rome became the capital of Christianity. Its Church claimed a precedence over others, which was generally recognized, till at length the Bishop of Rome became the Bishop of Bishops, he who admonished all others. Rome proclaims her right—a dangerous right—of excommunicating those who do not walk step by step with her. "At the end of the second century we can already recognize by signs which it is impossible to mistake the spirit which in 1870 will proclaim the infallibility of the Pope."‡

M. Renan shows that, to a much greater extent than is commonly supposed, the Empire was the mould in which the new religion took shape. The inner framework, the limits, the hierarchical divisions of the Church were those of the Empire.

The Church, like the Synagogue and the Mosque, is a thing that belongs essentially to the city; Christianity, like Judaism and Islamism, is to be a religion of towns. The final resistance which it has to encounter will come from the countryman, the *paganus*. The rural Christians, who were very few in number, no doubt frequented the church of the neighbouring town. The Roman *municipum* thus gave local limits to the Church. As the country and the small towns received the Gospel from the cities, they also received from them their clergy, who were always subordinate to the Bishop of the great town. Thus among the towns, the *civitas*, the great town alone has a real church with an *Episcopus*; the small town remains in ecclesiastical dependence upon the great one. This primacy of great towns was a fact of capital importance, the great town once converted, the small town and the country followed the movement. The Diocese was thus the original unit of the Christian organization. As to the ecclesiastical province, it answered in general to that Roman province; the divisions set up by the worship of Rome and of Augustus were here the secret law which determined all. The towns which had a *flamen* or *archiereus*

---

\* "Lectures," p. 152. † *Ibid.* pp. 154-5. ‡ *Ibid.* p. 173.

are those which at a later time had an archbishop. The *Flamen civitatis*, whose special charge was the worship of the *Lares*, became the Bishop; after the third century he possesses the civil and political powers in the *civitas* to which the Bishop will succeed. The *flamen*, in a word, occupied the same rank as the bishop afterwards in the diocese. Thus it comes to pass that the ecclesiastical geography of a country is almost identical with its geography in the Roman period. The map of Bishoprics and Archbishoprics is that of the ancient *civitates*, in their order of political subordination.\*

Dean Stanley has drawn out more particularly the truth of the secular origin of many things in the early customs of the Church. Not only was the word and idea of a diocese taken from the existing divisions of the Empire, but the early Churches were "basilicas," not temples, but Roman courts of justice accommodated to the purposes of Christian worship. The word, *Bishop*, *Episcopus*, was taken, not from any usage of the Temple or the synagogue, but from the officers created in the different subject towns of Athens—"borrowed," as Hooker says, "from the Grecians." "Ordo" (the origin of our present "orders") was the well-known name of the municipal senates of the Empire. "Ordinatio" (the original of our ordination) was never used by the Romans except for civil appointments. Again:—

The name by which the Pope's highest ecclesiastical character is indicated is derived, not from the Jewish high priest, but from the Roman emperor. The Latinized version of the Jewish high priest was "Summus Sacerdos." But the Pope is "Pontifex Maximus," and the "Pontifex Maximus" was a well-known and recognized personage in the eyes of the Roman population long before they had ever heard of the race of Aaron or of Caiaphas. He was the high pagan dignitary who lived in a public residence at the corner of the Palatine Hill, the chief of the college of pontiffs, or bridge makers. It was his duty to conduct all public sacrifices, to scourge to death any one who insulted the vestal virgins, to preside at the assemblies and games, to be present at the religious ceremony of any solemn marriage, and to arrange the calendar. His office was combined with many great secular posts and thus was at last held by the most illustrious sons of Rome.†

Cardinal Newman once said:—

If the State would but keep within its own province, it would find the Church its truest ally and best benefactor. She upholds obedience to the magistrate, she recognizes his office as from God, she is the preacher of peace, the sanction of law, the first element of order, and the safeguard of morality, and that without possible vacil-

---

\* "Lectures," pp. 15, 167-9.

† "Christian Institutions," pp. 183, 207-9.

lation or failure she may be fully trusted; she is a sure friend, for she is indefectible and undying.\*

The tenet of abject submission by the people to "the powers that be" was from the first one of the notes of the Roman Church. M. Renan thus states and accounts for the fact:—

Authority loves authority, the possessors of authority of every kind hold out a hand to one another. Men as conservative as were the heads of the Church of Rome must have felt a strong temptation towards reconciliation with the power of the State, which they admitted to be often exerted for good. This tendency had been noticeable from the earliest days of Christianity: Jesus himself laid down the rule. For him the image and superscription on the coin were the ultimate criterion of a legitimate power. A criterion which left no room for further inquiry.†

M. Renan then shows that while Nero was upon the throne Paul wrote to the Roman Christians, urging the servile view of their duty of abject submission to the ruling powers, which are found in chapter xiii. of his epistle; and that "some years afterwards Peter, or whoever wrote in his name the work known as his First Epistle, expresses himself in almost identical terms."‡ . . . . "In the same way Clement is a subject of the Roman empire, whose loyalty cannot be surpassed. The submission which is due to bishops and elders the Christian ought to pay to the powers of the world." And M. Renan cites from the epistle of Clement, written when Domitian was raging most cruelly against, not only the Church, but the human race, a passage which is as servile in spirit as that in Paul's epistle written at the moment of Nero's most diabolical atrocities.§ Not only so, but

A characteristic of St. Luke—and you know [adds M. Renan] that in my view there is a connection between St. Luke and the spirit of the Church of Rome—is his respect for the imperial authority, and the precautions which he takes not to offend it. The author of the Acts avoids whatever might present the Romans in the light of enemies of Christianity; on the contrary, he tries to show that in many cases they defended St. Paul and the Christians against the Jews.|| He never utters a word that would be offensive to the civil magistrate. He loves to show how the Roman functionaries were favourable to the new sect and sometimes even joined it,¶ how

\* "Lectures to Anglicans," pp. 144-146. † "Lectures," p. 182.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 183. § *Ibid.* p. 184.

|| "Acts xxiv. 7-17; xxv. 9-16, 25; xxviii. 17, 18."—Author's note on p. 155.

¶ "The centurion Cornelius, the pro-consul Paulus."—Author's note, *ibid.*



equitable Roman justice is, and how superior to the passions of merely local authorities. He insists upon the advantage which Paul derived from his Roman citizenship. If he closes his narrative with the arrival of Paul in Rome, it is possibly in order to avoid the necessity of recounting the atrocities of Nero. Luke nowhere allows that the Christians were compromised before the law. If Paul had not appealed unto the Emperor he might have been set at liberty. A legal *arrière pensée*, in full accord with the age of Trajan, preoccupies him; he wishes to create precedents, to show that there is no ground for persecuting those whom Roman tribunals have so often acquitted.\*

The working of this tendency of the early Christians to submit to the powers that be is shown in detail by another great master of history.

It so happened that the times during which the Church is universally acknowledged to have been in the highest state of purity were times of frequent and violent political change. One at least of the Apostles appears to have lived to see four Emperors pulled down in little more than a year. Of the martyrs of the third century a great proportion must have been able to remember ten or twelve revolutions. These martyrs must have had occasion often to consider what was their duty to a prince just raised to power by a successful insurrection. That they were one and all deterred by the fear of punishment from doing what they thought right is an imputation which no candid infidel would throw upon them. Yet if there be any proposition which can with perfect confidence be affirmed touching the early Christians, it is this, that they never once refused obedience to any actual ruler on account of the illegitimacy of his title. At one time, indeed, the supreme power was claimed by twenty or thirty competitors. Every province from Britain to Egypt had its own Augustus. All these pretenders could not be rightful emperors. Yet it does not appear that in any place the faithful had any scruple about submitting to the person who in that place exercised the imperial functions, while the Christian of Rome obeyed Aurelian, the Christian of Lyons obeyed Tetricus, and the Christian of Palmyra obeyed Zenobia. "Day and night"—such were the words which the great Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, addressed to the representative of Valerian and Gallienus—"day and night do we Christians pray to the one true God for the safety of our emperors." Yet those emperors had a few months before pulled down their predecessor Emilianus, who had pulled down his predecessor Gallus, who had climbed to power on the ruins of the house of his predecessor Decius, who had slain his predecessor Philip, who had slain his predecessor Gordian.†

We must here part from M. Renan, and in doing so beg leave to express our assent to the eloquent encomium on these Lectures

\* "Lectures," pp. 185-6.

† Macaulay's "History of England," chap. xiv.

pronounced by Dr. Martineau. We observe that, towards the close of his last lecture, M. Renan refers—in terms inconsistent with his present views—to his former connection with the Roman Church. “Ties of childhood, the closest of all ties, bind me to Catholicism; and I am often tempted to say of it what Job said (at least in our Latin version), *Etiam si occiderit me in ipso sperabo*. . . . This family is too large not to have a future before it.”

M. Renan’s forecast of the future of the Roman Church is at least enigmatical :

It may be that, to stay the progress of modern thought, which is her conqueror, she will have recourse to the arts of the sorceress, to words such as those which Balder murmured on his funeral pile. The Catholic Church is a woman; let us mistrust the magic words of her agony. What, some day, if she rouses herself to say to us, “My children, all here below is but symbol and dream. The only thing that is clear in this world is a tiny ray of azure light, which gleams across the darkness, and seems as if it were the reflection of a benevolent will. Come to my bosom, forgetfulness is there; for those who want fetishes, I have fetishes; to whomsoever desires good works, I offer good works. For those who wish for the intoxication of the heart I have the milk of my breasts, which intoxicates. For those who want love and hate also, I abound in both; and if any one desires rony, I pour it from a full cup. Come, one and all; the time of dogmatic sadness is past; I have music and incense for your burials, flowers for your weddings, the joyous welcome of my bells for your newly born.” Well, if she spoke thus, we should be sorely perplexed. But she will not speak thus.\*

---

\* “Lectures,” pp. 202-3-4.

### ART. III.—REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT IN OUR COLONIES.

1. *Parliamentary Government in the British Colonies.* By ALPHÆUS TODD. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 1880.
2. *Review of the Colonial Policy of Lord John Russell's Administration by Earl Grey.* 1853. By the Right Hon. Sir C. B. ADDERLEY, K.C.M.G., M.P. London: Edward Stanford, Charing Cross. 1869.
3. *Parliamentary Procedure and Practice.* By JOHN GEORGE BOURINOT, Clerk of the House of Commons, Canada. Montreal: Dawson Brothers. 1884.

IT may be interesting, in the present transitional period of politics in our own country, to bestow a few thoughts on the actual political condition of the great English-speaking communities living in our Colonies and dependencies across the seas. We see that in no less than nine of them, situated in such widely separated parts of the globe as North America, the South Pacific, and South Africa, responsible government on a broad and democratic basis has been in operation for some time past. Taken by themselves, these Colonies offer a distinct study, and are essentially different (1) from Crown Colonies, in which the Crown has the *entire control* of legislation, and (2) from those Colonies where representative institutions have been conceded, but not responsible government. It is obvious that the gift of full political responsibility at once alters the nature of a Colony. Western Australia belongs to quite a different class from South Australia, and in South Africa Natal provides us with one example, the Cape Colony with another. The only constitutional tie which binds a Colony with responsible government to the mother country is found in the governor.

The political development, therefore, of such colonies as Victoria and New Zealand, Tasmania, South Australia, Queensland, New South Wales, Newfoundland, the Cape Colony, and the Canadian Dominion seems to be in a manner complete. But is it possible for us to gather from the story of their political emancipation any greater benefits than those which attend an abstract historical study? We are often told that the corollary of the last Reform Bill is manhood suffrage, and, if this is to be the case, may not the working of our broad-based colonial constitutions throw light upon some of the political questions which now agitate the mother country? We are hardly prepared to answer these questions yet, and the prospect of England, the mother of

nations, having to turn, in her old age, to her children for political enlightenment is, to say the least of it, a strange and novel one. Has it come to this, that we in England must labour, as it were, in the field of empiricism, and learn from colonial experts lessons on such subjects, *inter alia*, as the best system of public education and the simplest codification of laws, and perhaps "a State Church"?

There can be no doubt that we may learn much from a survey of colonial politics, but we must take the utmost care, whilst we study them, not to follow any bias we may have inherited from party life in England. For instance, it has been maintained by some advocates of "Free Education" here that the principle has been acknowledged and acted upon in America and our colonial possessions with advantage to the State. It would seem, therefore, that the principle of "Free Education" was a natural result of the triumph of democratic principles in the Anglo-Saxon world. But, in answer to this position, the Right Honourable Sir F. Sandford, speaking recently, with his usual authoritative judgment on educational systems, pointed out that it had been found just and expedient in our Colonies for the State to subsidize not only elementary but higher education. Acting upon the well-known "pound for pound" principle all round, colonial legislatures encourage voluntarism, and meet the efforts of denominations half-way. There are State-aided colleges as well as schools in our colonies. This interpretation of the duties of a State would not recommend itself to the authors of the "Radical Programme."

Again, the example of our enfranchised colonies has been quoted as a strong argument in favour of simplifying the transfer and sale of land. But we must be careful how we apply anything like a drastic form of argument here. The prairies, and bush, and veldt of a colonial possession have not been burdened with title-deeds for generations, and although a simple law mechanism may suffice for them, it does not follow that it will suit the more complex conditions of land tenure which cluster round our ancestral acres in England.

There are, however, two essential points touching the very form of our constitution upon which colonial precedents may be quoted with advantage. British colonies are, as a body, sincerely attached to the monarchical principle and the bicameral form of our Constitution. Therefore such ardent reformers as Mr. John Morley, who are always arguing in favour of one legislative chamber, would find little consolation in the colonies, and the enemies of Royalty would find still less. But in all minor matters of practical statesmanship, we must recollect, how great are the differences between the old and new, and from what

widely different premisses and conditions home and colonial legislators are accustomed to start. The colonists have, in most cases, begun with *novæ tabulæ*; we, in the old land, are burdened with the debts of ancestors and the weight of immemorial usage. Settlers have had no time to accumulate "Augean" filth—this may come in the future. Their life is free; their acres are limitless; and, without the crucial ordeal of war and battle, they are, in some instances, working out and consummating a nationality of their own. We, in the old country, seem to groan under our traditions and the weight of our responsibilities, although we often point at them with justifiable pride. "Hungry generations tread us down," and the evils of poverty and over-population, so bitter to us here, are unfelt in the young worlds beyond the seas.

Although, therefore, the *fact* of a democracy in the old and new lands may, apparently, be the same, it is clear that the *conditions and circumstances* of this democracy in each case are separate, and deserve a separate study. The analogy between England and her Colonies is not complete, and the consciousness of this incompleteness should be always present with us whenever we institute a comparative study of the principles of representative government at home and abroad. Above all there is one prominent characteristic of our burdened political life here, and it is that it enlists, and we hope will ever continue to enlist, the laborious and gratuitous service of a leisured class. This unpaid public service constitutes one of the redeeming virtues of a plutocracy. However, it is not purposed to attempt any analysis here of the inner differences of home and colonial society. In touching upon them we seem to be on the fringe, simply, of a great and absorbing subject, full of suggestive thought. To follow the expansion of our race, not only in its geographical and material sense, but in its political and ethical development, is a study worthy of the deepest attention from moralists and philosophers. There is hardly a single political or social problem which does not at the present moment receive some elucidation by being studied with reference to our Colonies. The philanthropist, who wishes to relieve congested centres of population in England by means of private or State-aided emigration; the political economist, who wishes to discover a remedy for trade depression; and the imperialist, who, with wide aspirations, wishes to consolidate the imperial power of England, all turn to the Colonies.

On the present occasion it is simply our purpose to draw attention to a few epochs in the history of the growth of representative government in our dependencies. It may be taken for granted that civil and political freedom have had much to do with the material prosperity of our "Second Colonial Empire."

Writers have set forth recently a statistical survey of our colonial resources, but do we always realize by what hidden and subtle influences these resources have been accumulated? We recognize the fact of the extent of the "Britannica Civitas," and know vaguely that Great Britain, with her thirty-five millions, and her Colonies, with their twelve millions, rule conjointly over one-sixth of the population of the world and one-fifth of its habitable surface; but is the power of the administrative engine required for this colossal work duly understood and valued by us? Is it by some superhuman departmental energy, or is it by some privileges of a favoured caste, that we hold the rod of empire? No doubt it is by virtue of certain "caste" traditions that we rule in parts of Asia, and probably we are right in doing so, but in other parts of the world we rule as a caste that is ready to lay aside its exclusiveness and admit even the conquered and inferior native races into a governing partnership, as we have admitted Maoris in New Zealand, and Kafirs and Hottentots in the Cape. It is true that we have not always ruled in this spirit, for we were, not long ago, as much subject to oligarchic prejudice and monopolist principles as other Europeans, and a study of constitutional government in our Colonies will show how we have acted in past times, and how we now stand in our relations towards those Colonies and dependencies where emancipation and freedom have gone hand in hand.

It is a remarkable fact that England granted a representative form of government to her dependencies at a very early period. We are almost surprised to read that in the West Indies Charles II. established a regular civil government in Jamaica (1660), and appointed a governor with an elective council. Such a measure reads like an anachronism. But Jamaica was no exception, and Grenada, St. Vincent, and Montserrat enjoyed a constitution for two hundred years. Of course these "Island Constitutions" were not broadly based at any time of their existence, but the concession of representative government, even in a partial sense, is a proof of the willingness of the home authorities to delegate the management of local affairs to those who lived in the "Plantations." Nor can these "Island Constitutions" be considered as serious attempts to reproduce the home model, especially as we have come to regard it recently, or even within the present century. In course of time they were found to be unworkable, and the native rising in Jamaica (1865), during the regime of Governor Eyre, necessitated the substitution of a more direct form of government under the Crown. The West Indies, collectively speaking, have always presented to us a peculiar group of problems. The "Emancipation" Act and, later still,

the application of "free-trade" principles, have undoubtedly affected their prosperity. Whatever benefits have been conferred upon the British public at large by the exportation of bounty-fed sugar duty-free from the Continent, it cannot be said that the West Indian planter has enjoyed any great direct participation in these benefits. In these islands political and economical considerations are now reacting upon one another. The planters of Jamaica have obtained from Lord Derby, quite recently, the draft promise of a new Constitution, but it is to be feared that the real object in a demand for greater local power is to gain control over a West Indian fiscal policy which will probably be of a retaliatory character. But the West Indian islands, although historically they occupy such a prominent position in our early colonial history, do not furnish us with any instructive or illustrative lessons in representative government. If we wish to look for the best copies and imitations of our own constitutional form of Government, we must direct our attention to those Colonies where the population is homogeneous or, at any rate, of European extraction, and educated on the lines of European civilization. To a certain extent the black, negro, Chinese, Indian, or even the mulatto or half-caste elements, will complicate the principles as well as the actual working of representative government.

It is to Canada that we must look for some of the earliest struggles in the direction of responsible government, and here it is that these struggles were crowned with the earliest and most complete success. The Union Act of Canada (3 & 4 Vict., ch. 35) has been rightly regarded as the first real step in the emancipation of the Empire. Nothing can now, in all human probability, happen to interrupt the flow of Canadian prosperity. By the British North American Act (1867) a Federal form of government has been reached which promises to bring in its train the greatest possible number of blessings which can follow unanimity of colonial politicians upon vital and imperial questions, without interfering with local and provincial powers. The Australasian settlements having been emancipated from direct Imperial control, are also standing at the threshold of the Federal question, with undiminished loyalty to England and a firm belief in the destinies of the old home. New Zealand and New South Wales are hesitating to commit themselves to the principle of a Federal Council, and may be wise in their determination to balance well the "pros" and "cons" of the "Enabling" Bill, but in spite of the momentary indecision of two such important communities the confederation of our Australasian settlements cannot be a distant event. The political factors are, if anything, more homogeneous than those which meet our view in Canada, and their future is

less likely to be hampered by formidable commercial rivalries. No American, German, or French competition can really interfere seriously with the position of the Australasians as arbiters of the Pacific. It is even possible that German trading stations here will ultimately benefit the British colonies. As we have attracted within our midst thousands of European emigrants from time to time, and caused them to amalgamate with ourselves, so our colonists may attract the commerce from the isolated trading centres of the Pacific, and induce them to identify their interests with those of Australasia. There can be no question of rivalry, and the greater the degree such an island as New Guinea is subjected to European civilization, the more numerous the openings for Australasian trade.

In South Africa the political situation is far more complicated. This country must for some time to come constantly offer to the Colonial Office a series of embarrassing considerations. The presence of Dutch settlers in our midst, antagonistic to our Imperial position, has made the gift of responsible government to the Cape Colony in 1872 a doubtful blessing. The Hottentots and half-castes in the Colony, as well as the Kafirs on the eastern border and beyond it, constitute a third element which cannot be amalgamated with the body politic without the greatest legislative care and precaution. It would seem occasionally as if one section of the Cape Colonists would wish to rule the other by making capital out of the natives and of a native policy, but the most superficial observation will at once convey to us an idea of the lurking dangers of such an "opportunist" programme. In South Africa the heterogeneous character of the population is the most marked social feature; for where in her Majesty's dominions can so many ethnological types be found in various stages of development as in this country?

Moreover, the independent Dutch Republics of the Free State and the Transvaal, by their very proximity to the Cape Colony and Natal, do but still further impede uniform legislation by insisting upon systems of native administration and general conception of native rights diametrically opposed to our own. The Dutch burghers are noted for a strange and perverse stubbornness. They have always been in love, professedly, with liberty, and have cherished it as a kind of sacred tradition since they first set foot on African soil. But they have always leaned towards anarchy and rebellion. When the British forces took the Cape in 1795, they found the Dutch burghers in rebellion against their Government at two places in the Colony, Graaf Reinet and Swellendam.

Further, it is true that the black and subject population have demoralized their political sentiments and made them believe



that an impossible gap has been set by Nature between black and white. Although democrats and republicans by tradition and faith, they have ended by becoming oligarchs. Again, a hard and Puritan creed, harder and more merciless because practised in a black man's country, has made "the Afrikaner Boer" exclusive from a theological point of view. Both the Free State and the Transvaal deny, by an express clause in their Constitution ordinances, equality to the black man either in Church or State.

How different the case in Canada and Australasia, where colonists, quickened by an ever-growing sense of responsibility, one in sentiment and one in traditions, have advanced to the realization of a full civic life! In the attractive and picturesque homes of Catholic Acadia, immortalized by Longfellow, we have presented to us a charming picture of colonial life, far different from that of the "Afrikaner" Irreconcilable, haunted by the spectre of historical grievances.

It will be seen at a glance, therefore, that the constitutional history of the three great groups of our Colonies could never be, in detail or circumstance, identical. The main features of the process of political emancipation may be the same, but the climate and products and all the geographical and geological conditions of a settlement influence local industries and to a great extent the character of the inhabitants. Could we pass before us in a hurried survey all the numerous types of colonists, what a concourse we should behold! The backwoodsmen of the "North-West," the fishermen of the maritime provinces, the West Indian planters, the Australian gold-diggers, the sheep farmers of New Zealand, the diamond miners and ostrich farmers of the Cape, the frontiersmen of British Kaffraria, are but a few amongst the many types of colonists. It is a marvel to us that they have all agreed upon one particular form of government—yet they have done so. But how different their histories and varied their fortunes!

The reflection that occurs to us after a survey of the political condition of our colonial empire is that there has been a most wonderful absence of design and premeditation not only on the side of the Home Government, but on that of the colonists as well. It has been somewhat truly remarked somewhere that we seem to have founded our second colonial empire "in a fit of absence of mind." This assertion appears to be literally true. We have acquired our heritage across the seas in a very loose and unscientific way, and, in the opinion of some, are hardly deserving of our good luck. It is still objected to us as a nation that we are the worst cartographers, and the worst geographers in the world. Yet we are the best colonists and

the best explorers. Somehow or other, we use our knowledge in a practical way, although we do not carefully classify and tabulate it. Practical colonists of the Anglo-Saxon type have never attempted to introduce the elaborate conditions of a highly organized State system. They wished, in many instances, for religious and political equality, with leave to manage their homes and hamlets as they chose. The village or town was often a self-governing unit in itself—there was never any dream of a political Utopia in foreign lands. British settlers were plain, hard men, living plain, hard lives, and as they traded, sailed, fought, and cleared the ground before them, in every corner of the world, they seemed to be obeying, not the will of an ambitious despot at home or the mandates of a bureau, but some wandering and adventurous instinct of their own, inherited from sturdy ancestors, who had wrestled all their lives with the gloom and terrors of the northern seas. And behind every motive there has existed always in their hearts a steady adherence to the old life and the old home, and a loyalty to old principles and even old forms.

In 1886 an exhibition of Indian Colonial products and manufacture will be held in London. The spectacle in itself will, in all probability, be a great and imposing one, and from its peculiar character eminently suggestive. Every possible variety of wealth, every kind of product grown in temperate, tropical, and sub-tropical climates; will be collected together at this "Colonial World's Fair." We shall witness there a brilliant aggregate of all the resources of our "Second Colonial Empire." The materials of unbounded opulence, the visible proofs of progress, the ransacked treasures of the East, as well as the spoils gathered from the Southern Ocean, the levied contribution of every trading port found in their 28,500 miles of seaboard, which Sir R. Temple tells us is the property of the British nation, will be exhibited there, and appeal most powerfully to the imagination and fancy as they will to the eyes of spectators. And as we pass through the wonderful arcades and marvel at so full a "cornucopia," cannot we spare a brief interval wherein to moralize? Here, then, is the visible and tangible realization of that Empire our ancestors fought and bled for, here the colossal sum-total of the enterprises of our merchant-venturers and sailors; here, too, the realization of that "spirit of the English communion" Burke spoke of with enraptured eloquence; here the meeting ground of honourable rivalry in arts and handicraft; here the detailed results of a Trans-Atlantic—nay, also a Trans-Pacific republic of letters of which the Bishop of Cloyne was the prophet.

Let us carry our thoughts back to the *cunabula gentis*, as

it were, and to the very beginning of our colonial life. Where is our system? Where our method? Here it is hatred of the Spaniard, here jealousy of France, here a love of private adventure, here a desire for national aggrandisement that have sent our nation forth. Private venture and public expeditions seem jumbled together in disordered array, with no definite thread of policy, apparently, to guide the whole. The Athenians went to war with Syracuse to strengthen their hands against the Peloponnesians, and the French and Spaniards conquered strange lands and founded settlements to glorify themselves in Europe, but England never seemed to carry her colonial policy in the forefront. Our motives were always very mixed. Our Imperialism was certainly not of a dynastic character—perhaps Cromwell was a more ardent colonizer than any of our kings—it was simply the sum of a whole nation's energy worked out unconsciously and gradually. Often a private company or a chartered ship laid the foundation of a settlement, and the immediate object seemed to be gain and nothing more. Thus it appears as if a chivalrous interpretation of our position were often a complete after-thought. For instance, no British colonist can boast that for a long time he had a better conception than his neighbours of the paramount duties owed by a white and superior race to savage and uncivilized men. The horrors of the "middle passage" existed a long time before they were rectified. Nor, in another sense, had the Briton, in the beginning of his colonizing enterprises, any adequate idea of the extent to which constitutional freedom and representative Government would be carried in the future development of empire. True that he carried the germ of liberty with him, just as we may suppose that our forefathers had the seeds of mercy in their hearts before they emancipated the negro. In dealing with the negro the revolution of thought and feeling came with the impetuosity of a pent-up force. In what appears to us an agony of remorse, we flung freedom broadcast over the world to any man who would take it, and we emptied our exchequers in efforts of a magnificent national charity. We dealt with the constitutional question in our colonies in a similarly lax, irrational, and impulsive fashion. The administrators of our colonies were slow in recognizing a want, dilatory in their researches, and actually so blind and ignorant of the requirements of the case as to court the risks of mutiny and rebellion more than once.

For the sake of clearness, it may be assumed that in the whole of our colonial history there have been certain distinguishable epochs well described by Sir Charles Adderley (Lord Norton). In the *first period* we left the colonies to manage their own

internal affairs, not, be it said, from a spirit of concession or foresight, but because local autonomy seemed a harmless thing. Certainly our ancestors never calculated how the germs of freedom would develop. Sir G. C. Lewis, in his "Government of Dependencies," observes that our first colonists were nearly independent of the mother country, except as to their external commercial relations, and all business with them was referred to the Board of Trade. This was in accordance with the spirit of the old charters and the express stipulation of such an instrument as the first patent granted by Queen Elizabeth to Sir Walter Raleigh. In it we read "That British subjects should accompany him with the guarantee of a continuance of the enjoyment of all the rights which they enjoyed at home." Thus early in the history of British colonization was the fact formally recognized that the British colonists were entitled to equal rights and privileges with their compatriots still living at home. The sailor or emigrant as he drifted beyond the sight of his native shores, left no birthright behind him. Neither sea-captain nor merchant-venturer could so impress his services as to rob him of his citizenship, for the royal word was passed on his behalf. Unfortunately, we all realize, however, how this first period ended. England endeavoured to control the commercial policy of her settlements, and lost America. The "Stamp Act" was imposed upon Americans, it will be recollected, that England might recoup herself for military expenditure.

In the *second period* we tampered with colonial self-government. It was evidently thought by the statesmen of this time that we had lost our colonies through leaving them too much to themselves, therefore they drew the reins of imperial and official control tighter than they were before, and endeavoured to administer their affairs from a metropolitan bureau, "impounding freedom altogether," as Sir Charles Adderley remarked. Sir G. C. Lewis, writing about 1810, said, "Since the close of the American war it has not been the policy of England to vest any portion of the legislative power of the subordinate government of a dependency in a body elected by the inhabitants." It was not till 1847 that the Canadian Government, under Lord Elgin, obtained control of the Civil List. The Post Office and other departments used to be considered "Imperial Reserves." This policy of the Home Government was a dangerous one—how dangerous few Englishmen at home realized. When Queen Victoria came to the throne in 1837, rebellion was rampant in Upper and Lower Canada, and the fact is recorded that when "Te Deums" were sung in honour of her Majesty's accession, the congregations of worshippers in the Canadian towns and villages rose up and walked out of church.

The *third period* may be said to be most distinctly marked by the Administration of Earl Grey from 1846-1857. The old system of governing from a central bureau in London had failed. It was wisely determined to give the colonists Representative Government and allow them to manage their own affairs. It was laid down by Earl Grey "that the degree of control to be exercised over local authorities by the Secretary of State must differ according to the colonial constitution." The forms of the Constitution drafted in 1850 by the Imperial Parliament were not meant to be permanent. They were of a temporary and provisional nature, and it was determined to leave their ultimate shape as a matter of consideration for the colonists themselves. Accordingly, the Legislative Council of Sydney entrusted the important matter of the form of its government to a committee, who decided to adopt the English system of government by two Houses. The details as to the number of members, and the manner of election, the qualification for the franchise, caused some preliminary difficulties. Ultimately, a suitable scheme was found and submitted to the Imperial Government, coupled with a request for full responsible government. This was acceded to, and in 1856 the New South Wales Constitution was duly inaugurated, and it is a copy in miniature of the old forms faithfully observed. The Sovereign is represented in the person of the Governor, the House of Commons by the Legislative Assembly, and the House of Lords by the Legislative Council. After many political experiments and vicissitudes, colonists seemed to stand upon firm ground here. The striking feature of colonial history is its loyalty to old forms, fidelity to the old home in spite of official blundering and the crass and ignorant nepotism of the individual blunderers who presided over the Colonial Office. Distance has not isolated, nor have change of climate and circumstances altered, the character of Britons who have, from time to time, left their homes as voluntary or even involuntary exiles. An orator could at any time appeal to a sympathetic feeling which had its roots deep down in the natures and instincts of all Britons. The ties of race and language were strong, but no less strong was the sense of a common political and constitutional history. Too much stress cannot be laid upon this sense which has aided in developing the *πολιτεῖαι* of our colonists along parallel and sympathetic lines. This sympathy of colonists, coupled with their patriotism and loving adherence to old forms, may be of service to England and the old home if revolutionary citizens and "caucus" committees obtain in the future a temporary ascendancy. It may still be our good fortune, if England is hopelessly torn by rival political factions, "to call in the help of the new world to redress the balance of the old."

To describe in detail the nature of the struggle in our Colonies towards complete self-government would be nearly equivalent to rewriting their history. Here it is a fight for the freedom of the press, as Fairbairn, a well-known Cape colonist, fought in 1820 against the autocracy of Lord Charles Somerset, and as Messrs. Wentworth and Wardell, two Australian colonists, fought in 1831 against Governor Darling, and actually procured his recall. Here, again, it is a struggle against "convictism" and its attendant evils, as when *The Neptune* was "boycotted" in 1848 by the Cape Colonists, and *The Randolph* was forbidden in 1849 to enter Port Phillip Heads by the Victorians, and the stain of convictism swept away finally in 1851 by the Australian "Anti-Convict League." Here, again, it is a struggle of constitutional reform, pure and simple, as in Nova Scotia during the governorship of Sir Colin Campbell (1841), when petitions were sent to the Queen on the subject of the obstructive tactics of the governor. These and many other struggles and disputes helped eventually to purify political life in our colonies and to strengthen a spirit of independence.

But the broad historical epochs by which reform was advanced and full representation gained in our settlements may be illustrated briefly from the history of the most recently framed responsible government, that of the Cape Colony.

I. This colony passed into the hands of the British in 1806, and was ruled till 1825 by the Governor absolutely. No Ministers could advise him, no vote cross his purpose, and his sway was unquestioned.

II. From 1825-1834 the Governor was assisted by a council of six officers. This was the first step towards popularizing the Government, although, considering how these assessors were elected, it was a very small one.

III. From 1834-1850 we seem to feel the influence of the great Reform Bill of 1832. Two councils are created, the one executive and the other legislative. The executive consisted of four official persons, the legislative of twelve, or not less than ten, five being official persons and the remaining five or seven unofficial.

IV. In 1850, when liberties and civil rights were thrown broadcast over the colonial world, a constitution was granted consisting of a Crown Governor, Legislative Council, and a House of Assembly, both of them elected by the people, with power to appropriate its own revenue.

V. In 1872 full responsible Government was conceded, in virtue of which the Executive could be removed by the will of the majority.

It should be remarked that with regard to the Cape the era

of constitutional liberty was a natural sequel of the British occupation. It is doubtful whether the worthy Cape burghers would have ever gained the merest vestige of liberty if British ships had not come to Simon's Town and Table Bay and freed them from the oppressive rule of the Dutch monopolists and merchants at Cape Town.

This epitome of colonial constitutional history at the Cape represents what was done in most of the others, allowing for variation of treatment necessitated by time, place, and circumstance. The struggle is the same in kind, and the progress towards responsible Government substantially the same. A political ideal is reached at last, such as Burke and Adam Smith foreshadowed, and this ideal resembles that of the mother country by whose statutes and ordinances the spirit of the movement has been guided. There have been obstacles and impediments in the way, and there have been conflicts of an apparently desperate character between the Executive and the popular will. Colonists have, on the whole, been patient and loyal. They have petitioned, represented, until importunity won its reward. Victoria—the Port Phillip settlement of old—affords us an example of successful importunity. For some years previous to 1843 the colonists had felt that their local Government was hampered by their association with New South Wales. A certain representation was given them at that time to satisfy their wants, but the number of the members, six out of eighteen who composed the first representative Parliament of New South Wales, was thought to be insufficient. They felt, therefore, that this representation was a political sham, but they wanted a reality. They fixed upon a novel plan to get themselves heard at the Home Colonial Office. They refused to exercise their right of electing local members, and plumped for Earl Grey himself in 1845. The strange occurrence of the election of an English nobleman by a Port Phillip electorate was enough to arouse attention. Earl Grey was asked jokingly by his friends when he intended to set sail for Sydney and take his seat in the colonial legislature. Then, and not before, the true nature of the crisis in colonial politics was realized, the grievances of Port Phillip were discovered to be well-founded, and Earl Grey gave them a separate Constitution. He appealed to the loyalty of the colonists by asking them to name their settlement "Victoria," and it is needless to add that a ready answer was given to this appeal. Several important points are illustrated in the history of this event which fortunately terminated so auspiciously. The claims of the colonists, after irritating and vexatious delay, are found to be just. Departmental apathy here, as elsewhere in our colonial history, seemed to require something like a cata-

strophe to awaken it. Again, there is the patient attitude of the colonists who were determined not to take mortal offence, but to win by importunity. The ballast of patriotism was heavy here. Then there was the *amende honorable* of the Colonial Office given and accepted in an easy and pleasant manner. It must be recollected, moreover, that the patience of the Victorians had been rudely tested by alternations of hope and despair. The hopes which one Ministry had raised were dashed to the ground by their successors in 1846. How often has this uncertainty of administration been illustrated in the proceedings of the Colonial Office! How often have we witnessed reversals and repentances! The colony which, above all others, has been perplexed and irritated by counter policies is the Cape Colony. A brief survey of its history will convince us of this. South Africa is, therefore, strewn, metaphorically speaking, with wrecked policies and wrecked reputations. Unfortunately there is not always such an easy and pleasant way out of misunderstandings as that invented by the Port Phillip settlers.

At the present time it may be remarked that there is an agitation on foot in North Queensland for the political separation of the north and south portion of the colony. The men of Townsville and the adjoining towns complain, just as the "Port Phillip" settlers complained, of inadequate representation. They assert, moreover, that Queensland, stretching as it does through so many degrees of latitude, from 10° to 29° south lat., may be naturally bisected at some point far north of Brisbane. And whatever grounds there may be for complaint on the part of the North Queenslanders, their case should be carefully inquired into and intelligently handled.

In Australasia representative institutions, when once they were acknowledged as the only possible and legitimate forms of government, came more quickly than in Cape Colony. It took nearly seventy years—from 1806–1872—to achieve the complete triumph of full responsible legislatures in the latter country. Natal has not followed suit, and may take some time to do so. It is clear, of course, that there the native difficulty has been the cause of delay. In Australasia the first representative government was possessed by New South Wales in 1840, by the 5 & 6 Vict. ch. 76, and it consisted of a legislative council of thirty-six members, of whom twenty-four were elective, and the rest appointed by the Governor. In 1851, no less than four of the settlements, Victoria, South Australia, Tasmania, and New South Wales, possessed legislatures of this type. The conversion to principles already laid down in Canada was very quick. But these councils were only the forerunners of popular assemblies. Sir John Packington, Secretary for the Colonies in the late Lord Derby's



first Ministry, invited these councils to exercise certain rights conferred upon them by 13 & 14 Vict., ch. 59, and frame more liberal constitutions. Accordingly, in each case, a Constitution Act was passed, and a form of government adopted, proving how Conservative our colonists are in this respect, and how anxious to adhere to the old lines. In every instance the bicameral system was adopted, and fresh proof afforded that the advantages of a double legislature have been always recognized by practical colonists. In Natal and Western Australia there is at present but one Assembly, but immediately responsible government is given them it is almost certain that they will elect a Council as well as a Legislative Assembly.

Of course it was impossible to reproduce abroad a body like our House of Lords, but in the creation of the Upper Chamber, or Legislative Council, great care was taken in the Constitution Acts of the five important Australian colonies—Queensland was separated about this time from New South Wales—that property and wealth and social influences should be adequately represented. In Victoria every member of the Council was required to hold property to the value of £5,000 at least. In New South Wales and Queensland they were appointed for life by the Governors, and in Victoria, South Australia, and Tasmania they were elected for a term of several years by voters of high qualifications. It was evidently intended that the Upper House in the Colonies should represent that more stable and unbiassed element in the State, which, not being so absolutely at the mercy of sudden gusts of popular feeling, should maintain a calm and dignified attitude. In the Legislature of Quebec the twenty-four members of the Legislative Council are appointed for life by the Lieutenant-Governor in the Queen's name, and their qualifications are the same as those of the senators from the province.

On more than one occasion in the history of our colonies the Upper Chamber has exercised its constitutional power in a salutary manner. For instance, the Legislative Council of the Cape Colony, during the regime of Sir Henry Barkly, resisted steadily the movement set on foot for constitutional reform, although this reform was initiated by the Governor, and had all the prestige of imperial sanction and, moreover, had been already approved of by a majority of the Legislative Assembly. Undoubtedly, the council would have either triumphed in the end, or have brought, by their constitutional veto, a deeper scrutiny upon the whole question, had not some of their members been unexpectedly influenced by home pressure, and advised to withdraw their opposition. If we look upon the present state of South Africa, and consider the past difficulties and complications of party government in the Cape Colony since 1872, we may well

admire the cautious and seasonable reserve of the Upper Chamber. On all hands it is now confessed that responsible government was thrust somewhat hastily upon the Cape.

Occasionally there have been deadlocks between the two Chambers in the Colonies, as in the "Darling Grant" case in Victoria, but the council held their ground here with much tenacity even on a question of appropriation of revenue. An appeal to the electors was resorted to as a way out of a constitutional deadlock, but no attempt was made to illegally coerce and influence the free opinions of the Upper Chamber by threat or menace. Unconstitutional agitation outside the walls of the Parliament houses, and obstructive tactics within, seem to be two evils which have grown up in the mother country of late years. It is the boast of some Americans that they are linguistic purists, and that they have preserved the English of Shakespeare more faithfully in their Transatlantic homes than those Englishmen who live in the vicinity of Stratford-on-Avon itself. And in many instances they may be, doubtless, right. So with our institutions. Is it not possible that their original form and spirit may be preserved, even in democratic settlements, with greater fidelity, and with greater respect for precedent, than in our own mother country herself?

The differences in detail between the form of representative government in England and her colonies are naturally too numerous to be dwelt upon here. Generally speaking, the constitutions are more broadly based in the latter, as might be expected. Manhood suffrage was adopted—rather hastily perhaps at first—in Victoria and New South Wales, and the franchise is so low in the Cape Colony, that any labourer, whether white or black, can gain it. The conditions of the £25 qualification, like those of the \$20 qualification in Quebec, or the \$100 qualification in New Brunswick, are not hard to fulfil. In the Dominion representation is not uniform, and the franchise is denied to Indians and Chinamen. In the Cape Colony there is no exceptional legislation in this matter, and a Damara savage from Hereroland, or a "Zanzibar Boy" from the Sultan's dominions, can, by a brief sojourn in the colony as a labourer, enjoy all the privileges of the "Britannica Civitas." It may be remarked that this supreme gift is not appreciated as it ought to be. The coloured voters are openly and notoriously venal, the price of the Malay vote is openly quoted without any reserve or apology in the Cape papers, and the white men are so careless on the subject of registration, that many of them are non-electors by default. In the general election of 1878, when the cry before the country was the all-important one of South African Confederation, not one

[Vol. CXXV. No. CCXLIX.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. LXIX. No. I. E

third of the voters out of a modest total of 44,000 registered electors came to the poll. Time, however, alone can show whether similar difficulties in connection with the native and "half-breed" vote will be experienced in South Africa as are already experienced in America in connection with the growing "negro" vote. On this matter we may, in our lavish gifts of representative institutions, be only at the beginning of great class complications. It has been pointed out by more than one traveller in South Africa that if the form and spirit of responsible government were carried to its logical conclusion in the Cape coloured voters would swamp the poll, and return a coloured Parliament and a coloured Cabinet.

Our colonists are upon the whole extremely well represented, some may think that they are over-represented, in their popular assemblies, if we contrast the number of their senators and their population with our own. But we must recollect that the area of country for which an individual representative is returned is often very large. In the United Kingdom there are 570 members of the House of Commons representing an estimated population in England, Scotland, Ireland and Wales of thirty-five millions. This is to say that one member of our Second Chamber represents a population of fifty thousand. Leaving the Canadian Dominion out of the question for a moment, with its more complicated system of Provincial Legislatures, and turning our attention to the seven colonies of the Cape, Tasmania, Victoria, South Australia, Queensland, New South Wales, and New Zealand, we shall find that the total estimated population of all these, as taken from the Colonial Official List of 1885, is three millions three hundred and nine thousand (3,309,000). The members of their *Second*, or as it is generally termed their Legislative Assemblies, number altogether five hundred and seven (507). Roughly speaking, therefore, there is on the average one representative in the popular assembly for six thousand (6,000) colonists. This contrasts remarkably with the one M.P. for every fifty thousand in England.

The following table will show the population and the representation of the above-mentioned seven colonies:—

|                      | Population. | REPRESENTATION.      |                       |
|----------------------|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
|                      |             | Legislative Council. | Legislative Assembly. |
| I. New South Wales   | 751,000     | 55                   | 113                   |
| II. Victoria         | 945,000     | 42                   | 86                    |
| III. New Zealand     | 552,000     | 25                   | 95                    |
| IV. South Australia  | 304,000     | 24                   | 52                    |
| V. Tasmania          | 115,000     | 16                   | 32                    |
| VI. Queensland       | 302,000     | 34                   | 55                    |
| VII. The Cape Colony | 340,000     | 22                   | 74                    |
| Total                | 3,309,000   | 218                  | 507                   |

The representation of the Upper Chamber, or Legislative Council, would provide us with a separate study, but it is perhaps more interesting for our present purposes to point out the differences between the House of Commons in England and the Legislative Assemblies in our Colonies.

It may be remarked that in the Dominion of Canada the Senate numbers seventy-two (72) Members, and their House of Commons—(here the colonists have borrowed English phraseology)—one hundred and eighty-one (181). The population of the Dominion is estimated at four millions three hundred and twenty-one thousand (4,321,000). According to this calculation there will be one Member of the Canadian House of Commons for about twenty-three thousand (23,000) colonists. But it must be recollected that the provincial legislatures introduce the principle of sub-representation, if the term may be allowed. There is no ideal point where in popular Assemblies the exact proportion of legislators to their constituencies can be definitely laid down. The number of members of the Colonial legislative assemblies is constantly being added to as new districts are “proclaimed” and new legislative wants arise. Even in England we have witnessed recently a numerical increase in the House of Commons. An increase of the original numbers must depend upon time, place, and circumstances. It is a pity that a popular assembly should become unwieldy, but in the Colonies, with their comparatively new conditions and wants, it is far better that a district should be over-represented than under-represented. It often happens that a colonial member represents in himself vast tracts of land, equal in extent to two or three English counties.

But, however numerous the differences in detail, the main outlines of the British Constitution, with its fully representative character and its loyalty to the monarchical principle, are faithfully observed. The supreme sources of justice, honour, and of mercy are recognized in the peculiar powers and privileges reserved for the Governor as the representative of the Queen. He can, if he think fit, exercise the quality of mercy which becomes the throned monarch and grant a reprieve to a condemned criminal, or a remission of their debts to imprisoned debtors. His power is not so great as that of the Governor of Maryland in former times, who used to have power to grant patents of nobility, but he can recommend colonists for distinguished services to the Sovereign. And it may be observed that there is no honour prized more highly by colonists than that which is loyally and constitutionally won and loyally and constitutionally awarded. And who can deny that this laudable ambition to deserve well of one's country, or colony, or

empire—for it matters not which—and thereby to reap titular distinction at the hands of the oldest monarchy in Europe, is one of the strongest links, although, to use Burke's expression, it seems "light as air," which can bind in one patriotic whole both the mother country and her colonial children?

Let us contrast for a moment this second colonial empire of ours with its intricate machinery, its diverse interests, its wealth, energy, progress, and achievement of principle and promise of unity by the side of past empires and the efforts of other nations. We have seen that its colossal results have not been gained by the persistent carrying out of a preconceived official policy or by a school of self-conscious colonial statesmen working with a few leading principles in view from the very first. It has sprung into being in a gradual and erratic fashion, at times offending the diplomatic and official mind by the precocious forwardness of its architects. Neither at the bidding of a bureau nor at the will of an imperious chancellor, or a weary conqueror who sighed for new worlds, has it reared its stately growth. When Napoleon exclaimed that the old world wearied him, and that he wished for a Transatlantic empire, he probably thought of an empire not reared by solid work and destined to blossom late under the genial influences of representative institutions, but one which would receive and keep a certain number of dynastic traditions and bow the knee to Augustan purple. A Spanish vice-royalty was a perpetuation of Spanish courtly ways in an alien land at the expense of the indigenous population; it was never looked upon as a perpetuation and continuation of Spanish life in its fullest sense. The Portuguese Government made the same mistake as the Spaniards, and lost their splendid Brazilian empire. A constitutional sovereign, Don Pedro II., rules in Brazil, and the thriving state of the country is owing to its free institutions; but Brazilian life is not in its important aspects a continuation of Portuguese life. In certain parts of the world, notably on the coasts of East and West Africa, the old Portuguese official life is seen and can be judged of by its results. The Congo Conference has helped to deal a death-blow to its sluggish ways by ignoring the claims of Portuguese officials to sit for ever at the receipt of custom and tax the industries of other nations. Brazil has, it may be remarked, adhered to the monarchical principle, and did not follow the example of those Spanish colonies who, when they revolted, abandoned their principles. Undoubtedly the teaching of history here is that monarchical principles have a pacifying and moderating influence. Such an influence is of an insensible but efficacious nature, and it is as well to reflect what the loss of it would mean before we follow those theorists and visionaries who calmly dis-

cuss the disintegration of our own empire and the snapping of every constitutional link. We strenuously assert that English colonial life is, to all intents and purposes, in its social and political as well as ethnical aspects, a continuation of national life. But it takes a long time for this idea to filter down into the minds of Englishmen. Raleigh, Berkeley, Adam Smith, and Burke, who spoke so eloquently of the empire and of those fellow-countrymen who helped to build it, could feel it, but many distinguished and clever men did not. What can be said of the great philosopher, John Locke, who, although he could contribute work of the greatest literary value upon the "Human Understanding," could draw up such an eminently un-English production as "The Constitutions of Carolina" (1669)? The great philosopher, when requested by Lord Ashley to elaborate a scheme of government for the lords proprietors of Carolina who had been presented by the king with the royalties, properties, jurisdiction, and privileges of a county palatine as large as the county of Durham, conceived and put into writing a framework of society, the chief characteristic of which was its hollow artificiality. The province was divided carefully into counties, each county with eight seigniories, eight baronies, and four precincts, and each precinct into six colonies. The land was made to descend, in the strictest way, from father to son, and every consideration of justice and expediency seems to have been sacrificed to the purpose of keeping up an hereditary nobility. No manor was to be divided amongst co-heirs, and all the children of leet-men should be leet-men, and so to all generations. Nor could any leet-man go off from the laud of his particular lord without license. These provisions about leet-men remind us of the effete "placaats" of the Dutch Indian Company at the Cape, who condemned the burghers to a life-long inferiority and servitude, and ignored the right and power of the individual to rise if he could. Again, John Locke hedged in the divinity of the lords proprietors with the greatest care, and provided for their position by numberless vexatious rules of precedence. By Article XLV. the Chamberlain's court was to have care of all ceremonies, heraldry, pedigrees, and to have power to regulate all fashions, habits, badges, games and sports. In fact, the bureaucracy of the constable's court, treasurer, and high steward was of the hardest order. The Parliament, which it would have been a mockery to term of a popular description, was chosen of the freeholders of the precincts, and consisted of proprietors, landgraves, cassiques, and others. In fact, the whole machinery of a colonial government, as conceived and set forth by John Locke, in his one hundred and twenty articles, was of the most unphilosophic description. The very terminology

was strange and foreign, and the whole exclusive spirit of the contemplated bureaucracy sinned completely against the idea of the free life of British colonists. It was contrary to the charter granted by Queen Elizabeth to Raleigh in the view it took of the liberties of the individual. Unless the settler was one of the territorial aristocracy, he was a leet-man or serf, and destined to live as such. Nor had Locke any better ideas on the subject of slavery than his contemporaries, judging from the regulations touching slaves in his articles. It is scarcely surprising, therefore, to find out that the Constitutions of Carolina never came into actual force. They were abrogated some years after they were promulgated, but they remain, nevertheless, as a monument of the perverse and mistaken ideas entertained by a conspicuous English philosopher of the nature and drift of British colonization. It has always been understood that the energies of the individual should be allowed to expand with growing wants, not cramped by vexatious restrictions and official rules. The spirit of our explorers has been too sturdy to allow of the introduction in their midst of the refinements and distinctions of a miniature court. At the present moment we can turn to a most illustrious roll of colonists, skilled in debate, versed in constitutional law, and able to take a keen and statesmanlike view of questions as they arise. How they have become so may be best learnt from Charles Fox's criticism of Burke's speech on conciliation with America, when he said: "Let gentlemen read this speech by day, and meditate on it by night: let them peruse it again and again, study it, imprint it on their minds, impress it on their hearts. They would then learn that representation is the sovereign remedy for every evil."

Since the days of Fox we have been advancing quickly along the lines of constitutional development. The empire is before us with its wealth, promise, and unbounded patriotism. In its social and political aspects we recognize a continuity of national life and the fulfilment of national energies. We cannot afford to trifle with this heritage. May we now hope that in the new lands, as well as the old, we are gradually consummating a political union and realizing the dream of a Confederated Empire, true to the best teachings of constitutional government, and loyal to the constitutional monarchy of England!

## ART. IV.—THE WORKS OF BRET HARTE.

SOME of the slighter sketches of this great American writer have about them a delicate flavour of humour, subtle and undefinable, which is suggestive of the writing of Charles Lamb. Such is the paper on "Melons" (the mystery of the ultimate fate of which must ever remain a subject of regret to the sympathetic reader); on "The Little Vulgar Boy;" on the dog Boonder. But if he has stepped now and then into the peculiar domain of the most unique of English essayists, his ordinary haunts lie far away. His wild and extravagant wit, his savage dialect, the occasional coarseness of his humour, belong altogether to the New World, and are characteristic of the dweller in camps. His stories are of duellers, of highwaymen, of gamblers, and of the class of women who may be expected to dwell with such men; but they are very human; they are full of humour and pathos; and are so simple and unaffected, that, when dealing most with immoral people, they fail to be immoral themselves.

So mixed are the rough manners and kindly human instincts in the personages whom Bret Harte puts before us, that it is difficult sometimes to decide exactly what species of virtue it is that we perceive in this or that character, though genuine virtue is certainly there; we cannot tell what the pathos is that touches us in the history of some of those rough miners whose lives seem little higher than the lives of their dogs and their donkeys; nor do we precisely know in what the loveliness consists of some brief anecdotes which nevertheless linger in our memories with that persistent tendency to be a "joy for ever" which Keats declared to be an attribute of beauty. The qualities are there, and we must be content to recognise and enjoy them, without defining or analysing. When the author endeavours to do so himself, he fails. His sketches refuse to be worked up into elaborate pictures. He cannot guide his characters through the mazes of a complicated plot: his best situations are idyllic rather than dramatic, and his strongest characters are as simple as they are original. He can no more deal with an intricate play of motive than with an elaborate machinery of action; but he has brought some novel or neglected phases of human life into a clear and kindly atmosphere; he has gazed upon them with that illuminating faculty which is the great link between poetry and prose fiction; and in the light of his poetic perception the world has been enabled to see certain good things which it had missed before.

His great power lies in his originality and simplicity, in the



directness of his outlook on life. When he tries to imitate others, or to walk in the beaten paths of literature, his writing loses much of its force and charm.

It is not wonderful therefore that some readers of Bret Harte, happening to begin with his most pretentious work, "Gabriel Conroy," put the book down in disappointment, and perhaps disgust. They have not learnt by a study of the smaller and more characteristic pieces of the most characteristic of American writers, what manner of treasure to seek in that strange mass of melodrama and romance. They cannot strike a "lead" there successfully, principally because they don't know how to recognise the mineral when they find it. They may come across many a genuine bit of ore in their digging—rough specimens that want only a little rubbing on their sleeve, so to speak, to reveal sterling qualities; but they are looking for something quite different, the ready-made treasures of jewellers' shops, and they cast this rude metal aside as rubbish.

"So I took the stone from the fire, just as I take this," says Grace in "Gabriel Conroy;" "it looked black and burnt just like this; and I rubbed it hard on the blanket so, and it shone, just like silver,"—and silver it was, though the uninitiated would never have guessed it.

In "Gabriel Conroy" the writer has made the mistake of setting his rough but genuine ore in the authorized and conventional shape of jeweller's ware—namely, in the orthodox novel form, with an intricate plot, a love-affair running through the story, and a happy marriage at the end of it. His contributions to literature are best when they are given to us simply as nuggets.

As a novel, "Gabriel Conroy" is a poor affair: the incidents are improbable (and the most improbable of them quite unnecessary), the characters inconsistent, the causes and results out of all artistic proportion, the action wavering and wandering, the motive incomprehensible, the conclusion tame and disappointing, the moral of the story unpleasant and unhealthy.

Notwithstanding these objections, even this book of Bret Harte's is worth reading—at least to those whose previous studies have taught them how to perceive and appreciate the peculiar humour of the author—for the sake of the gems which it contains.

The sketch of Gabriel mending his little sister's clothes is, for example, excellent. He is interrupted by "a child's voice from behind the canvas screen."

"Is that you, Gabe?"

"Yes."

"Oh, Gabe, I got tired and went to bed."

"I see you did," said Gabriel, drily, picking up a needle and thread that had apparently been abandoned after a slight excursion into the neighbourhood of a rent, and left hopelessly sticking in the petticoat.

"Yes, Gabe; they're so awfully old."

"Old!" repeated Gabe, reproachfully. "Old! Lettin' on a little wear and tear, they're as good as they ever were. That petticoat is stronger," said Gabriel, holding up the garment and eyeing the patches with a slight glow of artistic pride—"stronger, Olly, than the first day you put it on."

"But that's five years ago, Gabe."

"Well," said Gabriel, turning round and addressing himself impatiently to the screen, "wot if it is?"

"And I've growed."

"Growed!" said Gabriel, scornfully, "and haven't I let out the tucks, and didn't I put three fingers of the best sacking around the waist? You'll just ruin me in clothes."

Another admirable and characteristic bit is the description of the death of Jack Hamlin, the gambler. His last moments are drawing near, and the doctor in attendance speaks to him :

"You've made Pete very happy this morning."

Jack looked up at Dr. Duchesne's critical face, and the doctor went on gravely—

"Confessing religion to him—saying you believed as he did!"

A faint laugh glimmered in the dark hollows of Jack's eyes.

"The old man," he said, explanatory, "has been preachin' mighty heavy at me ever since t'other doctor came, and I reckoned it might please him to allow that everything he said was so. You see the old man's bin right soft on me, and between us, doctor, I ain't much to give him in exchange. It's no square game!"

"Then you believe you're going to die?" said the doctor, gravely.

"I reckon."

"And you have no directions to give me?"

The only directions Jack has to give concern the few possessions he would like to distribute among his friends, but he finds that he has given them away already. Then he hears a "professional brother" utter a drunken laugh in the next room.

"Scotty ought to know better than to kick up a row in a decent woman's house," whispered Jack, faintly. "Tell him to dry up, or I'll——"

But his voice was failing him, and the sentence remained incomplete.

"Doc——" (after a long effort).

"Jack."

"Don't—let—on—to Pete—I fooled—him."

In this scene Bret Harte is at his best. He gives us the picture of a nature wild and ungoverned; criminal, if you like; vicious even at times, and according to higher standards; but never entirely ignoble, never wholly base; exhibiting traits of splendid generosity, of noble humanity, of touching gratitude, amid the most incongruous surroundings.

It is a pity to see this picture of the death of Jack Hamlin bound up in the same cover with the pages treating of Arthur's intercourse with Grace, and especially of their reconciliation; this reconciliation might have been fitting for two innocent and faithful lovers, but, with the memory of the snow-camp, the deserted girl, and the dead baby behind it, can only be revolting to the good taste of the reader.

There is a tender touch of humanity in the rough miner in "The Luck of Roaring Camp," who can find no fonder epithet for a baby than "the d— little cuss," but uses that epithet as if it were a loving diminutive. In the picture of Arthur Poinsett's misdoings there is nothing beyond the ordinary baseness of the conventional villain; and yet we are expected (after following his course with disgust throughout the book) to receive him as an accredited hero at the end.

The fact is that Bret Harte can give us sketches full of moral force, which are at times as pathetic as they are always vigorous; but he cannot reduce his principles of art to method, and when he tries to work out a complete and complicated picture his hand loses its cunning. When we see how the fingers which penned "The Idyll of Red Gulch" can vulgarize the same little story in the play of "Two Men of Sandy Bar," we wonder if all the fine effects are achieved by *mistake*, and if the author himself remains in ignorance of the good things he teaches us.

But it is not so. Bret Harte is most truly himself in his best stories, which are usually his shortest. He is trying to be some one else—the ordinary novelist or playwright—when he falls below his natural level. He is at home among wild characters who live outside the pale of ordinary life, and who must frame their own rude laws of honour and humanity to suit their own circumstances. Speaking from this, his own peculiar sphere, he gives us from time to time glimpses of simple moral laws which put our own to shame. Many of his characters speak and act from instincts which we must acknowledge to be pure and just, even when the conclusions to which they lead prove to be the direct opposite of those to which we have been brought by the force of inherited prejudices.

If the principles of virtue underlying Bret Harte's serious and pathetic stories are occasionally hard to seize and define, the humour of his comic poetry is, on the other hand, easy

enough to understand. It consists of a grave representation of motives and circumstances as ordinary or reasonable, which from the commonly accepted point of view are highly extraordinary or excessively unreasonable.

For example, the indignation of "Truthful James" and his comrade Nye at the "Heathen Chinees" who practised the same cheating tricks as themselves, is comic in the extreme. These excellent Europeans evidently expect the reader to sympathize with their feeling that Christians alone have the right to practise deceptions on their fellow-men. They sit down virtuously to swindle the ignorant Asiatic, and then rise up in righteous wrath when they find that he has an equal intention of swindling them.

But the hands that were played  
By that heathen Chinees,  
And the points that he made,  
Were quite frightful to see;  
Till at last he put down a right bower,  
Which the same Nye had dealt unto me.

Then I looked up at Nye,  
And he gazed upon me;  
And he rose with a sigh,  
And said, "Can this be?  
We are ruined by Chinese cheap labour;"  
And he went for that heathen Chinees.

The simplicity with which the term "going for" a man is used in the golden Western lands of these stories for making a violent attack upon him is highly characteristic of the prevailing spirit, brevity of words, and vigour—not to say violence—of action.

In the account of the breaking up of the learned society upon the Stanislaus, as given by Truthful James, the philosophic calm with which the unphilosophic fighting is reported is extremely amusing. Truthful James is nothing if not moderate in his language when discoursing on immoderate proceedings:

Now I hold it is not decent for a scientific gent  
To say another is an ass—at least, to all intent;  
Nor should the individual who happens to be meant  
Reply by heaving rocks at him to any great extent.

The qualifying phrase, "to any great extent," is very funny here, and if, as Mr. Ruskin might declare, it was originally suggested by the exigencies of rhyme, it is a striking example of the way in which genius produces its finest effects out of apparent difficulties.

The story told by the driver—the wheels of whose coach flew off one by one, till, keeping it upright by the mere force of its

own velocity and one wheel, he drove it safely into the station—is a comical parody on some poetic and highly impossible narratives, the bragging heroes of which pose as monuments of modest truthfulness. Accordingly, the driver of the one-wheeled coach concludes in fitting terms :

This is my story, sir ; a trifle, indeed, I assure you,  
 Much more, perchance, might be said ; but I hold him, of all men,  
 most lightly  
 Who swerves from the truth in his tale. No, thank you. Well,  
 since you are pressing,  
 Perhaps I don't care if I do ; you may give me the same, Jim—no  
 sugar.

The condensed novels of Bret Harte are not mere caricatures ; they are almost literally "condensed." We can imagine that some of them were produced by taking actual works of certain distinguished authors, adding nothing thereto, but putting them to boil or stew, or to some other condition favourable to evaporation, and so getting rid of all that was ordinary and common to other authors, until nothing was left behind except eccentricities of style or thought in a highly compressed, condensed, unadulterated form. The result might be offered to students of literature as "Essence of Bulwer Lytton," or "Essence of Victor Hugo," and it would be thus possible for such students to produce very passable papers on the peculiarities and originalities of these writers, without an actual acquaintance with any of their productions.

The finest qualities of every author are, of course, his least eccentric ones, and it is precisely these which cannot be parodied. They make the informing central spirit which gives life to eccentricities of style, and weight to originalities of expression. Such eccentricities and originalities are but the condiments which render a good literary dish more palatable to the jaded appetite of the reader ; they are not wholesome diet when taken for their own sake or offered without the accompaniment of more substantial literary nourishment. When they are so offered the parodist does good service by holding them up to ridicule ; and there are, indeed, one or two forms of popular romance which it would be well for the public to study *only* through the medium of Bret Harte.

Such is not, of course, the case with the writings of Victor Hugo. Those wonderful productions can bear a great deal of ridicule, just and unjust, and still stand much where they were before. Bret Harte's ridicule of them is, for the most part, entirely just. The odd, short sentences, the ingenious reasoning,

the astonishing turns and unexpected twists in the argument, are as true to their model as they are amusing in the imitation :

To be good is to be queer. What is a good man? Bishop Myriel.

My friend, you will possibly object to this. You will say you know what a good man is. Perhaps you will say your clergyman is a good man, for instance.

Bah! you are mistaken; you are an Englishman, and an Englishman is a beast.

Englishmen think they are moral when they are only serious. These Englishmen also wear ill-shaped hats, and dress horribly!

Bah! they are *canaille*.

Still, Bishop Myriel was a good man—quite as good as you. Better than you, in fact.

II.

When a man commits a crime, Society claps him in prison. A prison is one of the worst hotels imaginable. The people there are low and vulgar. The butter is bad, the coffee is green. Ah, it is horrible!

In prison, as in a bad hotel, a man soon loses, not only his morals, but what is much more to a Frenchman, his sense of refinement and delicacy.

Jean Valjean came from prison with confused notions of Society. He forgot the modern peculiarities of hospitality. So he walked off with the Bishop's candlesticks.

Let us consider: candlesticks were stolen; that was evident. Society put Jean Valjean in prison; that was evident, too. In prison, Society took away his refinement; that is evident, likewise.

Who is Society?

You and I are Society.

My friend, you and I stole those candlesticks!

III.

The Bishop thought so, too. He meditated profoundly for six days. On the morning of the seventh he went to the Prefecture of Police.

He said: "Monsieur, have me arrested. I have stolen candlesticks."

The official was governed by the law of Society, and refused.

What did this Bishop do?

He had a charming ball and chain made, affixed to his leg, and wore it the rest of his life. This is a fact!

The most ardent admirer of the great French writer may read these sentences with delighted laughter.

"These Englishmen also wear ill-shaped hats, and dress horribly," is what may almost be called an inimitable imitation.

Unhappily Bret Harte goes on to treat the degradation of Fantine in the same light spirit; and the subject is not one which should be touched in parody. The sufferings of the lost girl are too dreadful—above all, too possible—to afford a merry jest to any member of modern society. Whatever fault may be found with Victor Hugo's rendering of the story—however that may be accused by the serious critic of exaggeration, of coarseness, or of false sentimentality—the parodist should pass it by. It may invite criticism, but it is no fit food for laughter.

With the parody on Bulwer Lytton no such fault can be found. Here Bret Harte is right in his attack, not only on the manner, but also on the matter of the novelist. The sentiment which he ridicules is as false and immoral as the style is stilted and unreal:

“Eleven years ago,” said Sir Edward to himself, as his brougham slowly rolled him toward the committee-room; “just eleven years ago my natural son disappeared mysteriously. I have no doubt in the world but that this little bootblack is he. His mother died in Italy. He resembles his mother very much. Perhaps I ought to provide for him. Shall I disclose myself? No! no! Better he should taste the sweets of Labour. Penury ennobles the mind and kindles the Love of the Beautiful. I will act to him, not like a Father, not like a Guardian, not like a Friend—but like a Philosopher!”

And with this Rousseau-like sentiment on his lips he rolls onwards in his carriage to make a splendid speech from his place in Parliament, while his “beloved Lionel” blacks boots in the London streets. He bids farewell to the public in a characteristic utterance of Cheap Magnanimity and Empty Eloquence:

The Sublime and Beautiful are the Real; the only Ideal is the Ridiculous and Homely. Let us always remember this. Let us through life endeavour to personify the virtues, and always begin 'em with a capital letter. Let us, whenever we can find an opportunity, deliver our sentiments in the form of roundhand copies. Respect the Aged. Eschew Vulgarity. Admire Ourselves. Regard the Novelist.

After all, this is only Lord Lytton at his weakest moments, a little run to seed and forgetful of the critics. No readers of the recently published volumes of the life of the great novelist can consider that “The Dweller of the Threshold” does any serious injustice to the literary style or moral tone of Bulwer Lytton's early life. He does not wish to represent himself, nor is he represented by his filial biographer, as strictly virtuous. Rather does he pose before us as a person of good family sentimentally inclined to wrongdoing; he is ready to apologize to any one who does not consider his vice thorough or real enough.

In “Lothair” the faults attacked are not so serious. They do

not tamper with immorality, and are less likely to exercise a deeply injurious influence on society.

"Each of these pearls, my lord, is worth fifty thousand guineas," said Mr. Amethyst, the fashionable jeweller, as he lightly lifted a large shovelful from a convenient bin behind his counter.

"Indeed," said Lothair, carelessly, "I should prefer to see some expensive ones."

This delight in jewellery and tailoring, in lofty titles and high prices, is not difficult to recognise as having been met with before in English romantic literature.

"Lothair was immensely rich. The possessor of seventeen castles, fifteen villas, nine shooting-boxes, and seven town-houses, he had other estates of which he had not even heard."

The manners are in this sketch described as being quite on a level with the superb incomes; and the style is, on the whole, quite Disraelian. But one or two details plainly "hail from" farther West than the West End itself; as when Lothair goes down on his knees to look for a lost pearl.

"Dear friend," interposed the Duchess, with infinite tact, gently lifting him by the tails of his dress-coat, "I am waiting for your arm."

Mr. Charles Reade is, on the other hand, treated with absolute fairness in "Handsome is as Handsome Does." The heroine steps into a balloon car. The balloon suddenly rises. The heroine faints, is brought round by the cold nose of her poodle pressing against her face, embraces the poodle, weeps, and then—

She put her head over the car. Little was hanging at the end of a long rope. She put her head back again.

In another moment he saw her perplexed, blushing face over the edge—blissful sight.

"Oh, please don't think of coming up! Stay there, do!"

Little stayed. Of course she could make nothing out of the barometer, and said so. Little smiled.

"Will you kindly send it down to me?"

But she had no string or cord. Finally she said, "Wait a moment."

Little waited. This time her face did not appear. The barometer came slowly down at the end of—a stay-lace.

The barometer showed a frightful elevation. Little looked up at the valve and said nothing. Presently he heard a sigh. Then a sob. Then, rather sharply—

"Why don't you do something?"

If the author of "Put Yourself in his Place" did not actually write this, it must have been by a kind of accident. He might easily have written it, and would not have been ashamed to own it if he had.



In "No Title," Mr. Wilkie Collins's method of treating a mystery is well imitated. There is a secret. We are not told of what nature. It is set up for us to look at—vague, wonderful, incomprehensible. Then we are taken to different points of the compass, one after the other, and from each point conducted in a sort of blindfold manner towards the Central Secret. As soon as we approach it from one point we are turned back and made to start from another. Altogether we are reminded of that game in which the players are told to look at a post some distance off; then all are blindfolded and requested to find it. Some wander quite astray, some come into collision; one lucky person keeps straight in the confusion and reaches the post.

Mr. Bret Harte has not only imitated with success the method of Mr. Wilkie Collins, he has also caught something of his style—a certain naturalism of a slightly vulgar sort, very fluent and clever, but not very deep nor very high in its range.

"Can you go, Mary?" Her voice was quite gentle and saintlike, but I knew the struggle it cost, and says I—"With *you*, mem, to India's torrid clime, if required, but with African Gorillas," says I, looking towards the bed, "never." "Leave the room," says master, starting up and catching of his bootjack. "Why, Charles," says missus, "how you talk!" affecting surprise. "Do go, Mary," says she, slipping a half-crown into my hand.

So many men find it easy to catch the trick of feminine unreasonableness in discourse, that few trouble to provide their "female characters" with anything more distinctive. The good heroines are sweetly unreasonable, the bad heroines wickedly unreasonable, the women-servants comically unreasonable, and the parts are supposed to be satisfactorily filled. Among the distinguished authors who satisfy themselves with this easy classification of women may be mentioned Mr. Wilkie Collins, Mr. Charles Reade, and (with the exception of one or two characters, notably "Lorna Doone" herself, whose gentle dignity is never marred by feminine caprice or captiousness) Mr. Blackmore.

Bret Harte does not indulge, on his own account, in this easy form of smartness. Indeed, it is noticeable that his women say very little, and that little generally to the point. Their life is exceedingly free from conventional trammels, and their character from wayward moods. When they are pure they are admirably so, with a purity that does not arise from ignorance of wrongdoing, or from carefully guarded lives. Their virtue is a force from within, and is therefore no tax or demand upon the world for guardianship and support. It is a power in itself, which must

help, and may ultimately redeem from the bondage of vice, the society in which they live.

While still, in the Old World, men of generous hearts and high principles adhere to the ancient prejudices regarding the inequality of the standard of virtue to be applied to the two halves of the human race; while philosophers and philanthropists maintain that what is degrading vice in a woman is only youthful indiscretion in a man, it is refreshing and encouraging to hear in this voice from the far West a stronger tone of righteousness, a clearer note of virtue.

When the little "school-marm" of Red Gulch sits alone on her last evening in the place, she half expects her lover, "Sandy Morton," to come and make a clear declaration of his love, to which she can give a kindly answer. She is disappointed to receive instead a visit from the mother of her brightest pupil, a woman of loose life, with whom, so far, she has had nothing to do. But she listens patiently in the twilight to the poor woman, who has come with the strange request that "Miss Mary" would take away with her the boy, the poor woman's son. He has never known more than one parent, and she, though she has money enough to pay for his education, cannot hope to keep him with her, and also to see him grow up into a virtuous man. She desires to send him away to a pure atmosphere; for she would rather part with him than continue to injure his young life by the contamination of her own.

"You see, miss, there's no one the boy has any claim on but me, and I ain't the proper person to bring him up. . . . It is natural," she went on, rapidly, in a voice that trembled strangely between pride and humility. "it's natural that he should take to you, miss, for his father, when I first knew him, was a gentleman—and the boy must forget me, sooner or later, and so I ain't a-goin' to cry about that. For I come to ask you to take my Tommy—God bless him for the bestest sweetest boy that lives—to—to take him with you."

She had risen and caught the young girl's hand in her own, and had fallen on her knees beside her.

"I've money plenty, and it's all yours and his. Put him in some good school, where you can go and see him, and help him to—to—to forget his mother. Do with him what you like. The worst you can do will be kindness to what he will learn with me. Only take him out of this wicked life, this cruel place, this home of shame and sorrow. You will; I know you will—won't you? You will—you must not, you cannot say no! You will make him as pure, as gentle as yourself; and when he has grown up, you will tell him his father's name—the name that hasn't passed my lips for years—the name of Alexander Morton, whom they call here Sandy! Miss Mary! do not take your hand away! Miss Mary, speak to me! You will take my

boy? Do not put your face from me. Miss Mary!—my God, be merciful!—she is leaving me!”

Miss Mary had risen, and in the gathering twilight had felt her way to the open window. She stood there, leaning against the casement, her eyes fixed on the last rosy tints that were fading from the western sky. There was still some of its light on her pure young forehead, on her white collar, on her clasped white hands, but all fading slowly away. The suppliant had dragged herself, still on her knees, beside her.

“I know it takes time to consider—I will wait here all night; but I cannot go until you speak. Do not deny me now. You will!—I see it in your sweet face, such a face as I have seen in my dreams. I see it in your eyes, Miss Mary!—you will take my boy!”

The last red beam crept higher, suffused Miss Mary's eyes with something of its glory, flickered and faded, and went out. The sun had set on Red Gulch. In the twilight and silence Miss Mary's voice sounded pleasantly.

“I will take the boy. Send him to me to-night.”

The happy mother raised the hem of Miss Mary's skirt to her lips. She would have buried her hot face in its virgin folds, but she dared not. She rose to her feet.

“Does—this man—know of your intention?” asked Miss Mary suddenly.

“No, nor cares. He has never even seen the child to know it.”

“Go to him at once—to-night—now! Tell him what you have done. Tell him I have taken his child, and tell him—he must never see—see—the child again. Wherever it may be, he must not come; wherever I may take it, he must not follow! There, go now, please,—I'm weary, and—have much yet to do!”

They walked together to the door. On the threshold the woman turned.

“Good night.”

She would have fallen at Miss Mary's feet. But at the same moment the young girl reached out her arms, caught the sinful woman to her own pure breast for one brief moment, and then closed and locked the door.

Since the dawn of Christianity we have put our Mary Magdalens to the front in Art and in Religion. We have boasted of our mercy to them, and all the while they have asked in vain for justice. Still those among the men who are *not* without sin continue to cast stones, and the women who have kept their virtue intact turn aside from the erring of their own sex, but shed their smiles freely and bestow their hearts eagerly on the men who have erred with them. The woman who has sinned is not fit for intercourse with virtuous wives or admission to virtuous households; but the man who has been her fellow-sinner is accepted as the suitable husband of the one and the fitting head of the other.

Miss Mary of Red Gulch has not been educated in the social

sophistries which satisfy the conscience while they undermine the health and virtue of our old communities. With her simple instincts of reason and justice, of purity and good faith, she cuts the knot, and elects to lift away part of the burden from the shoulders of the woman who has sinned and must suffer, rather than share the indifferent prosperity of the man who has sinned and forgotten. For she is not one of those among us who treat the problems of the age as Felix treated Paul.

“And as he reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come, Felix trembled, and answered, Go thy way for this time; when I have a convenient season I will call for thee.”

We do not even tremble. The judgment has already come, and has made its home among us; but we do not recognise it, and wait still for the more convenient season.●

---

#### ART. V.—HENRY FAWCETT.

*Life of Henry Fawcett.* By LESLIE STEPHEN. London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1885.

**H**ENRY FAWCETT, whose life is well written in this volume, was a man it was easy to overpraise. He was possessed of great talents, of indomitable perseverance, of stalwart pluck, and of hearty good-humour. If he lacked genius he was possessed of what is much dearer to most common heads, sound common sense; and if his nature was perhaps a little narrow, it was, what is perhaps better than width, warm and loving. But besides all these qualities, his history was one to make friends. He raised himself, as his robust-natured father had done, from a comparatively humble to an important position. He was the son of a pushing and prosperous draper in the town of Salisbury, he took a good degree at Cambridge, represented Brighton and Hackney in Parliament, and was Postmaster-General in Gladstone's Government of 1880. Even that career is sufficient to create interest and admiration; but when it is remembered that that career, which the boy Fawcett had set before himself at a very early age—so early indeed, that his expressed intention of being “a Member of Parliament” was received with “roars of laughter”—had to be persevered in, and achieved notwith-

standing the loss of sight at a critical age, the heart warms to the brave man who overcame so much, who lived such an excellent life, and carried his courageous ambition so far. Under these circumstances there would have been nothing to be said against a biography which was little more than panegyric and eulogy. Fawcett, although a man of "stir and strife," although he adopted a career which involves bitter animosities, never made an enemy. He had a peculiarly open hearty nature, which invited to love and friendship. \* Even his opponents admired and liked him. It would then have been easy to overpraise the man, without outraging the feelings of readers of his biography. That the writer of this Life has not done so, is, under the circumstances, one of the highest marks of the merit of his book. Mr. Leslie Stephen has written a calm, admiring, judicious, almost judicial record of Fawcett's life. There is a good deal of quiet enthusiasm for Fawcett in these pages, a great deal of moderate sympathy with his life and work; but what strikes one most is the eminent fairness of the estimate, the real diffusion of light upon every part of the character and doings which are here carefully described. Mr. Leslie Stephen seldom produces a vivid picture, but there is a care in detail, and a warm glow over every part of this composition, which if it does not command the eye, yet makes for itself a genial home in memory.

Mr. Fawcett was in many ways one of the most interesting figures in the masque of English politics in these recent days. He attracted a share of attention which was scarcely in due proportion to his merits, great as these were; but that the public gave him liberal measure is a circumstance which no one could be found to grudge. Fawcett was without doubt a man of considerable capacity, with a warm kindly nature, with a perseverance which carried his purposes far to achievement, but he had not that sensitiveness which is at the same time the characteristic and the curse of much greatness; nor had he the width either of view or of sympathy which as often mars as it makes the career of a man in this troublous world. Owing to the fact that he was not very sensitive he bore with more than patience the loss of sight which would have put an end to most ambitions, which would have stopped the progress of most careers, but which, in his case, never diverted him from his firmly held projects for a day. To the narrowness, which even his biographer admits, we ascribe the curious one-sidedness of his education, and the firm grip of principles which he did not see enough of to observe that they were inconsistent. These are not detractions from our estimate of Fawcett. We are not certain that we do not admire him the more for the hearty way in which he took life, which enabled him to bear great ills with

fortitude, although it may have deprived him of experiences of sorrow in which he seemed peculiarly deficient. We like a robust man who takes life jollily, as Fawcett did. And as to the latter, even although there was, as it seems to us, serious inconsistencies in his political creed, which he sometimes got over by the usual excuse, that he was not "the slave of an abstract principle," or some such glib stroke over thin ice, we admire the persistency with which he drove at his object. A man with more doubt, although he might have come nearer the truth, would not have achieved as much or carried so far.

Most people remember Fawcett's face and figure. These are well recalled by the portraits in this volume. He had a long, strong, uncouth body; rather rough-hewn slouching features; a hearty laugh, which the portraits cannot recall, and a long swinging pace which those who walked with him must have found it difficult to match. There is nothing very particular to tell about his youth. It was not very remarkable. The old opinion that "just as the twig is bent the tree's inclined," was peculiarly true in his case, although it is as obviously false in a great number of others. Some very strong natures "set" just the other way from that in which, as twigs, they have been directed. And Nature and the sun are more powerful than any pruning. That is not the history of Fawcett's development, however. His mother was the daughter of a solicitor, who was Liberal agent in Salisbury—and if there is a decided politician, it is an agent for a party. Besides, Fawcett's father, who had been mayor of the town in 1832, was a politician of marked Liberal opinions, and Fawcett very early came to follow in their footsteps. As we have already said, he early said he would be a Member of Parliament, which is a saying which is remembered more because the events made it prophetic, than that it was really prophetic. His school life was not remarkable. At Queenwood he showed some straining in the direction of literature, and with Mr. Mansegh, the well-known engineer, was editor of a school newspaper. Had Fawcett's pen proved famous, this early editorship would be the delight of his second-rate biographers. Of course we are not referring to Mr. Leslie Stephen. He does not say one word too much about these early days. Although he is a little inclined to strain references in early essays upon the steam-engine or the uses of steam into adumbrations of the politico-economical bias of Fawcett's after-life, in much the same way as the early essay of the boy who described a horse as an animal with four legs, one at each corner, was thought to have indicated thus early the making of a great morphologist. Fawcett never was literary in the true sense. His best approaches to style were some specimens of stilted rhetoric. He had even in early college days—a time when

men are often the bond slaves of certain books or the writer of them—a contempt for literary studies, and his best efforts with the pen in later years are not excellent in any literary sense. His speeches, too, lack much that a more careful literary training might have given them. His repetitions are frequent, his expressions very often inadequate to the matter to be conveyed. Indeed, he never was, and never will be, regarded as a master of any style. But one thing he was determined upon, and that was, to push his way. He had a good command over his muscles, which is one of the elements of success, as his victory at quoits and billiards over the formidable "Captain" in his freshman days shows; and he always had a keen animal enjoyment in most kinds of exercise, which is a good means of health, as his walking, his long-stride skating, and his riding, testify. After the early billiard exploit, the name of "the old serpent" clung to him in college for some time. But boys generally indulge in misnomers, for although Fawcett on more than one occasion indicated shrewdness, as these pages show, there never was any one who deserved the name of serpent less than he, except upon the ground of his length, which, we are a little surprised to note, was over six feet three inches.

He destined himself for the bar as a means of passing into politics as a profession, and we are inclined to agree with the writer of his life that he would have done well in that profession. He seems, from all we can gather, to have had all the qualities which would have commanded success in that walk, or, as some of the juniors are inclined to call it, "crawl," in life. We cannot say that we think the Bar is the profession which requires the very highest human qualities, and we incline to the opinion that when the highest qualities are carried largely into that profession, they suffer by the work they have to do. But Fawcett's nature was of the exact kind of stuff that would have made an excellent counsel. As Mr. Leslie Stephen points out, much of his work upon the Indian Committee was in the nature of cross-examination, and cross-examination is a very difficult art. So far as we can see, Fawcett seems to have done this work admirably.

There is much in Fawcett's college career, and in his after-life, so far as it was connected with his college and his university, which interests a contemporary like his present biographer. His own interest in these pleasant days, when a "senior wrangler," was so much to him, that even now there is a sort of bated breath in his prose when he speaks of one in the serious disputes in the combination-room on the tactics of Fawcett and the junior party in Trinity Hall, by which the senior party, who desired to keep fellowships still connected with celibacy, and to give them for the life of the fellows, and in the ultimate

success of Fawcett, with the aid of the University Commissioners, in that regard, is so great, that to peruse these pages in which the story is clearly told will interest his readers. But for the public we think the real interest of Fawcett's life is associated with his political career, and begins where his intimate association with the university to some extent ceased. Of course, in one sense his connection with Cambridge continued to the end.\* He was, it must be remembered, Professor of Political Economy for many years; and he was, we think, made a Doctor of Political Economy of Wurzburg University in 1882. But, after all, although he delivered several excellent courses of lectures, and wrote at the instigation of Mr. Macmillan, who saw that it would found a claim to the chair which was then soon to be vacant, a good "Manual," his contributions to political economy are not by any means remarkable. He had, as is pointed out in these pages, a useful way of associating the principles of that now rather discredited science with the affairs which were going on around him, which even in the chair of political economy marked his strong tendency towards the practical side of the science or to politics themselves.

We confess we have a sincere sympathy with Fawcett's attitude in more than one of its aspects. He himself, although blind, was a real lover of rural scenery. His early days were spent in pleasant pasture lands and by clear trout streams, and he never lost his love for the beauties of external Nature, although he had to see these vicariously through the eyes of others. That he should be the champion of High Beach in Epping Forest when it was threatened by the axe; that he should also vigorously defend the New Forest against attacks, is a matter that causes us no wonder, and indeed invites our eager sympathy. There is far too little rural beauty left in England, and the preservation of these forests, which are in themselves the best of ancient monuments, and at the same time the new product of every spring, seems to us a most excellent work. There is, as we have been told by Ruskin, far more to be done in this direction. Our rivers, too, require protection, from their prostitution into sewers. But it is an odd thing that here we find Ruskin, who is not certainly in any strict sense of the word an economist, and Fawcett who professed to be of the strictest sect of those who follow what he would not allow to be called "that dismal science," upon the same platform. The second point in which we coincide with him is his large sympathy

---

\* He held his Professorship until his death. He lived in Cambridge for a portion of each year. He died there at last, and was buried in Trumpington Churchyard.



with the poor. He had compassion on the people. In early days he knew a good deal of the agricultural labourers about Salisbury. He was one of those friendly men to whose heart humanity is a sufficient introduction, and much of his political life was regulated by considerations of how the life of the poor and the distressed could be made brighter and happier. It struck him then that the dreary monotony and squalor of those poor lives would become worse and harder if they were deprived of the free access for their weary feet to such resorts as Epping Forest, the broad commons which the hills bear on their backs, and the shady nooks which the trees of Hampshire hold in their arms. It was these two considerations, we think, that made Fawcett such an active member of the Commons Preservation Society, and which dictated his action in this connection in Parliament. He could depart from his principles when his sympathies invited him, and at the same time he could profess to be a Liberal of the old type, objecting to the new-fangled notion of statesmanship, which meddles and interferes in every relation. That he succeeded in his efforts in Parliament, often with the help of the Tory vote, is only a sign of the times. Rightly or wrongly, we seem to be abandoning the old-fashioned Liberalism which boasted *laissez faire* as a creed, and we are adopting a policy of doing by State help that which men used to do for themselves, or of rectifying the results of private action by public control. Fawcett was on both sides in this controversy. His action as an administrator, when at last, after bothering the Government through one Parliament about Indian and other affairs, and fighting with his party through the Parliament elected in 1874, he was rewarded with the Postmaster-Generalship, is another indication, we think, of the same attitude of facing both ways. It is true that in some of the additions which he made to the duties of the Postal Department he was following out suggestions which had been made by predecessors in office; but the eagerness with which he threw himself into these so-called reforms, the energy with which he carried them out and furthered new departures, show that he was heart and soul in the policy of aggregating further functions to the Department over which he presided. The question as to whether a Government should carry our letters, spread information, or become the owners of the telegraph, had not to be decided in his day. The wisdom or unwisdom of such a policy is no doubt even now an open question. We can understand, however, even a thorough-going Liberal of the old school accepting office and doing nothing to reverse a policy which had been determined upon and acted upon. But it is a little difficult to think of one of the old school Liberals inaugurating and pressing the reforms with which Fawcett's name is identified. It is com-

mon to defend the action of Government in relation to the Post Office by saying that it pays. But surely that can be no sufficient reason for the exercise by the State of a function which does not properly belong to it. It is obvious that if the State became the sole baker of bread, large profits could be realized for the Exchequer. Some, however, of the reforms which Fawcett inaugurated do not seem even to have the excuse which we have mentioned. The Parcel Post is an extension of the functions of the office in a new direction. Why parcels should be carried, and goods and passengers not carried, by the State, it seems a little difficult to say. Yet Fawcett was happy in achieving the one, and his principles would have been outraged if the other had been suggested. There are, no doubt, objections to private banking in relation to the poor, and it is difficult obviously for persons with small sums of money to invest them in Government securities. But do these facts justify the extinction of the old savings banks, and the institution of Government as a stockbroker for the lower orders? Here, of course, Fawcett set at defiance the rule of the economists, that persons must be allowed to manage their own affairs, and that the most good will be done to the whole community if each person is allowed to do the very best he can for himself, and private enterprise is allowed to have fairplay. That telegrams should be cheapened is, of course, an advantage to the public; but that the senders of messages should have their messages sent at the expense of other persons does not seem such an obvious justice. Again, the annuities and insurances which the Post Office now undertake, might possibly by strict economists have been left to private enterprise, and the Postal Order system, which Fawcett also inaugurated, has questionable aspects in an economical point of view. Many of these projects were opposed by persons interested in insurance or in banking, and the limits of the transactions which Fawcett desired that the Post Office should undertake was, at their instance, reduced, in order that the Post Office might, as little as possible, interfere with the existing machinery which was in the hands of capitalists. But that fact of itself shows the direction of these reforms. It is an easy thing to submit at first to a limit, but it is a hardship to those whose transactions are just beyond such limit, that they should not have the advantage which is reaped by their poorer neighbour. Are not such reforms, then, the small end of the wedge which will drive capital to the wall? We desire to express no opinion on these matters, having, as we said, much sympathy with Fawcett's feelings in the matter. But we again say that we fail to see how he could reconcile such projects with a refusal—to

take a single instance—to support the extension of the Factory Acts to adult women.

But perhaps, after all, we are making too much of this point. The man who can be happily inconsistent is possibly to be congratulated, and Fawcett had, as we have seen, one of those blunt, happy natures, which presses on through proximate duties without much reference to conscientious quibbles, or the nicer questions of logical casuistry. Fawcett was, as we know, a democrat, and on more than one occasion there was talk about his being an exceedingly dangerous person. No doubt that is a very old Tory weapon of defence, and there are very few men who have come to the front of affairs who have not at one time or other been dubbed “dangerous persons.” But although Fawcett was a believer in democracy, he was a good deal of a Conservative too. Indeed most men are, when the exigencies of parties permit of it, Radical only in one or two aspects, while they are Conservative in many of their instincts and tendencies. We see how conservative Fawcett was of Cambridge, and the various means which had by the constitution of the university and colleges been provided to allow merit to come readily to the front. But in the larger sphere of politics he saw that there were serious evils incident to unadulterated democracy, and it was because he perceived that that he became as ardent follower of Mr. Hare in his proposals for proportional representation, as he was of Mill in the main features of his politico-economical creed. That Mr. Hare’s scheme would be a sufficient remedy for the evils in question may be open to doubt, but Fawcett thoroughly believed that it was at any rate one way by which the oppression of minorities might be prevented. So strenuous was his belief, that it is not improbable that he would, like his friend Mr. Courtney, have retired from office when the opportunity of adopting the principle was neglected by the late Government.

Most of his doings while he was in the House, in connection with India, must have every one’s hearty approval. He was perhaps unwisely scrupulous in beginning his campaign by objecting to the payment of the expenses of the ball which was given at the India Office to the Shah out of the revenues of India. It was a comparatively small matter, and Mill seems to have disapproved of his action. Still, on the whole, we think he was right in the principle of his protest. Again, we agree with Mill in thinking that there was almost a contemptible meanness in making India pay for the presents which the Duke of Edinburgh had given to Indian princes and the like during his tour, unless the presents which the Duke had received had been given to the Indian people. But apart from

those small matters, we think that Fawcett's action in relation to India, and Indian finance, was most salutary. It behoves this country to be especially careful in dealings with the finances of that *cestui que trust*; and that far more economy than was practised was necessary, that a better system of accounts was called for, is now admitted on all hands. We cannot follow Fawcett through all the hard work that he did on the Committee which sat during the three Sessions, 1871-1872-1873. Much light has been thrown upon Indian affairs by the minutes taken before that Committee, and a great deal of information was elicited by Fawcett's searching method of examination. To readers of the WESTMINSTER REVIEW, much of the information which is contained in this chapter of Mr. Leslie Stephen's book will not be new, and therefore it is the less necessary to refer to it in this place.\* Still the chapter is an interesting one, although there are one or two errors, inaccuracies, or misprints, which might have been corrected. For instance, the word "noticed" occurs twice in a line on page 367; the words "and no credit is given upon the original outlay," on page 393, should surely read, "no credit is given *for* the original outlay." On page 396 he says, "it became an invasion," the antecedent to *it* being "the English embassy." But, on the whole, there are very few mistakes in these carefully written pages.

It is impossible in the limits which we have set ourselves to give anything like an accurate description of the life-work of a man like Fawcett. Indeed it requires all Mr. Leslie Stephen's 472 well-concreted pages to do so. In Fawcett's political career, we admit errors. Even in relation to his favourite India, we think he never fully understood the significance of the Afghan war, or the importance of checking the hostile advances of Russia. We think too that his protest against the employment of Indian troops in Europe was a mistake. At that time he was supported in his protest by those who were his colleagues in office, when recourse was again had to India for troops to be employed in Egypt without protest from anybody. But Fawcett's errors were small in comparison with those which have been committed by most politicians. One thing we are convinced of, that while he was shrewd and acute, he was honest, and that however he

---

\* But Fawcett was right in thinking that the public knew and cared very little about India or Indian affairs, and the attention which he called to these matters was a distinct benefit in the formation of public opinion. The abuse, which his efforts was a means of putting an end to, of the introduction of the Indian budget in the sweltering August days, when every member is panting to be away from London, is an excellent illustration of the way Indian affairs used to be treated before he became "the Member for India." India requires some champion in the House.

may have merited the name of "the old serpent" in his undergraduate days at Cambridge, it was entirely inapplicable to him in his political career. He lived a good, vigorous, happy life, and although he died before old age had approached him, he had done as much as most men who have not lost their sight effect in much longer lives. He seems to have had few cares, sorrows or troubles; his domestic life appears to have been especially happy, his relations to his parents and his sister Maria, strike us as being exceedingly beautiful. He seems notwithstanding the position to which he had attained, never to have grown less of a son or a brother, as the years, which in most cases bring some estrangement, passed by. The same qualities, no doubt, which kept those relations sweet, brought him numerous friends not only amongst men of like position and culture, but amongst all with whom he was brought into any contact. There are some letters, good to read, in the last chapter, from working-men, which are excellent tributes to Fawcett's heart. He lived a good life, and has had a good Life written of him.

We have not spoken of Fawcett's official work except when alluding to the reforms which he introduced in relation to postal communication and to the Department generally. These, as we have seen, may be regarded by some as departures in a right, by others as departures in a wrong, direction. But no one who knew Fawcett, and who knew the work he did, could entertain any other opinion than that he made a most excellent official. The fact that he entered the service of Government so late in life, was a positive advantage. Many men become connected with a service or a Department so early in life that their mental growth is a development only in relation to the red tape in which they are swaddled. To these men, "officialism" is second nature. But Fawcett always regarded that "officialism" as a "fetish," and denounced the "evil spirit engendered by the tacit assumption that the nation exists to maintain the office." Into all the duties he had to perform he brought what is better than "Treasury minute," or rule, or precedent—a warm heart, a careful conscience, and a good head. He spared no pains in arriving at the truth; he always looked upon his subordinates as human beings; and any laxity of discipline which, as some stricter officials thought his conduct gave colour for, was an indication of a vice which leaned so decidedly to virtue's side, that we gladly forgive him. Fawcett had a great capacity for work; and we believe that, had he been spared, he would in all probability have distinguished himself more as the administrator of a Department than as a practical statesman in the long run.

We are almost sorry to quit Fawcett as the subject of our

thoughts. Even in the memory of him there is something genial and bracing, which rewards us while we think of him. His death was a distinct loss to the public life of England. What could be done to compensate for that loss by a good Life of him, has, as we have said, been done by Mr. Leslie Stephen, and the good repute of his actions is here preserved for us, and for those who are to come after us, not only as a pleasant but as a wholesome lesson.

---

## ART. VI.—THE GREVILLE MEMOIRS. Part II.

*A Journal of the Reign of Queen Victoria from 1837 to 1852.*  
By the late CHARLES C. F. GREVILLE, Esq., Clerk of the Council. In Three Volumes. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1885.

THE second portion of "The Greville Memoirs" surpasses in value the first, but we doubt if it will be found so generally interesting. Mr. Greville himself accurately described this portion to a friend. "You will find," he wrote, "the greater part political, not often narrative, mostly allusions and comments on passing events, the details of which were not notorious and accessible; some miscellanea of a different description, personal, social, official; you will find public characters freely, perhaps flippantly, dealt with; in some cases you will be surprised to see my opinions of certain men, some of whom, in many respects, I may perhaps think differently of now."\*

Referring to Gibbon's description of certain Pagan philosophers, "that their lives were spent in the pursuit of truth and the practice of virtue," Mr. Greville admits that he could not boast of having passed his life in the practice of virtue, but he claims for himself that he had always pursued truth—and made efforts to get at it, and that in his "Memoirs" he has endeavoured "to sum up conflicting statements of facts with a sort of judicial impartiality." The political part of these volumes so far outweighs the personal and social, that the general public, we suspect, will find them rather heavy reading, but the student of political history and future historians of the reign of Victoria will find them an inestimable treasure.

---

\* Preface, p. xiii.

We have seen the part which Mr. Greville took to secure the passing of the Reform Bill of 1832\* called most unjustly officious and fussy—evidently it made a very different impression on those who took part, and who knew the part he took, in the transactions of that time. There are proofs in these volumes that he was a confidential adviser of several of the Ministers during the period over which these volumes extend, and without assenting to the exaggerated estimate formed of him by Sir Henry Taylor, that he was fitter to be Prime Minister than several of the men who held that office during his life, we are convinced by these volumes that he was a man of more than common political sagacity. As in the former portion of the “Memoirs,” so in these, the lamentation “*Video meliora probo que deteriora sequor*” pervades these volumes. For instance, he records a dinner at Chief Justice Wilde’s:—

A great party, almost all lawyers. . . . I sat next to Alderson, and found him a very agreeable man, senior wrangler, senior medallist, a judge (and really a lawyer), a wit, a life all of law and letters, such as I might have led if I had chosen the good path. I always think of this, when I meet such men, who have scorned delights and lived laborious days, and now enjoy the benefit thereof.

In the same strain the entry continues, revealing a fact as to Lord Campbell’s literary ambition of which we were ignorant:—

Campbell is anxious to write again, and talked to me of writing the history of the Reform Bill. I told him I could give valuable materials, but that it is not yet time. He wants me to write memoirs of the last twenty years,† and was pleased to say no man could so well do it. This is not true, but I have some qualifications from personal acquaintance with the actors, and knowledge of the events of that period, and I might have had, and ought to have had more, but my habits and pursuits have prevented me, and only left me mere snatches of such real knowledge as could be turned to account;‡

Those who read the first part of these “Memoirs” will remember that Mr. Greville means by “his pursuits” racing, which, throughout his life, was his absorbing pursuit. In the second, as in the first, part, interesting narratives of political events are broken off, and when the Journal is resumed the break is accounted for by the fact that he had been engaged in his all-engrossing occupation, and there is generally added a complaint of his own folly in so doing. It is impossible to give a connected abstract or summary of these volumes, and we shall

\* “Memoirs,” first series, vol. ii. *passim*.

† The date of this entry is Feb. 18, 1848. ‡ Vol. iii. p. 125.

confine ourselves to noticing the characters Mr. Greville gives of several distinguished men, and some of the political transactions in which he was engaged. This second portion of the "Memoirs" commences at the beginning of the present reign. The character of William IV. is ably sketched:—

King William IV., if he had been born in a private station, would have passed unobserved through life like millions of other men, looked upon as possessing a good-natured and affectionate disposition, but without either elevation of mind or brightness of intellect. . . . His moral and intellectual qualities, however insignificant in themselves, became from their unavoidable influence an object of great interest and importance, and in the early part of his reign he acquired no small share of popularity. People liked a king whose habits presented such a striking contrast to those of his predecessor. His attention to business, his frank and good-humoured familiarity, and his general hospitality, were advantageously compared with the luxurious and selfish indolence and habits of seclusion in the society of dull and grasping favourites which characterized the former reign. He seemed to be more occupied with the pleasing novelty of his situation, providing for his children, and actively discharging the duties of his high functions, than in giving effect to any political opinions, and he took a correct view of his constitutional obligation. . . . But although King William was sometimes weak, sometimes obstinate and miserably deficient, he was manly, sincere, honest, and straightforward. The most painful moment of his life, and the greatest humiliation to which a king ever submitted, must have been when he again received the Whig Ministers in 1835; but it is to the credit of Lord Melbourne, as well as of the king, that their subsequent personal intercourse was not disagreeable to either, and greatly to the king's honour that he has never been accused or suspected of any underhand or indirect proceeding for the purpose of emancipating himself from a thralldom so galling. Of political dexterity and artifice he was altogether incapable, and although if he had been false, able and artful, he might have caused more perplexity to his Whig Government and have played a better party game, it is perhaps fortunate for the country, and certainly happy for his own reputation, that his virtues predominated over his talents. The most remarkable foible of the late king was his passion for speechifying.† He had considerable facility in expressing himself, but what he said was generally useless or improper. He never received the homage of a Bishop without giving him a lecture, and the custom he introduced of giving toasts and making speeches at all his dinners was more

---

\* As to the relations of the king and the Whig Ministry, see Fitzgerald's "Life of William IV.," vol. ii. p. 357 *et seq.*

† Various specimens of King William's eloquence are given in the first part of the "Memoirs," vols. ii. and iii.



suitable to a tavern than a palace. He was totally deficient in dignity or refinement, and neither his elevation to the throne nor his association with persons of the most distinguished manners, could give him any tincture of the one or the other. Though a good-natured and amiable man, he was passionate and hasty, and thus he was led into those bickerings and quarrels with the Duchess of Kent, and with his own children, which were a source of perpetual discomfort or disgrace to him, and all of which might have been avoided by a more consistent course of firmness and temper on his part. His sons generally behaved to him with great insolence and ingratitude, except Adolphus.\*

Mr. Greville relates this curious story as to the relations between the Queen and her mother:—

Madame de Lieven told me yesterday that she had an audience of the Queen, who was very civil and gracious, but timid and embarrassed, and talked of nothing but commonplaces. Her Majesty had probably been told that the Princess was *intrigante* and was afraid of committing herself. She had afterwards an interview with the Duchess of Kent, who (she told me) it was plain to see is overwhelmed with vexation and disappointment. Her daughter behaves to her with kindness and attention, but has rendered herself quite independent of the Duchess, who painfully feels her own insignificance. The almost contemptuous way in which Conroy† has been dismissed must be a bitter mortification to her. The Duchess said to Madame de Lieven, “qu’il n’y avait plus avenir pour elle qu’elle n’était plus rien,” that for eighteen years this child had been the sole object of her life, of all her thoughts and hopes, and now she was taken from her, and there was an end of all for which she had lived heretofore. Madame de Lieven told her that she ought to be the happiest of human beings, to see the elevation of this child, her prodigious success, and the praise and admiration of which she was universally the object—that it was a triumph and a glory which ought to be sufficient for her; to which she only shook her head with a melancholy smile, and gave her to understand that all this would not do, and that the accomplishment of her wishes had only made her to the last degree unhappy. King William is revenged, he little anticipated how or by what instrumentality, and if his ghost is a vindictive shade it may rejoice in the sight of this bitter disappointment of his enemy. In the midst of all her propriety of manner and conduct, the young Queen begins to exhibit slight signs of a peremptory disposition, and it is impossible not to suspect that, as she gains confidence and as her character begins to develop, she will evince a strong will of her own. In all trifling matters connected with her

---

\* Vol. i. pp. 3, 4, 5. The late Lord Adolphus Fitzclarence is here referred to.

† Sir John Conroy long held a high place in the Duchess of Kent’s household, and was her confidential friend and adviser.

Court and her palace, she already enacts the part of Queen and mistress as if it had long been familiar to her.\*

Mr. Greville proved a true prophet as to the Queen's character and conduct. In another passage he says of the Queen: "Strange as it is, there is good reason to believe that she thinks she has been ill-used by both the Duchess of Kent and Sir John Conroy for some years;" to which the editor of the "Memoirs" adds this note: "The Queen, in a letter to her uncle King Leopold, speaks significantly of what she terms 'my sad childhood.'"†

Mr. Greville relates many curious anecdotes of Brougham. It should be borne in mind that at the time this entry in the Journal was made (1837), Brougham was alternately flirting with the Radicals and the Tories:—

Le Marchant,‡ who was Brougham's secretary for four years and knows him well, told me that no man was a greater aristocrat in his heart than Brougham, from conviction attached to aristocracy, from taste desirous of being one of its members. He said that Dugald Stewart when talking of his pupils, had said though he envied most the understanding of Homer (whom he loved with peculiar affection), he considered Brougham the ablest man he had ever known, but that even then (forty years ago) he considered his to be a mind that was continually oscillating on the verge of insanity. Le Marchant said that Brougham's powers of application exceeded what he had believed possible of any human being. He had known him work incessantly from nine in the morning till one at night, and at the end be as fresh apparently as when he began. He could turn from one subject to another with surprising facility and promptitude, in the same day travelling through the details of a Chancery cause, writing a philosophical or mathematical treatise, correcting articles for the "Library of Useful Knowledge," and preparing a great speech for the House of Lords. When one thinks of the greatness of his genius, and the depth of his fall, from the loftiest summit of influence, power and fame, to the lowest abyss of political degradation, in spite of the faults and follies of his character and conduct, one cannot help feeling regret and compassion at the sight of such a noble wreck and of so much glory obscured.§

Again:—

Feb. 20, 1838.—We have had Brougham every day at the Council Office more busy writing a review of Lady Charlotte Bury's

\* Vol. i. pp. 15, 16. As to the relations of William IV. and the Duchess of Kent, see "Greville Memoirs" (Part I.), vol. iii., and Fitzgerald's "Life of William IV.," vol. ii.

† Vol. i. p. 21 and note. The letter will be found in Martin's "Life of the Prince Consort."

‡ Sir Denis Le Marchant.

§ Vol. i. pp. 33, 34.

[Vol. CXXV. No. CCXLIX.]—NEW SERIES. Vol., LXIX. No. I G

book than with the matter before the Judicial Committee. He writes this with inconceivable rapidity, seldom corrects and never reads over what he has written, but packs it up and despatches it rough from his pen to Macvey Napier.\* He is in exuberant spirits, and full of talk, and certainly marvellously agreeable. His talk (for conversation is not the word for it) is totally unlike that of any one else I ever heard. It comes forth without the slightest effort, provided he is in spirits and disposed to talk at all. It is the spontaneous outpouring of one of the most fertile and restless of minds, easy, familiar, abundant and discursive. The qualities and peculiarities of mind which mar his oratorical, give zest and effect to his conversational, powers; for the perpetual bubbling up of fresh ideas by incapacitating him from condensing his speeches, often make them tediously digressive and long, but in society he treads the ground with so elastic a step, he touches everything so lightly, and so adorns all that he touches, his turns and his breaks are so various, unexpected and pungent, that he not only interests and amuses, but always exhilarates his audience so as to render weariness and satiety impossible. He is now coquetting a little with the Tories, and especially professes great deference and profound respect for the Duke of Wellington; his sole object in politics, for the moment, is to badger, twit and torment the Ministry, † and in this he cannot contain himself within the bounds of common civility, as he exemplified the other night when he talked of Lord John this, and Mr. Spring that, which, however contemptuous, was too undignified to be effective. He calls this "The Thompson Government" from its *last* considerable member.‡

With regard to the relations between Brougham and the Duke of Wellington, a curious story, eminently characteristic of the Duke, is related in "The Life of Bishop Wilberforce." "Brougham," said Lord Aberdeen to the Bishop, "wou on the Duke by flattering him. I believe I was accessory to the beginning of it. The Duke hated him. But I told him that Brougham had said of his Despatches they will be read when we are forgotten. The Duke said with the greatest simplicity, 'By God, so they will; I cannot think how the devil I came to write them.'"§ Mr. Greville also writes on the subject of the Duke's Despatches: "I was amused at the simplicity with which he talked of the great interest of these Despatches, just as he might have done if they had been the work of any other man; said he had read them himself with considerable astonishment and

---

\* Then editor of the *Edinburgh Review*. This Review was the origin and foundation of Brougham's "Sketches of Statesmen."

† Lord Melbourne's second Ministry was now in office.

‡ Vol. i. pp. 66-68. Mr. Poulett Thompson, afterwards Lord Sydenham, is here referred to. Mr. Greville at one time very much underrated him, but afterwards corrected his judgment. *Vide* vol. ii. p. 117.

§ "Life of Bishop Wilberforce," vol. ii. p. 412.

interest, and that everybody might see there was not a word in them which was not strictly and literally true."\*

To return to Brougham. In August, 1839, Brougham made a violent attack on the Irish policy of the Melbourne Ministry in a speech which the Duke of Wellington said was "the finest he had ever heard in Parliament." Of his proceedings the next day Mr. Greville informs us:—

This curious and versatile creature is in the highest spirits, and finds in the admiration which his eloquence, and the delight which his mischievousness excite on the Tory benches and in Tory society, a compensation for old mortifications and disappointments. After acting Jupiter one day in the House of Lords, he is ready to act Scapin anywhere else the next; and the day after this great display, † he went to dine at Greenwich with the Duchess of Cambridge and a great party, where he danced with Lady Jersey, while Lyndhurst capered also with the Dowager Lady Cowper. After dinner they drank, among other toasts, Lady Jersey's health, and when she said she could not return thanks, Brougham undertook to do it for her. He said that "she was very sorry to return thanks in such a dress, but unfortunately she had quarrelled in the morning with her maid, who was a very cross, crabbed person, and consequently had not been able to put on the attire she would have wished, and in the difficulty she had recourse to her old friend Lord Brougham, who had kindly lent her his best wig and the coat which he wore on State occasions. [After more nonsense of this kind, that] she was very sorry she could not say any more, but that in the peculiar situation she then was in, she could not venture to remain any longer on her legs.‡

As Lord Brougham grew older, he, in Mr. Greville's judgment, deteriorated in every way. Referring to Brougham's well-known intrigue to get himself made President of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council with a salary, Mr. Greville writes:—

March 16, 1841.—Brougham has been outdoing himself about his Bill § He begins by naming a Committee very numerous, but containing hardly any of the Whigs, or of those who would be likely to oppose him, none, at least, that he could possibly help naming. On Monday an article appeared in the *Morning Chronicle*, very bitter and smart, and written by Clarendon, which stung him to the quick. He got up the next day in the House of Lords, and alluding to his having been accused of bringing in this Bill with personal views, rejected the accusation with vehement indignation and in the most extravagant language, "amidst loud laughter," as the report said, "in which the Lord

\* Vol. i. p. 38.

† His speech on the Irish Question.

‡ Vol. i. p. 229.

§ The Bill providing for the appointment of a President of the Judicial Committee.

ville talked of the elder Pitt, whom he did not admire, but had never heard him except as Lord Chatham. Rigby was a very agreeable speaker, in style not unlike Tierney.\*

Mr. Grenville had been, while in Parliament, a follower of Fox, but

he never could endure the Reform Bill or forgive its authors. He never would set his foot in Holland House after that measure, and he estranged himself from all his old political friends, even those with whom he had been the most intimate, not indeed absolutely quarrelling with them, but desisting from all intimacy. . . .

It is difficult to say what the exact colour of his political opinions were. He used to be a Whig, but he was, at all events latterly, a moderate anti-reforming Whig, with a horror of organic changes, and not fond of any changes, disliking free-trade and disliking Cobden more; favourable to Catholic Emancipation and the establishment of a Catholic Church, but abhorring O'Connell, who was his *bête noire*, and in his eyes the incarnation of all evil and mischief.

Mr. Greville gives a full and interesting sketch of Mr. Grenville's life and character,† of which this is the conclusion:—

A happier life and an easier death it would be difficult to discover; his life was extended to nearly a century without any intermission of bodily health, any decay of mental faculties, and, what is more extraordinary and more valuable, without any deadness or coldness of human affections. He was blessed with affluence, with the love of rational and elevating pursuits, and ample leisure and power to enjoy them. He was a philosopher, a gentleman, and a Christian, and he lived in constant social intercourse with the relations to whom he was attached or the friends of his predilection, to all of whom he was an object of the deepest respect and affection. A life so tranquil and prosperous was terminated by a death not less easy and serene; his indisposition was not such as to interfere with his usual habits; he rose at his accustomed hour and dressed himself to the last, even on the day of his death. He had always a book, latterly the Prayer-Book, before him, and his mind was undisturbed and unclouded. He dined and went to sleep in his chair, and from that sleep he never woke.‡

Mr. Greville did not look on O'Connell in the same light as his friend Mr. Grenville. On O'Connell's death in 1847, Mr. Greville writes of him:—

History will speak of him as one of the most remarkable men who ever existed. He will fill a great space in its pages. His position was unique; there never was before, there will never be again, any-

---

\* Vol. ij. pp. 115, 116.

† There is an interesting, though short, memoir of Mr. Grenville in Sir D. Le Marchant's "Memoir of Viscount Althorp, Earl Spencer," pp. 25, *et seq.*

‡ Vol. iii. pp. 3, 4.

thing at all resembling it. To rise from the humblest situation to the height of empire, like Napoleon, is no uncommon destiny; there have been innumerable successful adventurers and usurpers; but there never was a man who, without altering his social position in the slightest degree, without obtaining any office or situation whatever, raised himself to a height of political power which gave him an enormous capacity for good or evil, and made him the most important and conspicuous man of his time and country. It would not be a very easy matter to do him perfect justice. A careful examination of his career, and an accurate knowledge of his character, would be necessary for the purpose. It is impossible to question the greatness of his abilities or the sincerity of his patriotism. His dependence on his country's bounty, in the rent that was levied for so many years, was alike honourable to the contributors and the recipient; it was an income nobly given and nobly earned. Up to the conquest of Catholic Emancipation his was certainly a great and glorious career. What he might have done, and what he ought to have done, after that it is not easy to say, but undoubtedly he did more mischief than good, and exhibited anything but a wise, generous and patriotic spirit. In Peel's administration he did nothing but mischief, and it is difficult to comprehend with what object and with what hope he threw Ireland into confusion, and got up that Repeal agitation the folly and impracticability of which nobody must have known so well as himself.\*

We have lived to see the Repeal agitation conducted with much more earnestness and determination than was ever shown in it by O'Connell, and by a man who has far greater power over his countrymen than had O'Connell when his power was at its height.

No statesman of this reign is more frequently mentioned in these volumes than Lord Russell, Mr. Greville's opinion of whom from time to time greatly varied. In 1837 he wrote of him:—"He is a marvellous little man, always equal to the occasion, afraid of nobody, fixed in his principles, clear in his ideas, collected in his manner, and bold and straightforward in his disposition. He invariably speaks well when a good speech is required of him, and this upon every important question, for he gets no assistance from any of his colleagues, except now and then from Howick."†

In 1839 Lord Russell was opposed to the Radical section of the Liberal party. They advocated a further extension of the suffrage and the ballot. Lord Russell contended for "the finality of the Reform Bill," and by so doing gained the nickname, by which he was long known, of "Finality Jack." Mr. Greville writes of him at this time:—

---

\* Vol. iii. p. 85.

† Vol. i. p. 34. By Howick is meant the present Earl Grey.

1839, April 21st.—Some of the Cabinet, more of the subordinates and hangers on, and many of what are called the old Whigs, are earnestly pressing that concessions should be made, and they are very angry and very sorrowful because John Russell is inflexible on this point. He has to sustain the assaults, not only of the violent of his party, and of Ellice\* and the out-of-door advisers, monitors, and critics, but of his own father, who, after announcing that he had given up politics and quitted the stage, has been dragged forward and induced to try his parental rhetoric upon the conservative immobility of his son. To the letter which the Duke wrote him, Lord John merely replied that “he would shortly see his opinions in print,” and to Ellice’s warm remonstrances and entreaties, he only drily said, “I have made up my mind.” His nephew,† Lord Russell, who, from some extraordinary crotchet, has thought fit to embrace republican opinions, is an ultra-movement man, but restrained in the manifestation of his opinions from personal deference to his father and uncle, with whom he lives on excellent terms, said the other day to Lord Tavistock, “Lord John has undertaken a great task; he is endeavouring to arrest the progress of the movement, and if he succeeds he will be a very great man. He may succeed, and if he does it will be a great achievement.” This Lord Tavistock told Lord John, who replied that “he was convinced of the danger which threatened the country from the movement, and of the necessity of opposing its progress; that he considered this duty paramount to all other considerations. He did not desire the dissolution of the Government to which he belonged; on the contrary, he wished to remain in office, but nevertheless he considered the promotion of party objects and the retention of office subordinate to the higher and more imperative duty of opposing principles fraught with danger to the State, and to that end he would devote his best energies.”‡

Lord Russell did not succeed in the great achievement of stopping the movement, though he may have succeeded in delaying it. He himself set the movement going again. He abandoned the finality of the Reform Bill, and in 1852 reopened the question of the franchise. To the day of his death he remained firmly opposed to the ballot, though shortly after the date of Mr. Greville’s entry, for the sake of inducing Macaulay to enter the Cabinet, he concurred in making the ballot an open question. Here is a testimony to Lord Russell’s merits not only as leader of his party, but as a Minister :—

At the end of the Session of 1840, Sir Robert Inglis said to one of the Government people, “Well, you have managed to get through the

---

\* The late Right Hon. Edward Ellice, commonly called Bear Ellice. He was one of the whippers-in of the Whig party.

† Afterwards the eighth Duke of Bedford.

‡ Vol. i. pp. 101, 102.

Session very successfully." "Yes," said the other, "thanks to your dissensions among yourselves." "No," said Sir Robert, "it is not that, but it is the conduct of your leader, his honesty, courage, and ability, which has enabled you to do so." Ley, the Clerk of the House of Commons and a man of great experience, said he had never seen the business so well conducted as by John Russell. Besides this, his reputation in his office is immense, where all his subordinates admit that colonial affairs never were so well administered.

Sir Henry Taylor, a most competent judge, and a witness whose means of knowledge of the subject could not be surpassed, bears like witness, in his "Autobiography," to the efficiency of Lord Russell's management of the Colonial Office.

Lord Russell's submission to Lord Palmerston's overhearing conduct and warlike policy in the Eastern imbroglio of 1840 produced on Mr. Greville an unfavourable impression. "Lord John," he writes, "has disappointed me; and when I contrast the vigour of his original resolution with the feebleness of his subsequent efforts, the tameness with which he has submitted to be overruled and thwarted, and to endure the treachery and almost the insult of Palmerston's newspaper tricks, I am bound to acknowledge that he is not the man I took him for."

The revelations, we observe in passing, made by these "Memoirs" of the relations between Palmerston and his colleagues during the time he was at the Foreign Office, from 1837 to 1841, and again from 1846 to 1851, are amongst the most interesting and surprising portions of this work. However, Lord Russell regained Mr. Greville's esteem. He tells us that in August, 1841, he saw a confidential letter from Lord Russell to his brother (the Duke of Bedford), in which, alluding to the prospect of his losing office in the new Parliament, he said that he looked forward with delight to his establishment at Endsleigh,\* and to the opportunity of resuming some long-neglected studies, on which Mr. Greville writes:—

I was struck with the calm philosophy and the unselfish patriotism which his letter breathed, and with the grateful feelings he expressed at the happiness which seemed yet to be reserved for him. It is pleasant to contemplate a mind so well regulated, at once so vigorous, honest, and gentle, it cannot fail to be happy, because it possesses that salutary energy which is always filling the mind with good food, those pure and lofty aspirations which are able to quell the petty passions and infirmities which assail and degrade inferior minds, and above all those warm affections which seek for objects around which they may cling, which are the best safeguard against selfishness, and diffuse

---

\* The Devonshire seat of the Dukes of Bedford.



throughout the moral being that vital glow which animates existence itself, is superior to all other pleasures, and renders all evil comparatively light.\*

A year later Mr. Greville again veers round ; he then writes : " I have a great liking for Lord John, but have for some time discovered that, with high qualities and great abilities, he is not a great man, or anything like it. But where are we to look for great men ? The generation of them has passed away."† This unfavourable opinion of Lord Russell is several times reiterated in these volumes. Referring to his abortive attempt to form a Ministry in 1815, when Sir R. Peel's Cabinet broke up through internal dissension, and to what was supposed would be Lord Russell's opposition to Peel's Corn Law Repeal Bill, Mr. Greville writes : " In all this affair so far, and since his speech the first night,‡ which was very good, John Russell does not shine, but he is a very clever, ingenious, but *little* man, full of antipathies, and not, I suspect, without something of envy which galls and provokes him and makes him lose his head and his temper altogether."§ Lord Russell had antipathies and prejudices, and was an obstinate man, but it was a gross injustice to attribute to him any design to oppose Sir R. Peel's Corn Bill. His conduct with regard to that measure completely fulfilled the assurance he gave the Queen, " that, although he found it impossible to form an Administration, he should be ready to do all in his power as a Member of Parliament to promote the settlement of the question."¶ Every one remembers the late Lord Lytton's description of Lord Russell in the " New Timon " :—

How formed to lead if not too proud to please,  
His fame would fire you, but his manners freeze ;  
Like or dislike, he does not care a jot,  
He wants your vote, but your affections not.  
Yet human hearts need sun as well as oaks,  
So cold a climate plays the deuce with votes :  
And while his doctrines ripen day by day,  
His frost-nipped party pines itself away.

This is admirably illustrated in Mr. Greville's account of an interview between himself and Lord Russell :—

He received me with one of his coldest and most offensive manners, said nothing, and did not vouchsafe to tell me that they [the Cabinet] had made up their minds to do something, and that Grey was going to

\* Vol. ii. p. 28.

† *Ibid.* p. 85.

‡ Of the Session of 1846.

§ Vol. ii. p. 361.

¶ Letter from Lord Russell to the Queen, quoted in vol. ii. p. 361, editor's note.

give notice of a Bill\* in a few minutes from that time. Nothing could be more ungracious, and I mentally resolved never to go near him again to tell anything of use to him. I wrote to the Duke of Bedford to tell him all this, and he wrote me back word that he was not surprised, and that nobody had more to suffer from John's manner than he himself; that John is very obstinate and unmanageable, and does not like to be found fault with or told things which run counter to his own ideas—all of which he owned was very unfortunate and a grievous fault in his character.†

From our own experience we can bear testimony to the truth of Mr. Greville's description of what Lord Russell's manner at an interview could be.

After one more anecdote of Lord Russell from himself, and curiously illustrative of his *laissez aller* way of doing business, we must turn to another subject. Referring to the celebrated despatch in reference to the marriage of the Queen of Spain, in which Lord Palmerston named the Coburg Prince as one of the candidates for her hand, Mr. Greville tells us—

After admitting it was very injudicious, Lord John said: "I remember the despatch was brought to me on a Sunday morning just as I was going to church. I read it over in a hurry; it did not strike me at the moment that there was anything objectionable in it, and sent it back. If I had not gone to church, and had paid more attention to it, it would not have gone," and upon this despatch [such is Mr. Greville's comment], thus carelessly read and permitted to go, hinged the quarrel with France and Spain, the Montpensier marriage, and not impossibly, though indirectly, the French Revolution itself.‡

Readers of the first part of Greville's "Memoirs" will remember the high opinion he there expressed of Sir Robert Peel. We find a like vacillating or varying of Mr. Greville's opinion of Sir Robert as he shows in the case of Lord Russell. At the time of the formation of Peel's Administration in 1841, Mr. Greville became, to use his own words, "strangely enough established as the medium of communication between the present and the past Prime Ministers, and have got the office of smoothing away the asperities of royal and official intercourse. If I can do any good and prevent some evil, above all destroy the effects of falsehood and malignity, and assist in making truth prevail, I shall be satisfied." The intercourse he had at this time with Peel led him to form his estimate of his character.

I thought to myself, "You are a very clever man; you are not a bad man; but you are not great." He may become as great a Minister as

\* The Coercion Bill for Ireland of 1848.

† Vol. iii. p. 161.

‡ Vol. iii. pp. 298, 299.

abilities can make any man, but, to achieve real greatness, elevation of mind must be intermingled with intellectual capacity, and this I doubt his having. There is something which will confine his genius to the earth instead of letting it soar on high. I dare say he can be just, liberal, generous, and wise, but he has been so long habituated to expedients, to partial dissimulation, to indirect courses, and has such a limited knowledge of the world and human nature, and so little disposition or desire for reciprocal confidence with other men, that I doubt his mind ever expanding into a true liberality and generosity of feeling. However, he has never been before in possession of real and great power; his course has been impeded and embarrassed by all sorts of obstructions and difficulties. It remains to be seen how he will act in his new capacity, and whether he will assert his independence to its full extent; and, above all, whether he will elevate his moral being to "the height of his great argument." \*

Elsewhere Mr. Greville says of Peel: "It is difficult to feel entire confidence in a man who is not really high-minded." † Mr. Greville more than once repeats his observation that Peel was deficient in knowledge of men, and the same opinion of him was held by Lord Beaconsfield.‡ "The Queen," Mr. Greville tells us, "complained that Peel was so shy that it made her shy, which rendered their intercourse difficult and embarrassing."§ Peel, even in his own family, is described by Bishop Wilberforce as being "*reserved and shy*, the air of a man conscious of great powers and slight awkwardness."|| On Peel's death, Mr. Greville wrote an elaborate review of his career,¶ from which we have space for only a few extracts:—

"I am not capable of describing Peel with any certainty of doing justice to his character and delineating it correctly, but, as there are several notices of him not very favourable in preceding pages, at such a moment it becomes a duty to qualify what may have been misrepresented or exaggerated on the information of others, by expressing my own doubts as to the perfect accuracy of the statements that were formerly made to me. The Duke of Wellington pronounced in the House of Lords a few nights ago a panegyric on his love of truth,\*\*

\* Vol. ii. pp. 42, 43.

† Vol. iii. p. 94.

‡ "Life of Lord George Bentinck."

§ Vol. ii. p. 43.

|| "Life of Bishop Wilberforce," vol. i. p. 514.

¶ Vol. iii. pp. 348-60.

\*\* "In the whole course of my communication with him I never knew an instance in which he did not show the strongest attachment to truth—and I never saw in the whole course of my life the smallest reason for suspecting that he stated anything which he did not firmly believe to be the fact. My lords, I could not let this conversation come to a close without stating that which I believe to have been the strongest characteristic feature of his character."—The Duke of Wellington in the House of Lords, July 4, 1850.

and declared that during his long connection with him he had never known him to deviate from the strictest veracity. This praise would be undeserved if he had ever been guilty of any underhand, clandestine, and insincere conduct in political matters, and it leads me to suspect that resentment and disappointment may have caused an unfair and unwarrantable interpretation to be put upon his motives and behaviour on some important occasions. . . .

Notwithstanding his great sagacity, it may, however, be doubted whether his judgment was not often faulty, and whether, in the perplexity of conflicting objects and incompatible purposes, he was not led to erroneous conclusions as to the obligations imposed upon him and the course it was his duty to pursue. It is very difficult to account satisfactorily for his conduct on the Catholic question. I think that his course in respect to Reform exhibits a deficiency in sagacity and foresight, and must be accounted one of the blemishes of his political career. He fought the Reform battle with extraordinary energy, and the skill and perseverance with which he afterwards rallied the broken forces and restored the fallen spirits of his party were admirable. In 1835, the rash and abortive attempt of William IV. to get rid of the Whigs made Peel the Minister of a hundred days. This was the most brilliant period of his life, and it was during that magnificent campaign that he established the vast reputation which, while clouds of suspicion and distrust, of enmity and dislike, were all the while gathering round him, made him for nearly twenty years by far the most conspicuous, important and powerful of English statesmen.

With regard to Peel's conduct on the Corn Law question, Mr. Greville writes:—

It is almost impossible to discover what the process was by which he was gradually led to embrace the whole doctrine of Free Trade. We cannot distinguish what effect was made upon his mind by the reasoning and what by the organization and agitation of the Anti-Corn Law League . . . no man but himself could explain and vindicate the whole course of his conduct. . . . The misfortune of Peel all along was that there was no real community of sentiment between him and his party, except in respect to certain great principles which had ceased to be in jeopardy, and which, therefore, required no united efforts to defend

Mr. Greville ends his sketch by summing up Peel's character.

He was a good and, in some respects, a great man; he had a true English spirit, and was an ardent lover of his country, and he served the public with fidelity, with zeal, and great ability. But when future historians shall describe his career and sum up his character, they will pass a more sober and qualified judgment than that of his admiring and sorrowing contemporaries. It is impossible to forget that there never was a statesman who so often embraced erroneous opinions himself, and contributed so much to mislead the opinions of

others. The energy and skill with which he endeavoured to make the worse appear the better cause were productive of enormous mischiefs, and if on several occasions his patriotism and his ability were equally conspicuous, and he rendered important public service, his efforts were in great measure directed to repair the evils and dangers which he had been himself principally instrumental in creating.\*

When Lord Beaconsfield was writing his "Life of Lord George Bentinck," he told Mr. Greville that his book "was to contain a character of Peel which had never been described. I asked him if he would like to see what I had written about him. 'Very much,' he said, so I gave it to him."† When the Life came out, the author sent a copy to Mr. Greville, who has recorded his opinion of the well-known chapter on Peel. "The character of Peel in this book is curious, but I do not think it is unfair, and it is in a becoming spirit of seriousness, and even respectfully acknowledging his great qualities, but freely criticizing his character and career."‡ Lord George Bentinck was Mr. Greville's first cousin, and in early life they had been fast friends; afterwards they were—to use Mr. Greville's own words—"long and completely estranged, and between him and myself there existed strong feelings of alienation and dislike." He reviews his relative's career and character§ at great length, and his observations are evidently animated by the strong feelings the existence of which he admits; but the subject has lost its interest, and we pass on.

On the death of Lord Melbourne, Mr. Greville wrote a full and very interesting sketch of him,|| which, but for its length, we would gladly here transcribe, but a few extracts must suffice.

Melbourne lived surrounded by books, and nothing prevented him, even when Prime Minister, and with all the calls on his time to which he was compelled to attend, from reading every new publication of interest or merit, as well as frequently revelling amongst the favourite authors of his early studies. His memory was extremely retentive, and amply stored with chosen passages of every imaginable variety, so that he could converse learnedly upon almost all subjects, and was never at any loss for copious illustrations, amusing anecdotes, and happy quotations. This richness of talk was rendered more piquant by the quaintness and oddity of his manner, and an ease and naturalness proceeding, in no small degree, from habits of self-indulgence and freedom—a licence which was conceded to him by common consent, even by the Queen herself, who, partly from regard to him, and partly from being amused at his ways, permitted him to say and do whatever he pleased in her presence. He was often paradoxical, and often

---

\* P. 360.

† Vol. iii. p. 417.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 423.

§ Vol. iii. pp. 222-34.

|| *Ibid.* pp. 240-51.

coarse, terse, epigrammatic, acute, droll, with fits of silence and abstraction, from which he would break out with a vehemence and vigour which amused those who were accustomed to him, and filled with indescribable astonishment those who were not. (P. 242.)

Though Melbourne rose to be Prime Minister, he never was, in Mr. Greville's opinion, really fitted for political life, still less to be head of a party and the head of a Government. From education and turn of mind and habit, and from the society in which he was bred and lived, he was a Whig, but he was a very moderate one, abhorring all extremes. A thorough Conservative at heart, he hated the Reform Bill which he was obliged to advocate. At a period of great importance to the public weal, he took a part which entitles his memory to the grateful admiration of his countrymen.

It was [continues Mr. Greville] upon the accession of the Queen that his post suddenly grew into one of immense importance and interest, for he found himself placed in the most curious and delicate position which any statesman ever occupied. Victoria was transferred at once from the nursery to the throne—ignorant, inexperienced, and without one human being about her on whom she could rely for counsel and aid. She found in her Prime Minister and constitutional adviser a man of mature age, who instantly captivated her feelings and her fancy by his deferential solicitude, and by a shrewd, sagacious, and entertaining conversation, which were equally new and delightful to her. She at once cast herself with implicit confidence upon Melbourne; and from the first day of her reign their relations assumed a peculiar character, and were marked by an intimacy which he never abused—on the contrary, he only availed himself of his great influence to impress upon her mind sound maxims of constitutional government, and truths of every description that it behoved her to learn. It is impossible to imagine anything more interesting than the situation which had thus devolved upon him, or one more calculated to excite all the latent sensibility of his nature. His loyal devotion soon warmed into a parental affection, which she repaid by unbounded manifestations of confidence and regard. He set himself wisely, and with perfect disinterestedness, to form her mind and character, and to cure the defects and eradicate the prejudices from which the mistakes and defaults of her education had not left her entirely free. In all that Melbourne said or did, he appears to have been guided by a regard to justice and truth. He never scrupled to tell her what none other would have dared to say; and in the midst of that atmosphere of deceit and flattery which kings and queens are almost always destined to breathe, and by which their minds are so often perverted, he never scrupled to declare boldly and frankly his real opinions—strange as they sometimes sounded, and unpalatable as they often were—and to wage war with her prejudices and false impressions with regard to people or things whenever he saw

that she was led astray by them. He acted in all things an affectionate, conscientious, and patriotic part, endeavouring to make her happy as a woman and popular as a Queen.\*

Mr. Greville adds that

Melbourne's influence and authority at Court were not diminished, nor his position there altered, by the Queen's Message. But the Prince, though always living on very friendly terms with him, was secretly rejoiced when the political power of this great favourite was brought to a close, for so long as Melbourne was there, he undoubtedly played but an obscure and secondary part †

Melbourne being removed out of the Prince's path, he rapidly rose from his obscure and secondary position. Mr. Greville elsewhere relates, on the authority of Lords Russell and Lansdowne, that four years later, in the Ministerial crisis of December, 1815,

the first thing which struck them was the manner of their reception; all is changed since they went out of office. Formerly, the Queen received her Ministers alone; with her alone they communicated, though of course Prince Albert knew everything; but now the Queen and Prince were together, received Lord Lansdowne and John Russell together, and both of them always said *We*. We think or wish to do so and so; what had *we* better do, &c. The Prince is become so identified with the Queen that they are one person, and, as he likes business, it is obvious that, while she has the title, he is really discharging the functions of Sovereign. He is King to all intents and purposes. I am not surprised at this, but certainly was not aware that it had taken such a definite shape.‡

As was the case with most men of Mr. Greville's age and time, the old Duke of Wellington was the god of his political idolatry. His brother Algernon was the Duke's private secretary. Mr. Greville therefore had peculiarly good means of knowing about the Duke, with whom he also had a personal acquaintance. These volumes contain many interesting details of what Mr. Greville calls "the descending course of this great luminary." Of these we can afford space for only two.

Lord Wharncliffe told me [writes Mr. Greville in 1844] that it was pleasant to see the extraordinary deference and attention which are shown to the Duke by his colleagues at the Cabinet. He always sits in the same place, and each person who has anything to say to him or any subject to bring forward invariably goes and sits next to him, to

\* Pp. 244, 245.

† Pp. 245, 246.

‡ Vol. ii. p. 323. Conf. Lord Malmesbury's "Memoirs of an Ex-Minister," vol. i. p. 422.

enable him to hear better \* the material part of what is going forward, and the greatest respect is evinced to his opinion on all subjects. Algernon told me that this was also apparent in the correspondence of his colleagues, who addressed him in the most deferential manner, and often expressed their readiness to give up propositions which did not meet with his concurrence. But he said that he grew more and more irritable, and often expressed himself, even to his colleagues, with an asperity which was matter of great regret to him [Algernon Greville], and that frequently he felt the strongest desire to alter and soften the tone of his letters, but that this was quite impossible; nobody ever dared say anything to him, *he* could not, and it would be useless if he did, as it was not an accidental ebullition, but proceeded from the increased and increasing irritability of his mind. He instanced two cases lately, one of a letter to Sir Robert Peel, and another to Lord Haddington, not on very material subjects, but in which a tone of ruffled temper and something like pique was apparent, very unlike his old disposition. The only person who sees his letters is Arbuthnot,† who never ventures to object or to criticize them, and, if he did, Algy much doubts whether the Duke would take the trouble to alter what he had once written. However, he is a wonder, be his infirmities what they may.‡

This does not exhibit the old hero in an amiable light, and his asperity seems to have alienated his colleagues from him, for a year later Mr. Greville writes: "Arbuthnot told me that the Duke never knows anything of what is going on. They never tell him, and he is so deaf that in the Cabinet he does not hear. When they want him to know or to do something, Peel sends for Arbuthnot and tells it to him, well knowing he will report it to the Duke. Then he sends for papers, reads what is necessary for his information, and, without concert or communication with anybody, goes down to the House of Lords and speaks; hence the strange things he says, and the confusion that is often made between the apparent opinions of the Duke and his colleagues."§ When the Duke died, Mr. Greville wrote one of his reviews of the Duke's character, from which we make these extracts.

There were minute traits of character and peculiarities about the Duke which it was impossible for mere public writers and men personally unacquainted with him to seize, but the knowledge and appreciation of which are necessary in order to form a just and complete conception of the man. In spite of some foibles and faults, he was, beyond all doubt, a very great man—the only great man of the present time—and comparable, in point of greatness, to the most eminent of those who have lived before him. His greatness was

\* The Duke was by this time extremely deaf.

† Another of the Duke's secretaries.

‡ Vol. ii. pp. 223, 224.

§ *Ibid.* p. 386.



the result of a few striking qualities, a perfect simplicity of character without a particle of vanity or conceit, but with a thorough and strenuous self-reliance, a severe truthfulness, never misled by fancy or exaggeration, and an ever-abiding sense of duty and obligation which made him the humblest of citizens and most obedient of subjects. The Crown never possessed a more faithful, devoted, and disinterested subject. Without personal attachment to any of the monarchs whom he served, and fully understanding and appreciating their individual merits and demerits, he alike revered their great office in the persons of each of them, and would at any time have sacrificed his ease, his fortune, or his life to serve the Sovereign and the State. Passing almost his whole life in command and authority, and regarded with universal deference and submission, his head was never turned by the exalted position he occupied, and there was no duty, however humble, he would not have been ready to undertake at the bidding of his lawful superiors, whose behests he would never have hesitated to obey. Notwithstanding his age and his diminished strength, he would most assuredly have gone anywhere, and have accepted any post in which his personal assistance might have been essential to the safety or advantage of the realm.

A man of a very different cast of mind to Mr. Greville formed a like opinion of the Duke.

In his public capacity [writes Mr. Cobden] the Duke never seemed to ask himself, what *ought* I to do? but, what *must* I do? This principle of subordination, which is the very essence of military discipline, is at the same time the weak part and blot of the system. It deprives us of the man and gives us a machine, and not a self-acting machine, but one requiring power of some description to move it. The best that can be said of it is, that when honestly adhered to, as in the case of the Duke, it protects us against the attempts of individual selfishness and ambition. He would never have betrayed his trust so long as he could find a power to whom he was responsible. *That* was the only point upon which he could have ever felt any difficulty. Had he been, like Monk, in the command of the army in times of political confusion, he would have gone to London to discover the political heir to his "duty," whether it was the son of the Protector or the remains of the Rump Parliament; but he never would have dreamed of selling himself to a pretender, even had he been the son of a king.\*

Mr. Greville continues:—

The Duke was a good-natured, but not an amiable man; he had no tenderness in his disposition, and never evinced much affection for any of his relations. His nature was hard, and he does not appear to have had any real affection for anybody, man or woman, during the latter years of his life, since the death of Mrs. Arbuthnot, to whom he probably was attached, and in whom he certainly confided.

---

\* Cobden, "Political Writings," p. 161.

Domestic enjoyment he never possessed, and, as his wife was intolerable to him, though he always kept on decent terms with her, at least ostensibly, he sought the pleasure of women's society in a variety of capricious *liaisons*, from which his age took off all scandal; these he took up or laid aside and changed as fancy and inclination prompted him. His intimate friends and adherents used to smile at these senile *engouements*, but sometimes had to regret the ridicule to which they would have exposed him if a general reverence and regard had not made him a privileged person, and permitted him to do what no other man could have done with impunity. In his younger days he was extremely addicted to gallantry, and had great success with women, of whom one in Spain gained great influence over him, and his passion for whom very nearly involved him in serious difficulties. His other ladies did little more than amuse his idle hours and subserve his social habits, and with most of them his *liaisons* were certainly very innocent. He had been very fond of Grassini, and the successful lover of some women of fashion, whose weaknesses have never been known, though perhaps suspected. These habits of female intimacy and gossip led him to take a great interest in a thousand petty affairs, in which he delighted to be mixed up and consulted. He was always ready to enter into any personal matters, intrigues, or quarrels, political or social difficulties, and to give his advice, which generally (though not invariably) was very sound and good; but latterly he became morose and inaccessible, and cursed and swore at the people who sought to approach him, even on the most serious and necessary occasions.

The late Earl of Derby did not stand high in Mr. Greville's estimation, as is shown by this entry in his journal:—

April 10.—At Newmarket on Sunday, and returned yesterday. It was worth while to be there to see Stanley. A few weeks ago he was on the point of being Prime Minister, which only depended on himself. Then he stood up in the House of Lords and delivered an oration full of gravity and dignity, such as became the man who had just undertaken to form an Administration. A few days ago he was feasted in Merchant Tailors' Hall, amidst a vast assembly of lords and commoners, who all acknowledged him as their chief. He was complimented amidst thunders of applause upon his great and statesmanlike qualities, and he again delivered an oration, serious as befitted the lofty capacity in which he there appeared. If any of his vociferous disciples and admirers, if some grave member of either House of Parliament, or any distinguished foreigner who knew nothing of Lord Stanley but what he saw, heard, or read of him, could have suddenly found themselves in the betting-room at Newmarket on Tuesday evening and seen Stanley there, I think they would have been in a pretty state of astonishment. There he was in the midst of a crowd of blacklegs, betting men, and loose characters of every description, in uproarious spirits, chaffing, rowing, and shouting with laughter and joking. His amusement was to lay Lord Glasgow a wager that he did not sneeze in a given time, for which purpose he took

pinch after pinch of snuff, while Stanley jeered him and quizzed him with such noise that he drew the whole mob around him to partake of the coarse merriment he excited. It really was a sight and a wonder to see any man playing such different parts, and I don't suppose there is any other man who would act so naturally, and obey all his impulses in such a way, utterly regardless of appearances, and not caring what anybody might think of the Minister and the statesman so long as he could have his fun.

The following account of Macaulay at Bowood is amusing :—

Macaulay has been always talking. Never, certainly, was anything heard like him. It is inexhaustible, always amusing and instructive, about everybody and everything. I had at one time a notion of trying to remember and record some of the conversation that had been going on, and some of the anecdotes that have been told, but I find it is in vain to attempt it. The drollest thing is to see the effect upon Rogers,\* who is nearly extinguished, and can neither make himself heard nor find an interval to get in a word. He is exceedingly provoked, though he can't help admiring, and he will revive to-morrow when Macaulay goes. It certainly must be rather oppressive after a certain time, and would be intolerable if it was not altogether free from conceit, vanity and arrogance, unassuming, and the real genuie gushing out of overflowing stores of knowledge treasured up in his mind. We walked together for a long time the day before yesterday, when he talked of the History he is writing. I asked him if he was still collecting materials, or had begun to write. He said he was writing while collecting, going on upon the fund of his already acquired knowledge, and he added that it was very mortifying to find how much there was of which he was wholly ignorant. I said if he felt that with his superhuman memory and wonderful scope of knowledge, what must ordinary men feel? He said it was a mistake to impute to him either such a memory or so much knowledge, that Whewell and Brougham had more universal knowledge than he had, but that what he did possess was the ready, perhaps too ready, use of all he knew. I said what surprised me most was, his having had time to read certain books over and over again, *e.g.*, he said he had read Don Quixote, in Spanish, five or six times; and I am afraid to say how often he told me he had read "Clarissa." He said that he read no modern books, none of the novels or travels that come out day after day. He had read "Tom Jones" repeatedly, but "Cecil a Peer" not at all, and as to "Clarissa," he read it so often that, if the work were lost, he could give a very tolerable idea of it, could narrate the story completely, and many of the most remarkable passages and expressions. However, it would be vain, nor is it worth while, to attempt to recollect and record all his various talk. It is not true, as some say, that there is nothing original in it, but, certainly, by far the greater part is the mere outpouring of memory. Subjects are tapped, and

---

\* Samuel Rogers, the poet.

the current flows without stopping. Wonderful as it is, it is certainly oppressive after a time, and his departure is rather a relief than otherwise. Dundas, who is very agreeable, and very well informed, said to-day that he was a bore; but that he is not, because what comes from him is always good, and it comes naturally, and without any assumption of superiority. Perhaps the most extraordinary thing is the quantity of trifling matter which he recollects. He gave us verses of James Parke's,\* and others of Lawrence Peel's,† ludicrous lines, written on different occasions. His memory treasures up all sorts of trash and nonsense, as well as the most serious and most important matter; but there is never any confusion.

December 26th.—Macaulay went away the day before Christmas Day, and it was wonderful how quiet the house seemed after he was gone, and it was not less agreeable. Rogers was all alive again, Austin and Dundas talked much more than they would have done, and Lord Lansdowne too, and on the whole we were as well without him.

With the following very curious anecdote of the late Bishop Wilberforce we close our extracts from these "Memoirs":—

August, 1816.—Wilberforce, Bishop of Oxford, made a very brilliant speech a few nights ago on the Sugar Bill. As his father's son, he thought it necessary to make an Anti-Slavery oration; it was very able and eloquent, and in tone and manner so well regulated as to show that he has profited by the criticisms which were made on his former speeches. He is certainly a remarkable man, full of cleverness and vivacity, very unlike a Churchman in society and in Parliament, and yet he must be deficient in that worldly tact which it might be thought he would most surely have acquired. I judge of this from what has passed between him and myself, which is certainly extraordinary. I met him for the first time the year before last at the Grange, where I spent a couple of days with him, and afterwards I dined once or twice in his company, but never had much conversation with him. One morning I met him at breakfast at Macaulay's (this year), and shortly afterwards he asked me to breakfast with him, which I did. This is all the intercourse I ever had with him, never amounting to anything like intimacy. Just as I was recovering from my illness, Lord Lansdowne sent me a letter from the Bishop about the Eton College case,‡ which was pending before the Privy Council, entreating an early decision of it. I put the matter in train, and, a few days after, I went to Brighton. Just before I went, the Bishop called at my house, but I was out, and after I got to Brighton I heard

---

\* Baron Parke, afterwards Lord Wensleydale.

† Sir Lawrence Peel, formerly Chief Justice of Bengal.

‡ Eton College was a peculiar of the Diocese of Ely. A scheme had been prepared by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners to transfer it to the Diocese of Oxford, which Bishop Wilberforce was very anxious to promote. Ely objected, and the case was argued before the Privy Council. (Editor's note.)

that he had called again, and expressed some disappointment at not having seen me. Meanwhile, I learnt that a day was fixed for the hearing of his case. Never imagining that he had called on me for any other purpose than to urge this matter, by no means giving him credit for any especial interest in my health, but wishing to be very civil to him, I wrote him a letter from Brighton, saying that I concluded he had called on me about the Eton College case, and that I therefore wished to inform him that a day was fixed for argument. I received a letter from him by return of post, in which he told me that that was not his object in calling on me; that he had heard that I had been dangerously ill, and that he had called to tender his spiritual advice and aid, and (in a rather commonplace style of writing) he urged me to listen to his religious exhortations. In the whole course of my life I never was so astonished, for he was about the last clergyman from whom I should have expected such an overture, and my acquaintance with him was so slight that I could not conceive why he had selected me as the subject of a spiritual experiment. I was not a little puzzled how to reply to him. I determined, however, to take his letter in excellent part, to give him credit for the best motive, to express much gratitude, but to decline entering with him into any religious discussion, and to give him to understand, though with great civility, that his proposal was extraordinary and uncalled for. I think I succeeded tolerably well; but he never took any notice of my answer, so I do not know what he felt upon it, and I have not seen him since.\*

In parting with Mr. Greville, we must say that he himself exemplifies his own remarks on the value of keeping a journal.

The habit of recording is likely to generate a desire to have something of some interest to record, it will lead to habits of reflection and to trains of thought which may be pleasing and profitable, it will exercise the memory and sharpen the understanding generally, and though the thoughts may not be very profound, nor the remarks very lively or ingenious, still the exercise is, I think, calculated to make the writer wiser, and perhaps better.†

---

\* Vol. ii. pp. 410, 11, 12.

† Vol. i. pp. 36, 37.

## ART. VII.—MR. GLADSTONE AND GENESIS.

TO continental thinkers, for whom the term "Liberal" has a wider and less exclusively political meaning than it has in England, it must be a source of considerable surprise to learn that Mr. Gladstone, whose name has been known to them as the leader of the Liberal party in England, is in matters theological a staunch Conservative.

With us the Liberal, or progressive, party is associated almost entirely with the securing of certain measures in Parliament, contributing either directly or indirectly to the material welfare of the community. Sydney Smith tersely expressed this national view when he said "All good legislation ends in legs of mutton." We are often rated by our self-appointed schoolmasters, such as Matthew Arnold, for our materialism. And rightly so. We are in the main materialists: our progress aims at little higher or different. As a rule, when we speak of progress and congratulate ourselves on the progress of England during this century, we mean material progress, and the party that professes most loudly or most successfully to secure this end we term the "Liberal" or "Progressive" party. In Germany and France this is not so. There, the Liberals are those who claim to have freed themselves, not only from those antique political theories which vest the government of a country in and for a class, but from superstitions of every kind—social, religious, philosophic. With them progress has a more spiritual or philosophic meaning,—it is that enlightenment which brings improved material resources along with it, rather as an inseparable accident than as a part of its essence.

If this idea of liberalism is far removed from the views of most Englishmen, it is farthest of all from those of Mr. Gladstone. Not that we would associate Mr. Gladstone with the conscious indulgence of any gross form of materialism,—far from it. We only mean that liberalism in England signifies a form of politics, and that the end or aim of this politics is for the most part material. As a politician Mr. Gladstone is liberal, as a political thinker he seems undecided, as a religious thinker he is conservative, almost reactionary. It is in the last of these capacities that we approach him here. At a time when several divines of high rank in his Church have given evidence of growing freedom of thought in the interpretation of Scripture, Mr. Gladstone has felt himself called upon to champion the claims of Genesis. In an article published in the *Nineteenth Century* he upholds the "inspiration" of the account of creation contained in that

Book. The interest which this article evokes arises not so much from its subject-matter as from its authorship, and it is therefore chiefly as students of Mr. Gladstone that we approach it.

Amateur theology is even less successful than any other form of amateur work by reason of the indefinite vastness of its province. If Mr. Gladstone had not been a statesman it is often thought he would have been a bishop or perhaps a cardinal, but these undeveloped qualifications for clerical distinction have not enabled him to deal successfully with the Book of Genesis. The professional theologian is often rash: the unprofessional theologian is always rash. An examination of Mr. Gladstone's article will make this manifest.

There is, of course, little new in his arguments. All that could be said has been said over and over again in different words. Nothing was open save to restate and enlarge, and so Mr. Gladstone has sometimes restated, sometimes enlarged. We will take the points as nearly as possible in the order in which he places them. This order is, no doubt, in part suggested by the treatment of the subject by Dr. Réville in the work to which Mr. Gladstone's article is professedly a reply, but it is as convenient and natural an order as could be found.

The first difficulty in the account of creation is that the sun, moon, and stars appear to have been called into existence after the creation of the earth, and of light. The earth is created "in the beginning," light is called into being on the first day, the sun, moon, and stars are "made" on the fourth day. How can this be? Mr. Gladstone bases his solution of the difficulty upon an alleged distinction in the meanings of the words "created" and "made." About the actual difference in meaning of the two terms he says but little. "I will not attempt a definition of the distinction, further than this, that the one phrase points more to calling into a *separate or individual* existence, the other more to shaping and fashioning the conditions of that existence: the one to *quid*, the other to *quale*" (p. 690). This seems to us a rather slipshod definition, for the words we have italicised (*separate or individual*) will belong more rightly to the act of "forming" than of "creating." "To create," surely if it can be said to mean anything, means "to call into existence," nothing more, any qualifying adjective such as "separate" or "individual," touches the "*quale*." Creation means the making of "material," "formation" the using of it. Such would be the distinction which a modern Englishman would make between the use of the words in exact writing. Does the writer of this account of creation use them consistently with this distinction? Mr. Gladstone says "yes," and argues thus about the sun, moon, and stars: "Our earth, created in v. 1, undergoes structural change,

different arrangement of material, in v. 9. After this, and in the fourth day, comes, not the original creation, but the location in the firmament, of the sun and the moon. Of their 'creation' nothing particular has been said; for no use, palpable to man, was associated with it before their perfect equipment. Does it not seem allowable to suppose that in 'the heavens' (v. 1), of which after the first outset we hear no more, were included the heavenly bodies? In any case, what is afterwards conveyed is not the calling into existence of the sun and moon, but the assignment to them of a certain place and orbit respectively, with a light-giving power" (p. 991).

Before we discuss the "science" of this position let us revert to the terms "create" and "make." According to Mr. Gladstone, the writer "uses the word 'created' on the three grand occasions (1) of the beginning of the mighty work (v. 1); (2) of the beginning of animal life (v. 21): 'And God created great whales,' and every living creature that peoples the waters; (3) of the yet more important beginning of rational and spiritual life; 'so God created man in his own image' (v. 27)" (p. 690). Now, if the term "create" were only used with reference to these three acts, and *no other term* were used of the same acts, there might be some plausibility in the assertion that a distinct meaning was intended by the writer. The invidious distinction made between "whales" which are "created" and "beasts" and "cattle" which are only "made," might seem odd, but still there would be apparent signs of method. But while it is true that the word "create" is only used of these three acts, it is unfortunately not true that no other word is used of the same acts. No less than three different terms, "create," "make," "form," are all used of the beginning of man, though Mr. Gladstone would have it appear that only the first is used. In Gen. i., 27, we indeed read: "So God created man," &c., but in the preceding verse we read: "And God said, let us make man," &c., surely in reference to the same act. This of itself is conclusive evidence that the writer did not intend to attribute a distinct meaning to the two words. In chap. ii. v. 7, we read: "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground." Again, we find the terms "made" and "formed" are used of the same act. In chap. i. v. 25, "beasts" and "cattle" are described as "made"; in chap. ii. v. 19, we read that they are "formed." Thus we see that the writer does not make the distinction alleged, but uses the three words "created," "made," "formed," if not quite indiscriminately, yet without that distinction which Mr. Gladstone would wish to find. Again, surely no one would seriously assert that the act of "creating" "whales" was intended to be different



from that of "making" "beasts." Read together the following sentences and the mixed use will be quite patent: "And God reated great whales," "And God made the beasts of the field," "And God said, let us make man," "And God created man." We cannot indeed expect, and few besides Mr. Gladstone would expect, to find in such an early writer that keen analytic power which seeks refined distinctions in such abstract terms as describe creation. It does not therefore appear that the writer in Genesis intended to say that the sun, moon, and stars were called into existence in the beginning and "lighted up" afterwards on the fourth day. The idea is Mr. Gladstone's, and is not supported by Scripture. Is it supported by science or by common sense? Did it never occur to Mr. Gladstone to ask how it was that the evening and the morning were the first day, the second day, the third day, when the sun was only lighted on the fourth day. True, it was, according to him, already created, but only on the fourth day we get "the final and full concentration of light upon the sun, and its reflection on the moon and planets." On the first three days light and darkness came anyhow, they were without rule, for only on the fourth day were the sun and moon made "to rule over the day and the night and to divide the light from the darkness." It must have occurred to many readers of the *Nineteenth Century* to ask, What does Mr. Gladstone think light is? . Indeed, it would be very difficult to answer this question, when he says: "There would plainly be light diffused before there was light concentrated" (p. 691), and when he proceeds to speak, on p. 695, of "the detachment and collection of light, leaving in darkness, as it proceeded, the still chaotic mass from which it was detached," and to contrast it with "the detachment of wet from dry," it would seem as if he looked upon light as a sort of fluid, either concentrated in the mass or on the surface of self-luminous bodies; that such bodies not only emit light, but possess a stock of it to draw upon, a view which we need hardly say is not in strict harmony with modern teaching. What was the sun like during the first three days without light and heat? where was it when it was without a "certain place and orbit," before it was put into the heavens for the purpose of lighting our insignificant earth? are questions to which Mr. Gladstone would doubtless think it irreverent to attempt a reply. But he surely owes us some suggestion about the stars beyond the meagre remark: "The same observations apply to the light of the planets; while as to the other stars, such as were then perceptible to the human eye, we know nothing." The phrase, "He made the stars also," clearly applies to all stars, not only the planets of our system, but the suns and planets of other

systems. Were they all made in the beginning and lighted up on the fourth day for the purpose of being ornaments in the sky for the admiration of man? Were all these vast worlds, of which we know so little save their vastness, created and lighted (how? not by our sun) to inspire poets and assist navigators in our world? No one could believe this; it is surely beyond the credulity of Mr. Gladstone himself. If Mr. Gladstone is himself satisfied with his explanation of the beginnings of light, few of his readers can share this satisfaction. When asked to account for the beginning of vegetation occurring before the sun was made, he replies: "And why, let me ask Dr. Réville, as there would plainly be light diffused before there was light concentrated, why may not this light diffused have been sufficient for the purposes of vegetation? There was soil, there was atmosphere, there was moisture, there was light. What more could be required? Need we go beyond our constant experience to be aware that the process of vegetation, though it may be *suspended*, is not *arrested*, when, through the presence of cloud and vapour, the sun's globe becomes to us invisible."

In the first place, we would remark, that it must require the acute analytic power of Mr. Gladstone, or his "sacred writer," to detect the difference between the words "suspended" and "arrested," as used above. Surely Mr. Gladstone means retarded, for that alone describes the fact. Secondly, we would ask if there is any analogy between the fact of the process of vegetation being rendered more slow by the obscuration of the sun, and the fact of vegetation going on when there is no sun at all? When the sun is clouded over vegetation still proceeds, acted upon by rays which issue from the sun, but if there were no sun, whence would the rays issue? Until we have a more intelligible explanation of the nature of this "light diffused," which acts upon the earth from no centre, we cannot accept the notion that vegetation can be prior to the sun. On the whole, we would seriously prefer the other suggested explanation, that the sun was not only created but lighted in the beginning, but that during the first three days the clouds concealed it completely from the earth, so that only a little "got through," just enough for vegetation; and that on the fourth day these clouds were removed and the sun then first came to have a visible existence for our earth. The theory, is perhaps childish, but it is better than Mr. Gladstone's. But perhaps the clearest and best refutation of all such elaborate explanations is in the violence they do to the simplicity and solemnity of the verse describing the creation of light. Mr. Gladstone would make this read: "And God said, let there be a little light, just enough for vegetation." But what says the grand original? "And God

said, Let there be light, and there was light, and God saw the light that it was good." It is perfectly clear that the writer did not regard the sun as the sole source of light to our earth; that he considered light to have an existence independent of the sun, though the latter gave additional splendour to the light and served to mark the day from the night. It is possible that the phenomenon of the existence of light upon our earth when the sun is not visible, owing to obscuration by clouds, and the appearance of light at dawn before the sun is itself seen, may have lent a speciousness to such a notion. But whether this be so, or whether the writer is so bewildered in the ecstatic trance of inspiration as to misstate the order of events, we are not competent to decide. All we know is that there is a misstatement.

Before we leave inanimate nature and turn to animate nature, we may observe that Mr. Gladstone's explanation of the word "firmament," while briefer than his explanation of "light," is scarcely more satisfactory. "If our scholars are right in their judgment, just made known to the world by the recent revision of the Old Testament, the 'firmament' is, in the Hebrew original, *not* a solid vault, but an expanse" (p. 689). Now, if we may venture a surmise, it is this—that our revisers have selected the interpretation "expanse" because it alone will give any meaning to v. 6 in this first chapter of Genesis, and for no other reason. If we look at v. 17 we read that after God had made sun, moon, and stars, he "set them in the firmament of the heaven." Now, whatever be the meaning of "firmament" here, it cannot have the same meaning as in v. 6, for there it is only that portion of space which divides the waters above (clouds) from the waters below. A writer in "Essays and Reviews" remarks: "That the Hebrews understood the sky, firmament or heaven, to be a permanent, solid vault, as it appears to the ordinary observer, is evident enough from various expressions made use of concerning it. It is said to have pillars (Job xxvi. 11), foundations (2 Sam. xxii. 8), doors (Psalm lxxviii. 23), windows (Gen. vii. 11). It may be urged that these expressions are only poetry. To this we may reply that what would be poetry to us was plain fact to the earliest men, that the word which we translate "firmament" means "beaten out metal," and that etymology cannot be slighted when discussing very early conceptions; and lastly, that such a view of the sky is in strict accordance with the Greek idea of it as interpreted by Hesiod and Homer. These writers clearly represent the sky as a concave hemisphere, resting on the verge of earth, upon which the sun performed his course. Even Empedocles continued to regard it as solid (στερέμμιον). This evidence cannot be passed over slightly to suit the desires of orthodox commentators.

After dealing with inanimate nature, Mr. Gladstone endeavours to show that the accuracy of the account given in Genesis of the beginning of fishes, birds, beasts and man, is proof of inspiration. He traces "a grand fourfold division set forth in an orderly succession of time, as follows; on the fifth day—

"1. The water-population.

"2. The air-population.

"And, on the sixth day—

"3. The land-population of animals.

"4. The land-population consummated in man.

"Now, this same fourfold order is understood to have been so affirmed in our time by natural science that it may be taken as demonstrated conclusion and established fact. Then, I ask, how came Moses, or, not to cavil on the word, how came the author of the first chapter of Genesis to know that order, to possess knowledge which natural science has only within the present century, for the first time, dug out of the bowels of the earth? It is surely impossible to avoid the conclusion; first, that either this writer was gifted with faculties passing all human experience, or else his knowledge was divine" (p. 496).

Now, it is necessary, in our opinion, in order to make good the claim of the writer of Genesis to the possession either of "faculties passing human experience" or "inspiration," that two points shall be clearly established. First, it must appear that this account really does tally closely with the teaching of modern science. Secondly, it must be shown that the kind of knowledge displayed is such as to be beyond the range of speculation of a thoughtful man thinking on the mysteries of the universe, without the light of natural science to guide him. On the first of these points a sufficient answer has already been given by one whose right to speak, as a representative of modern science, Mr. Gladstone will scarcely question. Professor Huxley, in reference to Mr. Gladstone's assertion that "this fourfold order is understood to have been so affirmed in our time by natural science," speaks thus: "I can meet the statement with nothing but a direct negative." Since this is a subject upon which the most eminent biologist of our day may be considered as speaking *ex cathedra*, we may be allowed to quote his words upon two or three special points. Referring to the place of fowls in the order of creation, he says: "If we found ourselves on vertebrate animals and take 'fowl' to mean birds only, or at most flying vertebrates, natural science says that the order of succession was water, land, and air-population, and not as Mr. Gladstone, founding himself on Genesis, says, 'water, air, land-population.'"

"Again," he continues, "if the word in the original Hebrew translated 'fowl,' should really after all mean cockroach—and I have great faith in the elasticity of that tongue in the hands of

biblical exegetes—the order primarily suggested by the existing evidence is :—

“ 2. Land and air-population. 1. Water-population.

“ And Mr. Gladstone’s order—

“ 3. Land-population. 2. Air-population. 1. Water-population.”

So much for the order of the air-population.

Let us see what he has to say respecting the water-population.

“ All I desire to remark is, that, if whales and porpoises, dugongs and manatees are to be regarded as members of the water-population (and if they are not, what animals can claim the designation ?), then that much of the population has as certainly originated later than the land-population as bats and birds have” (p. 855). Lastly, we will quote his words in testimony of the teaching of science that the fourfold division of living creatures cannot be referred for their origin to distinct successive periods. “ If the species of animals have been all separately created, then it follows that hundreds of thousands of acts of creative energy have occurred at intervals throughout the whole time recorded by the fossiliferous rocks ; and during the greater part of that time the creation of the members of the water, land, and air-population, must have gone on contemporaneously ” (p. 858).

No more than this need be said to show how grossly Mr. Gladstone has misrepresented modern science. That he should have been so ignorant of the advance made, during the last half century, in geology and biology will in itself evoke surprise, but that, conscious of this ignorance, he should express in print his views upon what is affirmed by natural science is nothing short of fatal folly. But further, in this attempt to harmonize science with Genesis he is not satisfied with misrepresenting science, he misrepresents Genesis. Mr. Gladstone, in his order, places the “ air-population ” posterior in point of time to the “ water-population.” There is nothing in Genesis to justify this. “ And God created great whales, and every living creature that moveth, which the waters brought forth abundantly, after their kind, and every winged fowl after his kind : and God saw that it was good.” The water-population and the air-population were created on the same day, and though one is necessarily mentioned before the other, there is nothing to indicate that the creation was not simultaneous. We must also protest against Mr. Gladstone’s entire neglect of the second account of Creation, beginning chapter ii. v. 4. This is acknowledged by most authorities to be a separate account, and not a summary of the first account. Indeed, a mere summary it cannot be, for new facts are introduced. This second account distinctly places the creation of man before that of beasts and birds, and adds the story of the separate creation of Eve. Since Mr. Gladstone

does not even allude to this second account, we presume that he does not hold it to be inspired ; but it is scarcely fair of him to deprive his readers of the extra. display of ingenuity which would have been required in order to bring this second account into strict harmony with modern science—even modern science as understood by Mr. Gladstone.

Let us now turn to our second question. Supposing the Genesis account did, in the main, accord with modern science, would this general agreement afford sufficient evidence of inspiration ? It is, of course, difficult to say what amount of accurate information would be enough to justify the claim to inspiration on behalf of a writer writing in a pre-scientific age, but we can safely say that the amount contained in the first chapter of Genesis would not approach that standard. Even assuming that Genesis stated distinctly that fishes came first, birds second, beasts third, and man last, and that this order were confirmed by science, we see nothing in this statement to justify any extreme wonder in the modern reader. It is surely the order in which any thoughtful person in any age, who knew nothing of modern science, would naturally place them if he set himself to consider how they were created. All that is proved by such evidence is that the writer of Genesis was of a speculative turn of mind, and that his intellect was sufficiently well balanced to enable him to distinguish four tolerably distinct kinds of live creatures and to place them in order of structural complexity and intelligence. It is true that if he had known anything of anatomy he would not have regarded the air-population as, on the whole, less complex in structure than the land-population, but an ignorant man taking the more highly organized animals as representative of land-population would certainly make this mistake. In fine, we may say that any sane man, without knowledge of science, if asked to classify living creatures, would make these same four divisions ; and no thoughtful man, again without knowledge of science, if asked to give an order, would give an order different from this. In considering organisms it is natural to begin with what appears the most simple and to proceed by degrees to what appears the more complex. No inspiration beyond common sense is required for this. We cannot refrain from expressing our opinion that Mr. Gladstone's admiring conviction "that this writer was gifted with faculties passing all human experience, or else his knowledge was divine," will appear to any sober-minded person somewhat ridiculous. To sum up the whole argument, we find that Mr. Gladstone's attempt to reconcile the Genesis account of the beginning of animate and inanimate nature with modern science has failed completely, and that even if modern science had harmonized with Genesis to the extent that Mr.

Gladstone alleges, such an agreement would have been quite insufficient to justify the claims of Genesis to inspiration.

But although we have found Mr. Gladstone's science weak, we did expect to find him accurate where the question rests on an appeal to authority. Authority is the stronghold of theology. Let us see how Mr. Gladstone treats the expression: "Let us make man in our own image." Dr. Réville, it appears, holds that this use of *us* is simply the royal plural used in Hebrew as in many other languages; or, as it is commonly called, "the plural of dignity." Mr. Gladstone holds that this is "a direct assault upon the supreme truth of the unity of God," and continues as follows: "Can we disprove the assertion of Bishop Harold Browne, that this plurality of dignity is unknown to the language of Scripture?" He appeals to Bishop Harold Browne, and we will take him at his word. In the Introduction to the Book of Genesis, written by Dr. Harold Browne for the "Speaker's Bible," we read respecting the word "Elohim," which is the subject of our inquiry, "it occurs very seldom in the singular in the earlier books of Scripture, except in the abbreviated form of El. *The plural is probably a plural of excellence and majesty.* Elohim, in the plural, is applied to God as comprehending in Himself the fulness of all power, and all the attributes which the heathen ascribe to their several divinities" (p. 25). The expression we emphasize is surely explicit enough to satisfy Mr. Gladstone that he had better have appealed to some other authority.

In his next sentence, Mr. Gladstone speaks of "the violent assumption that the Christian Church, with its one voice, is wrong and Dr. Réville right," thus placing Bishop Harold Browne, somewhat abruptly, outside the pale of Christianity; and not Bishop Harold Browne alone, for the "Speaker's Bible" informs us "that some interpreters, both Jewish and Christian, have understood a plural of dignity after the manner of kings. This is the opinion of Gesenius and most of the Germans." So much the worse for the Germans, doubtless thinks Mr. Gladstone; but he must allow that German critics have earned their right to an opinion on philology.

Mr. Gladstone has a word to say upon the "days" of Genesis. He thinks that the use is "figurative" "in order to make this great procession of acts intelligible and impressive." To this we have just two words to say in reply.

I. That the writer of Genesis meant the word "days" to be interpreted literally is clear from the expression—"The evening and the morning were the first day."

II. The statement that the sun and moon were made "to rule over the day and over the night, and to divide the light from the

darkness," has no meaning unless day and night are to be understood literally and in their usual sense.

Mr. Gladstone, like many other reconcilers of science and religion, endeavours to fortify his arguments by the contention that it is not the object of the Bible "to rear cosmic philosophies, but to furnish ordinary men with some idea of what the Creator had done in the way of providing for them a home and giving them a place in Nature" (p. 690). So then, since the object of Genesis is not "to rear cosmic philosophers," it is not necessary for it to tell the truth! It were best to put the question plainly, "What was the Genesis account of Creation intended to teach, if not science?" The only element in it that can possibly lay claim to any moral signification is the statement that God made the world; the rest is scientific truth or it is nothing. An account more or less detailed, treating of the order and the manner in which the various phenomena of Nature were produced, was intended either to teach us science or it has no use whatever. It does not teach morality or metaphysics. "To furnish ordinary men with some idea of what the Creator had done in the way of providing for them a home" either means "to teach science," or in longer words, "to rear cosmic philosophers," or it is mere idle talk. The position taken up by some theologians that God wilfully and intentionally misrepresented or permitted the misrepresentation of his actions, because the mind of man (made by him) was not ripe for the full understanding of them, appears to us to savour of irreverence. Plato has some strong words of blame for those who impute falsehood to the gods, alleging that they manifest themselves in deceitful ways, and concludes: "Then is God perfectly simple and true both in deed and word; he changes not; he deceives not, either by dream or waking vision, by sign or word" (*Rep.* 382). This is surely a worthier and more reverent view to take than that of those who hold that the All-powerful and the All-true will consent to let his interpreters deviate from the absolute truth by reason of the imperfections of his own Creation. Apply this to our present subject. It was quite unnecessary that any detailed account of Creation should be given. No moral, no theologic dogma depends upon it. If statements respecting Nature had to be made by inspired writers, it is a pity that true statements were not made, and this for two reasons. (1.) The mind of man would one day have developed sufficiently to understand the truth, however dark it might appear to early man, and there would have been a glorious testimony to the truth of divine revelation. If it had appeared that the advance of science served only to corroborate more and more the wonderful accuracy of the sacred narrative, how much strife and bitter-



ness of doubt and unbelief had been spared us. (2.) All the energy of the Christian Church had not been expended during so many centuries in the obstruction of scientific progress. For, whatever may be the teaching of more lenient Christians of the present day, it is not the less true that the Church has, up to recent years, acted upon a firm conviction that the scientific statements in Genesis and other portions of the Bible were literally and verbally true: the theory that they were destined for the instruction of ignorant men and therefore adapted to suit their ignorance, was only invented when science had already gained sufficient ground to bring into discredit the literal rendering. It was only when the outworks of verbal inspiration had been carried by storm that theologians retired into the less easily assailed position of general inspiration.

If space admitted, we should like to analyze this conception of "general inspiration" and see what it really means, but we will forbear, and content ourselves with asking Mr. Gladstone what he means when he says he believes Genesis to be inspired. He will admit, it may be presumed, that even if Moses wrote the book as we now have it, he made use of earlier compositions. We appeal once more to Bishop Harold Browne, who, speaking of the account of Creation, the Flood, &c., says: "These, then, Moses appears to have adopted much as he found them, perhaps perpetuating, word for word, in his writings, what had been floating in unwritten record" (Intro. to Gen., p. 27). It would be interesting to know in what Mr. Gladstone believes the inspiration of these stories to consist. Were the original inventors of these detached stories inspired after the manner of the prophets at the shrines of Apollo; or, since it is surely more probable that the stories grew by transmission, are we to conclude that this inspiring spirit also ruled every slight addition or alteration of this growth? or should we suppose that the stories were miraculously preserved from those changes to which uninspired accounts are subject, and passed down to Moses, pure and intact as from their first composers? or, lastly, shall we rather say that Moses was inspired to make a correct selection from the numerous conflicting accounts current in his time? If Moses had anything to do with the inspiration of these stories, the last suggestion must be the accepted one, but how will it accord with the fact of the various discrepancies that occur throughout the Pentateuch, as, for instance, the inconsistencies of the two accounts of Creation? Whatever idea is formed of the real nature of "inspiration," it will be difficult to apply it consistently to a collection of traditions bearing so few marks of any unity of composition and construction as the Pentateuch. Although Mr. Gladstone would doubtless plead that, since his article was, in form, a reply to Dr.

Réville's attack, he was not bound to enter upon the wider questions involved in his orthodoxy, it would have been a satisfaction to many if he had tendered some explanation of the means by which there was conveyed to us "special knowledge to meet the special need everywhere so palpable in the state and history of our race"—if he had vouchsafed some information on the nature of inspiration as existent in the Book of Genesis. Perhaps, however, to the reverent mind of Mr. Gladstone, the term "inspiration" has never presented itself as requiring explanation. It is a peculiarity of minds like his that they are continually straining at gnats and swallowing camels: the mystical spirit that delights to work out refined distinctions in the meaning of terms like "create" and "make," finds inspiration too solemn and sublime a subject to be profaned by analysis. If half the ingenuity and labour bestowed by theologians on elaborating the superstructure of their system were expended on examination of the foundations, their edifice, though less magnificent, might present a safer spiritual dwelling-place.

But one of the most curious features in Mr. Gladstone's Church-militant character is his childlike ignorance of the forces of the enemy. What can be more exquisitely simple than the following? "We do not hear the authority of Scripture impeached on the ground that it assigns to the Almighty eyes and ears, hands, arms, and feet; nay, even the emotions of the human being." If Mr. Gladstone does "not hear," it is only because he does not listen. This anthropomorphic representation of the Deity has had more influence in undermining the superstitious interpretation of the Scriptures than all the scientific difficulties which have arisen since the days of Galileo. It is because the Scriptures bear within them such unmistakable evidence that, in the beginning it was man who made God in his own image, that the "Old Testament" books have fallen into such ill repute amongst the cultured men of every country. Man is no longer content to worship the creation of his own imagination; this God of the "Old Testament," of like passions with ourselves, no longer satisfies his spiritual cravings. It is difficult to conceive how a man of Mr. Gladstone's reading and reflection can have so utterly misread the spirit of his age as to be ignorant of the very existence of the deadliest weapon of the adversary.

This discussion may be not unaptly concluded by an examination of the meaning of the word "creation." Some theological writers of recent times have regarded the work of God, with reference to the beginning of this world, as one not of creation but of composition. They still use the word creation, but they would have it mean no more than this: that God took that amount of matter and force which together make up Nature, and

which had previously existed in a state of chaos, and out of it composed and built up our world. They claim to keep the term "creation," because they say that it alone expresses adequately the work done by God in bringing order out of chaos and in giving definite coherence to Nature, hitherto indefinite and incoherent. That this is not what Mr. Gladstone means by Creation, we need scarcely say. He would apply the term "make" to the process just described, and would reserve the more imposing word "create" to describe the actual calling into existence of something that did not previously exist. Now, when the common meaning of a word is called into question, it is usual to hear an indignant expression from some one to the effect that the word must have a meaning. And this is quite true. Every word must have a meaning to the person who uses it, but he may be deceived as to this meaning. A person using the term "creation" may think he is using it to express calling into existence out of nothing, and may proffer this definition if asked for one, and may yet all the time be using it in some quite different sense: he may think he means one thing and really mean another. It is, in fact, not true that every one knows exactly what he means. Many men constantly use abstract terms without ever having paused to analyze them,—they have a vague, cloudy notion that such words have a right meaning, nothing more. This habit of self-deception as to the meaning of terms is what has been, is, and ever will be, a constant stumbling-block in philosophy. Now we assert that when people use the term "creation," they do not really mean the "calling into existence," *i.e.*, "objective creation," that this latter form of words has no meaning at all; that what they really mean is something very different—*viz.*, "calling into appearance," or what we may call "subjective creation." Of the former act experience can give no example upon which to found any conception; of the latter act experience is constantly giving evidence. Every new sensation as it presents itself to me is a fresh "creation," in this sense: it did not appear before, it does appear now; it did not exist for me before, it does exist for me now. It is the apparent inability of most minds to grasp this fundamental distinction of thought—the difference between "subjective" and "objective"—that causes this confusion as it does so many others. The term "creation" as applied to "matter" and "force," considered as realities, as "things in themselves," has no meaning at all; as applied to phases of thought, it has a very distinct meaning. It is of the nature of our mind that we are unable to conceive of a beginning of matter or force, that we are unable to conceive of their ever being more or less in quantity than they are now. This is what the followers of Kant mean when they say that

they do not and cannot represent "things in themselves"—*i.e.*, objective existence, in terms of time.

It is true that all this can in no wise disprove the statement that God made matter and force. But if God did make matter and force, he also made our minds incapable of understanding the phrase "God made matter and force"—the words can have no meaning for us. When we conceive matter and force as having an existence independent of our thoughts we necessarily conceive them as eternal in respect of time and unalterable in respect of quantity. Bacon's summary of the dealings of man with Nature, "*Ad opera nil aliud potest homo, quam ut corpora naturalia admoveat et amoveat,*" is equally true of our possible conceptions of the working of God. We assert with confidence that when Mr. Gladstone or any other man interprets the opening words of Genesis, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth," to mean that God called into existence matter and force, they have no clear conception in their minds of what they mean. It follows necessarily from this that there can exist no belief in creation, for a belief requires that what is believed can be clearly presented to the mind, *i.e.*, that it is a possible conception. If it be urged that "creation" is a mystery and that faith can believe where it cannot understand, our reply is that such belief amounts to nothing more than a belief that a certain form of words, *e.g.*, "God made matter and force," means something. I may believe that the phrase "God created the heaven and the earth" means something, but I cannot believe that God created the heaven and the earth.

It is difficult to understand how Mr. Gladstone can conceive that a reconciliation can be achieved by a comparison of fragments of the Scriptures with fragments of scientific teaching, while ignoring utterly the wide divergence between the spirit of modern science and that of dogmatic Christianity. The most real and deep ground upon which modern science bases its rejection of Mr. Gladstone's theory of Creation is to be found, not in the detection of small discrepancies between Genesis and Geology, but in the firm establishment of the theory of "Conservation of Energy," which, by causing Continuity to be clearly recognized as a necessary attribute of "force," has struck a blow at the very foundation of the conception of Creation. For although it is true that the idea of Continuity is essentially a philosophic rather than a scientific truth, the discoveries of modern science have given flesh and blood to what would otherwise have been little better than a phantom.

The next champion of Genesis should begin by justifying the conception of "Creation." When he has done this, let him proceed to reconcile the text-book of religion with the text-

books of science, only reading the former more carefully than Mr. Gladstone has done, and selecting more recent editions of the latter than those of Cuvier and Herschel.

P.S.—In the January number of the *Nineteenth Century* Mr. Gladstone has published a reply to Professor Huxley's criticism. In this reply may be traced a method of meeting criticism which Mr. Gladstone has made peculiarly his own: it consists in a free and generous admission of error, followed by a detailed withdrawal of the points conceded. For example, we read on p. 14: "I distinguish, then, in the broadest manner, between Professor Huxley's exposition of certain facts of science and his treatment of the Book of Genesis. I accept the first, with the reverence due to a great teacher from the meanest of his hearers, as a needful correction to myself and a valuable instruction for the world."

Here is the humble admission of error; it is followed in the same paragraph by the withdrawal: "The five origins, or first appearances, of plants, fishes, birds, mammals, and man, are given to us in Genesis in the order of succession in which they are also given by the latest geological authorities." Mr. Gladstone would have it appear that he is correcting his opponent's interpretation of Genesis and not his science. The latter, however, is the case. The two writers have no dispute as to the meaning of the Genesis account; their sole difference is as to the extent of its agreement with modern science. Mr. Gladstone has evidently been trying hard to bring his science up to date by consulting modern hand-books, from one of which he derives considerable comfort. Reverting to the cosmogony, he supports his original contention by the introduction of the nebular hypothesis, though it is difficult to see how the nebular hypothesis can account for the sun, moon, and stars being created at one time and lighted at another.

Perhaps the most curious part of Mr. Gladstone's whole contention is to be found on p. 11, where he sums up the main statements of Genesis and arranges them in order. At the end of his summary he remarks: "Here is a chain of six links attached to a previous chain of three. And I think it not a little remarkable that of this entire succession the only slip directly challenged is that of numbers four and five, which (p. 858) Mr. Huxley is inclined rather to reverse." So Mr. Gladstone finds that out of eleven statements nine are for him and only two against him. The result is a majority of nine in favour of revelation.

Some one may object to the system of rule by majority being applied to decide such questions; Mr. Gladstone,

however, is evidently satisfied with his numerical triumph. But it is not necessary to re-open the detailed arguments, for Mr. Gladstone has not sought to strengthen his original position by the introduction of any important new material, but has merely sought to furbish up his old arguments with a little modern paint out of Phillips' "Manual of Geology."

There is, however, one point upon which he enlarges here, which in his former paper received scant justice—the nature of revelation as applied to Genesis. But even here he does not enlarge our knowledge. "It is perfectly conceivable that a document penned by the human hand and transmitted by human means, may contain matter questionable, uncertain, or even mistaken, and yet may, by its contents as a whole, present such *πίστεις*, such moral proofs of truth divinely imparted, as ought irrefragably *pro tanto* to command assent and govern practice" (p. 16). Our only remark in reply is, that Mr. Gladstone has not shown such *πίστεις* in the Book of Genesis. We urged above that any man of ordinary intelligence, without the light of modern science to guide him, would have divided animate nature as the writer of Genesis (ch. i.) has done, and would have placed the divisions in the order given in Genesis. To this it may be added, that if the same man had been required to give what seemed to him a reasonable account of the formation of the earth and the heavenly bodies, he would have given pretty much the same account that Genesis gives—at any rate, so far as order of events goes. He might, it is true, have been clearer in his statements respecting light, but he would naturally have begun with the formation of the mass of the earth he lived in, proceeding thence to the first division that would strike him—the division into sea and land; he would then probably have thought of the sun, moon, and stars as coming next in importance; and having thus obtained the outline of a complete cosmogony, would have proceeded to the creation of the vegetable world, &c.

Mr. Gladstone has done nothing further in this second paper to show that the Book of Genesis contains "astonishing anticipations," which are "a God-given supply."

## ART. VIII.—MISSIONS TO THE JEWS.

1. *Anglia Judaica*. By DE BLOSSIERES TORECY. Oxford : 1738.
2. *Essays addressed to the Jews*. By GREVILLE EWING. London : 1809.
3. *Narrative of J. C. S. F. Frey, Minister of the Gospel to the Jews*. London : 1809.
4. *History of the Jews in Great Britain*. By MOSES MARGOLIOUTH. London : 1851.
5. *Sketches of Anglo-Jewish History*. By JAMES PICCIOTTO. London : 1875.
6. *Biography of Bishop Barclay*. London : 1883.
7. *Reports of the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews, from 1809 to 1855*.

THERE is reason to believe that Jews were settled in England previous to the Norman Conquest; but, in the absence of direct historical evidence, the time of their arrival can only be a matter of speculation. They are mentioned in the Excerptions of Egbert, Archbishop of York, as early as the middle of the eighth century, in terms which show that some of them were established in the northern province, and that they were not then in favour with the clergy. One of these canons forbade Christians to be present at their feasts, another prohibited the sale to them of any Christian as a slave, and another declared such slavery, whether under Jews or Christians, to be unlawful. From the first canon it may be inferred that they observed the rites of their religion. Ninety-three years after these canons were promulgated, a charter was granted by Whitglaff, King of the Mercians, to Croyland Abbey, confirming in possession of the monks all the lands and other property which had been bestowed upon their Society by his predecessors, and by any other faithful Christians or Jews. From this it has also been inferred that even in that age they were sufficiently liberal and wealthy to enable them to assist in endowing a Christian ecclesiastical corporation. The story is told by Ingulphus in his "History of Croyland Abbey." Lindo, in his "Jewish Calendar," and Basnage assert that they were banished from England by Canute the Dane about the beginning of the eleventh century, and that they did not venture to return till after the Conquest, but there is no sufficient authority for such

assertions. That they were resident in the kingdom in the reign of Edward the Confessor is clear from the laws attributed to him, which placed their persons and property under the king's protection, and, in fact, reduced them to the position of his chattels, in which character they were claimed by his Norman successor, who regarded it as a lawful ground for the numerous exactions to which he compelled them to submit.

The history of the Jews in England from the Norman Conquest till their banishment, two centuries after, by Edward I., is little more than a record of continuous persecution, spoliation, and ill-usage, relieved by short intervals of peace and toleration, when, with the proverbial vitality of their race, they rose from their oppression, and anew accumulated wealth, which, when occasion required, only contributed to excite the cupidity of the ruling powers. The masses of the people were opposed to them, mainly on the ground of their prosperity, and from them came the sinister rumours which in many cases led to the most dreadful persecutions. The priesthood generally showed them little favour, although some benevolent Churchmen at different times endeavoured to ameliorate their condition, as will be seen hereafter. During the reigns of the first three Norman kings they enjoyed the protection of the Government, and lived free from molestation. William encouraged them to immigrate into his kingdom, and even assigned to them a town for their residence, which some suppose to have been Stamford. Large numbers settled at Oxford, in the City of London, and in other places, where their wealth and prosperity rapidly increased. Under Rufus, they appear in a new character. Owing to his dissolute life, the king was out of favour with the clergy, who avenged themselves by recording stories discreditable to his memory. The Jews, who had flocked into the kingdom from Rouen and other foreign cities, were his special chattels, whom no man, however powerful, dared to molest. They were present at court, and carried themselves independently, as if conscious of their immunities and freedom. Whether Rufus was an unbeliever or not is of little importance, because there is no reason to doubt that while he protected the persons and property of the Jews for his own advantage, he in reality mocked at their religion. That he might have an opportunity of forming an opinion whether Christianity or Judaism were true, he commanded the Bishops and a number of Jewish Rabbis to appear before him at the Whitsun Witengemot in 1092, and debate the merits and claims of their respective creeds, swearing by the face of St. Luke that he would accept the Hebrew faith if the Jews should get the better of their opponents in the argument. William of Malmes-



bury says that the whole business was a practical joke on the king's part; but it was cruel to the Bishops, who entered upon the debate with fear and trembling lest the Christian faith should sustain damage at their hands. They knew as little of the controversy with the Jews as the persons who in the present age assume to themselves the management of missions to the people of whose methods of thought and literature they are entirely ignorant. Each side claimed the victory, but the king could not see his way to accept circumcision and embrace the Hebrew faith. The Rabbis complained that they were defeated, not by argument but by fraud, while the Christians claimed the victory as much on the strength of a violent thunderstorm, to which superstition added an earthquake, which took place during the debate, as from the strength of their arguments. The mere fact of being allowed to argue the case of their religion in the royal presence afforded great encouragement to the Jews, so that they did not entirely despair of gaining over proselytes in other quarters, as some compensation for the defections from their community which were then beginning to take place.

If Rufus declined himself to become a Jew, he was equally resolute in not encouraging Jews to become Christians. The monkish chroniclers say that he was bribed to compel the return of converts to their original faith, and that he even summoned such persons into his presence, and required them under threats of the most dreadful punishment to give up Christianity. In one case the father of a Hebrew youth, who had been converted by a miracle, as the monks said, came in distress to the king, promising liberal compensation for his trouble if he could induce his son to return to Judaism. The effort proved unsuccessful, because the youth boldly told the king that it was his duty rather as a Christian to endeavour to gain converts to the true faith than to send back to Judaism those who had abandoned it. Rufus in anger commanded the neophyte to leave his presence, but he demanded from the father the fee which he had promised. After some wrangling the dispute was settled by his consenting to accept half, and of the sixty marks which had been promised, thirty only were paid. If there be any truth in these monkish stories, they would seem to show that even in that age there was in the minds of some persons a rudimentary idea of missions for the conversion of Jews to Christianity.

The rapacity of Rufus prompted him to appropriate the revenues of vacant sees and benefices for whatever time his necessities required, the agents who farmed them and managed his money transactions being Jews. These marks of the king's confidence would naturally place them in advantageous positions, which would provoke the jealousy of their less fortunate fellow-

subjects, and even stimulate them to attempt to gain over proselytes to the Hebrew faith. It has been asserted by Prynne, a Puritan writer, that in the reign of Henry I., during which their peace and prosperity continued uninterrupted, they bribed some Christians with money to embrace Judaism, which, with other proselytizing efforts, may account for Dominican monks being sent to the towns where there were Jewish colonists to preach against Judaism. In the tenth year of this king the abbot of Croyland sent missionaries to Cottenham and Cambridge to resist the Jews, while similar attempts were made by others at Stamford, which, a contemporary writer said, were attended with great success, and contributed to strengthen the Christian faith against "Jewish depravity." During the long reign of Henry the wealth of the Jews continued to increase, but from his death must be dated the misfortunes which pursued them till the accession of Henry III. in 1217.

In the early years of the youthful monarch they were treated with unusual consideration. One of the first acts of the Earl of Pembroke, the king's guardian, was to issue orders that all Jews who were imprisoned from any cause should be at once liberated, and that in every town where their numbers were considerable, certain responsible persons should be appointed to watch over their interests, so as to preserve them from sustaining any injury in their persons or property. Other privileges were granted, which, with the security they then enjoyed, enabled them once more to begin the accumulation of wealth. Foreign Jews were also encouraged to immigrate for the purposes of trade, who were required to enrol their names with the Justices of the Jews, and to undertake not to leave the kingdom without a special licence from the king. Usury being the principal source from whence the Jews obtained their wealth, the property obtained by such means soon began to excite the hostility of the people and the clergy, both classes being supposed to be alike overreached and impoverished by the obnoxious foreigners. Some measures were therefore deemed necessary to neutralize the privileges granted by the king's government. They assumed form and shape in two canons enacted by the Provincial Council held by Stephen Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury, in 1222, which forbade Jews to hold Christian slaves, or to build synagogues, or to enter a church for any purpose whatever. They were also required, for the sake of distinguishing them from Christians, to wear a piece of cloth of a different colour sewed upon their outer garment, and to pay tithes and other ecclesiastical dues in their various parishes. Langton, and the Bishops of Lincoln and Norwich also, published on their own account in their respective dioceses an order forbidding all persons to buy from, or sell to, the Jews food

or other necessaries, or to hold any communication with them on pain of excommunication, because by the ecclesiastical laws they were under the censure of the church for their infidelity and usury. This barbarous injunction, which, if allowed to take effect, might have caused many Jews to die of starvation, was speedily overruled by the Government, which issued an order to the sheriffs of counties and the mayors of towns where these bishops had jurisdiction, commanding all men to sell to the Jews whatever necessaries they required, any spiritual inhibition notwithstanding, under threat of imprisonment if they refused. This interposition of the civil power on their behalf was so effectual that for several years after nothing is said about persecution or spoliation. The Prior of Dunstable even gave them permission to live within his jurisdiction on condition of paying to the abbey a small annual contribution. As long as Hubert de Burgh, who had succeeded the Earl of Pembroke as administrator of the kingdom continued in power, they were not molested, but after his removal persecution began anew.

Whenever in Europe a Jew was converted to the Christian faith, it was the usual practice of the sovereign to seize his property. The injustice of such a proceeding was so obvious that the Council of Lateran denounced it under severe ecclesiastical penalties. The prohibition was ineffectual, because the custom continued unchanged, the justification alleged for it being the commandment of Jesus to the young ruler to sell all his possessions and then come and follow Him. About this time a Jew at Canterbury, who took the name of Augustin, was converted to Christianity, and in consequence all his property became forfeited to the king, who, as an act of grace, by a writ of restitution, allowed him to retain the house in which he had lived before his conversion.

In the fourteenth year of Henry, the remonstrances addressed to the king by some influential persons, who insinuated that the protection and privileges granted to the Jews were taken by his subjects as an evidence of his indifference to the interests of the Christian fath, are supposed to have been the cause of an alteration in his policy. Soon after they were required to pay into the Exchequer the value of a third of their movable property to enable the king to meet the encroachments of his barons, and to suppress troubles in the English possessions in France. A synagogue which they had built in London was also seized by the king, in defiance of reason and justice, and made over to a conventual body to be used by them as a church. Exactions of various kinds followed, which culminated, in the seventeenth year of his reign, in the taxation of the Jews to the exorbitant amount

of 18,000 silver marks, in addition to a poll-tax, the motive assigned being the zeal of Henry for the Christian faith.

The persecutions and sufferings to which the Jews had been exposed did not prevent some of them from becoming converts to Christianity, even though conversion entailed forfeiture to the Crown of all their property. King John had shown some consideration for them by allowing them to elect their own Chief Rabbi, and by granting him a charter of safe conduct throughout his dominions. He also authorized him to judge between Jews in cases which did not effect the interests of the Crown, and confirmed to them the privilege of trading, and the right to hold property free from molestation, for which he received from them in return 4,000 marks. Their subsequent ill usage may have been one of the motives which prompted his son to found and endow in London the house for the reception and maintenance of converts in the year 1232. The charter of foundation, which may be found in Rymer's "Foedera," explains that the king made over the house for the reception of converts from Judaism, which he had caused to be built in Chancery Lane, then called New Street, upon a site the forfeited property of John Heberton, a Jew, now occupied by the Rolls Chapel and surrounding buildings, and for its endowment, all forfeitures which might accrue to the Crown for felony or any other cause in the city, or in the suburbs within the Liberties of London. In a previous charter he had fixed the endowment at 700 marks per annum. A custos or warden was appointed to have the charge of this *domus conversorum*, but no name of any person holding the office can be found for many years after. Regulations for the management of this establishment were made in subsequent charters.

Previous to this foundation the ancient method of providing a support for converts from Judaism was by corrodies or rations in conventual establishments, which maintained numbers of such persons at their own expense. In one of the rolls of Henry III. are contained the names of five hundred converts, and the religious houses which received them. Each person presented himself at the gates of the convent with the king's writ in his hand; but as corrodies could not be legally demanded except for the king's servants and chaplains in monastic establishments of royal foundation, the request was not always attended to, so that it sometimes became necessary to send a second and more pressing request, of which examples are still extant.

The mediæval barbarity of robbing of all his property the Jew who turned Christian, is almost balanced on the other side by the absurdity of such a foundation as the *domus conversorum*. Like other similar recent establishments, it was putting a premium upon imposture, and offering to Jews, who may never have had

any property whatever, a support in idleness and comfort for the term of their natural lives, if they professed themselves converts to the Christian faith. Such conversions may well be regarded as real when they involved "the loss of all things;" but, owing to the mistaken opinions of the time, conversion, whether in the thirteenth or nineteenth century, which receives as a necessary consequence a provision, whether temporary or permanent, must be looked upon as suspicious. Tovey somewhat sarcastically observes that "the care of the hospital was committed to a sober and discreet person, by whom the conversion of many Jews was forwarded, who lived under his government in ease and plenty, without being obliged for a subsistence either to destroy their bodies or their souls by usury." The example of the king was followed by some of his subjects, because about this time the Prior of Bermondsey built near his convent a hospital for converts from Judaism, while a similar house was erected in the Jewry at Oxford, for those who had been gained over to Christianity by the Dominicans, in both of which the inmates were lodged and supported free of all cost to themselves. From contemporary records, it is clear that the Jews who were admitted to these establishments were of the lowest and most needy class.

The *domus conversorum*, as might have been expected, was soon so crowded with inmates that a Jew who came from France with a recommendatory letter from the king to the Archbishop of York and the Bishop of Worcester, whom he had appointed guardians of the kingdom during his absence, could not be admitted. They were commanded to provide him with the means of subsistence, and proper instruction in secular and religious knowledge. Some further provision was made at this time for the support of the establishment by Peter de Rupibus, Bishop of Winchester, who left by his will £100 to be invested in land to increase the endowment.

During the forty years which had elapsed since the foundation of the *domus*, abuses had crept into the management, and an inquiry was found to be necessary. A few of the more influential converts had got possession of the revenues, leaving to the poorer class only a lodging in the house, without any means of subsistence, so that they were compelled to seek for a precarious living by begging from door to door. To correct these abuses the king, towards the end of his reign, issued a mandate to the Lord Mayor and to John de St. Dennis, who was then warden, ordering that no converts should be admitted except those who were really destitute, and that returns should be laid before him showing in what way the revenues had been hitherto disposed of. The scale of rents was to be revised, reforms were to be introduced into the internal management, the revenues were to be

distributed in the house only, and the chapel services were to be improved and placed on a better footing. If opposition should be offered to the reforms proposed by the Royal Commissioners by any of the inmates, the portion of the endowment to which such persons were entitled was to be sequestrated. The warrant of the king, which is still extant, shows that there were abuses urgently requiring to be reformed.

The accession of Edward I. in 1272 brought at first some relief to the Jews from the exactions under which they had been suffering during the previous reign. In his third year was passed the statute "De Judaismo," which prohibited them from taking usury upon loans. Lord Cope thought that this severe enactment was the principal cause of their leaving the kingdom within a short time after. Richard was also zealous for their conversion to Christianity, and for the success of the *domus conversorum* founded by his father. The severity of the new law exasperated the Jews so violently that they now began to abuse the Christian religion, asserting that it could not have come from a merciful God, because it sanctioned such inhumanity. The king, in consequence, thought it necessary to show his zeal for the Faith by issuing a proclamation in the seventh year of his reign, in which he threatened with death and other penalties any Jew who was heard openly to blaspheme the Deity of the Saviour or the Christian faith. The proclamation also affords evidence that there were then Jewish impostors who, after being baptized, had relapsed to Judaism, because apostates who should join in the reviling are threatened with the same penalties. Some of the converts even objected to be called Christians, on the ground that to apply such a designation to them was a defamation of character.

The king's zeal for the credit of the Christian religion did not stop with the proclamation. In that age the Dominicans were the missionaries who sought to convert the Jews, whose attention they sometimes found it difficult to gain. With the view of overcoming the difficulty they petitioned the king to send a warrant to the sheriffs and bailiffs of the different towns where they resided throughout the kingdom, authorizing them to collect the Jews together, and to induce them by all reasonable means to listen to the preaching of the friars with attention, and without raising any disturbance. The plan had no better success than similar efforts in more recent times where no compulsion was used, because it is not to be supposed that Jews or any other people, whether induced to assemble voluntarily or by any other means, would give much heed to abuse showered by ignorant preachers upon their religion. The power given to the sheriffs was to continue only during the king's pleasure. Further, to

show his sincerity and his interest in the conversion of the Jews, within a few months he issued a patent declaring that for the next seven years he would waive his right to half the property of converts, and allow the other half to be appropriated to the maintenance of poor converts in the *domus conversorum*. He also gave up for the same period all forfeitures of the property of Jews which might accrue to the Crown, with the proceeds of the Jewish poll-tax and deodands. These munificent grants rendered necessary further regulations for the management of the institution. The warden was empowered to nominate a chaplain, who, with an assistant chaplain, were to reside in the building, and be responsible for the conduct of the services. In the absence of the warden, the chaplain was authorized to receive the rents and the grants from the Exchequer, and distribute the aggregate amount, according to a fixed scale, among the converts, retaining for the support of himself, assistant, and clerks sufficient remuneration, but being required each year to furnish to the Barons of the Exchequer an account of the receipts and expenditure.

If any convert in the *domus* were qualified to assist the chaplain, he was to be appointed assistant in preference to all other priests. Those who showed an inclination for literature were to be sent to the Universities and properly educated at the expense of the foundation. Converts who wished to learn trades were to be apprenticed to masters, receiving, till they were able to earn their own living, the benefits to which they were entitled in the *domus*. These regulations bear a remarkable resemblance to the methods adopted at the present time for providing a maintenance for converts from Judaism. If any of those who received a liberal education were afterwards to obtain preferment in the Church, their allowance from the institution was to cease, and be divided among the other converts. Whatever surplus revenue remained after meeting all claims was to be devoted to the repair and ornamentation of the chapel. The warrant containing these regulations was directed to John of St. Dennis, the warden, and is still extant.

The strong inducements held out to the Jews to abandon their religion did not tempt many to become Christians, whilst of those who did so the great majority were of the poorest class, as the regulations abundantly prove. But there were a few exceptions. Belager, an Oxford Jew, petitioned the Crown for the moiety of his property, in the inventory of which was found a number of valuable books. The king kept his word, and issued a warrant granting him what he claimed. Belager's conviction of the truth of the Christian religion must have been powerful, otherwise he would scarcely have parted with half of his property by becoming a convert.

This royal foundation continued to flourish under successive wardens till the banishment of the Jews from the kingdom in 1290, which was the forty-fifth year of the reign of Edward I. This event so far reduced the number of converts in the *domus conversorum* that the surplus revenue became available for the support of other necessitous persons who were admitted into the institution. In the eighteenth year of Edward III. the building was assigned by royal patent to a lady, for her residence; she also received a penny a day from the Exchequer, in addition to whatever one convert was entitled to receive from the revenues of the *domus*. In the thirtieth year of the same reign a foreign Jew, who was supposed to be a convert, was admitted to the benefits of it by royal warrant, addressed to the warden, Henry Ingleby. When the latter resigned, the wardenship was annexed for ever to the Mastership of the Rolls, in consideration of the expense which William Burstal had incurred in restoring the buildings, which, owing to the neglect of former wardens, had become dilapidated, on condition that he and his successors kept them in proper repair for the future. The grant was confirmed by Act of Parliament in the reign of Richard I., and was afterwards further confirmed by letters patent. In subsequent reigns, a few converted Jews claimed the benefits of the foundation, and as late as the reign of James II., two were allowed for their maintenance a pension for life of three half-pence per day. In the middle of the eighteenth century, some parts of the ancient buildings were standing; and the chapel, is still used for divine service; but the revenues seem to have disappeared. If they could be recovered, converts from Judaism would be entitled to demand a support from them.

The order for the banishment of the Jews and their families in 1290, caused about 15,000 Jews to leave the kingdom, their property being forfeited to the Crown. For several centuries after, and until the time of Cromwell, a few stragglers only were to be found in England, employed in various occupations which attracted no public attention. During the Protectorate they applied to the Government for permission to settle in the kingdom. Some foreign Jews, being under the impression that Cromwell was the Messiah, sent a deputation to England to investigate his pedigree in Huntingdonshire, but as soon as their object was discovered, they were ordered by the Protector to withdraw from the kingdom as speedily as possible. After lengthened negotiation, the utmost privilege which could be obtained for those who wished to immigrate was toleration. The door having been opened, the Jews began to come into England in ever-increasing numbers, and in some cases became so influential as to obtain the kindly consideration

. [Vol. CXXV. No. CXXLIX.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. LXIX. No. I. K



of Charles II. and his successors. After the Revolution their prosperity greatly increased, and several families of note became converts to Christianity. This is not so much a statement based on recorded historical facts, as an inference drawn from an Act of Parliament passed in the first year of Anne, which provided that the children of Jews who were converted to Christianity, or desirous of embracing it, upon application to the Lord Chancellor, could compel their parents to provide them with a sufficient maintenance, in proportion to their circumstances. When the heads of families became converts the rest of the household usually followed, and all were absorbed into the Christian population. But when a younger member was converted he was treated as an apostate by the Synagogue and discarded by his relations, so that the condition of such converts sometimes became desperate. It was to relieve them that the statute of Anne was enacted, and from this the inference has been drawn that the number of conversions during the reign of William III. was sufficiently large to attract the attention of Parliament. How they were brought about does not appear, but there have been instances of private persons, before proselytizing societies came into existence, who showed an interest in the spiritual welfare of the Jews. About the middle of the eighteenth century one Edward Goldney, a wealthy City merchant, proposed a strange plan for attracting their attention. He published an epistle to them, with a preface addressed to Secker, who was then Archbishop of Canterbury, in which he recommended his Grace to show kindness and hospitality to their principal men by entertaining them at banquets prepared according to the requirements of Jewish law. The suggestion does not seem to have been acted upon, but it was precisely the same in principle as that adopted by conversionists in mediæval and modern times to gain over the lowest class of necessitous Jews. Mr. Goldney had several interviews with the aged Rabbi, Aaron Hart, but the latter declined to discuss with him the subject of Christianity, contenting himself with saying, as many other Hebrews have since said, that his ancestors were Jews, and that he intended to adhere to the cred in which he had been born, as he would if he had belonged to Moham-medanism or any other faith. Similar efforts were made about the same time by other well-intentioned persons to engage the Jews in friendly correspondence about their religion, but without much success.

These isolated attempts to gain their attention were the precursors of organized schemes for their conversion. The first regular mission to the Jews was set on foot in 1796 by the Dissenters, in a series of lectures, intended for the instruction of any of them who could be induced to attend, delivered in a chapel

in Bury Street in the city. Ignorance of the subject with which they attempted to grapple was the principal difficulty with which the lecturers had to contend, and, as a natural consequence, the results were nugatory. The concluding lecture was delivered by a Doctor Hunter, who candidly told his audience that, while contributing his assistance to the conversion of the Jews, he was convinced of its total inutility. He also said that whenever the salvation of Israel was brought about, it would be accomplished at a time and by means of instruments far beyond the power of human sagacity to determine. Such language did not say much for the enthusiasm of the lecturer, nor was it calculated to galvanize into activity a half-hearted and perfunctory effort when it seemed likely to collapse. About this time a German convert from Judaism turned up, who became the means of exciting fresh interest in the Jews, and was in reality the founder of the present system. Joseph Samuel Christian Frederic Frey was the son of Prussian Jewish parents in indigent circumstances. At first he earned his living as a tutor in Hebrew families, but ultimately he was obliged to apprentice himself to a shoemaker, and for several years worked at his trade. His conversion to Christianity from strict Judaism was brought about by circumstances not in any way connected with missionaries, but it ought to be said that he may have learned from an uncle, who had embraced the Christian faith, some of its fundamental principles. He was baptized in 1798, and subsequently went to Berlin, where he worked at his trade, associating himself with the United Brethren or Moravians, who took him into their seminary there with the view of training him to be a missionary. He was brought by them under the notice of the London Missionary Society, which appointed him to labour at one of their stations in South Africa. After his arrival in England on his way to his destination, a proposal was made to him to remain in London, and work among the Jews, as the Society at that time included missions to them among its objects. Frey was then placed in a missionary seminary at Gosport, under the instruction of a Nonconformist minister called Boguc, partly to enable him to learn the English language, and partly to receive further instruction. Here he gave lessons in Hebrew to the other students, and compiled his Hebrew grammar. After remaining in the seminary a considerable time, he removed to London to begin his work among the Jews, under the auspices of the Society. His labours at first were desultory, because there was no chapel where he could be admitted to preach regularly. They were continued in connection with the Society for several years, but it was ultimately dissolved by a dispute about the maintenance and education of Jewish children, and about the best means of enabling proselytes

to support themselves. As is usual in such cases, taunts, recrimination, abusive letters, hostile resolutions, sinister rumours, personalities, and turning out for public scrutiny the affairs of Frey's domestic life, illustrated and exemplified the spirit with which the combatants were animated. When he manifested a disposition to withdraw from the Society, Mr. Bogue, who had been his tutor at Gosport, wrote him a letter, in which he told him in a taunting spirit, that the Society had educated and maintained him for six years with the object of his becoming their missionary, that they had spent two thousand pounds upon him, that in withdrawing he was guilty of base ingratitude, that if he set up a mission of his own he would find every minister warned against him, and every chapel door shut in his face, that his freedom of action would be destroyed, that efforts for the conversion of the Jews would be stopped, and the plan adopted by the Society covered with disgrace, that his character would be ruined, that the Directors were exceedingly displeased at his plan for forming a new and independent institution, and that no work among the Jews could succeed unless carried on under their auspices and direction. Others followed up this abusive and threatening tirade, by expressing doubts whether Frey was a Christian at all, and by setting on foot injurious rumours about his domestic concerns, to which he replied with more effect than probably suited the convenience of the Directors of the Society. The language used by Bogue, and their rage at his withdrawal, are explained by their inability to find another missionary equally well qualified to carry on the work, which from that time can scarcely be said to have had any vitality. Frey's character has been summed up by Picciotto, from a Jewish point of view, in the following terms:—  
 “A certain foreign convert, who adopted the name of Frey, exerted himself zealously to induce his former brethren to follow his example, like the fox which had lost its tail. Frey became a Christian clergyman, and to inspire faith in his sincerity he adopted such extreme views as to check rather than encourage neophytes, and his own fellow labourers were constrained to admit that he effected little good in their cause.”

Frey soon found that missions to the Jews were impracticable, unless supplemented by pecuniary and material assistance, and his views have been abundantly confirmed by subsequent experience. The Society had a school for the free education of Jewish children, which he affirmed did not succeed, and proposed to establish in addition to it an institution for the maintenance and education of the children of Jewish parents, without any charge to themselves, but the Directors rejected the proposal as nothing but bribery. He also wished to set on foot another

institution for giving relief to sick and destitute Jews, and for enabling those who had lost their means of living by becoming proselytes, to obtain employment, and for maintaining them till they had found it. These plans were also rejected, and for a similar reason, it being obvious that Frey's proposals, while they might lead to nominal conversions of a few of the lowest and poorest class, would only excite the hostility and indignation of thoughtful and independent Jews. While still an agent of the Society, he and some of his friends, who were mostly Nonconformists, formed themselves in August, 1808, into a committee, the object of which was to relieve the sick and distressed, and to instruct the ignorant, especially those that were of the Jewish nation. This new Society, being the offspring of the strife between him and the Directors, very soon found itself in collision with them, and a re-construction of it under a new title was resolved upon. Several Churchmen had joined it, and in the ensuing year it was determined that from henceforward it should be called "The London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews," the subsidiary plans for attaining this object being kept in the background, or probably not being then very clearly defined, but what subsequently happened showed that Frey's plans were literally adopted, as they are in existence to this day. From henceforward the Society was a combination of Churchmen and Nonconformists. Having originated in contention, the seed of the dragon's teeth speedily sprang up in the form of a crop of armed combatants. Strife generated strife among the members, debts were contracted which the Society could not meet, the objects for which it was constituted were being neutralized, and ruin was admitted to be imminent, when a well-meaning but weak-minded clergyman called Lewis Way came forward as a *deus ex machinâ*, and offered to contribute a large sum towards the payment of the debts, and enable the Society to start afresh, on condition that the Nonconformists withdrew. This proposal was accepted, and Way's munificence saved the Society from destruction. In the report for 1814 it was announced that means had been found for clearing off the debts, and that the Dissenters had retired, leaving the Society exclusively in the hands of Churchmen.

The reports for the five years during which the affairs of the Society were managed by a joint committee of Churchmen and Nonconformists are instructive reading, because they contain the principles by which their successors have been since guided, and the germs of vices which have long been at work in this and other kindred missionary organizations. The Society was constituted under its new title on March 1, 1809, and on May 23 in the same year the first report was issued. The interval was so

short that the committee, which then consisted of two clergymen and seventeen laymen, including Joseph Samuel Frey, were only able to state a few general principles, and enunciate some plans for future action. On December 27 following a second appeared, containing a further account of the state of the Society. In this document the committee said, at the outset, that they looked with suspicion upon the Christianity of those who stood aloof or looked with cold contempt or neglect upon so interesting an undertaking as that which the London Society had set on foot, which was not the most charitable or judicious method of conciliating public support to an untried and doubtful cause. The occasional conversion of a few without the interference of any missionary, and the interest in such converts manifested by Bishop Wilkins, editor of the *Concilia*, and by Bishop Kidder, were taken as showing the possibility of the success of the Society, and an illustration of the interest which benevolent persons would probably take in it. To the objection that the time had not come for the conversion of Israel, the committee replied that no one could be certain that the time had not come, or that it was not rapidly approaching, and that there were signs that the great event could not be far distant, the principal of them being that there were supposed to be not less than thirty converted Jews in England who, *although they could not be considered to be pious Christians*, were nevertheless thoroughly convinced of the truth of Christianity. The objection seemed so forcible that in their third report they deemed it necessary to attempt a further confutation; but they were only able to reiterate the answer already given, and to quote some irrelevant texts of Scripture, and equally irrelevant extracts from Dr. Johnston and other writers who knew little or nothing about the Jews. The committee justified the existence of their Society by asserting that the missions to the Jews carried on by the body from which they had seceded were a failure; that a missionary society could not successfully manage more than one undertaking at a time; and, while admitting that they were on delicate ground when speaking about this matter, quietly relieved themselves from embarrassment by referring their supporters to the statement of Frey, soon to be published, in which he intended to assign his reasons for leaving the London Missionary Society.

They next proceeded to explain their plans in a more detailed manner. A chapel had been temporarily rented in Bury Street where lectures were to be delivered to the Jews. As soon as arrangements could be made the lectures were to be transferred to a building in Spitalfields called the Jews' Chapel, where Frey was to carry on regular ministrations as a Nonconformist, with a

licence under the Toleration Act. There was also to be established a free school for the education of Christian and Jewish children alike, some of the latter being supported and educated in another charity school as Frey had originally proposed. This latter is still in existence, and carried on on the same principle. They also proposed to bind both boys and girls, when old enough, as apprentices to useful mechanical trades in pious families. It was also intended to find employment for those Jews who might be reduced to penury by expulsion from the Synagogue for attending Christian services, or for becoming converts to Christianity, which meant that such persons would be supported as long as they continued inquirers, and when they said that they were convinced of the truth of Christianity, that means of earning their living would be provided for them, which in particular cases is still the principle of the Society. Controversial tracts were to be circulated among the Jews with a liberal hand as soon as clergymen having the proper qualifications for writing them could be found. They also announced the questionable policy, which had been even then stigmatized, of selling to the Jews at a cheap rate the Old Testament dissociated from the New. They said that several Jews had applied for employment, which had been procured for them; that two children had been taken under the care of the Society; that from fifty to a hundred Jews generally attended Frey's lectures in Bury Street, many of whom belonged to a respectable class in society, and that they listened with decent attention. A premium was offered to the author who within a certain time would produce the best answer to David Lewis's "Dissertations on the Prophecies," and certain books were recommended to the friends of the Society for perusal.

The latter part of the report is characteristic of the spirit of the men and their successors. The committee called the attention of the Jews to the statute of Anne, already referred to, and informed them that under its provisions a child of Jewish parents, who was cast off and refused a maintenance for embracing Christianity, might compel his father to make, in proportion to his means, an adequate provision for his education and support, by application to the Lord Chancellor. The statute had been inoperative, and this mean attempt to revive it for aiding efforts to proselytize the Jews cannot be condemned with too much severity. According to the committee, at one of Frey's lectures an attempt had been made by some persons to inculcate in the minds of the Jews who were present Arian or Socinian doctrines. They declared that such conduct could not be tolerated, and therefore they solemnly warned such persons that the Toleration Act did not protect those who denied the Deity of the Saviour, and that while nothing was further from

their disposition than an intolerant spirit, they could not but feel indignant at the gross indecency of such conduct, and were determined not to pass over any future recurrence of it.

Another report published at the end of the year gives further information. It was admitted that the number of Jews who, attracted by the novelty of the mission, had at first attended Frey's lectures in Bury Street, had diminished. When they were first set on foot, the attendance of Jews was supposed to vary from two hundred to five hundred, although it is difficult to understand how they could be distinguished from the rest of the audience, but now all that the committee could say was that there was no service without the presence of many Jews, while upon every particular occasion there was a very considerable number. Even at this early stage of the Society, dissensions were beginning to break out between Churchmen and Nonconformists. They had taken the Bible Society as their model, in which Church dignitaries and Protestant Dissenters worked harmoniously together on neutral principles, but it was soon found that missions to the Jews could not be conducted on the same footing. The Committee claimed to be neutral, and on this ground asked for the co-operation of all denominations of Christians, but the religious ministrations which they carried on for the conversion of the Jews, could not legally be conducted in the same chapel by clergymen and Nonconformist ministers. After mature deliberation, and after free and full discussion of this difficulty, or rather after a sufficient amount of wrangling, the dispute was adjusted by a compromise. Frey was to continue his lectures in the chapel in Bury Street, with the help of any Dissenting ministers who might be found qualified and willing to assist him, and the "ministers of the Establishment" were to preach a monthly lecture to the Jews in one of the churches. Books and tracts had been presented to the Society for controversial use, but they had also deemed it expedient to purchase from the London Missionary Society a number of copies of the Rev. Greville Ewing's "Addresses to the Jews," which they sent to the chief Rabbis of the German and Portuguese Synagogues, and to several of the most influential Jews in London. The copy sent to Rabbi Mendola was returned to the Society with an indignant letter, complaining of the officious rudeness with which the book was thrust into his house against his will. He said that the laws of the Spanish and Portuguese Jews prohibited members of their congregation from engaging in controversy, while in his opinion the attacks of rash and blind visionaries were not in any instance deserving of refutation or even of investigation. The letter was answered by Mr. Joseph Fox, one of the secretaries, who invited a reply from the Rabbi, but he declined further controversy. To the other Jews.

who retained their copies the Committee said menacingly "That they would have to give account to the Searcher of hearts for the use they made of them."

These essays, which were prepared at the instance of the Missionary Society, are able and interesting, and would be read with pleasure and profit by Christians; but as the author does not appear to have been versed in Rabbinical literature, or to have been acquainted with the Jewish controversial works against Christianity, they would have been useless for attaining the object aimed at. The committee of the London Jews' Society thought that if they might not do much good in this world, they would at least rise up in the Judgment and condemn the unfortunate Hebrews who were induced to accept copies. Rabbi Mendola, who returned the present sent to him, because, as he said, he did not sufficiently understand the English language, and disapproved of controversy, would of course not be prejudiced.

A considerable number of Christian and Jewish children were being educated in the free school, of whom two interesting Hebrew street arabs had been received by the committee into the charity school as a nucleus to begin with. One of them had been deserted by his parents when little more than an infant, and the other, who came from Ipswich, after wandering for a long time through London, went one day by accident into the Jews' Chapel to see Frey, who sent him on to the committee, upon whom he produced so powerful an impression by saying, amid his tears, that he wanted to be made a good Christian, that they at once took him under their protection. Within a very short time a handbill was circulated by his father offering a reward for the recovery of the boy, whose name was Hyam Davis. When the place of his retreat was discovered the committee refused to allow his own father to see him lest he might be induced to return to Judaism. Legal proceedings were then taken by those who were interested in the case, and a mandamus was applied for to compel the committee to give up the boy; but for some reason they failed, although it was afterwards deemed expedient to allow the father to have access to his son at reasonable times.

Pamphlets attacking and defending the Society were being published from time to time, and the press was generally hostile, but nevertheless the Society's affairs financial and otherwise seemed to prosper. It was a matter of regret with the committee that, although animated by a conciliatory spirit, they had not been able to settle their differences with the Missionary Society, owing to the officious interference of private irresponsible persons.

A report, which the committee called the third, was published on June 6, 1811. After alluding to the difficulties which they had hitherto been called on to meet, they somewhat injudiciously



referred to a circumstance which has long been a slur upon the reputation of the Jews and other kindred societies. They said that their undertaking exposed them to many objections from which those who were engaged in conducting missions to the heathen were comparatively free. The latter were not carried on under the immediate eye of a discerning Christian community, but at a distance from observation. The missionaries abroad had leisure and opportunity for selecting and arranging such information as they deemed expedient to transmit to the committees of their societies at home, who again allowed to be known only that portion of it which they thought would suit the public. In making these observations they were only anticipating charges of mutilating and garbling reports, which have since been made against the Society, and of which examples will be given hereafter. The committee of the London Jews' Society, they said, was very differently situated. Every step they took was in full view of both friends and enemies, and although they were fully conscious of purity of design and integrity of motive in an undertaking so novel and arduous, being only fallible men, mistakes could not be avoided, for which they were constrained to throw themselves upon the forbearance of the Christian public.

They thought themselves called upon to answer objections against their operations which had been raised in the press. A proposal had been made to set on foot a fund to enable the committee to advance temporary loans on good security to Jews of good character who had married Christian women, and who therefore might lose the countenance of Jewish employers; and they resolved to invite contributions towards it from wealthy Jews who had married out of their nation, and who might, in consequence, be supposed to know the difficulties in which their humbler brethren thereby involved themselves. The project was severely criticised in the press as nothing but bribery, and seems never to have been acted upon. A less objectionable method of assisting necessitous foreign Jews was giving them employment in a candlewick manufactory, which required no previous training, and in a printing office, both under the supervision of the Society. The former, after being carried on for some time at a heavy loss, was abandoned, but the latter is still in existence.

They also deemed it expedient to meet the charge that the greater part of the children taken up and educated by the Society were illegitimate. They answered it by saying that forty-six out of the number had been clearly ascertained to be legitimate, and that most of them were descended from parents who were Jews on both sides, but they were willing to admit

that some were illegitimate. They said that there were hardships under which the Jews laboured in respect to their marriages which necessarily led to the birth of such children. An English Jew who wished to marry a Christian woman could only be married in Holland, and not even there by a Rabbi, unless she were previously initiated into Judaism by the ceremony called *Giyuress*, which could not legally be performed in England. The committee and the person who wrote the report can only be excused for making these erroneous statements by supposing them to be totally ignorant of what they were writing about. According to Jewish usage and laws a Christian woman can only be married to a Jew after she has become a proselyte, which is effected by the ceremony of immersion in a bath called in Hebrew *Giyureth*, and not *Giyuress*, which has never been illegal in England. In order the more effectually to exclude illegitimate children the committee said that they had resolved not to admit any such into the institution born subsequent to January 1, 1810, whose parents should not be able to produce a certificate of their marriage, either according to the rites of the Church of England or those in use among the Jews, *subsequent to the birth of such child or children*, which seems to mean that they were prepared to admit all Jewish illegimates whom they could lay hold upon. But the truth is that the committee evaded the real difficulty, as their successors have so often done, when confronted with objections in subsequent years. The Jews technically call those children bastards, of whose parents one has been a Christian, and it is from this class that the children, who at that time and subsequently have been supported and educated by the Society in its schools in London and elsewhere, have been principally, if not exclusively, taken, because it is inconceivable that Jewish parents, even of the lowest class, would for the bribe of maintenance and education deliberately hand them over to a society whose avowed object is to bring them up as Christians.

The further objection that their adult proselytes were of the lowest class of Jews, was readily and easily answered; but the difficulty remains that the doors of the wealthy are still shut against the agents of the Society, and, as will be shown hereafter, that the converts from the higher classes who have embraced Christianity have done so irrespective of them and it. After discussing the difficulty, the committee said that their efforts had been encouraged by some members of a family of distinction amongst the Jews, and had excited an anxious interest in the minds of others, referring their supporters for particulars to Appendix No. 9 attached to the same report. This old method of inaccuracy has since repeated itself on many occasions. No. 9 contains no allusion

to any distinguished Jewish family, and nothing but the indignant letter of Rabbi Mendola, and the reply to it of Mr. Joseph Fox, one of the secretaries. The latter is only noteworthy because the writer somewhat presumptuously said that as the prophet Ezekiel was charged to warn the House of Israel, so the London Society thought that they were charged with a similar function. But Rabbi Mendola might have asked where their credentials were. Accuracy of assertion beyond the possibility of being misunderstood was not then, and has never since been, the characteristic of the Society, when its proceedings have been brought to the test of public opinion.

Another much more important event, which has repeated itself over and over again in the subsequent history of the Society, required to be explained to their supporters. In 1808 a Jewish Rabbi, called Judah Catarivas, a native of Jerusalem, of respectable family and connections, and, as the committee said, of acknowledged proficiency in Jewish literature, voluntarily placed himself under the patronage of the Society, declaring that he had long been convinced of the truth of Christianity, and that he had only been waiting for a public opportunity of avowing his belief in it. The committee, in their exultation, being unable to wait to see whether the conversion, which had not been brought about by their agents, was genuine or not, at once published to their supporters, without giving the name, the joyful news of this supposed secession from Judaism, although troubled with some secret misgivings that everything might not turn out right in the end. They put Catarivas under the care of a clergyman, whose business it was partly to have an eye upon his movements, and partly to assist him in learning the English, Latin, and Greek languages. They said that he was a perfect master of Talmudic and Cabalistic learning, and expressed a hope that, after being properly trained, he would ultimately render eminent service to the Society, in the prosecution of its various purposes. They added that the Jews, alarmed by the secession of such a man, had set on foot reports prejudicial to his character, which the committee had investigated and ascertained to be unfounded, so far that nothing had been discovered which ought to prevent them from receiving and placing him under instruction. To obviate further the idea that they had been imposed upon by this young Jew, the committee said that they had satisfactory ground for believing that it was his original intention not to have applied to the Society at all, but to have embraced Christianity in a different country and under different circumstances. If they should find that they had been deceived, they asked for the indulgence of their friends.

In the report for 1810 they were compelled mournfully to

admit that Catarivas had disappointed them, and that in consequence he had been removed from the Society's protection. The charge against him was that he had yielded to the impetuosity of his passions and given way to sin, that the reproofs of the committee had not suited his unhumiliated spirit, and that he had gone back to the Jews. They said that at his own urgent request he had been taken back again by the Society on trial; but as no signs could be discovered of any radical change of heart, they did not feel themselves justified in retaining him in connection with them any longer. Such was the story told by the committee. If Catarivas had had an opportunity of giving his account of the circumstances he might have put a different aspect upon it. As the committee did not at that time give any detailed account of their expenditure upon individual Jews, no means exist of ascertaining how much money they threw away upon this individual.

At the end of the report the committee announced that they had taken on lease for ninety-nine years five acres of land in Bethnal Green, on which they proposed to erect a chapel, schools for boys and girls, a printing office, and other buildings, for which they hoped the public would contribute the funds. They also proposed to have the New Testament translated into pure Biblical Hebrew, for which undertaking they invited the co-operation of competent scholars irrespective of creed or church. The revision was ultimately accomplished. It has been pronounced to be, and is, barbarous, as might have been expected.

The next report dated May 21, 1812, contains a further account of the operations of the Society. Having demolished all objections and overthrown all objectors, they were free to pursue their own course for the future unmolested. They were, upon the whole, prosperous, because during the previous twelve months they had received upwards of £8,000. Frey's lectures in the chapel in Bury Street had been well attended, both by Christians and Jews, and efforts had been made in various other places, by means of sermons, to attract public attention. The schools for boys and girls were successful, and from the former five had been selected to be trained as missionaries. Others had been put in the way of earning their own living hereafter. The difficulty of supporting Jews who were only inquirers into the truth of Christianity, owing to the loss of their employment, when even suspected of holding communication with the agents of the Society, had been solved by providing a maintenance for them. The committee had heard of several wealthy and respectable Jews, who, since the institution of the Society, had professed the Christian faith and been baptized, although they admitted that it was not the immediate instrumentality in their conversions.

They claimed, however, to have been the indirect cause, because they said that they knew of an influential family which had abandoned Judaism from a conviction of the truth of Christianity derived from the publications of the Society. They could not tell how many other conversions had been effected by the sermons and tracts issued from their printing press. This vice of claiming actual results, which they had no share in producing, and possible results, which may never have happened, has clung to the Society ever since. They suggested the formation of a manufactory of articles in common use to provide occupation for Jewish converts, which subsequently assumed the form of the "Operative Jewish Converts' Institution," which is still in existence.

The committee did not deem it judicious to say how many adult Jews had applied to them at different times for religious instruction, but they informed their supporters that forty-one persons had been baptized into the Christian Church, of whom only three, as far as they knew, had turned out impostors. Of these, Catarivas was one. The second was a young Pole, who, like him, had received a learned education, and was able to speak five modern languages. He was placed, at the expense of the Society, under the care of a German Lutheran minister, that he might learn English; but it was soon discovered that he had only discarded Judaism for the sceptical opinions of Moses Mendelsson. The committee then changed their intention of training him for a missionary, and offered him employment in their printing office, which he declined, and withdrew from the Society. This man could scarcely be called an impostor. The third was a Hungarian Jew, as usual of great learning; but the committee soon became doubtful about the propriety of his moral conduct, and abandoned all hope of his future usefulness. None of these persons had been baptized. In consequence of these failures the committee determined that every person applying for the patronage of the Society should be required to submit to the test of working for his own living for a time to enable them to judge of his sincerity. The rest of the report was taken up with an absurd attempt to predict the approaching fulfilment of prophecy by events which have never yet come to pass, with the expression of the belief of the committee that Judaism was breaking up, because the Jews, as they thought, were exchanging their religion for Deism, retaining only the name without any real attachment to the doctrines of Moses, and with the announcement that they had appointed a paid traveller, who was the first of his class to speak at meetings on their behalf. They had received during the year £7,400, and they were already in debt to the amount of £2,100.

[ The next report, read at the general meeting on May 1, 1813, showed that the receipts for the previous year had been £8,100, and that the debt had been reduced to £1,591; but the financial statement is so confused that, like all similar subsequent statements, it is impossible clearly to understand it. The most important events announced were that the Duke of Kent had become patron of the Society, that he had laid, on April 7, 1812, the first stone of the Episcopal Chapel and other buildings on the Society's land at Bethnal Green, and that a new monthly publication, called the *Jewish Repository*, had been started, which still continues under another name. The schools and other institutions were flourishing, but the committee felt themselves compelled to meet once more objections which had been made to their Society. Their replies are the same in principle as those which have been given by their successors over and over again when called upon to answer difficulties. Instead of facing them honestly they resorted to evasion, and proceeded to demolish objections which had not been urged against them, raising a false issue in order to turn away public attention from the real issue. It was objected that the Jews whom they had baptized, were all either of the lowest class, or such as had sought the patronage of the Society for secular advantage. Assuming that this meant that the Jews whom they had baptized were impostors, who only wanted to benefit themselves in a worldly sense, they said that they had endeavoured to exercise a sound discretion in the selection of candidates, and that if they had been ambitious to increase the number of converts they might have baptized many more, which is precisely the same answer which was given by an agent of the Society on a recent occasion to the charge of the complete failure of their mission to the Jews in Jerusalem. They said that the objection arising from the situation in life of their converts was without foundation. This charge—if charge it can be called—would better have been left unnoticed, than that the committee should have brought discredit upon themselves by an evasive and mendacious answer. They said that it was not true that none of the richest Jews had embraced the Christian faith *during the period of the Society's existence*; the real charge, however, being that they had not converted any such persons, because some opulent and distinguished Jews had been united to the Christian Church, candidly, however, admitting that the Society had nothing to do with them. Then, advancing a little upon the answer given to the same objection in a previous report, they said that they could not tell whether or not such persons had been converted by their exertions, which came very near claiming the credit of them. They admitted that, of the forty-three Jews who had been

baptized under their sanction, three at least had turned out impostors; so that, besides the three already alluded to, six persons whom they had taken up during the brief period of the existence of the Society had proved unworthy. The report concluded with an attempt to reply to the Jews who complained that the work of the Society was carried on in a spirit of intolerance and persecution, and from other unworthy motives.

The next report discloses a contradiction and a suppression of circumstances which ought to have been laid at once fully before the subscribers. The committee had stated in the previous report that forty-three persons had been baptized under their sanction, leaving it to be supposed that all of them were adults; but now they said that, previous to the anniversary on May 6, 1814, they had baptized thirty-two adults and twenty-seven children, which, with those baptized at that time, would increase the number to forty-five of the former and thirty-five of the latter. It was also announced that an asylum for Jewesses had been set on foot, to which several had been already admitted, that the manufactory above referred to had been given up, and that another had been established in its place. The receipts for the year amounted to £9,800. Up to this time the impression left upon the mind of a reader of the reports would be that something was suppressed which it did not suit the committee to allow their supporters to know, and that the financial statements did not disclose the true state of the funds, objections which apply to the present Society as much as to their predecessors. In the financial statement for 1813 the debt of the Society had been set down as £2,676; but in a subsequent report it was said that there ought to have been added to this a sum of £2,878 due for printing, making in all £5,554. The report for 1814 disclosed the extraordinary fact that the debt in the interval had increased to £7,500, besides the sum of £5,000 due on the building account of the Episcopal Chapel. In the previous reports nothing had been said of the way in which the former had been incurred. The committee were, however, able to announce that means had been found for clearing off their liabilities. The Rev. Lewis Way, who took a great interest in the Jews, rather than see the Society involved in ruin, had munificently offered a contribution of £14,000 to enable the Society to pay its debts and start afresh.

The pecuniary difficulties of the Society had brought its affairs to such a point that it would have either to be given up or re-organized. At an extraordinary general meeting a report was presented which disclosed the causes that had produced the crisis, so that then, as now, the evils which affected the Society, however carefully they are suppressed for the time, must ultimately come

under public notice. Those who drew up the report were compelled to admit that the Society had never received support from the Dissenters in general, and that influential Churchmen had declined to join it, on the ground that it was Nonconformist in matters of discipline, and especially because they regarded the Jews' Chapel in Spitalfields as a Dissenting place of worship. The extent of this impediment had only been fully discovered when attempts were made to remedy the financial difficulties. These were next stated, and proposals were made for raising money to meet them, both from Churchmen and Nonconformists, but the latter being unable or unwilling to collect the proportion of the funds assigned to them, preferred to withdraw and leave the management of the affairs of the Society exclusively in the hands of the former, so that its reorganization became necessary. This was effected at the same meeting, by the alteration of some of the rules and the addition of others, adapting it more closely to the constitution and principles of the Church of England. In the year 1815, when the Dissenters retired, the general receipts amounted to £11,000, and in 1816 they fell off to £8,000.

The Episcopal Chapel had been opened in July, 1814, when the Duke of Kent was present at the services, but in the following year he withdrew from the Society, the reasons which induced him to retire not being stated in any report. In a resolution, proposing a vote of thanks for his patronage, at the anniversary meeting in May, 1816, it was incidentally stated, however, that he had expressed an anxious wish to be relieved from the duties of his office. It was not considered expedient to state that His Royal Highness withdrew because he was dissatisfied with the management of the Society, and disapproved of the objects at which it aimed. The committee reported that the chapel was well attended, the congregation being principally composed of Christians who lived in the neighbourhood, but they could not say that much notice was taken of it by unconverted Jews. The interest of the latter in the mission was beginning to decline, because during the previous year only two adults had been baptized. A difficulty had arisen about Frey, because, as the management of the Society had passed into the hands of Churchmen, being a Dissenter, he could not be allowed to officiate in the chapel in Spitalfields. Applications for his ordination as a clergyman had proved unsuccessful, and the committee were then unable to determine upon his future sphere of labour. In the list of the committee in all former reports he had been described as the Rev. J. C. S. F. Frey, but in the first issued after the disruption, both prefix and suffix were omitted, all the other gentlemen being called Esq.

The rules of the new Society have, during the last seventy years, [Vol. CXXV. No. CCXLIX.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. LXIX. No. I. L



been modified in various details. The principal object now aimed at is the "spiritual welfare of the Jews," giving temporal relief being secondary, and under certain conditions, the exceptions being the hospital and school of industry at Jerusalem. Relief cannot be given to destitute Jews out of the general fund of the Society, but separate funds may be opened for that purpose, the management of which is to be entrusted to special committees selected from the general committee. Every clergyman who subscribes a few shillings, and every layman a guinea, becomes, as long as he continues his subscription, a member of the Society. The composition and method of appointing the committee deserve notice. The lay members are to be chosen at the annual general meeting. All clergymen who have been five years members of the Society become *de facto* members without election. The lay members are to be elected, the practice being for some person in the office of the Society to select eighteen of the retiring members who have been most diligent in their attendance during the previous year, and six others, if they can be found, and submit the names to the meeting, it not being usual for notice to be taken or objection to be made by any one when the names are read out. No list of the names of the clerical members of the committee has ever been published, but those of the laymen are published each year. The general committee has power to elect from among themselves or other members of the institution such standing sub-committees as may be found necessary, and from time to time such special sub-committees as occasion may require. The committee is also authorized to elect annually two persons from among themselves, and three from the general body of subscribers, to audit the accounts, than which obviously nothing could be more objectionable and less calculated to inspire confidence in the published financial statements.

Of the eighteen lay gentlemen who at present compose the ostensible lay section of the committee, as the names are published in the last report, it may be sufficient to observe that while they may reasonably be regarded as well-meaning persons, having a legitimate interest in the welfare of the Jews, there is no reason to believe that they have any special knowledge individually or collectively of their religious opinions, manners, customs, language, and literature, or that they have any qualifications for the management of such missions. Of the eighteen, five are officers in the army, two are officers in the navy, one is an army surgeon, two are bankers, and the rest are gentlemen whose names are little known beyond their Society. A gentleman, now deceased, was lately at the same time a trustee and chairman of the committee, and chairman of the committee of the Church Association, which had for its object the prosecution and persecution of the

Ritualists. This case illustrates the absurdity of the method of appointing the committee. It may well be asked, How could the Jews look with any sympathy upon the work of a Society when they saw the chairman and trustee at the same time filling the post of persecutor of his own Christian brethren? and what notion would they form of the spirit of Christianity, if they looked only to the proceedings of this man and his colleagues?

The constitution of the clerical section of the committee is equally faulty. By the annual payment of half a sovereign for five years in succession, all clergymen became members. As they belong almost exclusively to one section of one party, which is not famous for its learning or liberality, it would be too much to expect from them any knowledge of the Jews or their literature. The suppression of their names and of the lists of the sub-committees destroys personal and individual responsibility, and is not calculated to generate public confidence. It will be fully admitted by most people that ability to talk cant and speak the religious dialect of the party is no compensation for deficiency in the other qualifications, whether of clergymen or laymen, required for the conduct of missions to the Jews. By the twelfth rule the committee must meet once a month, or oftener if necessary, so that from the facts of the case the affairs of the Society must be managed to a great extent by London clergymen, who find it more agreeable and less onerous to frequent the committee-rooms of the Society than to work among the poor in the back streets of their parishes. Experience has, however, shown that the paid secretaries are ultimately the executive officers, owing to the irregularity of the attendance of the members of the committee. The proceedings being secret, and the members not being responsible to any recognized tribunal, no confidence in a body of men so constituted and acting can be placed by any person, except those who are content to place money at their disposal, and ask no questions about the way in which it is expended.

The fatal objection to this and other kindred societies which are off-shoots from the extreme section of one party in the Church is, that they are composed of private persons who act in her name without having received any public authority or official sanction, involving her in the discredit of their own mismanagement and failure in foreign missions. It is absurd to suppose that a number of private irresponsible anonymous persons, meeting occasionally in a room in London, and calling themselves "The London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews," or by any other name, can represent the Church in her missionary character. She is morally responsible for their acts, but she has no control over their conduct. The constitution and formation of such societies tend, as all experience shows, to aggravate and intensify the vices

of the extreme religious party of which they are the representatives, calling down the disapproval of all conscientious and independent Churchmen.

At foreign stations where the Society has a church, as in Jerusalem, in which the ministrations of religion are carried on, the Church of England is not presented in her real character to Jews and Native Christians and to the tourists, who, from all parts of the world, every year visit the Holy City, because the ritual and teaching are those of a very small section of a narrow and reactionary party in the Church at the present time. They may represent the opinions of the Society, but they are not those of Churchmen in general.

The vices of the party to which the Society belongs can be traced through its whole history. Besides those which developed themselves in the management in its early years, others much more offensive and ruinous have since showed themselves. The Society is admittedly constituted on a narrow religious basis, but how narrow is not generally known. The first committee being composed of Churchmen and Dissenters, applied no religious tests, and their successors after the disruption were not in a position to require from candidates for missionary employment any beyond what the Church requires. At what time the attempt to introduce a creed within a creed was made, and the inquisitorial religious questions now in use were first prepared is not known, because there is no reference to them in any of the publications of the Society. It is probable that they never would have become known if the biographer of Bishop Barclay had not published some of them as they were put to him when a candidate for missionary work among the Jews. The tendency of legislation in recent times has been to relax the stringency of subscription and enlarge the liberty of action of the clergy, but the committee of the London Jews' Society will have none of these innovations. Mr. Barclay was then a young clergyman, who had been carefully educated for his profession in the University of Dublin. He had been in holy orders for several years, and had worked in his parish without reproach. The ignorant persons who, in 1858, constituted the committee of the Society, making no account of his previous career, proceeded to deal with him as a suspected person until they thought they had obtained satisfactory evidence that he was such a person as themselves. They asked him what books he had read, whether he believed the Thirty Nine Articles, whether he was in debt, whether he was married or engaged to be married, whether he was converted, and what were the reasons which led him to such a conclusion, and other questions equally insolent. He was also put, like Catarivas, under the surveillance of a petty Islington incumbent of no note,

now deceased, whose business it was to ascertain whether his views were the same as those of the committee, and whether he was really converted or not. Application was also made to his referees to know whether he had given correct answers to the questions.

His biographer commented upon these unworthy proceedings with righteous and indignant severity. He asked who the men were who took it upon themselves to put such questions to a young and irreproachable clergyman? whether they were themselves converted and who had certified them as such? To require any man to lay bare his inmost conscience, and divulge the secrets of his heart for the inspection of a set of narrow and intolerant religionists, who, in the absence of proof to the contrary, may have been themselves unconverted men, was an exercise of the Roman confessional in one of its most offensive forms which cannot be condemned with too much severity. The insolence of asking Mr. Barclay whether he believed the Thirty Nine Articles after he had on three previous occasions solemnly given his assent and consent to them in the form then required by law, speaks for the suspicious character of the men. Such proceedings always tend to defeat their own purpose. The effect of the publication of these inquisitorial questions has been such that no clergyman has since been found willing to connect himself with the Society.

A most objectionable characteristic of the London Jews' Society, and other so-called Evangelical societies, which could not exist if their proceedings were public, deserves the most unqualified reprobation. A clergyman or other person becomes obnoxious to the committee for any reason, or to any member of it, and they avenge themselves upon him by passing a resolution that they will not employ him in their work, for which he probably never intended to become a candidate. If the record of their proceedings were open to the inspection of the public such a resolution would be impossible. Some of these cases have ultimately transpired, the person assailed in this way behind his back being in the meantime ignorant of the injury done to his character by the committee, as far as they could injure it, with all the members of the Society. If one of the worst features of the Roman confessional reappears in the London Jews' Society in their examination of missionary candidates, it is not less singular that excommunication should be used in the nineteenth century, as the weapon of a self-styled Evangelicalism, for the overthrow of obnoxious persons. This displeasing characteristic also narrows the London Jews' Society within very contracted limits, and contributes to drive away from it all high-minded and independent men.

The charge urged against religious societies of publishing garbled reports is not a new one. The original committee, when denouncing in their third report those missionary societies which presented cooked statements to their supporters, little thought that they were condemning the conduct of their successors in subsequent years. The present Society has inherited from their predecessors a vice which has become a necessary part of their tactics, because if the whole truth were told about their missions the Society could not hold together for a week. Illustrations of suppression and garbling are to be found in the papers and documents published by the Society, which would never have been detected if other works subsequently issued from the press had not shown the real state of the case. The committee have said that Jerusalem is their principal foreign station. From 1873 to 1882 the reports give glowing accounts of the work carried on among the Jews there, of which the general effect is, when they are compared together, to leave upon the mind the impression that the missionaries were efficient and zealous, and that the mission was successful. The average annual expenditure upon it was £7,000, if the financial statements can be relied on. The committee, however, neglected to tell their supporters that there was in Jerusalem an organized opposition to the work of the mission, and that the Jews were so carefully looked after by the Rabbis that proselytizing was impossible. The late Bishop Gobat, in his annual pastoral letter in 1876, said that the Jews' Society had done little or nothing in the mission during the previous two or three years. Their only clerical missionary having been absent in Europe during the summer of that year there had been no person to carry on any work. The report of the mission shows that there were then in Jerusalem nineteen agents, including an English clergyman, the head of the mission, who had left and returned to England without the idle formality of a resignation. When Bishop Barclay arrived in Jerusalem in the spring of 1880, he was grieved to find that the mission was in a dying state, even those who were favourably disposed towards it agreeing in the opinion that during the previous ten years it had been a complete failure. In that year the Society employed twenty-four agents, the head of the mission, who was an English clergyman, being useless, because he could not speak any language known to the Jews. A person who was resident in Jerusalem said that it was grievous to see nothing being done although there were so many agents. For six years no adult convert had been made from the 20,000 Jews then settled in Jerusalem. The unfortunate and disorganized state of the mission was carefully suppressed by the Society, although their financial statements show that the expenditure went on as usual.

The charge of publishing garbled documents has been established against the Society by the biographer of Bishop Barclay. In the *Jewish Intelligence* for July, 1860, they published, in a garbled and mutilated form, a portion of a journal of a missionary tour in the Danubian Principalities by Mr. Barclay, who was accompanied by the late Henry Abraham Stern. The biographer has reproduced the suppressed portions of Mr. Barclay's MS., and printed, side by side with them, in parallel columns, the remainder as he wrote it in one, and the printed journal as it appeared in the *Jewish Intelligence* in the other, with the garbling and alterations. The latter descends to very minute particulars, but in some cases the reviser overlooked details which betrayed his hand. The object of the garbling was to make it appear that the journal was written by Stern, and that it was as far as might be the record of his labours. This man was one of the Abyssinian captives who were detained in the clutches of the Emperor Theodore. He is called in the "Biography of Bishop Gobat" a very moderate person. He died last year (1885) in the service of the Society.

Still more severely to be censured is the conduct of the Society in publishing in the *Jewish Records* for December, 1861, a journal written by Mr. Barclay of a missionary tour in the Holy Land soon after he went to Jerusalem, which they attributed to another clergyman, as if it were written by him, and contained a record of his labours. It must be admitted that this was a very strange proceeding. These cases destroy all confidence in the trustworthiness of documents which the Society has hitherto published, and of any which they may hereafter publish.

Extravagance and recklessness in the expenditure of the funds entrusted to the Society for missionary purposes constitute a vice which has adhered to it from the outset. To what extent the money has been judiciously appropriated is not easy to determine, owing to the difficulty of understanding the financial statements, and the suppression of detailed information, but some cases have lately come to light which render it probable that if a committee of investigation were appointed, the Society might in respect to them find it difficult to justify its action. A rough estimate, based on the annual statements of receipts, would put the amount of money received up to this time at about a million sterling, besides vast sums given to the Society for particular purposes, which have long since disappeared, without any tangible result, in the bottomless abyss of Jewish pauperism and imposture. In 1827 some sinister rumours were afloat about the method of expenditure, which induced the committee, at the instance of Sir Thomas Baring, who was then President, to nominate a special committee to investigate the\*

matter. Gentlemen who were members of the Society were accordingly chosen, whose report could not of necessity command much confidence. After numerous meetings, during which the subject was only partially investigated, they agreed to a statement, which was suppressed by the committee, on the ground that it was too long to be published, and that anything short of the whole would present but a partial view of the truth. They, however, quoted in their report for 1828 the concluding observations, in which the committee of investigation said that it was the clear duty of the persons who were appointed to manage societies like the London Jews' Society to give to their constituents a clear and intelligible account of the nature and extent of the expenditure of the sums committed to them, and that after they had done so, they were entitled to claim a full confidence in the integrity of their motives and of their desire properly to execute the duties with which they were charged. The investigation proved abortive, and the expenditure went on unchecked. No clear and intelligible account of it is to be found in any subsequent financial statement. By referring to any of them it will be seen that the items are jumbled together in lump sums, which renders it impossible to determine whether they were justifiable or not. A sum of £2,400 was admittedly expended in 1863 and 1864, in the purchase of land for a sanatorium near Jerusalem, and in erecting buildings upon it, to which the agents of the mission might retire during the hot season, but the reports for each of these years contain no account of such a transaction. The expenditure has since been proved to be questionable, because, although it was said at the time that the property would soon be worth double what was given for it, the sanatorium has been cast aside, like old government stores, and is now for sale to any one who will buy it. By comparing the reports of the Jerusalem mission with the expenditure upon the school for Jewish boys for six years subsequent to 1874, a curious illustration appears of the recklessness of the committee and of the failure of this department of the mission. In the report for 1875 the number of boys in attendance is not given, the expenditure being £1,153. In that for 1876 the number is not given, the expenditure being £799 18s. 3d. In that for 1877 it is stated that the number in attendance was *the same as in the previous year*, the expenditure being £799 18s. 4d., which sum looks suspiciously like the preceding. In 1878 there is no report about the schools, but the expenditure is set down at £843. In that for 1879 the average attendance is stated to have been 35 per week, being rather less than six per day, with an expenditure of £828. In that for \* 1880 it was said that the school was *not quite so well attended*

as in former years, although the expenditure amounted to £805.

A transaction, about which the committee never ventured to give their supporters any information, has been brought to light by the biographer of Bishop Barclay, who has given dates and figures. Attached to Christ Church, Jerusalem, there is a small house, consisting of six rooms, for the use of the clerical head of the mission and his family. It had been occupied for years by successive missionaries, when one of them discovered that it was not suited for his family. Representations were accordingly made to the committee that a new and much more commodious house near Jerusalem was for sale, under peculiar circumstances, and might be bought cheap. In the report for 1879, the committee complained that, owing to the falling off of the funds, they had been obliged to reduce the number of beds in the hospital in Jerusalem, and that they did not know what amount of suffering had been in consequence left unrelieved. In that year the sum received for missionary purposes was £34,795, the debt owing by the Society being £6,043, which was an increase of deficit upon the previous years of £1,700, when the receipts amounted to £35,909. The report makes no mention whatever of the purchase of the new house at Jerusalem, nor does the item of £1,800, which was the sum given for it, appear in the accounts of the Jerusalem mission, as given in the financial statement for the year, or in any other place or document issued by the Society. This scandalous business coincides significantly with the appointment of an English clergyman to be head of the mission, who was so incapable that he was able only to hold communication with the Jews through a dragoman, as he has himself admitted. This man has been living in the house ever since.

The total income of the Society for 1884 was £35,000, being a decrease of £4,200 on the previous year. There was a debt of £5,700, which was an increase of £2,600 upon the deficit for 1883. The expenses of collection and management were upwards of £6,000, leaving only £29,000 available for missionary purposes, and the payment of debt. The report shows that nearly 1,000 associations had ceased to contribute.

Sir John Kennaway, speaking as chairman at the last anniversary meeting in Exeter Hall, claimed that the Society had been successful during the last seventy years. The actual results, owing to the unsatisfactory character of the reports, can be estimated with difficulty; but some means exist for forming an estimate of them, both in Jerusalem, which they say is their most important mission station, and in London. When judging of what the Society has accomplished, a distinction must always be carefully drawn between conversions and baptisms of adults.



and between the baptism of adults and children, because in a recent controversy in *The Times*, the advocate of the Society sought to throw dust in the eyes of the public, by confusing together the former and the latter, with the object of showing results which were quite delusive. Of the adults baptized from time to time in the East and elsewhere, the Society admits that a considerable proportion turn out impostors. The agencies of the mission in Jerusalem, besides the public ministrations in Christ Church, are a House of Industry, where destitute Jews are taught trades, an institution for Jewesses, where they receive instruction and training, schools for boys and girls, where they are supported and educated, a hospital, a book-shop, and a home for inquirers, where Jews who profess to be investigating the truth of Christianity are maintained in idleness for a definite time, or until they have made up their minds one way or other. It is doubtful whether many of these wandering Hebrew gentlemen understand much, if anything, of what is said to them. Each of these institutions is of long standing. In 1883, owing to the great influx of starving refugees into Palestine, driven by persecution from Russia and Roumania, a fund was set on foot by the Society in England for their relief, called the "Jewish Refugees from Russia Fund at Jerusalem," to which in two years contributions were given amounting to upwards of £5,000. When it was found that the receipts of the Society for purely missionary purposes were becoming diminished, the fund was closed, and another was opened elsewhere by members of the Society, under the name of the "Jewish Refugees' Aid Society," which maintains destitute and inquiring Jews, as a colony, at a place called Artouf in Palestine, where land was purchased with part of the money contributed. Although nominally independent of the Society, it is really under its control, because the committee admit that those of their missionaries who can speak the language have preached in the settlement since its foundation, which is not likely to be continued, because the colony is discountenanced by the Turkish Government, and has been set on foot in defiance of the first principles of political economy. It is really cruel to the refugees, because it is nothing but an organized system of bribery; and when it collapses, as other colonies in Palestine have collapsed, they will be left in a worse state than they were in the beginning. Besides the foregoing, there are six eleemosynary funds for the relief and assistance of necessitous Jews, all under the control of the mission. - It has now been in existence for sixty years, and it might be supposed that out of the 20,000 Jews now resident in Jerusalem a sufficient number of proselytes would have been made to constitute a church able, like other native churches, to

stand by itself. In 1865 the mission had been in existence for forty years. Mr. Barclay was then head of the mission, and in that year, speaking at the anniversary meeting in Exeter Hall, he said that he knew of 144 converted Jews, of whom one-half were adults. The Rev. E. B. Frankel, who supplied his place during his temporary absence, said, in the report for the year, that the proselyte community numbered about 150 souls, which must be taken to include children of former proselytes. A somewhat different account was given in the following year by F. H. Apel, in a pamphlet published at Zurich, entitled "Three Months in Abyssinia." He had been German tutor in the family of one of the most opulent proselytes, and had in consequence good opportunities of forming an opinion about the characters of the converts from Judaism. According to him there were two whom he believed to be men of thorough integrity, two who were neither hot nor cold, while, in his opinion, the rest were little better than impostors, who, it must be supposed, had made a nominal profession of Christianity for the sake of the temporal advantages. In the report of the Jerusalem Mission for 1877, the committee said that of the converts who had been baptized as adults in Christ Church, twenty-three were still living in Jerusalem, of whom not more than one or two had turned out impostors, to which were to be added six others who had been baptized elsewhere. It was also stated, without giving particulars, that the converts, with their families and grandchildren, then formed a pretty considerable community. No person was converted during the year.

In the report for 1882 the committee said that the Society had under its care in Jerusalem a community of 203 persons, of whom ninety-four were communicants, although in the reports for the intervening years no mention can be found of any conversions, except that of one adult, who was said to have been baptized in 1879. This case is an illustration of the misleading statements frequently published by the Society, which only escape public criticism because few persons read the reports, and still fewer take the trouble to criticize them. The 203 persons obviously include men, women, and children, the suggestion being that the whole of them were converts, nominal or otherwise, from Judaism. In that year the Society had in Jerusalem twenty-two agents, who, with their families and servants, must be deducted. There must also be deducted the resident English families, with their children and servants, who ought not to be included, because they were only accidentally connected with the services in Christ Church. These deductions will reduce the number to about one-half, giving the probable total of the professed adult proselytes, with their children and grandchildren, as

about 100. Assuming this conclusion to be only approximately correct, the adult convert community will shrink within very narrow limits.

In the same report, by the use of the multiplication and division tables, the committee endeavoured to make it appear that of the ninety-four communicants, at each of the thirty-one times the Holy Communion was administered the average number present was twenty-seven, or a monthly average of sixty-nine, the aggregate attendances in the year being 833. The figures look large, and, if credible, would show that the mission, as far as converts were concerned, was in a prosperous condition. From the ninety-four communicants must, however, in the first place, be deducted all the agents of the Society, and all the English families and other residents in Jerusalem who might occasionally communicate. From the aggregate of 833 must also be deducted the whole of the English-speaking tourists who, from all parts of the world, come to Jerusalem during the season, who are known to crowd Christ Church during that period, and to communicate in large numbers. The committee took care not to say how many of them were included in the aggregate of communicants.

The failure of the Society to comply with the requirements of Turkish law, and register their adult male nominal converts, with all births and deaths, with the Protestant Vakeel at Constantinople, casts great doubt upon the reality of the result of their mission. The Protestant Firman of 1850, which was intended to found a new Protestant community in the Turkish Empire, and secure the civil rights of its members, requires seceders from the jurisdiction of the Chief Rabbi to be registered at Constantinople by this officer. The register is the true test of the success of these missions, and as the agents of the Society have never registered a single adult convert, the statistics of the mission furnished by the committee from time to time can neither be verified nor relied on. They frequently say that Jews who have been under instruction in Jerusalem go to other stations, where some of them are baptized, but there is no possibility of verifying any such statements, while there are examples of such persons being counted twice over to swell the statistics. The reports of tourists in the Holy Land cannot be relied on. Such persons cannot understand the language spoken by the Jews, any more than the head of the mission during the Episcopate of the late Bishop Barclay. They can know nothing about the mission except what it suits the agents to tell them, and having no means of making independent inquiries, except through dragomans, who are always ready to say what is most agreeable, they fail to understand the real state of the mission. There are on record cases of the hoodwinking of tourists. Arriving

in Jerusalem they see Christ Church filled with people, but they cannot distinguish between Jewish converts, inquirers and the rest of the congregation. Of what its condition may be out of the season they know nothing. There is no more pitiable spectacle than the sight of such gentlemen put forward by the committee at the anniversary meeting in Exeter Hall to state what they saw or were told about the mission in Jerusalem. Their testimony, whatever form it may assume, can only prove injurious to the cause which they ignorantly advocate.

The organization of the Society for the conversion of the Jews in London, of whom, including those residing in provincial towns, there are said to be 60,000, includes the Episcopal Jews' Chapel in Bethnal Green, in which, besides the services in English, there is on Sunday afternoon a service intended for Jews and proselytes in which the liturgy is read in barbarous Hebrew, and a sermon is preached in English or German. There are also schools for Jewish children, where they are supported and educated till they are able to earn their own living. Most of them are only half Jews, one or other parent being in almost every instance a Christian. There is also an institution for training candidates for missionary work, where instruction is given in various subjects affecting the Jews, as far as the Society is able to provide it. The students, who are selected from the most promising boys in the schools, or from the Operative Converts' Institution, or from the Wanderers' Home, are supported and educated at the expense of the Society. During 1884 there were only three candidates under instruction. The Operative Converts' Institution in Palestine Place, to use the language of the Report, "afforded a comfortable home and Christian instruction and the means of learning a trade to twenty-nine sons of Abraham," of whom twenty-four were proselytes, and four Jews who had retired from it after staying a few weeks. Nearly all of them had been occupants of the Wanderers' Home, where, as in the Enquirers' Home at Jerusalem, they were put under strict supervision and supported, on condition of receiving Christian instruction from the agents of the Society. This institution, like the colony at Artouf, is only an auxiliary to the Society, being supported by funds obtained from other sources. In 1882 the income amounted to £743. There is at present a proposal before the public to raise a fund for its permanent endowment, but, like that for lending money to the Jews in the early history of the Society, it equally deserves to be reprobated. Except the Episcopal Chapel all these institutions are eleemosynary, and without their assistance very few even nominal proselytes could be made. The persons who are received into them are chiefly foreign Jews who are found by the lay agents of the Society wandering in the streets in a state

of semi-starvation, or miserable wretches concealing themselves in some den in the slums, who, impelled by necessity, are glad to receive such assistance as they can get, on the hypocritical pretence of a desire to learn what Christianity really is. It is well known that the first question of a destitute Jew, when accosted in the streets of London by an agent of the Society is, what will you give me if I become a Christian? If these persons were not interfered with by the agents of the Society they would be taken care of by the Jews themselves. There are at present in London two Jewish Boards of Guardians for the relief of the Jewish poor, with large available funds derived from various sources, and forty-two other Jewish charities designed to assist in the education of the young, in emigration, in providing meals for Jewish strangers, and to relieve almost every possible form of distress whether among young or old. These charities are either connected with the synagogues, or managed independently by societies of wealthy and benevolent Jews. Many of them are part of the organization with which the Rabbis oppose the efforts of the agents of the Society.

As many respectable Jews have abandoned Judaism irrespective of the Society and been absorbed into the Christian population, it is difficult to ascertain how many nominal converts have been actually baptized, and how many have proved worthless, but a statement was made by Bishop Hellmuth, himself a German converted Jew, in the anniversary sermon preached by him in St. George's, Bloomsbury Square, on the 31st of March, 1884, which may be taken as what the Society wishes to be understood as the results of its labours during the last seventy-six years. He said that it was recorded in their publications as facts, that there are at present not less than a hundred converted Jews, who are now clergymen in England and Ireland, and that there are thousands of converts. Supposing the former part of this assertion to be true, that these clergymen were converted as laymen to Christianity by the agents of the Society, it should not be forgotten that it must be modified by certain other considerations. There are Jewish clergymen who are known not to have been converted by the Society. Many Jews have become converts by simply reading the New Testament, without any external interference. These are the best converts, who, having voluntarily changed their faith without any improper motive, never relapse. This class of converts cannot be claimed by the Society any more than those Jews who, having given up Judaism of their own accord, for family or other reasons, have changed their names and been absorbed into the population. A third class, composed almost entirely of destitute Jews constitute the source from whence the Society has mainly derived its converts, and how many of these have afterwards become clergy-

men the Society has nowhere stated. The process by which such a result can be brought about is easily explained. A destitute Jew is picked up by an agent in the streets, and after enjoying the hospitality of the Society for a time, he professes himself to be converted and is baptized. Previous to being under its protection he was a wretched wanderer, but after this event he becomes quite an interesting person to sentimental ladies, is called "a Christian Israelite," is petted in every way, provided with the means of earning his living for the future, or if he be thought peculiarly promising, funds are raised by benevolent persons to defray the expenses of his education with the view of his becoming a clergyman. This is the history of several Jewish clergymen within the knowledge of the writer of this article. If such persons are in a respectable position in life they rise rapidly in the Church, not because they are in any way superior to other clergymen, but because they are surrounded with a halo of sentimentalism which to some people proves irresistible.

Bishop Hellmuth also said that 782 adult converts had been baptized in the chapel in Bethnal Green, and about as many children, during the previous seventy-five years—but what if there were? Baptisms are by no means equivalent to real conversions, and the handful of converted Jews who at present attend the services in the chapel on Sunday afternoons does not suggest that the conversions are numerous. He also claimed that there were 5,000 Jewish Christians in Prussia alone, but he did not venture to assert that the Society had been instrumental in their conversion. It has several mission stations in that kingdom, but the reports for many years do not show any such results or any approximating to them.

The Jews freely admit that secessions from Judaism to Christianity have been going on for many years past, but they deny that any respectable family has been induced to forsake their ancient faith by the London Jews' Society. The denial must be admitted to be well-founded. The Eardly family, of which Sir Sampson Gideon was the founder, Mr. Bernal, the ancestor of the present Duchess of St. Albans, the Lopes, Goschen, Ricardo, and Disraeli families, one branch of the Mocattas, and many more, who have established themselves in English Christian society, and made names for themselves in politics and commerce, were never brought into contact with the London Society, which is only known to respectable and wealthy Jews as a body of conversionists to be carefully shunned, and whose agents, if known as such, would not be admitted into their houses.

That there have been secessions to Christianity of influential

Jews is not denied by their co-religionists. Mr. Picciotto has dealt with the subject from a Jewish point of view, and endeavoured to find out the reasons which induced them to abandon their faith. As might naturally be supposed, according to him, very few, if any, arose from conviction, the causes being either social or domestic or personal. In his view the greater number of conversions took place in the last quarter of the eighteenth century and the first quarter of the nineteenth, before the removal of Jewish disabilities. Up to the time of this important event in the history of the English Jews, they were debarred by their religion from a political or professional career. They could not acquire or inherit landed property. Commerce was the only opening which a Jew could find for his energies, but when wealth was obtained by it, his aspirations were still unsatisfied, because he felt that he stood in a position of unequal privileges with his Christian fellow-subjects. For these disadvantages, which must be admitted to have been real, there was one remedy. If he became a Christian, they all disappeared at once, and his own career and that of his descendants was for the future free from obstruction. There may be some truth in this reason for an ambitious Jew changing his religion, but such accessions to Christianity would not be of the most creditable character. There is no known example of the descendants of such converts returning to Judaism.

These conversions took place more frequently among the Sephardic or Spanish Jews than among the Askenazim or German Jews, the latter, retaining some traits which distinguish the natives of the fatherland, were more plodding and earnest of purpose than the former, and being content with the pursuits and profits of trade, with the free exercise of their religion and the occupations of domestic life, were under little temptation to pass over to Christianity. The Jews of Teutonic descent being of inferior intellectual culture to the Spanish Jews, and being content with their freedom and safety from persecution, were not troubled with aspirations after unattainable objects, and for this reason it is thought there was among them less tendency to apostatize.

Another powerful reason for leaving Judaism was marriage into Christian families, for which the way was easily opened by the wealth which the Jews were known to possess. Christian children by Christian mothers were common among the Sephardim, who adopted the maternal surname and religion, and were absorbed into the Christian population, so that by this means many an ancient family and great accumulated wealth have been lost to Judaism. The old Jewish family of Medina, under another name, has long since disappeared in the general body of Christian Englishmen. Another cause of losses to the Hebrew

community has been traced to the practice of sending Jewish children to public schools, where, surrounded by Christian influences, overcome by the efforts of a tutor or companion, seeds have been sown in the minds of young Jews, which, sooner or later, have germinated and led to the secession of the whole family. Mr. Picciotto mentions the case of an eminent member of the chief German Synagogue, who, with his household, was lost to the Jews through sending his son to the Charter House. Over-strictness in Synagogue discipline among the Spanish Jews has also been assigned as a cause for the secession of more of its members than from the Askenazim. The domineering spirit of the elders and their rigid enforcement of rules, which tended to generate pique and to stir up hostility, have caused the withdrawal altogether of many intellectual and influential Jews. The cause of the secession of the Disraeli family is well known. Mr. Picciotto refers to the case of a member of one of the first families in the Portuguese Synagogue who withdrew because he could not obtain a particular honour on the Day of Atonement.

Some of the foregoing causes of conversions to Christianity have disappeared, but the tendency of the higher class of Jews to secede still continues. The final abolition of Jewish disabilities, instead of removing, has rather served to encourage it, by affording opportunities for Christian and Jewish families to associate together on a footing of equality. In a Christian country the influences surrounding the Jews must necessarily have an effect upon them, because freedom of intercourse will enable them to understand what Christianity really is, irrespective of the aspect, not always attractive, under which it is presented by the agents of proselytizing societies. The denunciation by a London Rabbi, in a funeral sermon for the late Sir Moses Montefiore in one of the Synagogues, of some members of the congregation whom he called recreants, because they manifested a disposition to embrace Christianity is a proof that this influence is real.

The view of the operations of the London Society taken by the better class of Jews has been forcibly expressed by Mr. Picciotto in the following terms:—

In our days conversions of another and a coarser type have become more frequent in this country. Powerfully organized associations, with extensive pecuniary resources at their command, send out paid officials to chase Jewish souls, and to bring them within the pale of imaginary salvation. Their instruments, chiefly apostates themselves, interpose between parents and children, and by ingenious devices destroy the peace of families, in order to produce at head-quarters some poor simpleton or child said to have been converted. These organizations, which all right-minded Christians condemn, have their field of operations principally among the uneducated children of the



indigent and among destitute foreigners. Their salaried agents do not disdain the use of bribery, and with keen mockery call their victims "inquirers after truth." After truth, indeed! Empty stomachs and half-clad bodies know better the objects of their inquiries.

Disregarding some offensive expressions in this quotation, it is impossible not to feel that the description, although expressed in somewhat coarse language, is literally true.

The London Jews' Society has expended vast sums of money with very little results to show in return. The evil which it has generated in the minds of Christians far out-balances any good which it professes to have accomplished among the Jews. The Church has been discredited by its mismanagement and failure. Clerical members have seceded from the committee and the Society at different times in disgust. Out of the 141 agents employed in 1884, which is a decrease of ten on the previous year, only four are English clergymen of Christian birth and descent. So unpopular has it become among the clergy that when the Society advertised last year in the newspapers for a clerical agent for a foreign station, not one of them could be found to accept their offer. Having originated in strife, its history is full of the records of contention both in Jerusalem and in England, and it is now in the midst of an acute crisis caused by the misconduct of a member of its committee in publishing gross inaccuracies and in vilifying on its behalf the memory of the last Anglican Bishop of Jerusalem, who in early life had been its best and most successful agent. Public opinion is turning against it, the funds are decreasing, and heavy losses have lately been sustained by the deaths of its most influential supporters, and of an agent whose place they are unable to fill. The best friends of the cause of missions to the Jews are disgusted with the abuses which exist in it, and with its discreditable failure. Some of them are calling out for its reform, which is impossible. The real remedy for existing evils is for the Church to take out of private hands the management of her missions, whether to Jews or other unbelievers, and to place them under the control of a public responsible board, consisting of lay and clerical Churchmen, elected irrespective of party. In such a body the abuses, mismanagement, inaccuracies, and failures which now discredit and neutralize missionary operations at home and abroad, could not continue long without reform and correction, because the members would be amenable to public opinion, the prospects of success would be improved, and Churchmen would contribute the funds to maintain them with greater confidence.

## 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.]

## GRATTAN, AND THE IRISH PARLIAMENT.

**HENRY GRATTAN**—*clarum et venerabile nomen*—entered the Irish Parliament on the 11th of December, 1775. He was returned for the borough of Charlemont, in which a vacancy was caused by the death of its representative, Major Caulfeild, who was drowned on his passage from England. The patron of the borough, Lord Charlemont, was desirous to obtain for the cause of commercial freedom the parliamentary services of Grattan, whose abilities his lordship had already recognized.

In 1779, the public distress had reached a most alarming point. The Viceroy at that time was the Earl of Buckinghamshire. On October 12 he met Parliament, and delivered from the throne a speech expressing, by command of his Majesty, the affectionate concern of the King in the interests and distresses of Ireland. His Excellency told the House of Commons that on account of the extraordinary decline of the revenue, the very liberal supplies of the last session had proved inadequate to meet the expenses of government; he therefore hoped the commons would make a provision suitable to the exigency of the times.

Sir Robert Deane moved for an address to the throne, praising in terms of extravagant eulogy the administration of the Viceroy; lavishing thanks for the gracious dispositions of the king; and in general, as is usual in such addresses, slavishly echoing the speech. Sir Robert at the time was trying to obtain a peerage; and accordingly we find the Viceroy recommending him to Lord North for a coronet in the following terms:—"Sir Robert Deane has uniformly, with four friends, supported his Majesty's measures, and has never suggested a difficulty on any occasion."

Just as little difficulty in supporting his Majesty's measures had Mr. Richard Hely Hutchinson, who seconded Sir Robert's motion. He was then, like Sir Robert, on the outlook for a peerage, and he accordingly declared that the interests of Ireland must be well managed by the present administration, as their designs were, in his opinion, pure. "The veil of

calumny," he said, "which so long traduced them, would disappear, and the factious calumniators, touched with truth, as with the spear of Ithuriel, would start into shape." He was effusive in expressing his admiration of the Government and the gratitude due by the nation to the Viceroy.\*

Grattan moved an amendment to the address. The Viceroy's speech, he said, contains nothing explicit, nothing satisfactory. It meant to quiet the minds of the people without any declaration whatever. Having described the wretched condition of the kingdom, he went on:—

The distresses of this kingdom are twofold, the beggary of the people and the bankruptcy of the State. The first, he would not ask the commissioners of the revenue to prove, but he would ask them upon oath whether the restrictions on our trade were not the cause? Whether the prohibitions, laid on by England, against the export of woollen cloth, did not occasion it? . . . As to the bankruptcies of the State, they are the consequence of a system of boundless prodigality, profligacy, and violence; a boundless prodigality while our means were limited—a profligacy and violence uniformly maintained. . . . The peace establishment of this poor country amounts to one-sixth of that of England; what proportion is there in our means? What is this establishment? Infamous pensions to infamous men.

Grattan continued to denounce the systematic corruption by which the Court attempted to deprive the Legislature of popular confidence and support. He ended by moving an amendment to the address, reciting the national grievances, and demanding a free export trade. Lord Westport seconded the amendment. A spirited discussion followed, in which the ministerial members, finding the sense of the House decidedly against the address, declared that rather than impair unanimity, they would not oppose the amendment. Hussey Burgh, the Prime Serjeant, moved, in place of Grattan's amendment, "That it is not by temporary expedients, but by a free trade alone, that this nation is now to be saved from impending ruin." In reply to the Viceroy's demand for more money, his Excellency was told that the limited state of our trade and commerce must, by narrowing Irish resources, set bounds to Irish liberality. The Prime Serjeant's amendment was carried without a division; and the address, thus improved, was presented by the Speaker to the Viceroy; the Dublin Volunteers, under the command of the Duke of Leinster, lining the street from the Parliament House to the Castle.

The history of this transaction strongly demonstrates the

---

\* Deane was created Lord Muskerry. R. H. Hutchinson's mother was created Baroness Donoughmore, October 16, 1783, and on her death he inherited the peerage.

utility of a resident Legislature. Here was a Parliament so badly constructed as to give exceptional encouragement to venality; the Court plied the traffic of place, pension, and peerage with incessant and scandalous profusion: every influence was in full operation to undermine the political integrity of members; yet, in the midst of this dense atmosphere of corruption, the Houses of Parliament stood by their country and against the Court. Why did they so act? Because they legislated at home. Many years later Grattan described the effect of this home influence in words which deserve enduring record:—

How came the Irish Parliament with all its borough members in 1779 to demand a free trade—in 1782 to demand a free constitution? Because they sat in Ireland, Because they sat in their own country, and because at that time they had a country; because, however uninfluenced as many of its members were by popular representation, yet they were influenced by popular sympathy. They did not like to meet every hour faces that looked shame upon them. They did not like to stand in the sphere of their own infamy. Thus they acted as the Irish absentee at the very same time did not act; they saved the country because they lived in it, as the others abandoned the country because they lived out of it.

Mr. Lecky observes that during the eighteenth century the Irish Parliament was, on the whole, a vigilant and intelligent guardian of the material interests of the country:—

During the greater part of the century, indeed, it had little power except that of protesting against laws crushing Irish commerce; but what little it could do it appears to have done. Its journals show a minute attention to industrial questions, to the improvement of the means of communication, to the execution of public works. *Leaders of Public Opinion*, p. 187.

The reader is probably aware that in 1778 there were important relaxations of the Penal Laws. The whole penal system was thoroughly detested by Grattan. He loved Ireland with a devotion, passionate, yet regulated and intelligent. He early saw that Irish prosperity and Irish constitutional freedom were impracticable so long as the productive energies of the people were cramped, or rather neutralized, by the legal fetters that made the great Catholic majority mere hewers of wood and drawers of water. A Protestant himself, he spurned the baseness of the bigots who desired to monopolize for Protestants all the privileges of citizenship. By his patriotic politics he incurred the displeasure of his father, who was colleague with the celebrated Charles Lucas in the representation of Dublin, and who marked his anger by bequeathing away from his son the family mansion of the Grattans.

In those days the county of Kilkenny was renowned, as it has

been at much later periods, for the extensive hospitality and social amusements of the principal inhabitants. In looking at the records of the time, we are struck with the contrast between the jovial, sometimes riotous, festivity of the wealthier members of the landocracy, and the prevalent penury with which they were surrounded. In Kilkenny, as in Dublin and elsewhere, amateur theatricals were frequently practised. Grave divines occasionally trod the Thespian boards. In a farce called "Bon Ton," performed in 1779, at a theatre in Cuffe Street, we find the part of Lord Minikin represented by the Rev. Peter Lefanu; and in the tragedy of "Jane Shore" the same reverend gentleman personated Gloucester. The Rev. Gilbert Austin appeared as Bardolph in the play of "Henry the Fourth," performed at Drumree in 1773. Dean Marlay appeared as Locket in the "Beggars' Opera" in a private theatre at Carton, and recited a prologue of his own composition. The theatrical mania even infected the legal profession; for Hotspur was performed by no less a personage than Lord Chief Baron Burgh, at Mr. Connolly's theatre at Castletown. Grattan was drawn into the theatrical vortex. He wrote an epilogue to the "Masque of Comus," which was spoken by Miss Latouche, afterwards Countess of Lanesborough. He had connections in Kilkenny; and when there he entered with spirit into the histrionic exhibitions of the joyous coteries whose refinement and brilliancy yet linger in the local traditions; and among whom a prominent character was Henry Flood, whose career, long continuing in friendly connection with Grattan, and afterwards diverging into embittered rivalry, is inseparably connected with the great public transactions of the time. Grattan and Flood read poetry and acted plays together. Flood was fourteen years older than his friend, over whom his talents, his attractive manners, his extensive information, and, above all, his services in asserting Irish legislative independence, necessarily gave him great influence. He had been in Parliament since 1759, and had greatly distinguished himself by creating a powerful opposition in the House, and eliciting from the country a large display of public opinion in favour of the course he adopted. But while Flood was in most points in accordance with Grattan, there was one vital matter on which their principles were at variance. Flood, whilst strenuously asserting the independence of the Irish Legislature, opposed every political concession to the Catholics. He was willing to relieve them from all restrictions as to property or industrial employment, but he would not remove one link of the purely political chain; he would not suffer them to vote at parliamentary elections. Grattan, with a larger heart and greater sagacity, conceived that the permanence of the Irish Constitution was

fatally imperilled by excluding the great majority of the people from full participation in its benefits. The result has justified his prescient wisdom. He desired to consolidate the national elements of strength by conferring on all classes of religionists perfect equality of political privilege. He could see nothing but national weakness in the policy that made aliens of five-sixths of the nation.

We return to the Volunteer movement. This national army was officered by men of the first rank, and the Earl of Charlemont accepted the supreme command. The Lord Lieutenant, in the speech from the throne already referred to, said that the great military preparations of the House of Bourbon seemed only to have roused the courage and called forth the exertions of his Majesty's brave and loyal Irish subjects. "I have only to lament," continued his Excellency, "that the exhausted state of the treasury has hitherto put it out of my power to give those exertions the most extensive and constitutional operation by carrying the militia law into execution." The Government, destitute of the means of national defence, could not well forbid the nation to defend itself. Yet it looked with great jealousy at the Volunteer movement. On the 7th of June, 1779, Lord Weymouth, Secretary of State for the Home Department, had written from London to the Viceroy, recommending that the proposed additions to the Volunteer Companies already raised should be "discouraged by all proper and gentle means." To this recommendation the Viceroy replied on the 12th, that applications for arms were hourly made to the Castle, "which," he added, "shall in every instance be civilly refused." On the 23rd of July, however, a Council held at the Castle advised the Viceroy to relax his refusal so far as to deliver a part of the militia arms to the governors of counties. But this concession seems scarcely to have been needed, so great was the zeal with which supplies were poured into the Volunteer treasury to furnish the munitions of war. Free Trade had been carried in Parliament; and the patriotic action of the senate was emphasized by a label attached to the cannon at a Volunteer display in College Green—"Free Trade—or This."

The triumph of Free Trade was indeed important. But the speeches of Grattan, and of the patriots who worked with him in Parliament, produced a strong conviction throughout Ireland that the acquisitions they had gained were insecure so long as the British Legislature considered itself entitled to any species of authority in Irish concerns. True, that Legislature, pressed by the necessity of the time, had repealed some destructive restrictions upon Irish commerce. But it might at any time re-enact those restrictions, unless Ireland should assert and establish her

own just right to exclusive legislation within her own shores. The country gentlemen caught the spirit of patriotism. Although their minds had been cramped by the sectarian bigotry that had found its expression in the Penal Laws, they now began to discover that they had a country to defend against English aggression, and to feel that their individual dignity was inseparably associated with the constitutional independence of their country. They began to feel that an Irish gentleman sustained personal disgrace from the degradation of Ireland, and that he could not perform an office of more disgusting, more scandalous baseness, than in helping to fasten British fetters on his native land.

Early in the session of 1780, Grattan gave notice that he would move for a Declaration of Irish Rights. "This measure," says his son, "alarmed the Castle, and every effort was made to stop the growth of popular feeling. The Government proceeded to canvass against the Declaration of Rights and the repeal of Poyning's law." But the Government canvassed in vain. Grand juries, county meetings, meetings of Volunteer corps, passed numberless resolutions affirming that no power on earth was entitled to make laws to bind Ireland save only the King, Lords, and Commons of Ireland. Grattan, previously to bringing on his resolution in the House of Commons, retired to the residence of his uncle, Colonel Marlay, of Celbridge Abbey, to meditate on his approaching motion. He has himself given us the following account of his patriotic meditations:—

I grew convinced that I was right; arguments unanswerable came to my mind, and what I then prepared confirmed me in my determination to persevere. A great spirit arose among the people, and the speech which I delivered afterwards in the House communicated its fire and impelled them on; the country caught the flame, and it rapidly extended. I was supported by eighteen counties, by the grand jury addresses, and the resolutions of the Volunteers. I stood upon that ground, and was determined never to yield. I brought on the question on the 19th day of April, 1780. That was a great day for Ireland; that day gave her liberty.

The speech Grattan delivered on that day was a triumphant vindication of his country's rights. We cannot resist the temptation of transcribing a few extracts. Having exposed the unrighteous nature of the British usurpation and stated its destructive results, he thus exhorts his countrymen:—

Do not tolerate a power—the power of the British Parliament over this land—which has no foundation in utility, or necessity, or empire, or the laws of England, or the laws of Ireland, or the laws of Nature, or the laws of God. Do not suffer it to have a duration in your mind. Do not tolerate that power which wasted you for a century, that power which shattered your loom, banished your manufactures, dishonoured

your peerage, and stopped the growth of your people. Do not, I say, be bribed by an export of woollens or an import of sugar, and permit the power that has thus withered the land to remain in your country and have existence in your pusillanimity. Do not suffer the arrogance of England to have a surviving hope in the fears of Ireland. Do not send the people to their own resolves for liberty, passing by the tribunals of justice and the High Court of Parliament; neither imagine that by any formation of apology you can palliate such conduct to your hearts, still less to your children, who will sting you with their curses in your graves, for having interposed between them and their Maker, robbing them of an immense occasion, and losing an opportunity which you did not create and can never restore.

Again :—

I have no ambition, unless it be the ambition to break your chain and contemplate your glory. I never will be satisfied so long as the meanest cottager in Ireland has a link of the British chain clanking to his rags. He may be naked, he shall not be in irons; and I do see that the time is at hand, the spirit is gone forth, the Declaration is planted. And though the public speaker should die, yet the immortal fire shall outlast the organ that conveyed it, and the breath of liberty, like the word of the holy man, will not die with the prophet but survive him. I shall move you, That the King's most excellent majesty, and the Lords and Commons of Ireland, are the only powers competent to make laws to bind Ireland.

Grattan, when moving this resolution, had to deal with a Parliament accustomed to the restraints imposed on it by the English Declaratory Act of 1719. Its motions had so long been fettered that it was not prepared to endorse all at once the grand principle of legislative independence. In the letters of the Viceroy of the period, and of other members of the Government, the measures of Grattan are stigmatized as revolutionary and rebellious. Those measures, however, had the warm sympathy of so many members of the House of Commons that his motion was not, in terms, rejected. A middle course, extremely perplexing to the Government, was adopted—namely, an amendment for adjournment to the following September, on the ground that a resolution was already on the books of the House, equivalent to that now moved by Mr. Grattan. The resolution thus referred to was that of the 26th of July, 1641, affirmatory of Irish legislative independence.

Notwithstanding the discouragement of Government the cause advanced apace. Spirited resolutions were enthusiastically carried in numberless localities. On the 15th of February, 1782, 242 delegates from the Volunteer associations of Ulster assembled in the Protestant church of Dungannon. Prior to that day Lord Charlemont, Flood, and Grattan met at Charlemont House in Dublin to prepare resolutions for the coming



meeting. Grattan drew the first resolution, which affirmed,—“That a claim of any body of men, other than the King, Lords, and Commons of Ireland, to make laws to bind this kingdom, is unconstitutional, illegal, and a grievance.” The second resolution, against Poyning’s law, was drawn by Flood. Grattan drew a third ; it was as follows :—

Resolved, that we hold the right of private judgment in matters of religion to be as sacred in others as in ourselves ; that we rejoice in the relaxation of the Penal Laws against our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects ; and that we conceive the measure to be fraught with, the happiest consequences to the union and prosperity of the inhabitants of Ireland.

These resolutions were adopted by the Volunteer Convention at Dungannon, and the last, which referred to the Catholics, was seconded by the Rev. Mr. Black, a Presbyterian clergyman. It is most worthy of notice that in proportion as the principle of Irish nationality advanced, did that of sectarian animosity decline. The national spirit among Irish Protestants was weakest during the reign of penal intolerance. It is well observed by Mr. Lecky that the Irish penal code originated in an English law ; and that the time when the Irish Parliament was most persecuting, and the Irish Protestants were most intolerant, was the time when the first was absolutely subservient to English control, and when the latter merely deemed themselves a garrison in an enemy’s country. Although there were numerous exceptions to the general rule, yet on the whole it is undoubted that as soon as the Protestants began to feel themselves thoroughly Irish, their anti-Catholic acerbities began to give way. It was natural that it should be so ; and we are fortified by the experience of that period in the belief that the feelings of sectarian virulence which partisan journalists and bigots do their worst to inflame would vanish beneath the blessed influences of Home Rule. All classes of religionists, standing on the level of perfect legal and constitutional equality, would find more profitable occupation in attending to their various common interests, than in playing into the hands of the common enemy by wretched squabbles for a worthless sectarian ascendancy.

The Government made several efforts to obstruct the progress of the nation. They offered office to Lord Charlemont, Mr. Grattan, and their principal friends. The offer was promptly rejected. Grattan said that office in this country “was not a situation held for Ireland, but held for an English Government often in collision with, and frequently hostile to, Ireland.” Office may, under certain circumstances, be honourably and patriotically held. But those circumstances did not exist at a

time when Grattan's acceptance of it would have weakened his public influence by arousing the distrust of the people in his integrity. His health had suffered much from the great anxieties incident to his position, and the prolonged strain upon his energies. In April, 1782, Fox and Lord Rockingham wrote from England to entreat that the Irish Parliament should adjourn for three weeks to afford time to the English Government to consider the great question at issue between the countries. Grattan was confined to bed. Lord Charlemont brought the letters of Fox and Rockingham to his bedside. Grattan vehemently cried, "No time! no time!" and Lord Charlemont wrote to his English correspondents that the Irish leaders were pledged to their own people to bring on the question on the day appointed. That day was the 16th of April, 1782.

Public expectation had been wrought up to the highest point. The streets of the metropolis were filled with the Volunteer troops who had come in great numbers to attend the meeting of the province of Leinster. Their air of exultation did not quite conceal the feeling of anxiety which the crisis that had now arrived was calculated to excite in every breast. But their splendid array was inspiring, and their arms flashed brightly in the sun, as Grattan, accompanied by some trusty confederates, passed through their gallant ranks to the Parliament House. Mr. Hely Hutchinson, Secretary of State, rose to communicate a message from the King, recommending the House to take into consideration all causes of complaint, with a view to the final adjustment of all constitutional questions between Great Britain and Ireland. Grattan then delivered a speech in which he reviewed the various stages by which the national rights had advanced to their present triumphant position. He specified the grievances that English power had inflicted upon Ireland. This portion of his speech has an interest for modern readers, because some of the worst of them have been revived by the Union:—

What [said he] were the grievances? An army imposed on us by another country; that army rendered perpetual; the Privy Council of both countries made a part of our legislature; our legislature deprived of its originating and propounding power; another country exercising over us supreme legislative authority; that country disposing of our property by its judgments, and prohibiting our trade by its statutes; these were not grievances, but spoliations which left you nothing. When you contended against them you contended for the whole of your condition. When the Minister asks, by what right? we refer him to our Maker; we sought our privileges by the right we have to defend our property against a robber, our life against a murderer, our country against an invader, whether coming with civil or military force—a foreign army or a foreign legislature.

Grattan concluded his speech by moving an address to the King embodying the principles of Irish legislative independence, the adoption of which by both Houses of Parliament left the Government no choice but acquiescence. There was at that time much sincere and hearty patriotism in the House of Commons. The Lords, however, were more timid, or less honest; some of them doubtless loved Ireland and willingly supported Grattan's policy; others gave the aid of their votes so reluctantly that Grattan, speaking at a later period, said of them: "I carried the Lords on my back, and a heavier load I never bore; I never could have got them to move if it had not been for the bayonets of the Volunteers." Grattan was now the idol of his countrymen. Parliament, in grateful recognition of his splendid services, voted him a grant of £50,000. The Duke of Portland was then Viceroy, and in his speech from the throne he called the new arrangement "a compact" between the two countries; and with an outward semblance of sincerity he exhorted the Houses to impress on the people "that both countries have pledged their good faith to each other, and that their best security will be an inviolable adherence to that compact." General Fitzpatrick, who was a member of the Irish Government, wrote from London on the 20th of December, 1782, to Mr. Ogle, that the settlement between the two kingdoms was a compact, "for the religious observance of which the Duke of Portland must ever consider himself a guarantee." But England broke the compact in 1800, and to her breach of faith the Duke of Portland was an active party. In January, 1800, General Fitzpatrick wrote to Grattan concerning the then projected Union in the following terms: "With respect to myself, allow me to avail myself of this opportunity to express my abhorrence of the most shameful and unprincipled violation of a solemn treaty as history can furnish an example of between two independent nations;" and farther on he styled the Union a measure of "outrageous profligacy." But in 1782 the affectation of frankness and friendliness by the Viceroy and other English statesmen imposed on Grattan. His own noble nature, incapable of treachery or fraud, led him to place unmerited confidence in the good faith of English statesmen. He could not believe that solemn and earnest professions of unchangeable fidelity to the international compact were falsehoods, uttered with a latent purpose of reclaiming the concessions which his virtue had extorted, as soon as opportunity should enable the English Government to break its pledged faith. He could not believe that men, with the honeyed words of friendship on their lips, had the venom of the asp in their hearts. Relying on British sincerity, he conceived that the Irish Constitution was thenceforth safe from British attacks. Flood, how-

ever, conceived that Ireland needed additional security; and in order to satisfy him and all other doubters of England's perfect honour, the English Parliament in 1783 enacted a statute, 23rd of George III., chap. 28, by which it was declared that the legislative and judicial independence of Ireland should at no future time be questioned or questionable. Assuredly if plain words have any meaning, this Act put the final seal on the international compact, and rendered the breach of it seventeen years afterwards indescribably infamous. His Majesty King George III. also gave his personal pledge to maintain the Irish Parliament in his answer to an address from that body after the session of 1783. Here are his royal words:—

His Majesty's faithful Parliament may rest assured of his Majesty's determined resolution to concur with them at all times in the maintenance of that free and excellent constitution on which the happiness and interests of his people of Ireland so essentially depend.

Some years afterwards his Majesty conferred numerous peerages as bribes to venal legislators to destroy that excellent constitution which he promised to maintain.

The English Act, 23rd George III., chap. 28, renouncing for all time to come the power to legislate for Ireland, is commonly known as the Renunciation Act. It was, as intimated above, procured by the agitation raised by Flood, who succeeded in producing a popular belief that the mere repeal of the Declaratory Act of 6th George I. was insufficient to secure the constitutional liberties of Ireland. England, by that Act, had asserted her right to make laws for Ireland; and Grattan contended that by simply repealing it she had effectively renounced her claim. Flood, on the other hand, argued that the 6th of George I. was a declaratory law, and as such only stated what the law had previously been, but did not enact a new law; that it therefore left the claim to legislate for Ireland untouched, and did not relinquish in principle the assumed power, which at any future time England might, if able, seize an opportunity to exercise. Grattan defended the sufficiency of the repeal of the 6th of George I. He said that to place our security in an Act of Renunciation by the English Parliament, implied an admission that the English Parliament did actually possess the right to give liberty to Ireland. "We go to the King," said he, "not *for*, but *with* a charter."

Again:—

Your legal security is not repeal, nor renunciation, nor recognition, nor the laws of England, but the laws of Ireland. Your security consists in this—that you are not dependent for liberty on the laws of England or the Parliament of England; your legal security is, that you

do not require legal security in the Parliament of England, and have nothing to do with her judges or their comments; nor are you dependent on the laws, construction, comment, power, or quibble of a foreign land. Your legal security is the law of Ireland.

This reasoning is powerful. But it must be admitted that a solemn pledge given by the English Parliament to respect *in eternum* the independence of the Irish legislature gave especial emphasis to a great international transaction. It did not make England the donor of liberty to Ireland; *that* had been the work of the Volunteers and of the Irish Parliament. But it imposed on her the strongest moral obligation to abstain from all attacks on the Irish Constitution.

In 1783, there had been much distress among the Irish manufacturers, which distress was aggravated by an exceedingly bad harvest. The sufferers loudly complained, and their complaints have been made use of since the Union by anti-repealers, as proofs that the settlement of 1782 had failed to create manufacturing prosperity. We must, however, remember that Ireland had but just emerged from a long course of ruinous commercial restriction, and it is not matter of surprise that the evil results of that restriction did not immediately disappear. We must also remember that even under the best systems of government, the proverbial mutability of human affairs will exhibit fluctuations of prosperity and depression. Ireland, beyond all doubt, became very prosperous under her free Constitution. To deny that prosperity on the ground of occasional distress, would be as absurd as to deny the general prosperity of England, because Bethnal Green has often been starving, or because of the misery entailed on English cotton operatives by the cotton famine some years ago.

While Grattan effectively asserted the constitutional rights of his country, he warmly supported the claim of the Catholics to the full privileges of citizenship. He is pre-eminently entitled to Catholic gratitude. There was much obstinate prejudice to be encountered, and Catholic emancipation could only be obtained in instalments. Every relaxation of the chain had Grattan's earnest advocacy, which, as he was a Protestant, was especially praiseworthy. A Catholic agitator for emancipation was working to *get* political equality; but a Protestant emancipator was working to *give* to the excluded class a share of the privileges of which he himself, as a Protestant, was already possessed. On the 20th of January, 1782, the House of Commons went into committee to consider a Bill for extending the privileges of the Catholics. Grattan, of course, supported the Bill; remarking that it was no reproach to the Catholics to have fought under the banner of James II., inasmuch as they had extorted from

him a Magna Charta, a free Constitution, before they took up arms in his cause. Grattan's predominating principle of nationality breaks out in his question to the House, "Whether we shall be a Protestant garrison or an Irish nation?"

The growth of Irish prosperity under the Constitution of 1782 is placed beyond doubt by the concurrent testimony of numerous witnesses. The Court of Dublin was conducted in a style of great splendour, and the resident nobility embellished the capital by the erection of many stately mansions. To infuse into the minds of all classes the overmastering love of Ireland with which his own mind was animated, was Grattan's earnest labour. He saw with delight the increasing prosperity of the country. He saw with pride the growing magnificence of the metropolis. To perpetuate the progress of both town and country, it was indispensable that men should cherish the sentiment of nationhood as an active, energizing principle. Among the political coteries of the time there were adventurers who did not recognize the fact that the spirit of nationality is to the nation what the spirit of self-defence is to the individual.

There are gentlemen [said Grattan] who call England the whole empire, and her exclusive power and domination the general welfare; and the servants of Government in Ireland may, if they would stoop to it, on such a principle, advance a pretence for abjuring every prejudice of their nativity, every special advantage of their own country, and for preferring the power of another land. . . . I laugh at those Irish gentlemen who talk as if they were the representatives of something higher than their native land—the representatives of empire, not of Ireland; but, so talking and so acting, they will in fact be the representatives of their salary. Let me tell those gentlemen, *if they are not Irishmen they are nothing.*

But Grattan, while insisting on the sole right of Ireland to control her own concerns, was sensitively anxious to maintain the most friendly relations with England. He said: "I am desirous above all things, next to the liberty of my country, not to accustom the Irish mind to an alien or suspicious habit with regard to Great Britain." These words were spoken while he yet believed that the compact of 1782 would be faithfully observed by the English Government. Some years later his confidence was rudely shaken.

Meanwhile, the country was advancing in prosperity; but this advance was less rapid than it would have been had the Executive been sincere in its friendly professions. The reluctance with which the concessions to Ireland were made, peeps out in the debates and political correspondence of the time. For instance, Lord Northington, when Viceroy, wrote to C. J. Fox from Dublin Castle on the 18th of November, 1783:—

I must refer to my old idea, that is, that the trade of Ireland, being open to England, any regulations she may find it expedient to make must interfere with English trade; and I cannot help observing that the old notions seem to govern, even in the King's councils, and that a strong jealousy exists about every trifling advantage that is likely to be gained by Ireland.

His Excellency, however, was not destitute of consolation, for in the same letter he wrote: "There never can exist a competition, at least for a century, owing to the superior skill, diligence, and capital of England."

Yet Grattan was able to say, in 1785:—

We can go on; we have a growing prosperity, and as yet an exemption from intolerable taxes. We can from time to time regulate our own commerce, cherish our manufactures, keep down our taxes, bring on our people, and brood over the growing prosperity of young Ireland. In the meantime we will guard our free trade and our free Constitution as our only real resources; they were the struggles of great virtue, the result of much perseverance, and our broad base of public action.

Lord Sheffield, who, in 1785, wrote on Irish commerce, said: "At present, perhaps, the improvement of Ireland is as rapid as any country ever experienced."

Having mentioned Lord Northington, we may observe that his correspondence affords a glimpse of the festive habits of the period. He apologizes for the possible incoherence or obscurity of one of his official despatches, pleading that after a great Irish dinner his brains were scarcely in proper diplomatic order.

Among the evils of the time, the exactions of the State Church excited loud complaints. There were anti-tithe riots in Munster. Grattan took up the subject in 1788. His object was to lessen the pressure of the people by substituting a moderate *modus* for the then existing system. A few passages from one of his speeches will show his view of the grievance:

"A tenth of your land, your labour, and your capital, to those who contribute in no shape whatever to the produce, must be oppression." Again: "The peasantry in Apostolic times had been the object of charity, not of exaction. Those to whose cabin the tithe-farmer has gone for tithe of turf, and to whose garden he has gone for the tithe potatoes, the Apostles would have visited likewise—but they would have visited for contribution, not for exaction." He defined the difference between rent and tithe: "Rent is a charge on land, tithe on labour; the one definite, the other indefinite." He quoted Paley, who said: "Of all institutions adverse to cultivation, none so noxious as tithe; not only a tax on industry, but the industry that feeds mankind." Mr. Fitzgibbon, on a previous occasion, had said

that he knew the unhappy peasantry were ground to powder by relentless landlords: Grattan deemed the clergy more relentless than the landlords, for in his first anti-tithe speech he said that the middleman's over-reaching, compared to the tithe-farmer's, was mercy. The State Church was a lucrative job, whose advocates pleaded the necessity of handsome incomes for its clergy. "As if," said Grattan, "Christ could not prevail over the earth unless Mammon took him by the hand." It appears that non-residence in their parishes was then as prevalent among the State-clergy as it ever had been. Among Grattan's proposed revolutions was the enforcement of a moderate tax on non-residence; but this proposal was rejected; and the only result of his efforts at the time was the exposure of the iniquitous character of a system too strongly entrenched in the personal interests of a powerful party to be shaken by patriotic eloquence.

In 1789 the memorable Regency Question occurred. Concerning this subject we shall only say here that Fox and his friends considered the action of the Irish Parliament on the question more accordant with constitutional principle than the action of the English Parliament influenced by Pitt.

In February, 1793, a Bill for the further relief of the Catholics was introduced by Mr. Hobart. The elective franchise was one of its provisions. Grattan said that he wished the Bill had gone farther, but that it deserved thanks because it contained much, and would lead to much more. He complained, on behalf of the Catholics, that while they were three-fourths of the nation they paid their proportion of nearly £2,000,000 of taxes without any share in the representation or expenditure; they paid the Protestant Church establishment without any retribution; they discharged the active and laborious duties of life, manufacture, husbandry, and commerce, without those franchises which are annexed to the fruits of industry; they replenished the army and navy, without commission, rank, or reward. Among the opponents of the Bill was the notorious Doctor Patrick Duigenan, whose anti-Catholic virulence was the leading principle of his political existence. Sir Jonah Barrington says that his father was parish clerk of the Protestant church of Saint Werburgh. He is said to have entered Trinity College as a sizar, and by industry to have worked his way up to a scholarship and to one of the two lay fellowships in that learned corporation. His countenance was coarse, and its expression was of somewhat a pugnacious cast. He was brought into Parliament by clerical influence for the borough of Old Leighlin. His speech against the Catholic Bill is not without the sort of interest that attaches to ludicrous bigotry. He complained that although statutes of Henry VIII. and Elizabeth had vested all spiritual



and ecclesiastical authority in the Sovereign, yet the Catholics actually refused to renounce the spiritual and ecclesiastical authority of the Pope ; and that by their contumacious conduct they robbed his Majesty of one of the brightest and most valuable gems in his imperial crown. It was, he said, highly unreasonable for the Catholics to expect permission to found and endow universities, colleges, and schools, "for the home manufacture of Romish priests ; a measure," continued Duigenan, "which I will venture to affirm no English Minister will presume to attempt." He affirmed that the loyalty of a Catholic nation to a Protestant king was impossible. He declared that only for the presence of the English Protestant army in Ireland it was reasonable to suppose that the habitations of the Protestants would "by this time" have been in flames, and their persons butchered. He said that large bodies of Catholics publicly declared that no Protestant should reside within the kingdom. The Treaty of Limerick, he affirmed, had *not* been violated ; the Irish army in that city were a band of routed traitors, enclosed like rats in a trap, the certain victims of the avenging gibbet or the sword. The House should seriously consider whether they ought not to re-enact the penal code in whole or in part, instead of giving further privileges to the Catholics. With respect to the elective franchise, the Catholics in the reign of Anne "became troublesome to the Protestants on elections. The Legislature therefore, in the second of Anne, thought fit to erect the barrier against their votes." In the first year of George II. "Parliament found it absolutely necessary, for the preservation of the Protestant Establishment in Church and State, to incapacitate all Catholics from voting at the election of any member to serve in Parliament." . . . "In truth, the Protestants in Ireland are but a British garrison in an enemy's country, and if entirely deserted by the parent State must surrender at discretion, though with a very little help they are still able to repel the common enemy."

The Tory corporation of Dublin had recently accompanied their resolution to uphold Protestant ascendancy with the following detailed definition of that blessing, which Duigenan adopted and repeated for the edification of the House :—

A PROTESTANT KING OF IRELAND,  
 A PROTESTANT PARLIAMENT,  
 A PROTESTANT HIERARCHY,  
 PROTESTANT ELECTORS AND GOVERNMENT,  
 THE BENCHES OF JUSTICE,  
 THE ARMY AND THE REVENUE  
 THROUGH ALL THEIR BRANCHES AND DETAILS PROTESTANT.

The reckless bellowing of Duigenan failed to defeat the Bill ; the elective franchise was restored by the House to the Catholics.

In 1794 Grattan had received from Pitt a promise that if the Catholic claim of full emancipation were brought forward in the Irish Parliament it should receive the support of the Government. Relying on this promise, Grattan, early in February, 1795, introduced the Catholic Bill, of which the Viceroy, Earl Fitzwilliam, was an earnest advocate. His Excellency's arrival in Ireland was the subject of great public rejoicing. His political principles necessarily rendered him popular ; he was looked on as the Viceroy destined to heal the wounds of the nation by abolishing all disabilities on account of religion. Add to this, he kept a splendid Court in Dublin Castle, of which a contemporary writer thus speaks :—

The magnificence of all his appointments, while it bespoke the dignity of the proprietor, furnished the means of industry and happiness to thousands. The laudable example held out at the Irish Court by Lord and Lady Fitzwilliam, operated by attracting thither the truly good, amiable, and virtuous part of the nation ; in the same proportion that the vicious, the profligate, and the abandoned, fled from its lustre.—*Public Characters of 1799, 1800.*

Many of our readers are aware that the encouragement of Catholic hopes by the appointment of an emancipating Viceroy was part of Pitt's plan to embroil the Irish nation by the rage and disappointment his Excellency's sudden recall was certain to produce. Sir Lawrence Parsons, member for King's County, was one of those who saw through the tortuous project. He gave expression to his fears on the 2nd of March. He said that the state of the kingdom was most alarming :—

The people, under the auspices of their old friends, had been taught to expect measures which he feared would very shortly be resisted. How far his apprehensions were founded, the gentlemen opposite to him [the Treasury bench] were better able to explain ; but if the hopes of the nation were blasted, he could not, without sensations of the greatest horror, look to the consequences.

Speaking of the Catholic Bill, Sir Lawrence said that if a resistance to any one measure more than another was likely to produce dreadful consequences, it was this. . . . If the Irish Administration had countenanced the Catholics in this expectation without the concurrence of the British Cabinet, they had much to answer for. On the other hand, if the British Cabinet had held out an assent, and had afterwards retracted, if the demon of discord had come from the infernal regions upon earth and thrown a firebrand among the people, he could not do more to promote mischief. The hopes of the public were raised, and in one instant they were blasted. . . . He protested to God that in all the history he had read, he

had never met a parallel of such ominous infatuation as that by which the British Minister appeared to be led. Let him persevere [said Sir Lawrence], and you must increase your army to myriads.

In 1795 the Orange institution was founded. Orangeism may be defined as Protestantism run mad. An intelligent writer in the Belfast *Northern Whig*, who seems minutely acquainted with the history of Orangeism, and who traces it from its origin to the present time, records that its practical operation commenced by an attack, made by a body of Protestant yeomanry, on the Catholic inhabitants of a village called "The Diamond," slaughtered them, burned their houses, and destroyed their cattle. "In the midst of their destruction and crime," says this writer, "was formed the first Orange lodge. Such was the birthplace of Orangeism, which was baptized in innocent blood."\* The institution efficiently helped the Government to lash the people into rebellion. But the persecution of the Catholics had preceded the formal organization of the Orange body. The words of Edmund Burke on this subject are remarkable. Writing to Grattan on the 3rd of September, 1794, he refers to the great part Grattan had acted in promoting the partial Emancipation Act of the preceding year. The wickedness of the Executive counteracted the healing tendency of beneficial legislation; and Burke, speaking of his son Richard, who had visited Ireland in the Catholic interest, says:

He [Richard] saw with horror the systematic pains which were taken, and which perhaps are still taken, to frustrate the effects of your labours so far as the union and concord of the nation were to be promoted by them. He saw with sorrow an attempt to demonstrate that a great mass of mankind may be made to feel all the weight and pressure of penal statutes even after they are repealed; and that, when the laws have taken men into protection, the ill disposition of the magistrate may make them experience many of the evils of proscription.

On the 9th of February, 1795, Mr. Jephson, member for Mallow, said:

Since 1782 the tried friends of Ireland had been excluded from power; the patronage of the Crown most wantonly employed in the House, not to support the empire, but to oppose the people.

---

\* The writer we have quoted is *au fait* at the scandalous history of the Orange faction. He gives ample details of their traitorous conspiracy to prevent our Queen's accession to the throne, and to establish the Duke of Cumberland as Sovereign. The rebellious faction try at present to obliterate the memory of their treasonable plot by vociferous professions of loyalty to her Majesty. It must be admitted that, if similarity of character should determine the choice of the Sovereign, the Orange rebels would be much more appropriately governed by a profligate whom popular indignation hunted out of England than by a virtuous Queen whose personal character is irreproachable.

Necessitous and intolerant individuals had been advanced to direct the public affairs on the principle of *Divide et Impera*; and hence it was that Ireland had been a scene of distress and embarrassment. Through rancour of persecution and excess of insult, men had been alienated from the throne.

In the examination of William James M'Nevin (a leader of the United Irishmen) before the Secret Committee of the House of Commons, August 8, 1798, he was asked by the Speaker, "What do you think occasioned the insurrection?" Mr. M'Nevin replied, "The insurrection was occasioned by the house-burnings, the whippings to extort confessions, the tortures of various kinds, the free quarters, and the murders committed on the people by the magistrates and the army."

Mr. Thomas Addis Emmett was examined by the Secret Committee of the House of Lords, August 10, 1798. He was asked at what period the military organization of the United Irishmen included firearms and ammunition; he answered, "After the Insurrection and Indemnity Acts had been passed, when the people were led to think on resistance, and after 4,000 persons had been driven from the county Armagh by the Orangemen."

A leading feature in Orangism is the mixture of brutal ferocity with effusive professions of religion. They have their "chaplains" and their "grand chaplains." Church steeples are occasionally decorated with orange flags on the anniversaries of battles fought nearly two centuries ago. The Orange mission of hatred and crime is accompanied with boasts of profound reverence for "the free, open Bible." What they call their religion is in fact an infragant species of truculent piety.

The Executive, as Edmund Burke observed, worked effectually to neutralize the good results that would have naturally followed the partial restoration of Catholic rights. The influence of Government in producing the mutual exasperation of Protestants and Catholics, and in corrupting the Legislature, brought matters to the desired point of public disorder. The Government plot was successful. While corruption predominated in the Legislature, the people were tortured into disloyalty by the policy of the British Cabinet. Lord Fitzwilliam was recalled from the viceroyalty at the end of March, 1795. Universal gloom prevailed; the shops of Dublin were closed. The trick with which Pitt had deluded and insulted the people bore its natural fruits of wrath and indignation.

Lord Camden succeeded Lord Fitzwilliam. It was customary for the Fellows of the University to congratulate each Viceroy on his appointment. In accordance with this custom, the Provost and Fellows of Trinity College proceeded to the Castle,

accompanied by a number of the students. An interesting incident occurred, showing that the efforts of the Government to promote sectarian hatred had not yet corrupted the hearts of those young men. When the procession arrived at the Castle gate, the students, instead of entering the viceregal precincts, proceeded *en masse* to the Catholic church in Francis Street, where John Keogh (O'Connell's predecessor in the leadership) was addressing a large audience on the Catholic claims. The entrance of the students was greeted with delight; and they gave emphatic expression to their sentiments by presenting, a day or two afterwards, an address to Grattan, in which they declared their hope that the harmony and strength of Ireland would be founded "on the solid basis of Catholic Emancipation and the reform of those grievances which have inflamed public indignation." We take the following sentences from Grattan's reply:—

Ingenuous young men, for this effusion of the heart I owe you more than ordinary gratitude, and am proud to sympathize in your native, honest, and unadulterated impressions. I receive your address as the offering of the young year—better garland than the artificial honours of a Court. It is the work of disinterested hands, and the present of uncontaminated hearts. . . . I join in your fullest wishes for the Catholics, and I feel the important service which you now render them by marking in their favour the sentiments of the rising generation; doing, at the same time, so much honour to yourselves when you give, I had almost said, your first vote in favour of your country.

But the persecution of the people went on, as did also the trade of parliamentary corruption. The outrages on Catholic property and life were loudly denounced by Grattan. Of the incessant and gigantic efforts to corrupt the Parliament, he said, "There is no object which a course of corrupt government will not finally ruin—morality, constitution, commerce, manufacture, agriculture, industry. A corrupt Minister issues forth from his Cabinet like sin and death, and senates first wither under his footsteps; then he consumes the treasury, and then he corrupts the capital and the different forms of constitutional life, and the moral system; and at last the whole island is involved in one capacious curse from shore to shore, from the nadir to the zenith." In 1797, parliamentary corruption had become so rank that Grattan, feeling the inefficacy of his efforts to obtain the measures which he deemed indispensable to the peace and prosperity of Ireland, withdrew from Parliament, and addressed to his fellow-citizens a letter explaining his reasons for taking that step. He enumerated the measures for oppressing and inflaming the people successively obtained from Parliament by Ministerial bribery. He enumerated the crimes committed with impunity

against the people, and referred to the fruitless attempts of himself and his friends to reform the Parliament and rescue it from the poisonous influence of the Minister.

No—no—no—the half-million,\* said the Minister, that is my principle of attraction. Among the rich I send my half-million, and I despatch my coercion among the people. His Devil went forth; he destroyed liberty and property; he consumed the press; he burned houses and villages; he murdered; and he failed. Recall your murderer, we said, and in his place despatch *our* messenger—try conciliation. You have declared you wish the people to rebel, to which we answer, God forbid! Rather let them weary the royal ear with petitions, and let the dove be again sent to the King; it may bring back the olive.

Pitt's Government had determined on their policy, to the triumph of which a rebellion was indispensable. Without a rebellion, and the consequent confusion and weakness of the country, the Union could not have been carried. George III. desired a Union because he thought it would "shut the door" for ever against Catholic Emancipation. The royal ear might indeed have been wearied with petitions, but not influenced by them. The dove might indeed have been despatched to his Majesty, but it would not have brought back the olive. The King's narrow mind was cramped by bigotry; and with ends so desirable (to him) as the extinction of the Irish Parliament, and (as he supposed) the perpetual exclusion of the Catholics, he was indifferent to the horrors entailed on the country by the Ministerial policy.

Grattan's address ended with a noble declaration of the principles that inspired his whole political life. Had those principles been the guide of our rulers, how different had now been the condition of our country! I quote them:—

May the kingly power that forms one estate in our Constitution continue for ever; but let it be as it professes to be, and as by the principles and laws of these countries it should be, one estate only, and not a power constituting one estate, creating another, and influencing a third.

May the parliamentary Constitution prosper; but let it be an operative, independent, and integral part of the Constitution—advising, confining, and sometimes directing the kingly power.

May the House of Commons flourish; but let the people be the sole author of its existence, as they should be the great object of its care.

May the connection with Great Britain continue; but let the result

---

\* This referred to Lord Clare's declaration that half a million was found necessary to break an opposition. .

of that connection be the perfect freedom, in the fullest and fairest sense, of all descriptions of men, without distinction of religion.

To this purpose we spoke; and, speaking this to no purpose, withdrew. It now remains to add this supplication:—However it may please the Almighty to dispose of princes or of Parliaments, may the liberties of the people be immortal!

HENRY GRATTAN.

The country was now thoroughly embroiled by Pitt's machinations. Protestant outrages on Catholics—Catholic outrages on Protestants; the growing harmony of all classes of our people destroyed, and replaced by a system of the bitterest sectarian hatred and sanguinary anarchy. And for what purpose? For a purpose which equalled in atrocity the abominable crimes by which it was promoted; for the destruction of the Irish Legislature; for the overthrow of that Constitution which England, by her statesmen, by her Legislature, by the words of her Sovereign, had solemnly engaged to uphold in all time coming.

I do not believe that Almighty God ever looked down from heaven on a transaction of blacker iniquity than the suppression of our Parliament, whether considered with regard to the mode of its accomplishment or the thing to be effected. No wonder that General Sir John Moore, when conversing on these matters with Grattan, exclaimed, "If I were an Irishman I should be a rebel." We often hear it said by advocates of the Union that the arrangement of 1782 failed. This is untrue. It did not fail. So far as a powerful and hostile Executive allowed it to operate, it produced great benefits, notwithstanding the defective construction of the borough Parliament. What is called its failure is simply its violent and criminal destruction by unprincipled enemies.

The rebellion broke out in May, 1798, and the horrible carnage on both sides fulfilled the prediction of Earl Fitzwilliam respecting the results of Pitt's policy. Arthur O'Connor, M'Nevin, and the other leaders of the United Irishmen had originally associated to obtain parliamentary reform and Catholic Emancipation, with which acquisitions they would have been satisfied. But when, instead of those just and reasonable measures—measures which the next generation adopted—they found the system of torture and coercion encouraged by the Executive Government, they despaired of effecting beneficial changes for their country by any other means than armed force, for which they negotiated the assistance of France. This course was always condemned by Grattan as a fatal mistake. He was loyal to the Crown. He hated French revolutionary principles; and, above all, he thought that an appeal to arms, probably abortive, would greatly facilitate the enactment of the legislative union. Yet it is very hard to see how the people

could have remained quiet. They were stung, goaded, maddened into rebellion by political exasperation and personal torture; by every means which Satanic ingenuity could devise or profligate power put in practice. It is remarkable that nearly all the leaders of the insurrection were Protestants; and in Ulster alone the number of United Irishmen in 1797 is set forth in the Report of the Secret Committee of the Irish House of Commons as having been 100,000. But the great mass of the insurgents were of course Catholics, from the numerical predominance of the Catholic religion.

Grattan was summoned to England in 1797 to give evidence at Maidstone at the trial of Arthur O'Connor. His health had broken down, and he suffered so severely from nervous disorders that his physicians directed an entire cessation of political effort; he was even forbidden to read newspapers. The rebellion had been crushed after a struggle of a few weeks, and Pitt deemed that Ireland, prostrate at the feet of Government and overrun with hostile troops, was reduced to such weakness that the Union could be easily forced upon her. It was introduced into the Irish Parliament by Lord Castlereagh in 1799, and defeated by a small majority. Towards the end of that year Grattan, who had sought health in a prolonged sojourn in the Isle of Wight, returned to Ireland. Government, although defeated on the question of the Union, determined to renew their attack on the liberties of Ireland in the following session. The details of their renewed campaign are too generally known to require more than a brief reference. Martial law was prolonged. The suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act was continued. The army of occupation was kept up in full complement. Every species of corruption was practised on a scale of fabulous magnitude. An Act, introduced by Attorney-General Toler (afterwards Lord Norbury), was passed to indemnify the agents of Government for any legal difficulties to which they had exposed themselves by what was called "vigour beyond the law," which vigour had often been displayed in the infliction of bodily torture, especially flogging, in the burning of houses, and the murder of the inhabitants. The Government bribed ten Catholic prelates to support the Union by leading them to believe that it would be followed by State payment of the Catholic hierarchy and priesthood and by Catholic Emancipation. The Protestant bishops were bribed by an assurance, incorporated in the Act of Union, that their Church should be upheld for ever as an integral member of the United Church of the empire; and only two of their right reverend lordships had the honesty to vote against the Union. The Presbyterian ministers were promised the bribe of an increased *Regium Donum*, which Castlereagh expected would



disarm their opposition to the Government. The expression of public opinion was as far as possible stifled. Sheriffs were appointed in the anti-national interest. Mr. Darby, high sheriff of the King's County, and Major Rogers, who commanded the British artillery at Birr, conspired to disperse a meeting of freeholders convened by the magistrates to petition against the Union. Major Rogers approached the sessions house, where the petitioners were assembled, riding at the head of four pieces of artillery with matches, and he declared that he only waited for one word from the sheriff to blow the sessions house about the ears of its occupants. After some parley, the magistrates and freeholders, having rapidly adopted the petition, deemed it prudent to disperse, and adjourned to the inn where the petition lay for signatures.

The friends of Ireland were naturally anxious that Grattan should re-enter Parliament. It chanced that a vacancy in the borough of Wicklow occurred just in time to enable Mr. Tighe, the patron of the borough, to have Grattan returned at the opening of the session. A stormy debate had occupied the day and night, when at seven o'clock in the morning of the 15th of January, 1800, Grattan, emaciated and feeble from his long illness, entered the House of Commons supported by two trusty friends, Mr. Arthur Moore and Mr. W. B. Ponsonby. His re-appearance at this awful crisis of his country's fate excited the strongest emotion in the House and the galleries. A cheer broke forth, long and vehement; friends crowded round him, but their delight at his return to the scene of his old glories was qualified by the deep anxiety with which they regarded his evident physical exhaustion. Being unable to stand, he obtained permission to address the House sitting; and in a speech of two hours he dissected the Ministerial project, exposing the sophistry of its advocates and demonstrating its fatal tendency with the vigorous logic and impassioned eloquence that had characterized his most effective parliamentary efforts. During the session he frequently spoke against the Union. On the 14th of February Mr. Corry taunted him with his absence from Ireland during the previous year. Grattan, in his answer, took occasion to refer to the monstrous crimes committed by the agents of the Administration. "I could not join the rebels—I could not join the Government—I could not join torture—I could not join half-hanging—I could not join free quarter—I could take no part with either. I was therefore absent from a scene where I could not be active without self-reproach, nor indifferent with safety." He also said, "The treason of the Minister against the liberties of the people was infinitely worse than the rebellion of the people against the Minister."

The battle of Ireland was fought to the last with honourable desperation by the patriotic minority. Foster, Ponsonby, Goold, Bushe, Plunket, Barrington, and a host of able allies powerfully showed that the Union was a shameless breach of national faith, that it was incapable of conferring upon Ireland the smallest benefit, and that its inevitable operation would be purely and exclusively evil.

The Parliament had great faults; but its benefits exceeded the mischiefs that resulted from its faults.

I do not mean [said Grattan] to approve of all the Parliaments that have sat in Ireland. I left the former Parliament because I condemned its proceedings; but I argue not, like the Minister, from the misconduct of one Parliament against the being of Parliament itself. I value the parliamentary Constitution by the average of its benefits, and I affirm that the blessings procured by the Irish Parliament in the last twenty years are greater than all the blessings afforded by British Parliaments to Ireland for the last century; greater even than the mischiefs inflicted on Ireland by British Parliaments; greater than all the blessings procured by those Parliaments for their own country within that period.

Grattan eulogized the Catholics for their steady devotion to their country. In 1795, on the rumour of a Union, an aggregate meeting of Catholics resolved that they would resist even their own emancipation if it was only to be conceded on condition of extinguishing the Irish Parliament. In January, 1800, the Catholics met at the Royal Exchange, and unanimously condemned the Ministerial project.

The Catholics of the city of Dublin [said Grattan] have come forth in support of the Constitution. I rejoice at it. They have answered their enemies by the best possible answer—by services. Such answer is more than refutation; it is triumph. . . . The path of glory leads on to privilege; “enjoy with me, if you please; without me, if you be illiberal: but by me, certainly; and at all events enjoy the parliamentary Constitution of your country.” This is to defend the tower; this is to leap upon the wreck; this is to sit beside the country in her sick bed. If she recover, there is a long and bright order of days before her, and the Catholics will have contributed to that event. If she perish, they will have done their utmost to save her; they will have done as an honest man ought in such an extreme case—they will have flung out their last setting glories and sunk with their country.

But the enemies of Ireland triumphed. Their army of occupation in the country, and their unlimited bribery in a carefully packed Parliament, secured their guilty success. A graphic description of the final scene has been given by De Quincey in his “Autobiographical Sketches;” he was one of the spectators,

and, although an Englishman, felt "unaffected sorrow and solemn awe" at the political extinction of Ireland. Here are his reflections as he surveyed the ermined peers assembled for the last time in their legislative chamber:—

How is it, and by what unaccountable magic, that William Pitt can have prevailed on all these hereditary legislators and heads of patrician houses to renounce so easily, with nothing worth the name of a struggle, and no reward worth the name of indemnification, the very brightest jewel in their coronets? This morning they all rose from their couches peers of Parliament, individual pillars of the realm, indispensable parties to every law that could pass. To-morrow they will be nobody—men of straw—*terre filii*. What madness has persuaded them to part with their birthright? and to cashier themselves and their children for ever into mere titular lords? . . . You are all, thought I to myself, a pack of vagabonds henceforward, and interlopers, with actually no more right to be here than myself. Apparently, they thought so themselves, for soon after this solemn fiat of Jove had gone forth, their lordships, having no further title to their robes (for which I could not help wishing that a party of Jewish old clothesmen would at this moment have appeared and made a loud bidding), made what haste they could to lay them aside for ever.

De Quincey's contempt for the unprincipled deserters of their country was well merited. It is impossible to exaggerate the anguish of Grattan at the overthrow of Ireland. In the words of his son, "he could scarce speak tranquilly on the subject of the Union; at one time he would start into fits as if seized with frenzy; at another he would remain musing and melancholy; or if he ventured to speak on the subject his eyes almost filled with tears."

The Catholic prelates, and the few other members of their communion who had been cajoled into the belief that Pitt would carry Catholic Emancipation as a sequel to the Union, were speedily undeceived. Pitt indeed resigned office, alleging that he could not honourably hold it, as the King's objection to emancipation rendered it impossible to carry that measure. But he soon resumed office, refused to support the Catholic petition, and, as Lord Hawkesbury afterwards informed the public, voluntarily promised the King that he never would again bring the Catholic question under his Majesty's consideration.

Grattan to the end of his life regarded the Union as the very worst measure that had ever been inflicted on Ireland. "Self-legislation," he said, "is life, and has been fought for as for being." "Every civilized country," says John Stuart Mill, "is entitled to settle its internal affairs in its own way, and no other country ought to interfere with its discretion; because one country, even with the best intentions, has no chance of properly understanding the internal affairs of another."

The Rev. George Croly, in a comparison of great contemporary orators, gives the following estimate of Grattan :—

Grattan cannot be judged of in England. He declared that his spirit went down into the grave with the Parliament of Ireland. It was in his own country, when he gathered her rights and hopes like the wanderers of the air, and gave them shelter under his branches, that this monarch of the wilderness rose and spread in his full magnificence. On the questions which issued in giving a Constitution to Ireland, Grattan exhibited powers as lofty as his cause. His feeling, his reason, his imagination, were condensed into one resistless splendour; he smote with intense light; the adversary might as well have stood before a thunderbolt. *Serius in certum*. His fame and his labours are part of the renown and property of his country.

In 1805 Grattan was returned for Malton by the influence of Earl Fitzwilliam. His career in the English Parliament cannot interest us as much as his labours in the Irish assembly. But that career entitles him to the deep and enduring reverence and gratitude of the Catholics, whose emancipation was thenceforth the principal object of his efforts. All sorts of horrors were predicted by the enemies of that measure as its necessary consequence. Among the prophecies was that of Mr. Perceval, who said that, if emancipation were granted, the Catholic electors would never return a Protestant representative. How nobly the Catholics have falsified the predictions of their opponents it is unnecessary to say. Mr. Perceval's prophecy was of the same character with the ravings about Ultramontaniam which distinguish some of the foes of Home Rule.

Grattan in his private life was as estimable as in his public career he had been admirable. All his intimate friends loved him tenderly. Casual acquaintances have left on record the impressions they derived from his fascinating conversation. Moore describes him as "so wise, so odd, so good." His thoughts in private were frequently occupied by the concerns of his country. His son Henry, from whose book we have derived much of the information we possess concerning his illustrious father, describes him as wandering through the wild and picturesque defiles in the neighbourhood of Tinnehinch; "here," says his son, "he often trod, meditating on his country's wrongs; her long, dreary night of darkness and oppression; and here he first beheld the bright, transient light of her redemption and her glory. Here, too, in the moments of grief, he wept over her divisions and her downfall. How often have I beheld the tear glistening in his eye as he strode along her paths engrossed with the thought of some of his speeches, and stamping on the soil as if he would crush her enemies."

In 1810 the grand jury of the city of Dublin passed reso-

lutions in favour of a Repeal of the Union. The freemen and freeholders of Dublin then assembled, and agreed on petitions to the King and Parliament, which were entrusted to Grattan for presentation. In his answer he promised to support the Repeal, but added :

You will please to observe that a proposition of that sort in Parliament, to be either prudent or possible, must wait until it shall be called for and backed by the nation. When proposed, I shall then, as at all times I hope I shall, prove myself an Irishman, and that Irishman whose first and last passion was his native country.

His son gives the following description of one of the favourite haunts of the great patriot :—

About a mile from Tinnehinch there was an ancient Roman Catholic churchyard, situated on a rising ground above the Waterfall river : the remains of the ruined walls were overhung with ivy, and the old trees that grew around them covered the place with a grave and solemn shade. It was a lonely but an interesting spot ; along its border lay a little dell, through which a brook murmured gently round moss-grown stones, till a few yards farther on it fell over a steep cascade, and there joined the river that flowed to Tinnehinch. This was the favourite retreat of Mr. Grattan. To this sequestered spot he loved to retire ; and on the Sunday mornings in spring, when the wild violets and primroses began to appear, and in summertide, he used to sit, or saunter beneath the blossoming hawthorn, wrapt in thought and meditation ; “ there,” he would say ; “ it is not within a church alone that I can offer up my prayers to Heaven ; God is visible in all His works around ; I behold, I admire, I adore.”

In the beginning of 1820 Grattan's health gave way, and his physical weakness, increased by old age, rendered it apparent that his time on earth must be short. His anxiety to get to London to move the Catholic question in Parliament induced him to disregard the advice of his physicians, who assured him that he ought to avoid all mental and bodily exertion, and that, if he persisted in undertaking the journey, the responsibility would be his own. His weakness was so great that the leading Catholics implored him to abandon the intention of going to plead their cause in London. He said, “ Nothing but physical impossibility shall prevent me, as I consider that my last breath belongs to my country.” He also said that if unable to speak for the Catholics he could pray for them. He had always a deep respect for religion. He was free from sanctimonious pretension or the cant of piety ; but he only gave expression to his lifelong sentiments when he said in his last illness, “ I can do nothing of myself ; I prostrate myself with all my sins at the foot of the cross, and I trust myself to the mercy of my Redeemer.”

Grattan persisted in going to London, where he hoped to utter

his last public words in the cause of Catholic Emancipation. But the journey realized the fears of his physicians. He reached London on the 31st of May, 1820, and died there on the 6th of June. He has bequeathed to Ireland an illustrious memory—illustrious from genius, but more so from resplendent and unpurchasable virtue. His statue has been erected in College Green, in front of the old house whose walls so often echoed his magnificent eloquence; and this tribute of national gratitude to one of the best and greatest of Irishmen was set on foot by a faithful disciple of his patriotic teaching, the late Alexander Sullivan, formerly Home Rule member for the county of Louth.

Grattan is interred at Westminster. He expressed the strongest wish that his body might repose in the graveyard of Moyanna, in Queen's County; and it was not until the very day of his death that, when reduced to the last stage of physical prostration, he gave his assent to the importunate request of the Duke of Sussex and some other English friends, communicated by Mr. Blake, that Westminster Abbey should be his place of sepulture. But, in my humble judgment, his remains belong to Ireland, and it is not too much to expect that they may yet be restored to the land he loved so well and served so faithfully.

W. J. O'N. DAUNT.

---

## THE WOMAN QUESTION.

*From a Socialist Point of View.*

THE publication of August Bebel's "Die Frau in der Vergangenheit, Gegenwart, and Zukunft," and the issue of a translation of the work in English, make any attempt to explain the position of Socialists in respect to the woman question timely. The reception that the work has met with in Germany and in England renders such an attempt imperative, unless our antagonists are willing to misunderstand us, and we are willing to remain passive under the misunderstanding. The writers of this article have thought that the English public, with that fairness which is said to be its special prerogative, would give hearing to the views, the arguments, the conclusions of those who call themselves Socialists. Thus, whatever opinions may be held by that English public as to the conclusions, its opinions will at least have a basis of knowledge. And the writers have further considered that the treatment of such a question as this is at its best when it is that of a man and a woman thinking and working together. In all that follows they desire it to be understood that they are giving utterance to their own opinions

as two individual Socialists. Whilst they believe that these opinions are shared by the majority of their fellow-thinkers and fellow-workers in England, on the Continent, and in America, they are in no sense to be understood as pledging their Party to all, or necessarily to any particular one, of the propositions put forward.

A word or two, first, on the work that serves as the text of this discourse. Bebel is a working-man, a Socialist, and a member of the Reichstag. His book "*Die Frau*" has been prohibited in Germany. This has increased at once the difficulty of obtaining the book, and the number of those that obtain it. The German press has almost to a journal condemned it, and has ascribed to its author every possible and impossible vice. The influence of the work, and the significance of these attacks, will both be understood by those that bear in mind the position and the personal character of Bebel. One of the founders of the Socialist Party in Germany, one of the foremost among the exponents of the economics of Karl Marx, perhaps the finest orator of his country, Bebel is beloved and trusted by the Proletariat, hated and feared by the capitalists and aristocrats. He is not only the most popular man in Germany. He is by those that know him, foes as well as friends, respected. Calumny has, of course, been busy with him, but, without any hesitation, we may say that the accusations made against him are as false as they are venomous.

The English translation of his latest work has met in certain quarters with a vituperative reception. The wrath of these irritated critics would have been well placed had it been poured out on the quite unequalled carelessness of the publishers of this English version. This carelessness is the more noticeable and unpardonable as the German edition, printed at Zurich, is singularly free from errors. We ought to except in part from our condemnation the translator, Dr. Harriet B. Adams Walther. On the whole, her work has been fairly well done, though an apparent want of acquaintance with economic words and phrases has here and there produced ambiguity, and there is a most unaccountable objection to the use of the plural. But the book teems with printer's errors, in type, in spelling, and in punctuation. To have in a book of only 264 pages an aggregate of at least 170 blunders is really too bad.

With the first or historical part of the work we do not propose dealing. Deeply interesting as it is, this must be passed over, as so much is to be said on the present relations between men and women, and on the changes that we believe are impending. Moreover, the historic portion is not quite the best in the book. It has its errors here and there. The most reliable book to

consult on this particular branch of the woman question is Friedrich Engels' "Ursprung der Familie, des Eigenthums, und des Staats." Let us turn, therefore, to the society and the women of to-day.

Society is, from the point of view of Bebel, and we may fairly say here of Socialists generally, in a condition of unrest, of fermentation. The unrest is that of a mass of rottenness; the fermentation that of putrefaction. Dissolution is at hand, in both senses of the word. The death of the capitalistic method of production, and therefore of the society based on it, is, as we think, within a distance measurable in terms of years rather than of centuries. And that death means the re-solution of society into simpler forms, even into elements, that re-combining will produce a new and better order of things. Society is morally bankrupt, and in nothing does this gruesome moral bankruptcy come out with a more hideous distinctness than in the relation between men and women. Efforts to postpone the crash by drawing bills upon the imagination are useless. The facts have to be faced.

One of these facts of the most fundamental importance is not, and never has been, fairly confronted by the average man or woman in considering these relations. It has not been understood even by those men and women above the average who have made the struggle for the greater freedom of women the very business of their lives. This fundamental fact is, that the question is one of economics. The position of women rests, as everything in our complex modern society rests, on an economic basis. Had Bebel done nothing, but insist upon this, his work would have been valuable. The woman question is one of the organization of society as a whole. For those who have not grasped this conception, we may quote Bacon in the first book of the "Advancement of Learning." "Another error . . . is that, after the distribution of particular Arts and Sciences, men have abandoned universality . . . which cannot but cease and stop all progression. . . . Neither is it possible to discover the more remote and deeper parts of any science if you stand but upon the level of the same science and ascend not to a higher." This error, indeed, when "men [and women] have abandoned universality," is something more than a "peccant humour." It is a disease. Or, to use an illustration possibly suggested by the passage and the phrase just quoted, those who attack the present treatment of women without seeking for the cause of this in the economics of our latter-day society are like doctors who treat a local affection without inquiring into the general bodily health.

This criticism applies not alone to the commonplace person who makes a jest of any discussion into which the element of sex



enters. It applies to those higher natures, in many cases earnest and thoughtful, who see that women are in a parlous state, and are anxious that something should be done to better their condition. These are the excellent and hard-working folk who agitate for that perfectly just aim, woman suffrage; for the repeal of the Contagious Diseases Act, a monstrosity begotten of male cowardice and brutality; for the higher education of women; for the opening to them of universities, the learned professions, and all callings, from that of teacher to that of bag-man. In all this work—good as far as it goes—three things are especially notable. First, those concerned in it are of the well-to-do classes, as a rule. With the single and only partial exception of the Contagious Diseases agitation, scarcely any of the women taking a prominent part in these various movements belong to the working class. We are prepared for the comment that something very like this may be said, as far as concerns England, of the larger movement that claims our special efforts. Certainly, Socialism is at present in this country little more than a literary movement. It has but a fringe of working men on its border. But we can answer to this criticism that in Germany this is not the case, and that even here Socialism is now beginning to extend among the workers.

The second point is that all these ideas of our "advanced" women are based either on property, or on sentimental or professional questions. Not one of them gets down through these to the bed-rock of the economic basis, not only of each of these three, but of society itself. This fact is not astonishing to those who note the ignorance of economics characteristic of most of those that labour for the enfranchisement of women. Judging from the writings and speeches of the majority of women's advocates, no attention has been given by them to the study of the evolution of society. Even the orthodox political economy, which is, as we think, misleading in its statements and inaccurate in its conclusions, does not appear to have been mastered generally.

The third point grows out of the second. The school of whom we speak make no suggestion that is outside the limits of the society of to-day. Hence their work is, always from our point of view, of little value. We will suppose all women, not only those having property, enabled to vote; the Contagious Diseases Act repealed; every calling thrown open to both sexes. The actual position of women in respect to men would not be very vitally touched. (We are not concerned at present with the results of the increased competition and more embittered struggle for existence.) For not one of these things, save indirectly the Contagious Diseases Act, touches them in their sex relations.

Nor should we deny that, with the gain of each or all of these points, the tremendous change that is to come would be more easy of attainment. But it is essential to keep in mind that ultimate change, only to come about when the yet more tremendous social change whose corollary it will be has taken place. Without that larger social change women will never be free.

The truth, not fully recognized even by those anxious to do good to woman, is that she, like the labour-classes, is in an oppressed condition; that her position, like theirs, is one of unjust and merciless degradation. Women are the creatures of an organized tyranny of men, as the workers are the creatures of an organized tyranny of idlers. Even where thus much is grasped, we must never be weary of insisting on the non-understanding that for women, as for the labouring classes, no solution of the difficulties and problems that present themselves is really possible in the present condition of society. All that is done, heralded with no matter what flourish of trumpets, is palliative, not remedial. Both the oppressed classes, women and the immediate producers, must understand that their emancipation will come from themselves. Women will find allies in the better sort of men, as the labourers are finding allies among the philosophers, artists, and poets. But the one has nothing to hope from man as a whole, and the other has nothing to hope from the middle-class as a whole.

The truth of this comes out in the fact that, before we pass to the consideration of the condition of women, we have to speak this word of warning. To many, that which we have to say of the Now will seem exaggerated; much that we have to say of the Hereafter, visionary, and perhaps all that is said, dangerous. To cultured people, public opinion is still that of man alone, and the customary is the moral. The majority still lays stress upon the occasional sex-helplessness of woman as a bar to her even consideration with man. It still descants upon the "natural calling" of the female. As to the former, people forget that sex-helplessness at certain times is largely exaggerated by the unhealthy conditions of our modern life, if, indeed, it is not wholly due to these. Given rational conditions, it would largely, if not completely, disappear. They forget also that all this about which the talk is so glib when woman's freedom is under discussion is conveniently ignored when the question is one of woman's enslavement. They forget that by capitalist employers this very sex-helplessness of woman is only taken into account with the view of lowering the general rate of wages. Again, there is no more a "natural calling" of woman than there is a "natural" law of capitalistic production, or a "natural" limit

to the amount of the labourer's product that goes to him for means of subsistence. That, in the first case, woman's "calling" is supposed to be only the tending of children, the maintenance of household conditions, and a general obedience to her lord; that, in the second, the production of surplus-value is a necessary preliminary to the production of capital; that, in the third, the amount the labourer receives for his means of subsistence is so much as will keep him only just above starvation point: these are not natural laws in the same sense as are the laws of motion. They are only certain temporary conventions of society, like the convention that French is the language of diplomacy.

To treat the position of women at the present time in detail is to repeat a thousand-times-told tale. Yet, for our purpose, we must re-emphasize some familiar points, and perhaps mention one or two less familiar. And first, a general idea that has to do with all women. The life of woman does not coincide with that of man. Their lives do not intersect; in many cases do not even touch. Hence the life of the race is stunted. According to Kant, "man and woman constitute, when united, the whole and entire being; one sex completes the other." But when each sex is incomplete, and the one incomplete to the most lamentable extent, and when, as a rule, neither of them comes into real, thorough, habitual, free contact, mind to mind, with the other, the being is neither whole nor entire.

Second, a special idea that has to do with only a certain number, but that a large one, of women. Everyone knows the effect that certain callings, or habits of life, have on the *physique* and on the face of those that follow them. The horsy man, the drunkard, are known by gait, physiognomy. How many of us have ever paused, or dared to pause, upon the serious fact that in the streets and public buildings, in the friend-circle, we can, in a moment, tell the unmarried women, if they are beyond a certain age which lively writers call, with a delicate irony peculiarly their own, "uncertain?" But we cannot tell a man that is unmarried from one that is wedded. Before the question that arises out of this fact is asked, let us call to mind the terrible proportion of women that are unmarried. For example, in England, in the year 1870, 42 per cent. of the women were in this condition. The question to which all this leads is a plain one, a legitimate one, and is only an unpleasant one because of the answer that must be given. How is it that our sisters bear upon their brows this stamp of lost instincts, stifled affections, a nature in part murdered? How is it that their "more fortunate brothers" bear no such mark? Here, assuredly, no "natural law" obtains. This licence for the man, this prevention of legions of noble and holy unions that does not affect him, but

falls heavily on her, are the inevitable outcome of our economic system. Our marriages, like our morals, are based upon commercialism. Not to be able to meet one's business engagements is a greater sin than the slander of a friend, and our weddings are business transactions.

Whether we consider women as a whole, or only that sad sisterhood wearing upon its melancholy brows the stamp of eternal virginity, we find alike a want of ideas and of ideals. The reason of this is again the economic position of dependency upon man. Women, once more like the labourers, have been expropriated as to their rights as human beings, just as the labourers were expropriated as to their rights as producers. The method in each case is the only one that makes expropriation at any time and under any circumstances possible—and that method is force.

In Germany at the present day the woman is a minor with regard to man. A husband "of low estate" may chastise a wife. All decisions as to the children rest with him, even to the fixing of the date of weanings. Whatever fortune the wife may have he manages. She may not enter into agreements without his consent; she may not take part in political associations. It is unnecessary for us to point out how much better, within the last few years, these things have been managed in England, or to remind our readers that the recent changes were due to the action of women themselves. But it is necessary to remind them that with all these added civil rights English women, married and unmarried alike, are morally dependent upon man, and are badly treated by him. The position is little better in other civilized lands, with the strange exception of Russia, where women are socially more free than in any other part of Europe. In France, the women of the upper middle class are more unhappily situated than in England. Those of the lower middle and working-classes are better off than either in England or Germany. But two consecutive paragraphs in the "Code Civil," 340 and 341, show that injustice to women is not only Teutonic. "*La recherche de la paternité est interdite,*" and "*La recherche de la maternité est admise.*"

Everyone who refuses to blink facts knows that Demosthenes' words of the Athenians are true of our English middle and upper classes to-day. "We marry in order to obtain legitimate children and a faithful warder of the house; we keep concubines as servants for our daily attendance, but we seek the Hetairai for love's delight." The wife is still the child-bearer, the house-warder. The husband lives and loves according to his own bad pleasure. Even those who admit this will possibly join issue with us when we suggest as another wrong to women the

rigorous social rule that from man only must come the first proffer of affection, the proposal for marriage. This may be on the principle of compensation. After marriage the proffers come generally from the woman, and the reserve is the man's. That this is no natural law our Shakspeare has shown. Miranda, untrammelled by society, tenders herself to Ferdinand. "I am your wife if you will marry me: if not I'll die your maid;" and Helena, in "All's Well that Ends Well," with her love for Bertram, that carries her from Rousillon to Paris and Florence, is, as Coleridge has it, "Shakspeare's loveliest character."

We have said that marriage is based upon commercialism. It is a barter transaction in many cases, and in all, under the condition of things to-day, the question of ways and means plays of necessity a large part. Among the upper classes the business is carried on quite unblushingly. The Sir Gorgius Midas pictures in *Punch* testify to this. The nature of the periodical in which they appear reminds us that all the horrors they reveal are only regarded as foibles, not as sins. In the lower middle class many a man denies himself the joy of home life until he grows out of the longing for it; many a woman closes the book of her life at its fairest page for ever, because of the dread *rerum angustarum domi*.

Another proof of the commercial nature of our marriage system is afforded by the varying times at which wedlock is customary in the varying grades of society. The time is in no sense regulated, as it ought to be, by the time of life. Some favoured individuals, kings, princes, aristocrats, marry, or are married, at the age to which 'Nature' points as fitting. Many of the working class marry young—that is, at the natural period. The virtuous capitalist who at that age makes a habitual use of prostitution dilates unctuously upon the improvidence of the artisan. The student of physiology and economics notes the fact as interesting evidence that not even the frightful capitalistic system has crushed out a normal and righteous instinct. But, with the stratum of society wedged in between these two, unions, as we have just seen, cannot take place as a rule until years after the heyday of youth is passed and passion is on the wane.

All this tells far more on the women than the men. Society provides, recognizes, legalizes for the latter the means of gratifying the sex instinct. In the eyes of that same society an unmarried woman who acts after the fashion habitual to her unmarried brothers and the men that dance with her at balls, or work with her in the shop, is a pariah. And even with the working classes who marry at the normal time, the life of the woman under the present system is the more arduous and irksome of the two. The old promise of the legend, "in sorrow

shalt thou bring forth children," is not only realized, but extended. She has to bring them up through long years, unrelieved by rest, unbrightened by hope, in the same atmosphere of perennial labour and sorrow. The man, worn out as he may be by labour, has the evening in which to do nothing. The woman is occupied until bed-time comes. Often with young children her toil goes far into, or all through, the night.

When marriage has taken place all is in favour of the one and is adverse to the other. Some wonder that John Stuart Mill wrote, "Marriage is at the present day the only actual form of serfdom recognised by law." The wonder to us is that he never saw this serfdom as a question, not of sentiment, but of economics, the result of our capitalistic system. After marriage, as before, the woman is under restraint, and the man is not. Adultery in her is a crime, in him a venial offence. He can obtain a divorce, she cannot, on the ground of adultery. She must prove that "cruelty" (*i.e.*, of a physical kind) has been shown. Marriages thus arranged, thus carried out, with such an attendant train of circumstance and of consequence, seem to us—let us say it with all deliberation—worse than prostitution. To call them sacred or moral is a desecration.

In connexion with the subject of divorce we may note an instance of the self-deception, not only of society and its constituent classes, but of individuals. The clergy are ready and willing to marry anybody and everybody, age to youth, vice to virtue, "and no questions asked," as a certain class of advertisementers put it. Yet the clergy set their faces most sternly against divorce. To protest against such discordant unions as they again and again ratify would be an "interference with the liberty of the subject." But to oppose anything that facilitates divorce is a most serious interference with the liberty of the subject. The whole question of divorce, complex in any case, is made more complicated by the fact that it has to be considered, first in relation to the present conditions, second in relation to the socialistic conditions of the future. Many advanced thinkers plead for greater facility of divorce now. They contend that divorce ought to be made at least as easy as marriage; that an engagement entered into by people who have had little or no opportunity of knowing one another ought not to be irrevocably, or even stringently binding; that incompatibility of temper, non-realization of deep-rooted hopes, actual dislike, should be sufficient grounds for separation; finally, and most important of all, that the conditions of divorce should be the same for the two sexes. All this is excellent, and would be not only feasible but just, if—but mark the if—the economic positions of the two sexes were the same. They are not the same. Hence, whilst

agreeing with every one of these ideas theoretically, we believe that they would, practically applied under our present system, result, in the majority of cases, in yet further injustice to women. The man would be able to take advantage of them; the woman would not, except in the rare instances where she had private property or some means of livelihood. The annulling of the union would be to him freedom; to her, starvation for herself and her children.

We may be asked, will these same principles of divorce hold under the socialistic régime? Our answer is this—the union between men and women, to be explained in the sequel, will be seen to be of such a nature as wholly to obviate the necessity of divorce.

Upon our treatment of the last two points, ere we consider the future, we expect more hostile judgment than on anything that has gone before. To both of these points passing reference has already been made. The first is the sex instinct. To us, the whole of the method adopted by society in dealing with this is fatally wrong. It is wrong from the very beginning. Our children are constantly silenced when they ask about the begetting and the birth of offspring. The question is as natural as one about the beats of the heart or the movements of respiration. The one ought to be answered as readily and as clearly as the others. Perhaps there may be a time in the very young life when an explanation of any physiological fact in answer to a question would not be understood, though we are not prepared to define that time. There can never be a time when falsehood should be taught about any function of the body. As our boys and girls grow up, the whole subject of sex relations is made a mystery and a shame. This is the reason why an undue and unhealthy curiosity is begotten in respect to them. The mind becomes excessively concentrated upon them, remains long unsatisfied, or incompletely satisfied—passes into a morbid condition. To us, it seems that the reproductive organs ought to be discussed as frankly, as freely, between parents and children as the digestive. The objection to this is but a form of the vulgar prejudice against the teaching of physiology, a prejudice that found its truest expression in a recent letter from a parent to a School Board mistress, "Please don't teach my girl anything about her inside. It does her no good, and which it is rude." How many of us have suffered from the *suggestio falsi* or the *suppressio veri* in this matter, due to parents, or teachers, or even servants? Let us each honestly ask ourselves from whose lips, under what circumstances, did we first learn the truth about parentage. And yet it is a truth which, having to do with the birth of little children, we cannot err in calling sacred. In how

many cases was it from the mother, who had the holiest right to teach—a right acquired by suffering?

Nor can we admit that to speak honestly to children on these matters is to injure them. Let us quote Bebel, who in his turn quotes Mrs. Isabella Beecher Hooker. "In order to satisfy the constant questionings of her little boy of eight with regard to his origin, and to avoid telling him fables, which she regarded as immoral, she told him the whole truth. The child listened with the greatest attention, and from the day on which he heard what pain and anxiety he had caused his mother, clung to her with an entirely new tenderness and reverence. The same reverence he had shown also towards other women." To us at least one woman is known who has told all her children the whole truth. The children have for her a love and reverence altogether deeper than, and different from, that which they had before.

With the false shame and false secrecy, against which we protest, goes the unhealthy separation of the sexes that begins as children quit the nursery, and only ends when the dead men and women are laid in the common earth. In the "Story of an African Farm" the girl Lyndall cries out, "We were equals once when we lay new-born babes on our nurse's knees. We shall be equal again when they tie up our jaws for the last sleep." In the schools this separation is carried out, and even in some churches the system, with all its suggestiveness, is in vogue. Its worst form is, of course, in the non-human institutions called monasteries and nunneries. But all the less virulent forms of the same evil are, only in less degree, non-human.

In ordinary society even, the restrictions laid upon the intercourse of the sexes are, like repressive measures with school-boys, the source of much mischief. These restrictions are especially dangerous in regard to conversational subjects. Every man sees the consequence of this, though he may not know it as a consequence, in the kind of talk that goes on in the smoking-rooms of middle and upper-class society. Only when men and women pure-minded, or at least striving after purity, discuss the sexual question in all its bearings, as free human beings, looking frankly into each other's faces, will there be any hope of its solution. With this, as we are constantly iterating, must go the understanding that the basis of the whole matter is economic. Mary Wollstonecraft, in the "Rights of Woman," taught, in part, this commingling of the sexes, instead of the separation of them throughout life. She demanded that women should have equal educational advantages, should be educated in the same schools and colleges with men; that from infancy to adult age the two should be trained side by side. This demand is a sore thorn in the flesh of Mr. J. C. Jeaffreson in his latest compilation.



Two extreme forms of the distinction of the sexes that springs from this their separation are, as Bebel points out, the effeminate man and masculine woman. These are two types from which even the average person recoils with a perfectly natural horror of the unnatural. For reasons that have been indicated more than once, the former is less frequent than the latter. But these two types do not exhaust the list of diseased forms due to our unnatural dealing with the sex relations. That morbid virginity, of which mention has already been made, is another. Lunacy is a fourth. Suicide is a fifth. As to these last two, a few figures in the one case and a reminder in the other. The reminder first. Most women suicides are between the ages of sixteen and twenty-one. Many of these, of course, are due to the pregnancy which our social system drags down to the level of a crime. But others are due to ungratified sex instincts, often concealed under the euphemism "disappointed love." Here are a few lunacy numbers, taken from p. 47 of the English translation of Bebel:—Hanover, 188, 1 lunatic to 457 unmarried, 1 lunatic to 1,316 married inhabitants; Saxony, 260 unmarried lunatics to a million unmarried sane women, 125 married lunatics to a million married sane; Prussia, in 1882, to every 10,000 inhabitants 32·2 unmarried male lunatics, 9·5 married male lunatics, 29·3 female unmarried lunatics, 9·5 married female lunatics.

It is time for men and women to recognize that the slaying of sex is always followed by disaster. Extreme passion is ill. But the opposite extreme of the sacrifice of healthy natural instinct is as ill. "They that are in extremity of either are abominable fellows" is as true in this connexion as of melancholy and over-mirth when Rosalind railed at them in the Forest of Arden. And yet thousands of women pass, through what hell-fires they only know, to the Moloch of our social system; thousands of women are defrauded, month after month, year after year, "of their unreturning May-time." Hence we—and with us, in this, at all events, most Socialists—contend that chastity is unhealthy and unholy. Always understanding by chastity the entire suppression of all instincts connected with the begetting of children, we regard chastity as a crime. As with all crimes, the criminal is not the individual sufferer, but the society that forces her to sin and to suffer. Here we are at one with Shelley. In his notes to "Queen Mab" we have the following passage:—"Chastity is a monkish and evangelical superstition, a greater foe to natural temperance even than un-intellectual sensuality; it strikes at the root of all domestic happiness, and consigns more than half of the human race to misery, that some few may monopolize according to law." Finally,

in this most important connexion, we call to mind the accumulated medical testimony to the fact that women suffer more than men under these restraints.

Our other point, before we pass to the concluding portion of this article, is that necessary result of our to-day system—prostitution. This evil is, as we have said, recognized, and it is legalized, in some European countries. All that we need add here is the truism that its chief supporters are of the middle class. The aristocracy are not, of course, excepted; but the mainstay of the hideous system is the respectable, well-to-do, “most seeming-virtuous” capitalist. This is not due only to the great accumulation of wealth and the consequent habits of luxury. The significant fact is that in a society based upon capital, whose centre is therefore the capitalistic middle-class, prostitution, one of the worst outcomes of that society, is supported chiefly by that very class. This points clearly the moral that once again, under a new form, we urge. That which might be said on the special cases which the *Pall Mall Gazette* has made familiar to us applies to prostitution generally. To get rid of prostitution, we must get rid of the social conditions that are its parent. Midnight meetings, refuges for the distressed, all the well-meant attempts to grapple with this awful problem are, as their initiators despairingly admit, futile. And futile they will remain as long as the system of production lasts which, creating a surplus labour-population, creates with this criminal men, and women that are very literally and sadly “abandoned.” Get rid of this, the capitalistic system of production, say the Socialists, and prostitution will pass away.

This leads us to our last point. What is it that we as Socialists desire? What is it that we expect? What is that of whose coming we feel as assured as of the rising of to-morrow’s sun? What are the evolution changes in society that we believe are already close at hand? And what are the changes in the condition of woman that we anticipate as consequence of these? Let us disclaim all intention of the prophetic. He that, reasoning on a series of observed phenomena, sees the inevitable event to which they lead is no prophet. A man cannot prophesy any more than he has a right to wager, about a certainty. To us it seems clear that as in England the Germanic society, whose basis was the free landholder, gave way to the feudal system, and this to the capitalistic, so this last, no more eternal than its predecessors, will give way to the Socialistic system; that as slavery passed into serfdom, and serfdom into the wage-slavery of to-day, so this last will pass into the condition where all the means of production will belong neither to slaveowner, nor to serf’s lord, nor to the wage-slave’s master, the capitalist, but to

the community as a whole. At the risk of raising the habitual smile and sneer, we confess that into every detail of that Socialistic working of society we are no more prepared to enter than were the first capitalists to enter into the details of the system that they founded. Nothing is more common, nothing is more unjust, nothing is more indicative of meagre understanding, than the vulgar clamour for exact details of things under the social condition towards which we believe the world is moving. No expounder of any new great truth, no one of his followers, can hope to work out all the truth into its ultimate ramifications. What would have been thought of those who rejected the gravitation discovery of Newton because he had not, by application of it, found out Neptune? Or of those who rejected the Darwinian theory of Natural Selection because Instinct presented certain difficulties? Yet this is precisely what the average opponents of Socialism do; always with a vacuous calmness, ignoring the fact that for every difficulty or misery they suppose will arise from the socialization of the means of production a score worse are actually existent in the putrescent society of to-day.

What is it that we feel certain is coming? We have wandered so far from Bebel along our own lines of thought, at the entrance of whose ways his suggestive work has generally placed us, that for the answer to this question we return gladly and gratefully to him. "A society in which all the means of production are the property of the community, a society which recognizes the full equality of all without distinction of sex, which provides for the application of every kind of technical and scientific improvement or discovery, which enrolls as workers all those who are at present unproductive, or whose activity assumes an injurious shape, the idlers and the drones, and which, while it minimizes the period of labour necessary for its support, raises the mental and physical condition of all its members to the highest attainable pitch."

We disguise neither from ourselves nor from our antagonists that the first step to this is the expropriation of all private property in land and in all other means of production. With this would happen the abolition of the State as it now is. No confusion as to our aims is more common than that which leads woolly thinking people to imagine that the changes we desire can be brought about, and the conditions subsequent upon them can exist, under a State régime such as that of to-day. The State is now a force-organization for the maintenance of the present conditions of property and of social rule. Its representatives are a few middle and upper-class men contending for places-yielding abnormal salaries. The State under Socialism,

if indeed a word of such ugly historical associations is retained, will be the organized capacity of a community of workers. Its officials will be no better and no worse off than their fellows. The divorce between art and labour, the antagonism between head and hand work, that grieves the souls of artists, without their knowing in most cases the economic cause of their grief, will vanish.

And now comes the question as to how the future position of woman, and therefore of the race, will be affected by all this. Of one or two things we may be very sure. Others the evolution of society alone will decide positively, though every one of us may have his own idea upon each particular point. Clearly there will be equality for all, without distinction of sex. Thus, woman will be independent: her education and all other opportunities as those of man. Like him, she, if sound in mind and body (and how the number of women thus will grow!) will have to give her one, two, or three hours of social labour to supply the wants of the community, and therefore of herself. Thereafter she will be free for art or science, or teaching or writing, or amusement in any form. Prostitution will have vanished with the economic conditions that made it, and make it at this hour, a necessity.

Whether monogamy or polygamy will obtain in the Socialistic state is a detail on which one can only speak as an individual. The question is too large to be solved within the mists and miasmata of the capitalistic system. Personally, we believe that monogamy will gain the day. There are approximately equal numbers of men and women, and the highest ideal seems to be the complete, harmonious, lasting blending of two human lives. Such an ideal, almost never attainable to-day, needs at least four things. These are love, respect, intellectual likeness, and command of the necessities of life. Each of these four is far more possible under the system towards which we move than under that in which we now scarce "have our being." The last is absolutely ensured to all. As Ibsen makes Helmer say to Nora, "Home life ceases to be free and beautiful directly its foundations are borrowing and debts." But borrowing and debts, when one is a member of a community, and not an isolated man fighting for his own hand, can never come. Intellectual likeness. The same education for men and women; the bringing up of these twain side by side, until they join hands at last, will ensure a greater degree of this. That objectionable product of capitalism, Tennyson's "In Memoriam" young woman, with her "I cannot understand, I love," will be a myth. Every one will have learnt that there can be no love without understanding. And the love and respect that are wanting or are lost to-day,

because of sins and shortcomings, the product of the commercial system of society, will be more easily forthcoming, and vanish almost never. The contract between man and woman will be of a purely private nature, without the intervention of any public functionary. The woman will no longer be the man's slave, but his equal. For divorce there will be no need.

And whether we are right or not in regarding monogamy as the best form for society, we may be sure that the best form will be chosen, and that by wisdoms riper and richer than ours. We may be equally sure that the choice will not be of the barter-marriages, with its one-sided polygamy, of our own sad time. Above all, we may be sure that two great curses that help, with others, to ruin the relations between men and women will have passed. Those curses are the treatment of men and women as different beings, and the want of truth. There will no longer be one law for the woman and one for the man. If the coming society, like European society to-day, regards it as right for man to have mistresses as well as wife, we may be certain that the like freedom will be extended to women. Nor will there be the hideous disguise, the constant lying, that makes the domestic life of almost all our English homes an organized hypocrisy. Whatever the matured and deliberate opinion of the community finds best will be carried out fairly, openly. Husband and wife will be able to do that which but few can do now—look clear through one another's eyes into one another's heart. For ourselves, we believe that the cleaving of one man to one woman will be best for all, and that these will find each in the heart of the other, that which is in the eyes, their own image.

ELEANOR MARX AVELING.  
EDWARD AVELING.

## CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

## THEOLOGY.

A GREAT change is passing over English theology—a change the full significance of which we cannot exactly estimate, but which the first three books on our list clearly indicate and the first allows us in some degree to measure. Principal Tulloch's<sup>1</sup> admirable lectures on the movements of English religious thought during the first sixty years of the present century, show us thinkers who aim chiefly, though not solely, at satisfying the intellectual and spiritual questionings of the individual consciousness. Coleridge, according to Principal Tulloch, marks a break in religious history: he is a quickener of the spiritual life who differs from the Evangelicals in that he transfers the solution of the main problems of religion from external revelation to spiritual experience. Christianity—to use Dr. Tulloch's excellent expression—becomes with him mainly “a philosophical expression of the spiritual consciousness.” The same search for a theory of spiritual things, or at least for quieting answers to spiritual questions, seems to be prominent in the Oxford movement, in the work—the account of which is of more than merely local interest—of Erskine of Linlathen and Campbell the Universalist; of Carlyle, of Maurice and Robertson, and even of J. S. Mill. The chapter on the “Early Oriol School and its congeners”—Whately, Hampden, Arnold, Milman—deals, indeed, rather with another province of religious thought. Especial stress is laid on the work of the second: “there are modes of thought in Dr. Hampden's writings far more fertile than any that are to be found in the works of his chief opponents” (p. 76)—modes which have since become the special property of Liberal Churchmen. The other “Oxford Movement”—the Anglo-Catholic—is fairly, if not very fully, treated; but the matter is too copious for one chapter. It is perhaps the lecture on J. S. Mill which calls for especial criticism. We may question the justice of imputing to him “intellectual pride” (pp. 239, 246), and doubt if his fame will mainly rest on his *Logic*; and Prof. Tulloch's treatment of his philosophy seems wholly to ignore the idealist element in it. But the author is an old opponent of Mill, and revives here the old controversy—familiar to all students of the “*Logic*”—as to the relation between will and cause. His own theory, we venture to think, is discredited by anthropology. The hypostasizing of cause as will seems to us only a more refined form of the hypostasizing of particular processes or forces of Nature as persons, to which mythology is largely referable. The other chapters seem not to demand special notice here. The book is one of great interest and value, and the work of showing

<sup>1</sup> “Movements of Religious Thought in Britain during the Nineteenth Century.” By John Tulloch, D.D., LL.D. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1885.

"how much larger is the truth of God than any one man's notions of it" (p. 335) is at all times eminently requisite. We can only wish the author success in his endeavour.

His book comes down only to 1860, and since that time, as he justly remarks, religious thought in England has been subjected to powerful new influences; chief among them those of historical criticism and the doctrine of evolution. Primarily, as we said, the thinkers with whom he deals aimed at satisfying the spiritual needs of the individual. But besides this, some of them—Coleridge, Arnold, and the Anglo-Catholics—insisted, each from a different standpoint, on the character of the Church as a living organism. Now it is partly the prominence of this latter doctrine, partly the difference of method pursued by theology, that constitute the leading features of the change. The writers Dr. Tulloch describes worked largely by introspection.—The new theology, as represented by Dr. Fairbairn,<sup>3</sup> is (at least professedly) historical and scientific. It starts with a respectful criticism of the non-Christian solutions of the religious problem. It attempts to show that they are inadequate, and that the best solution is offered by another theory—the Christian—of which it claims to have independent evidence. It lays stress on the historical character of this theory, and especially on its value for society and social organization; in short, it aims at being (we cannot quite say that it is) scientific, historical, political. Of course, there are deficiencies in the execution. We may think that Prof. Fairbairn would have done better to leave anthropology and ancestor-worship alone, rather than to attack, and, so far as we can see, to misinterpret the doctrines of anthropologists (p. 80); and we must take exception to his attack on Mr. Herbert Spencer (p. 18) and his insistence on the empiricism of the "religion of humanity" (p. 16). Surely Positivism and Phenomenalism are intensely idealist in tendency: it is the transfigured spiritualism of the Neo-Hegelians which ends with dogmatic materialism. And (after the manner of theologians) he puts too theological an aspect upon Anaxagoras and Plato. The nous of Anaxagoras (p. 50) is hardly (as he takes it to be) mind or reason: it is force acting according to laws of its own. The Demiourgos of the Timæus, whatever that dialogue may mean, is surely figurative and symbolic: Prof. Fairbairn takes him literally (p. 53). The real inventor of the argument from design is not Plato, but Socrates [Xen. Mem. I. 4]. And Prof. Fairbairn should really leave such expressions as "Physical necessity, which is only another name for chance" (p. 61), and "How did evolution accomplish so extraordinary a revolution?" (as to change atoms into a rational and moral being) (p. 71) to more ordinary and less competent apologists. The Idea of Humanity, too, is assuredly not due to Christianity (p. 275), but (as far as it is traceable to any one source) to Stoicism. Christianity, at least Pauline Christianity, popularized it and gave it content, and also a support in religious feeling. But Jewish Christians were slow to take it in. But these

<sup>3</sup> "The City of God: a Series of Discussions on Religion." By A. M. Fairbairn, D.D. Second Edition. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1886.

are not very serious defects, and the work as a whole displays deep learning and high eloquence, and is pervaded by the Christian spirit. Would that the same could be said of all current apologetics!

The same tendency to insist on the corporate and organic side of Christianity is expressed, from a somewhat different standpoint, by the distinguished head of the Theological School at Cambridge (Mass.) His work<sup>3</sup> (dedicated to Dr. Phillips Brooks) is a plea for a return to the great doctrine of the Greek Fathers down to Athanasius—the immanence of God in the universe. This doctrine, the product of Stoicism and Neo-Platonism, had to give way to the transcendence-theory of Tertullian and Augustine, with its notions—drawn largely, Dr. Allen holds, from the contemplation of Roman Imperialism—of a Deity outside the world, and working upon it through his ministers (pp. 156, 221). The current theories of sin and eternal punishment are, in fact, due to Augustine (p. 165). His doctrine is a reversion to a ruder theory—a reversion necessary in the interest of the barbaric invaders (p. 169). But the doctrine of immanence, in some form or other, has always been held in the Church—in Anselm, in Aquinas, in Hooker; when it declines in importance the difficulties in the extreme transcendence-theory give birth to the unsatisfying optimism of Leibnitz, to the special weaknesses of teleology, above all, to the neglect of that personal and individual relation to God which is the essence of Christianity. Thus we get “English deism” and eighteenth-century “atheism” [or rather scepticism]. But a reaction begins in England with Wesley. It is seen in the Evangelical movement, still more in the Tractarians, who strive after the re-creation of the Church as a living organism and the absorption of the individual in it (cf. p. 413, *note*); most of all in Germany, in Schleiermacher and Hegel. We notice one or two little blemishes in the book. It is odd to find Augustine successively compared with Brownson and Mr. W. H. Mallock, and to learn that likenesses may be detected between the trio and Origen (p. 3). And Dr. Allen is possessed by the view, common among theologians and amateurs in philosophy, that philosophers are always studying theological questions in a theological aspect. Thus he takes the *Timæus* of Plato as literally (p. 43) as if he himself were a Greek Father; he overrates, most decidedly, the theological significance of Hegel—not, perhaps, his effects, but his actual participation in theology (pp. 139, 431). He seems to us to over-theologize even the Neo-Platonists (p. 73); and he gives a wholly fanciful account of the genesis of Hume’s system (p. 352). Nothing can be clearer than that Hume’s “atheism” (he should surely have said agnosticism) comes simply out of the difficulties in the empirical theory of knowledge; not from any transformation of religious belief. But there must be slips when the interpretation of the history of seventeen centuries of thought has to be compressed into 400 pages; and on the whole the book may be cordially welcomed—though its conclusion seems to in-

<sup>3</sup> “The Continuity of Christian Thought.” By Alexander V. G. Allen, Professor in the Episcopal Theological School of Cambridge, Mass. London: Ward, Lock & Co.



volve some practical dangers. The "Hegelianism" of modern thought has got rid, not of the transcendence of the Deity, but of Theosophy proper. It is because the Immanent Deity so speedily becomes Nothing, that we seem to be thrown back on the Transcendent Deity of earlier thought. An Immanent Deity soon comes to be regarded as a force or process, rather than as a mind; and a force or process is easily treated as a mere hypostasized abstraction. The current tendency to emphasize the corporate character of the Church favours the prevalence of Dr. Allen's view; the danger is that its success may cause Christianity to become a diluted form of the Religion of Humanity—a decline the consummation of which is the avowed aim of much of the minor religious literature before us.

The collection of sermons<sup>4</sup> by well-known European and American (Episcopalian) clergymen is bound together (so far as it has a common bond) by the same kind of principles as are dominant in Dr. Allen's book. They insist on the corporate character of the Church, on the superiority of Christian love over accuracy of dogma, of work over speculative belief. They contain a good deal besides; but that seems the basis of connection, so far as they have one. It is needless to say that they are good sermons.

The same view is prominent in the bold suggestions (bold, that is, for an Anglican archbishop) for Church reform put forward in the Visitation Addresses<sup>5</sup> of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Each address deals more or less with one of the Seven Gifts of the Spirit, and suggests modes of their application. Under Wisdom, for instance, we find a comprehensive outline of Cathedral reform (pp. 13-34); under Understanding, suggestions for the development of parochial councils, the encouragement of lay lecturers on ecclesiastical history and biography; under Counsel, the development of the Diocesan Conference; under Strength, an insistence on the value of association in Church matters, on the power of voluntary societies for mission work, and on the claims of the Church to maintain its organic unity and connection with the State. The ideal sketched out is a noble one; but when we consider the implements with which it is to be realized, we have some doubts as to the probability of its success.

The next set of books on our list seems, at first sight, to be absolutely and entirely out of relation to the new quasi-scientific theology and to all our current systems and methods of thought. What are we to make of Boehme's<sup>6</sup> Theosophy, which starts with a direct intuition of the Deity—an intuition which is so clear that dialectical and ratiocinative skill is but little required by the theosophist, so that Boehme's want of it is no grave defect? (p. 51). How

<sup>4</sup> "Christ for To-day." Edited by the Rev. H. D. Rawnsley. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1885.

<sup>5</sup> "The Seven Gifts." By Edward White, Archbishop. London: Macmillan & Co. 1885.

<sup>6</sup> "Jakob Boehme." By the late Dr. Hans Lassen Martensen, Metropolitan of Denmark. Translated by T. Rhys Evans. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1885.

are we to understand a generation of Deity which does not imply time (p. 53), a Sophia which is at once an eternal maiden, God's companion (p. 59), and a mirror wherein He beholds His perfections? What are we to make of a doctrine which speaks the language, not of modern science, but of Paracelsus and Agrippa the magician, and which—*inter alia*—revives from Plato's "Symposium" the doctrine that human beings were originally androgynous; that the "plurality of *hes* and *shes*" (p. 240) is a consequence of the Fall, and that in the future the severed halves will again unite? (pp. 237–247). Nor was Bishop Martensen exactly pervaded by the scientific spirit and temper (pp. 218–222). Neither Mysticism nor Theosophy (the two are well distinguished, p. 19) is accessible to the casual visitor, and no one but a theosophist is competent to deal with theosophic doctrine. But when we look into Boehme more closely we find doctrines not wholly out of relation to the religious problems of our time. His doctrine of creation: his insistence on an uncreated universe as the basis of the created (p. 42): his view that the Spirit makes its own hell, and that its own voluntary hatred of God is the sole cause of the eternity of punishment. (p. 331): his doctrine of Spiritualism, or rather that of his disciples Oetinger and the author of this book (p. 326): his view of mythology (p. 254): his notion that the ultimate restitution of all things is "restoration to temperature" (= function, or equilibrium, pp. 34, 329) all seem to afford points of contact with current religious thought. For the rest—the mental attitude of Bishop Martensen was apparently that of Baader and Schelling, who, we fancy, are—to most theologians—unknown and unknowable. But we may at least be grateful for his presentation of a Christian theosophy, and for his sketch of the life of a man of rare simplicity, purity, and devotion. Mr. Rhys Evans' translation is on the whole excellent. We have also received two volumes of a new edition of Boehme's works<sup>7</sup> with an introduction and notes (by a disciple) which seem to deserve favourable mention. Into the special doctrines of Swedenborgianism,<sup>8</sup> we must confess our entire inability to enter, unaided by an expositor. A spirit which is poured into matter,—which latter is directly caused by the natural sun: lungs which are the understanding of the body (p. 42), and the like, have no meaning for the modern world. But the book has the note of the truly religious spirit. The treatment of evolution and of esoteric Buddhism may be found of general interest.

Jakob Boehme has, at any rate, historical importance; but the next resuscitation<sup>9</sup> with which we have to deal has hardly that justification. And, despite the commendation quoted from Mr. Matthew

<sup>7</sup> "Jakob Böhme, sein Leben u. seine theosophischen Werke in geordnetem Auszuge mit Einleitungen und Erläuterungen durch Johannes Claasen." 3 vols. Stuttgart: Steinkopf. 1885.

<sup>8</sup> "The Issues of Modern Thought." By the Rev. R. L. Tafel, A.M., Ph.D. London: James Speirs. 1885

<sup>9</sup> "The Natural Truth of Christianity." Selections from the writings of John Smith, M.A., and others. With Introduction by Matthew Arnold. Edited by William M. Metcalfe. Paisley: Alexander Gardner. 1885.

Arnold in the preface, we fail to see any very strong reason for it. John Smith (we follow Mr. Arnold) was a Cambridge Platonist who saw that Christianity was not essentially a system of ritual or a system of dogma, but a temper and behaviour (p. x.). The great merit of the *Select Discourses*, he tells us, is "that they insist on the profound natural truth of Christianity, and thus base it on a ground which will not crumble under our feet" (p. xi.). But when we come to the discourses themselves, we find that—though to some extent interesting as an example, if a minor one, of Cambridge Platonism—they are wholly out of relation to current philosophical thought. It is no use reproducing a book which is saturated with discredited and forgotten philosophic theories. Christianity, if it is to live at all, must be "in touch" with the thought and science of the time: must use its notions and speak its language. Now, this book—excellent as it is in the spiritual truths it embodies—overlays them with quotations from and references to the Greek philosophers, the doctrines of whom it almost invariably misapprehends—interprets, we mean, in a manner now considered "unhistorical;" and "proves" the immortality of the soul, the existence of the Deity in the manner which Kant disposed of once for all.\* Cudworth, and perhaps Henry More, have a place in the history of thought, and we trust Mr. Metcalfe will fulfil his promise of republishing part of their works; but John Smith seems to be little more than the associate of Cudworth: and the matter of his book—apart from the form, which hinders its presentation—is the common property of all Christians of mystical and quietist tendency.

Yet a different side of the Christian life is presented by the "Sermons"<sup>10</sup> which are, we suppose, the last remains of the late Rector of Lincoln which the world is ever likely to see. To them Mr. Arnold's criticism on John Smith is really applicable. Christianity is here really regarded as essentially a temper, a habit of mind and life, the *σοφία* or *φιλοσοφία* of Plato and Aristotle which it is the true function of a liberal education to cultivate and maintain. It is this habit which a university has to develop; but it can only be maintained—most of all in the teacher—by the constant maintenance of the spiritual life (pp. 95–102). There is at present a breach between religious doctrine and the best thought; it rests with the Church of England to unite them. Such is, very roughly, the leading tendency of the sermons; but so brief a statement of course does them great injustice. The last sermon—dealing with the revolution in religion at the end of the last century—is, we need hardly say, of special historical value. That depth and solidity of thought, that reserve and concentration of strength, which marked all the work of the author, is nowhere more manifest than in this book. The "College Sermons," too, have more than a biographical interest. Probably, however, the

\* Examples are too lengthy for quotation; but cf. pp. 89, 169, 207.

<sup>10</sup> "Sermons." By Mark Pattison, late Rector of Lincoln College, Oxford. London: Macmillan & Co. 1885.

Sophia of most Christian men would require a more concrete object matter than is here apparent.

Dr. Salmon's<sup>11</sup> expansion of his professorial lectures—which are confined to the province of historical criticism—presents, with admirable clearness and not a little humour, the orthodox view of the composition of the New Testament. The humour is called forth by the eccentricities of German theorizers. That the book is learned and thorough goes without saying; anything like a criticism of it would take far more than the space allotted to this article. One point, however, we must notice. Are there only two alternatives about the composition of an ancient book—viz., either it is genuine or it is a deliberate forgery? Is there not a third hypothesis possible, that it may be the product of a succession of writers—the first writing, perhaps, what the alleged author might be supposed to have written, the next attributing the book to the alleged author, on internal evidence, and editing and explaining it, and the rest incorporating additional matter such as the supposed author has, or may be supposed to have, written? In a word, may not an ancient book be supposed to be the production of a series of imitators, editors, and syncretists, none of whom is exactly a deliberate forger? We are far from saying that this is the case with the New Testament, but we think the view is implied in much modern criticism, and that the defender of the New Testament ought to take it into account. But perhaps the suggestion is only another example of the "Protean character" of negative criticism on which Dr. Salmon justly comments.

The second and at present (according to the common German custom of publication) the only volume of Prof. Schurer's<sup>12</sup> work is less a history than a book of Jewish antiquities at the beginning of the Christian era. It is a vast and, we need hardly say, an admirable work of reference, containing all that is known on (*e.g.*) the influence of Hellenism on Judaism, the Hellenic cities in Judæa, the Sanhedrim, the priesthood, the Jewish sects and Scriptures, the Jews outside Judæa, and similar subjects; while some 300 pages deal with the Jewish and Hellenistic-Jewish literature of the period, including what Dr. Schurer terms "the Jewish propaganda under the mask of heathenism"—*i.e.*, such forgeries as the Sibylline verses, the works of the Pseudo-Phocylides, and the like. The work now appears in an enlarged and remodelled shape.

The first chapters of Herr Radenhausen's vigorous little book<sup>13</sup> can only be described as comparative mythology run mad. The Deity of the Old Testament is analyzed into seven separate and conflicting nature-deities; among them a fire-deity, a deity representing the sand storm of the desert, a moon-god, having affinity with Io, the goddess whence

<sup>11</sup> "A Historical Introduction to the Study of the Books of the New Testament." By George Salmon, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Dublin. London: John Murray. 1885.

<sup>12</sup> "Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi." Von D. Emil Schürer, ord. Prof. d. Theologie zu Giessen. II. Theil. Leipzig: Hinrichs. 1886.

<sup>13</sup> "Die Echte Bibel und die Falsche." Von C. Radenhausen. Hamburg: Otto Meissner. 1885.

the Ionians derive their name (?), a Dionysiac deity, a Lord of the starry heaven ; the exaltation by the prophets of morality over sacrifice is the exaltation of the harmony and order of the stars over the crude and cruel worships of the other gods (11 pp. 40, 41). The "Jehovist" interpolator has done his best to insist on the primacy of his own deity, in the interest (if we understand Herr Radenhausen aright) of the Eliakim whose name was changed to Jehoiakim (2 Kings xxiii. 34): and monotheism has been promoted by the Adonai-worship acquired during the Captivity, and still more by the fusion of all these deities in the Septuagint. But the Old Testament, as it stands, is a mere remnant—such of the sacred books of the Jews as survived the destruction of Jerusalem. At last it can be examined and duly estimated. After the ingenuity shown in the first two chapters it is disappointing to find that the rest of the book consists of merely the ordinary trivialities of the anti-theologic moralist. When Herr Radenhausen expects modern ideas as to the relations of the sexes in a people surrounded by obscene nature-worships and survivals of the matriarchate, when he actually makes the plainness of speech of the Old Testament a ground for condemnation, we regret that he should not have seen through the elementary difficulties of the earnest, perplexed religionist, whose historical sense is as yet undeveloped. However, the Old Testament is to go; and with it disappear the doctrine of the Trinity, the Sacraments, the Atonement, Churches, Priesthoods. But are none of these mentioned in the New Testament? What is left is a more or less sentimental morality, in which divided Christendom may unite, but which is far more vacuous as described than any form of the Religion of Humanity with which we are acquainted. It is a feeble ending to the fireworks of the early chapters.

As to Mr. Wilson's<sup>14</sup> perfervid work, we have only space for a few abridged specimens. Evolution is held to be a force: but light, heat, and electricity differ from it: therefore its existence cannot be proved by analogy from them: therefore it is not a force (p. 13). Man cannot be of high antiquity, because population doubles itself every 200 years or so: hence the earth would not afford standing room for man if he had been here much more than 4,000 years (p. 321). Many flint implements are manifestly not artificial, and thousands of the others are forgeries (p. 298). The kitchen middens of the Danish coast are very probably due to the action of wind and tide (p. 291). Scientific men see nothing to indicate how the world will end (p. 192.) Animals-only vary when under the control of human intelligence (p. 45.) Decrease of food, according to the evolutionist, lengthened the neck of the giraffe. But decrease of food is a mere negation, and out of nothing comes nothing: therefore the evolution theory is untrue (p. 48). After this it is not surprising to find that Mr. Wilson knows eight objections to the doctrine of Providence, and seven abuses of it; five wrong opinions, and the right one,

---

<sup>14</sup> "Nature, Man, God." By the Rev. J. M. Wilson. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1885.

as to what civilization is: that he triumphantly proves that the Creator *could* make iron float (p. 140—who has denied it?), or *could* keep a store of electricity and hail and discharge it on the Egyptians: that he blunders far beyond even the blundering of some better known apologists about the meaning of a law of Nature (pp. 111, 112): that he falls into the most obvious pitfalls in criticizing Hume without having read him (p. 459, *seq.*), and that he triumphantly refutes the doctrine that men are descended from monkeys (whose doctrine is it but the apologist's?) by demanding what churches monkeys have built (p. 67). Comment is needless. Against the theology we have nothing to say; but the stuff with which it is overlaid is not likely to render it more acceptable to the man of science.—Mr. Tymm's<sup>15</sup> work, on the other hand, is grave, temperate, learned, and, except for one or two little slips, an example of all that a work on Christian evidences should be.

We have left ourselves no space to speak of three works which deserve especial notice—a Rabbinical commentary on Genesis,<sup>16</sup> the first instalment of a translation of the Talmud of Jerusalem,<sup>17</sup> and a study<sup>18</sup> which seems extremely interesting, of the Jews in the first century after their return from captivity: and of the usual flood of minor literature. The latter comprises a new instalment of the Pulpit Commentary,<sup>19</sup> and its less valuable companion;<sup>20</sup> two<sup>21,22</sup> useful little books for the amateur theological scholar: a Sunday book for children,<sup>23</sup> which, despite a surprising story about S. Nicolas restoring to life some children who had been cut up and pickled and served up to him as bacon (a story which the authoress is careful to remark is very doubtful) is better than the stuff about nice young ladies and shadowy curates which forms the staple of Sunday books for children: a little book on Ulfilas,<sup>24</sup> which seems of considerable value: an argument<sup>25</sup> that the various non-Christian religions are

<sup>15</sup> "The Mystery of God." By T. Vincent Tymm. London: Elliot Stock. 1885.

<sup>16</sup> "A Rabbinical Commentary on Genesis." By Paul Isaac Hershon. With Introduction by Archdeacon Farrar. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1885.

<sup>17</sup> "The Talmud of Jerusalem." Translated for the first time by Dr. Moses Schwab. Vol. I. Berakboth. London: Williams & Norgate. 1886.

<sup>18</sup> "Das Jahrhundert nach dem Babylonischen Exile." Von Dr. Adolf Rosenzweig. Berlin: Dummler. 1885.

<sup>19</sup> "The Pulpit Commentary." (1 Corinthians and Galatians.) London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1885.

<sup>20</sup> "Thirty Thousand Thoughts." Sections XII.—XV. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1885.

<sup>21</sup> "A Guide to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament." By Edward Miller, M.A. London: George Bell & Sons. 1885.

<sup>22</sup> "Revision Reasons." By the Rev. C. K. Gillespie, M.A. I. The Pentateuch. London and Manchester: John Heywood. 1885.

<sup>23</sup> "Saints of the Prayer Book." By C. A. Jones. With a Preface by R. F. Littledale, LL.D., D.C.L. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1885.

<sup>24</sup> "Ulfilas, Apostle of the Goths." By Charles A. A. Scott, B.A. Cambridge: Macmillan & Bowes. 1885.

<sup>25</sup> "Christianity before Christ." By Charles J. Stone, F.R.S.L., &c. London: Trübner & Co. 1885.

really corrupted revelations of Christian truth: a group of books<sup>26 27 28</sup> reducing religion to a morality based on the love of humanity: a defence of Christianity by a Scotch lady<sup>29</sup>—excellent in tone and spirit, and so far as we have been able to examine it, in argument also: and a common-sense lecture<sup>30</sup> on the same subject, addressed to a Young Men's Christian Association: a work<sup>31</sup> which we can best describe as a kind of spiritualized "Self-Help"—"a gospel of getting-on" for both worlds, varied by most un-"business" like digressions: an admirable little collection of short practical sermons:<sup>32</sup> a Roman Catholic account of Moses,<sup>33</sup> filled in with the results of recent research: a list of books<sup>34</sup> on ecclesiastical history (which contains no German books except translations) which may be useful to the beginner: a pamphlet<sup>35</sup> on a topic of the day: some selections from the Bible<sup>36</sup> and an interesting defence<sup>37</sup> of the right of private judgment against the "Protestant Episcopal" Bishop of Illinois. (Strange that such a defence should be needed in the United States!) Last, not least, we have a biography of Athanase Coquerel<sup>38</sup> which has arrived too late to receive the attention it deserves.

#### PHILOSOPHY.

PROFESSOR SETH'S book on "Scottish Philosophy"<sup>1</sup> is a new addition to Reid's good fortune in commentators. It is generally considered that Hamilton put more into "the philosopher of common-

<sup>26</sup> "Religious Progress." London: Trubner & Co. 1885.

<sup>27</sup> "Die Religion der Moral." Von William Mackintire Salter. (Uebersetzt von Georg von Gizycki.) Leipzig und Berlin: William Friedrich. 1885.

<sup>28</sup> "What I have Taught my Children." By a Member of the Theistic Church. London: Williams and Norgate. 1885.

<sup>29</sup> "The Symmetry and Solidarity of Truth." By Mary Catharine Irvine (Aura). Part I. London: Williams & Norgate. 1885.

<sup>30</sup> "Unbelief." By Maurice C. Hime, M.A., LL.D. London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co. 1885.

<sup>31</sup> "God and Mammon." By James Platt, F.S.S. London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co. 1886.

<sup>32</sup> "Short Practical Sermons." By the Rev. F. Case, M.A. London: Williams & Norgate. 1884.

<sup>33</sup> "Moses u. sein Volk." Von Dr. Hugo Weiss. Freiburg i. B.: Herder. 1885.

<sup>34</sup> "A Select Bibliography of Ecclesiastical History." Compiled by J. A. Fisher. Boston: E. C. Heath & Co. 1885.

<sup>35</sup> "Purity treated Purely." By the Rev. C. Lloyd Engström, M.A. London: Rivingtons. 1885.

<sup>36</sup> "Bible Readings." Selected from the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua. By the Rev. J. H. Cross. London: Macmillan & Co. 1885.

<sup>37</sup> "Dogma no Antidote for Doubt." By a Member of the New York Bar. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company. 1885.

<sup>38</sup> "Athanase Coquerel Fils." Étude Biographique. Par Ernest Stroehlin. Paris: Fischbacher. 1886.

<sup>1</sup> "Scottish Philosophy: a Comparison of the Scottish and German Answers to Hume." By Andrew Seth, M.A., Professor of Logic and Philosophy in the University College of South Wales and Monmouthshire ("Balfour Philosophical Lectures, University of Edinburgh"). Edinburgh and London: W. Blackwood & Sons. 1885.

sense" than he found; and those who have held this opinion will not be likely to hold a different one of his present interpreter. Professor Seth maintains that what is really to be understood by Reid's appeal to "common-sense" is not, as is often supposed, a rejection of philosophy whenever it seems to contradict firmly held convictions; but is, in fact, the truly philosophical process of studying experience in order to find out what are those principles without which anything that can be called experience would be impossible. Thus Reid, in some respects, went beyond Kant in his answer to Hume. For while Kant did not question presuppositions common to Hume and Locke, such as the doctrine of "representative perception," this was exactly what Reid did. In the case of this particular doctrine, for example, by refusing to follow previous philosophers in supposing "ideas" of things, different from things themselves, that convey mediately a knowledge of them to the mind—a knowledge which, as the sceptics showed, must be imperfect and even delusive—Reid anticipated Hegel in identifying the reality of things with things as they are known. For Hegel's greatest service to philosophy was in getting rid of the unknowable thing-in-itself behind our ideas of things. With the unknowable thing-in-itself disappears "the Relativity of Knowledge," as conceived by Hamilton and Mansel, and by modern agnosticism. When it is seen that the reality of things consists in their being parts of a system of relations for a self-consciousness—not the self-consciousness of the individual, but an absolute self-consciousness—then it becomes clear that we must hold our knowledge of the universe to be true and valid. "So far as it goes, it expresses the actual nature of the fact, and there is nothing in the fact that is essentially unknowable." On the other hand, "there is a great deal which is *unknown*," a "background of ignorance," an "unexhausted remainder always present to our feelings, that partly explains the contrast we draw between the phenomenon, or the object as known, and the noumenon, or the object as it exists."

The noumenon is, in this sense, an ideal to which we are always approximating, but to which we never attain. It is this also which lends a certain dynamic impulse even to an abstraction apparently so barren as the Unknowable. The *Unknowable* would, indeed, be absolutely barren. But there mingles subtly with the conception the feeling of the *Unknown*, the not yet known, the vast unexplored possibilities of the universe; and thus the notion is half redeemed in spite of itself. It is to this fact also of the vast unknown, and not to the other supposed fact of unknowableness, that most of Hamilton's "cloud of witnesses" really refer.

The opposition to "Relativism" Professor Seth regards as the "catholic doctrine and traditional tendency of Scottish philosophy;" and from this, "as observable before their time and since," Hamilton and Mansel must be held to depart. From this sketch of only a part of the contents of Professor Seth's book, it will be seen that it is not a mere history of the school of thought known as "the Scottish School," but a general view of modern philosophy in which that school (and more especially Reid as its typical representative) has its place assigned to it. Nor is it entirely historical even in this sense;



much of it is also constructive. In the constructive parts, it is certainly one of the ablest expositions of the doctrines held by "the English Kantio-Hegelians" that has yet appeared. There is one passage containing a statement of the position of that school in relation to Kant and Hegel that may be quoted both for the sake of its importance (for it is perhaps the first explicit statement of the independent standpoint of the school) and for the sake of showing the relation of the historical to the constructive parts of the book. "In comparing Kant with Reid, it must not be forgotten that Kant's followers—his English followers especially—have transformed his doctrine. It is a serious mistake to suppose that in Green, for example, we have simply a revival of Kant, or a revival of Hegel, or a combination of the two. Materials certainly have been drawn from both these thinkers; but the result is a type of thought which has never existed before, and of which it is absurd, therefore, to speak as an importation from Germany. It has been developed within the shadow of, and with special reference to, the 'Treatise of Human Nature'—a book which was practically unknown to the great German thinkers. Its method is Kantian, and it uses Hegel only as a means of surmounting Kant's subjective presuppositions, leaving on one side the technicalities of the Hegelian system. But it is far more thoroughgoing than Kant; and it is hardly paradoxical to say that, if we take Reid at his strongest and best, the broad sweep of his protest against independent ideas bears a very close resemblance to Green's massive argument against unrelated impressions." The author's intention, in making his argument revolve on Reid, is to try to bring the "opposing armies" of the "Hegelians" and the "Empiricists" "within fighting range of one another." It seemed to him that this would be promoted by choosing for treatment a philosopher "nearer home" than the "single group of foreign thinkers" upon whom the Hegelians have bestowed a too exclusive attention. He recognizes that the defects which opponents find in the writings of the school, although they have been exaggerated, really have something to do with the ineffectiveness, so far, of the attack on Empiricism; and these defects could not be more forcibly stated than they are in a sentence on p. 2: "This new way of ideas labours, it is said, under a mortal weakness, in the cumbrous jargon in which its propositions are enunciated, and its representatives are taunted with a slavish adherence to set phrases and formulæ, and with a general inability to apply them in an intelligent and living way." Of "slavish adherence to set phrases and formulæ" no one can accuse the author of the present work. "This new way of ideas" is understood to be more favourable to Christianity—or at least to Theism—than the doctrine of English experiential philosophy. Yet Professor Seth admits that it leaves "the questions of individual destiny" to "the great sphere of philosophic faith" (p. 217). How great this sphere is may be seen if we quote a passage from the preceding page.

What are we to say of the nature of this self-consciousness which we call eternal? Has it an existence for itself, or is it realized only in the individuals

whose thought it co-ordinates? And what of my own individual existence and its relation to this eternal or universal consciousness? Hegelianism treats man simply as he is a universal or perceptive consciousness, gazing at the spectacle of things. In that process the individual is, as it were, merged in the universal; we occupy, for the time, a universal standpoint, and it is quite indifferent whether it is my Ego or another that surveys the world.

Passages such as these suggest that, logically, there is place for an English Hegelian "Left." Is this to remain among the unrealized possibilities of things?

Mr. Sorley's "Ethics of Naturalism"<sup>3</sup> is a criticism of hedonist and evolutionist ethics from the point of view of what we must still, for want of a better name, call Hegelianism. For the term "Idealism," which the writers of this school have a tendency to appropriate, may equally well be claimed by experientialists. The term "Rationalism," used by Mr. Sorley with special ethical reference as the antithesis of "Naturalism," would be in some respects better. At the beginning of his book, Mr. Sorley classifies possible views of man into "naturalistic" and "rationalistic," according as they do or do not attribute spontaneity to reason; and this is really a metaphysical rather than a specially ethical distinction. One of the objects of the book is, however, to show that ethical doctrines necessarily depend on the metaphysics of their authors. Primarily a criticism of "naturalistic" systems, it is intended at the same time, by showing their inadequacy, to lead up to the "rationalistic" view, and in the last chapter, "On the Basis of Ethics," the author briefly sets forth the doctrine of his school. Two kinds of "naturalistic" systems are recognized—the older, or "individualistic," and the modern, or "historical." The "individualistic theory" has assumed the two forms of "egoistic hedonism" and "utilitarianism." The historical theories are, of course, the various systems of ethics (whether hedonistic or not) that claim to be founded on the doctrine of evolution. As the result of his examination, the author arrives at the conclusions that the transition from egoistic hedonism to utilitarianism is illogical; that the doctrine of evolution does not confirm but destroys the hedonistic theories with which attempts are made to connect it; and lastly that no independent ethical ideal is afforded by the theory of evolution, either when evolution is interpreted (1) as increase of adaptation, (2) as increase of complexity, or (3) more generally as "increase of life." "This want of competency to determine practical ends" is, however, due to the "superficiality of the ordinary empirical interpretation of evolution." When we consider the process of evolution on its internal side, we find that it must be interpreted teleologically. We are thus brought to regard "man's nature as a harmony of impulses," and the end of man as "self-realization." "Realization of one's own nature involves realization of that of others," and "self-realization in both its aspects—as individual and as social—is necessarily pro-

<sup>3</sup> "On the Ethics of Naturalism." By W. R. Sorley, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Examiner in Philosophy in the University of Edinburgh. ("Shaw Fellowship Lectures, 1884.") Edinburgh and London: W. Blackwood & Sons. 1885.

gressive." "Evolution is thus not the foundation of morality, but the manifestation of the principle on which it depends. Morality cannot be explained by reason of its own development without reference to the self-consciousness which makes that development possible. However valuable may be the information we get from experience as to the gradual evolution of conduct, its nature and end can only be explained by a principle that transcends experience." These are the concluding words of the volume, and here we find in combination one position that may be regarded as proved, and others that do not follow from it. Mr. Sorley has brought out very well in the course of his argument the distinction between the strictly ethical—that is, the philosophical—and the historical point of view. He has shown that evolutionists, for example, have often thought themselves to be establishing ethical propositions when they have only been establishing propositions as to the history of conduct. But when all this has been conceded to the fullest extent, there are still two sides to the question. There still remains a philosophical "naturalism" that is not demolished when "naturalists" have been shown to have sometimes confused philosophy and "history." No doubt Mr. Sorley would himself admit this. Yet he seems to make the transition at once from the discovery of imperfections of procedure in naturalistic theories—which, it must be remembered, are themselves in process of growth—to the Hegelian view of the universe as having its reality in a system of relations for an absolute self-consciousness and of the history of the universe as determined teleologically. It is only from this teleological point of view, he affirms—only when, in considering the sum of things, we pass "from efficient to final cause"—that it becomes possible to develop a philosophical doctrine of ethics. If, however, Mr. Sorley would try to develop the formula of "self-realization" from "naturalistic" evolution, he might find the task not impossible. The formula, although as yet it does not seem to have been adopted by any evolutionist, strikes one as being, from the evolutionist point of view, not at all a bad formula. Perhaps hedonists and "empirical" evolutionists have been too much pre-occupied with the consideration that they must let their righteousness exceed that of the Scribes and Pharisees. There is a distinctly pagan ring about "self-realization," even when it has been interpreted by the Hegelian dialectic to mean self-renunciation. Evolutionists and hedonists, in their effort to be more Christian than Christianity itself, have preferred "altruism." It would be curious if a needed correction, in an entirely "naturalistic" sense, of traditional moral ideals should come from the philosophical school that is supposed to be most favourable to ethical and religious traditions.

According to Dr. Romundt,<sup>3</sup> "the completion of Socrates" was Kant. The completion of Kant, we are allowed to infer, is Dr. Romundt. First Socrates introduced a good deal of "prose" into

---

<sup>3</sup> "Die Vollendung des Sokrates." Immanuel Kants Grundlegung zur Reform der Sittenlehre dargestellt von Dr. Heinrich Romundt. Berlin: Nicolaische Verlags-Buchhandlung. 1885.

philosophy, but not enough. Then Kant made philosophy more "prosaic" still; but Kant's sound doctrine has been perverted by those who have followed him. For the greatest merit of Kant was that "der Glaube"—the correct French translation of which, as was impressed on the youthful Heine, is "la religion"—found itself perfectly safe with him. Dr. Romundt's satirical allusions to "prose" and "the prosaic" occur in a castigation of Heine at the end of his book for some disrespectful remarks, in the "History of Religion and Philosophy in Germany," on Kant, who, it may be remembered, is there associated with Robespierre in a way that recalls a well-known anecdote about the description given by a candidate in a historical examination of "the last words of Oliver Cromwell." Kant, Dr. Romundt demonstrates, in a number of pages that appears considerable in the reading, was really not destined by Nature "to sell coffee and sugar." And then, Heine's description of the "practical reason" as a device of Kant to console his old servant, Lampe, for the destruction wrought by the transcendental dialectic! But Kant, according to Heine, must have been "an old Lampe himself"! Observe the inconsistencies of a poet! How much better it is to be a man of prose and of sense! Whatever may have been the place of the practical reason in Kant's philosophy (a point which there is no need at present to discuss), one thing is certain—that Dr. Romundt's relation to Kant is very much like that of old Lampe as Heine imagined it.

We have not had time to examine Prof. Veitch's "Institutes of Logic" <sup>4</sup> with the attention it deserves. Its chief divisions are part i., "Logical Psychology—Historical Notices—The Laws of Thought;" part ii., "Concepts and Terms;" part iii., "Judgment;" part iv., "Inference."

Received also:—"Mind-Cure on a Material Basis." By Sarah Elizabeth Titcomb, author of "Early New England People." Boston: Cupples, Upham & Co. 1885.

---

## POLITICS, SOCIOLOGY, VOYAGES AND TRAVELS.

**W**HATEVER Sir Henry Maine writes or says on political institutions, ancient or modern, is certain not only to merit the most careful and respectful consideration, but to receive it. We gladly join in the chorus of welcome which has greeted the latest work of a thinker, so profound, so well-balanced, so patient, and impartial as the author of "The Early History of Institutions." It is hardly uncomplimentary to "Popular Government,"<sup>1</sup> to say that it will probably add nothing to its author's great reputation, and may possibly detract

---

<sup>4</sup> "Institutes of Logic." By John Veitch, LL.D., Professor of Logic and Rhetoric in the University of Glasgow. Edinburgh and London. W. Blackwood & Sons. 1885.

<sup>1</sup> "Popular Government." Four Essays. By Sir Henry Sumner Maine. London: John Murray. 1885.

from it. True, we find in it most, if not all, the characteristics which distinguish Sir Henry Maine's treatment of his subjects in former works. The difference lies in the subject of these essays. Sir Henry Maine won his well-earned reputation in the field of antiquarian politics, where he had no rivals—in England at all events—and few critics. In that field of research his method was recognized as most effective, and his conclusions were accepted as established, provisionally at least. But in modern politics Sir Henry can expect no such unquestioning acquiescence. We all fancy we know as much as our neighbours about the virtues and vices of the political institutions under which we live. We think ourselves capable of forming sound opinions upon the principles involved in current political controversies. And when we find that any one, even a great political thinker, holds opposite opinions, we are apt to say to ourselves that even great thinkers may be wrong sometimes—a suggestion which would never present itself to any ordinary reader of "Ancient Law" or "Village Communities." But although many will disagree with the conclusions drawn or suggested in "Popular Government," there is no man so wise that he will not be a good deal wiser for studying that work. Probably, too, in this, as in most cases, wisdom will bring with it a measure of sadness. Admitting that Democracy, government by the many, is for England in its present stage of development, better than aristocracy, or monarchy, it will be impossible for the reader to shut his eyes to the serious defects inherent in that system, and the terrible danger to which, by reason of these defects, it is exposed. With unsparing, yet impartial hand, Sir Henry Maine lays bare these defects and overturns many a cherished popular belief. It is impossible, in such a notice as this, to give even a summary of the conclusions at which Sir Henry arrives; still less is it possible to attempt any criticism, or to give any reasons for disagreeing with some of these conclusions. We think we shall best consult our readers' convenience, and avoid possible misrepresentation, by quoting at length the following passage from the Preface :—

In the Essay on the "Prospects of Popular Government," I have shown that, as a matter of fact, Popular Government, since its re-introduction into the world, has proved itself to be extremely fragile. In the Essay on the "Nature of Democracy," I have given some reasons for thinking that, in the extreme form to which it tends, it is, of all kinds of Government, by far the most difficult. In the "Age of Progress" I have argued that the perpetual change which, as understood in modern times, it appears to demand, is not in harmony with the normal forces ruling human nature, and is apt therefore to lead to cruel disappointment or serious disaster. . . . For the purpose of bringing out a certain number of facts (which suggest that it is not beyond the power of human reason to discover remedies for the infirmities of popular Government), and at the same time of indicating the quarter in which the political student (once set free from *à priori* assumption) may seek materials for a reconstruction of his science, I have examined and analysed the constitution of the United States, a topic on which much misconception seems to be abroad.

The first of these four essays is purely historical, and the only criticism we will stop to make is, that a period of transition, when a

new set of ideas on government are trying to supplant the old established ideas (as has been the case in Europe throughout the period comprised in Sir Henry's review), is certain to be stormy, and to give birth to unstable governments more or less experimental and provisional. England passed through such a period in the seventeenth century, but the new ideas emerged at last triumphant and secure. The second essay, on "The Nature of Democracy," is partly historical, partly speculative. No one will be surprised to find that it expresses the author's profound uneasiness and distrust of that form of government. And, indeed, its warnings are too solemn and come from too wise a man not to leave a sense of uneasiness in all but blind enthusiasts. "We are drifting," says Sir Henry Maine, "towards a type of government, associated with terrible events—a single assembly, armed with full power over the constitution, which it may exercise at discretion." The dangers might be averted, even yet, by

borrowing a few of the American securities against surprise and irreflection in constitutional legislation, and expressing them with something like the American precision. . . . There does not seem to be any insuperable objection, first of all, to making a distinction between ordinary legislation and legislation which in any other country would be called constitutional; and next, to requiring for the last a special legislative procedure, intended to secure caution and deliberation, and as near an approach to impartiality as a system of party Government will admit of.

Amongst the popular errors most strongly combated in this essay, is the belief that democracies are progressive. They are, he argues, averse to legislative changes, and indeed are suspicious and opposed to all changes, including those which science most clearly demonstrates to be beneficial. He returns to this characteristic of the human mind again in the next essay on "The Age of Progress." In his final essay he sketches the chief features of each of the great Federal Institutions set up by the Americans—the President, the Supreme Court, the Senate, and the House of Representatives, and points out their relation to pre-existing European, and especially British, institutions. The picture can hardly fail to gratify the patriotic American, and Sir Henry himself exclaims that "it may well fill the Englishmen who now live *in faxe Romuli* with wonder and envy."

The work just noticed can hardly fail to stimulate the desire for a fuller understanding of the foundations on which the British constitution rests; and Mr. Dicey's "Lectures"<sup>2</sup> come in most appropriately to meet the want. Bearing in mind that Mr. Dicey does not profess to cover the whole field of constitutional law, but only to clear the way for its study in detail, by directing attention to "two or three guiding principles which pervade the modern constitution of England," it will readily be admitted that he has been entirely successful in the admirable "Lectures" now published. After criticizing very justly the different points of view from which the study of con-

<sup>2</sup> "Lectures Introductory to the Law of the Constitution." By A. V. Dicey, B.C.L., Vinerian Professor of English Law, &c. London: Macmillan & Co. 1885.

stitutional law has generally been approached—the lawyer giving undue prominence to unreal fictions, the historian to antiquarianism and the investigation of “origins,” and the political theorist to “conventions”—Mr. Dicey gives, with admirable clearness, his own analysis of what is generally understood by constitutional law. He points out that it includes, in fact, two very distinct elements—viz., (1) rules which are in the strictest sense laws, because whether written or unwritten, whether enacted by statute or derived from the mass of customs, traditions, and judge-made maxims known as the common law, they are enforced by the courts of law; (2) those more or less definite maxims and practices which, though they regulate the ordinary conduct of Crown and Ministers, are not in reality “laws,” because they cannot be, and are not intended to be, enforced by courts of law. The former he calls collectively “the law of the constitution;” the latter “conventions of the constitution.” With the latter students of law have no direct concern, and accordingly in these lectures they are not directly treated of. Falling back on first principles in search of a clue to guide him through the “mazes of a perplexed topic,” Mr. Dicey selects three such guiding principles. “*First*, the legislative sovereignty of Parliament; *secondly*, the universal supremacy of ordinary law throughout the constitution; and *thirdly*, the dependence in the last resort of the conventions upon the constitution.” It appears to be hardly consistent with the author’s view of the proper province of his own office to introduce this third principle at all; but we readily pardon the inconsistency, as we owe to it a very interesting chapter which throws a fresh light on these conventions. Moreover, this third principle is the author’s answer to a question suggested to him by Mr. Freeman’s statement of the difference between our so-called “written law” and our “conventional constitution”—namely, “what may be the true source whence constitutional understandings, which are not laws, derive their binding power?” The problem is examined and its solution stated at length in the final lecture. Chapters ii. iii. and iv. are devoted to the principle of the sovereignty of Parliament; and for the purpose of bringing out clearly its salient features he compares Parliament with our own Colonial Legislatures and that of France, all of which are non-sovereign, inasmuch as they are bound by certain fundamental laws which they cannot get rid of by *ordinary* legislation. Here he treads on ground which Sir Henry Maine has recently occupied, and exhaustively examined in his final chapters on “Popular Government.” Mr. Dicey does not dig so deeply as Sir Henry Maine, but the results of his labour are the same in kind. In another chapter he compares Parliamentary sovereignty as it exists in England with various forms of Federalism, especially that of the United States of America. This chapter leaves on the reader’s mind the impression that its author has not thought out Federalism or been at much pains to focus his thoughts. But whatever dissatisfaction one feels with this chapter is quickly dispelled by the succeeding lectures which deal with the second of his guiding principles—the “Rule of Law.” Under this

expression are included three "distinct but kindred conceptions," which, put briefly, are (1) the supremacy of ordinary law as opposed to arbitrary power; (2) the equality of all citizens, without exception, before the law administered by the ordinary Law Courts; (3) "the fact that with us the law of the constitution, the rules which, in foreign countries, naturally form part of a constitutional code, are not the source, but the consequence, of the rights of individuals, as defined and enforced by the Courts." From this it follows that our constitution is, like most of our law, judge-made, which accounts for its abounding in fictions. In his final chapter Mr. Dicey makes very clear the important distinction between the "conventions" of the constitution and the "law" of the constitution. The former are, in fact, rules for determining how the discretionary powers of the Crown—i.e., the prerogative—ought to be used. On the rather speculative question of the ultimate sanction of these conventions, he holds that the "law" of the constitution, as previously defined by him, is the real ultimate sanction. On the whole these lectures may be taken as a trustworthy guide, and from their clearness of thought and expression they will be found easy to follow, through a subject of great interest, of great importance, but of equally great complexity—"a sort of maze in which the wanderer is perplexed by unreality . . . by antiquarianism and by conventionalism." Mr. Dicey has brushed aside these "shams" to the great benefit of students who wish to see the actual machinery of the constitution.

In his enthusiasm for change the next political thinker whose work we are going to notice is at the opposite pole from Sir Henry Maine. M. Donnat<sup>3</sup> is a careful observer of political phenomena, not in France only but in England and America, which he appears to know better than Frenchmen usually do. He has also grasped the scientific conception of causation, and is anxious to apply the methods of induction commonly employed in experimental sciences to the phenomena which meet the student of political science. He wishes to see experiments in government conducted as far as possible in accordance with the requirements of a rigid induction, the conditions under which a given phenomenon occurs being arranged and varied, with a view to determining their connection with the phenomenon. Such experiments, he urges, are both essential to the discovery of political truth and practically feasible. They can be effected by allowing particular districts or particular local authorities to adopt, when they desire to do so, measures which the rest of the nation do not desire to become the law of the land. We have had some difficulty in discovering the drift of M. Donnat's work. There is no definition, that we can find, of the "Méthode expérimentale." The nearest approach to a clear description of it is to be found on the last page of the book (p. 487), where he says:—"Rassembler les documents que fournissent l'ethnographie, la statistique, l'observation comparée des peuples civilisés; en déduire les lois naturelles

<sup>3</sup> "La Politique expérimentale." (Bibliothèque des Sciences contemporaines.) Par Léon Donnat. Paris: C. Reinwald. 1885.



de la sociologie; vérifier l'exactitude de ces lois, et en rechercher l'application par le système des législations séparées et temporaires: voilà en quoi consiste le Méthode." Elsewhere (p. 50) he tells us that the experimental method comprises three elements—observation, experiment and *consensus*: "l'assentiment des unités associées à toute réforme modifiant leur existence individuelle ou collective." The greater portion of his book is devoted to proving that his method is justified by comparative observation of free peoples, by history, by science, by the failures of reformers, and by the political situation in France. In conclusion, he anticipates and replies to some objections, and gives a summary of questions to be solved by the experimental method. The principle involved in this method seems to be identical with that which is known amongst us as "local option." Obviously its application on a large scale would completely dislocate the framework of the constitution of this or any other European community in which it was applied. Even on a small scale its adoption might create precedents which would lead to disruption. The fact is that the range within which experiments can safely be made on living organisms is very narrow indeed, and is far narrower in the case of so complex a thing as a modern political community. Nevertheless, occasions do occur when M. Donnat's idea might be applied as the lesser of two evils. Indeed, the general reaction against excessive centralization of administrative powers proves that there is a truth at the bottom of M. Donnat's theory. Universal uniformity is by no means desirable; but nonconformity carried too far becomes a serious source of waste and weakness. How is the movement to be checked if once M. Donnat's principle of "local option" is adopted as broadly and explicitly as he desires?

The views of Professor Vambéry on the expansion of Russia in Central Asia are so well known to English readers that we need not attempt to reproduce them here. The book<sup>4</sup> now offered to the public contains the substance of the addresses delivered during his recent lecturing tour in this country. His careful study of the whole subject, and his exceptional personal experiences, give weight to his opinions. But we may easily over-estimate their true weight; for, after all, M. Vambéry is not a statesman: he is an eminent Oriental scholar and traveller, and he will pardon us, we feel sure, for saying that scholars and travellers are perilous guides in practical politics. But, indeed, we have little to complain of in M. Vambéry's criticisms of either English or Russian doings in the past. He regrets that we did not undertake for the Khanates what Russia has accomplished for them—their subjugation and civilization. He thinks we could have conquered them more easily than Russia was able to do, and he prefers civilization of the English to that of the Russian type. We doubt not he is right in both these views. But Englishmen may be excused if they do not admit that their mission is to civilize, sword in hand, all the uncivilized

<sup>4</sup> "The Coming Struggle for India. Being an Account of the Encroachments of Russia in Central Asia, and of the Difficulties sure to arise therefrom to England." By Arminius Vambéry. Cassell & Co. 1885.

people they can find. We have done, and shall continue to do, at least our fair share of that work, and we are under no obligation to wander off into Central Asia in search of more. But M. Vambéry thinks the work we have already done is threatened with destruction by the advancing wave of Russian conquest, and that by our supineness we have lost the great advantages we formerly possessed for stemming that wave. We have read M. Vambéry's reasons in support of these views and are still unconvinced. That the danger, be it great or little, is now nearer than ever and more obvious to all the world, is of course true. But it has not been unforeseen; nor, except in petty matters of detail, could any amount of forewarning have enabled us to be better forearmed than we are at this moment. That at least follows if the views of the most eminent Anglo-Indian statesmen be well founded.\* The Professor urges England to occupy at once, and at all costs, Herat and Kandahar, to conciliate the Mahomedans, and above all to exclude considerations of party politics. The two last articles of this three-fold policy we can heartily adopt.

From dangers threatening our Indian empire from without, we pass naturally to dangers arising from internal causes. In "New India,"<sup>5</sup> Mr. Cotton, who justly prides himself on being "as it were, an hereditary member of the Administration" in India, draws attention to the great changes that are taking place there—changes political, social, and religious—and to the spirit which, in his judgment, should inspire our policy in relation to them. He is an ardent disciple of the school of Lord Ripon, to whom he dedicates his book. The substance of the greater part of these chapters has already appeared in magazines; but both from the importance of the subject and the authority of the writer, they are well worth republication. He appears to look forward to a time, generations hence perhaps, when India shall be a federation of Native States, occupying towards England a relation similar to that now held by the Dominion of Canada.

The man who shall discover the true cause or causes of the terrible depression of trade, which for the last decade has pressed so severely on the greater portion of the civilized world, and shall succeed in convincing the public opinion of Europe, or even England, of the truth of his discovery, will have done an incalculable service to mankind. Hitherto, it must be admitted, the truth, if known to any one, has not been generally accepted. Dr. Alfred Russel Wallace,<sup>6</sup> whose splendid achievements in other fields of investigation entitle him to a respectful hearing in this, offers an explanation which, if it brings to light no hitherto unsuspected causes, very clearly demonstrates the importance of some known causes, and the futility of others that are often suggested. The inadequacy of hostile tariffs, or changes in currency,

---

\* "New India; or, India in Transition." By H. J. S. Cotton, Bengal Civil Service. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1885.

<sup>6</sup> "Bad Times: an Essay on the Present Depression of Trade, Tracing it to its Sources in Enormous Foreign Loans, Excessive War Expenditure, the Increase of Speculation and of Millionaires, and the Depopulation of the Rural Districts. With Suggested Remedies." By Alfred Russel Wallace, LL.D. London: Macmillan & Co. 1885.

as causes of depression, is evident when we remember that the depression began suddenly in 1874 without any corresponding alteration in these alleged causes. Bad harvests, again, cannot be an explanation of a phenomenon which is found existing equally where harvests are good. And as to what is called "over production," it is obviously a symptom and not a cause. The phenomenon to be explained is "the widespread diminution in the demand for our chief manufactures, both at home and abroad." The diagram on page 19 exhibits the notorious fact that while we have gone on taking ever more and more from foreign countries, our foreign customers have been taking less from us than they formerly did. Our foreign customers must therefore have been purchasing elsewhere, or else must have greatly reduced their consumption. That they are not purchasing elsewhere is proved by the depression existing simultaneously in all great manufacturing countries, and the falling off of customers there too. Hence we are driven to "the startling but inevitable conclusion that the total demand for the staple manufactures of the world has diminished in proportion to population;" in other words the mass of mankind have become poorer. Dr. Wallace then lays down the following criterion of a true explanation:—

In order to show that any alleged cause of the depression is a true cause, it must be proved that, either directly or indirectly, it impoverishes or otherwise diminishes the purchasing power of some considerable body of our customers; and further, that it is a cause which began to act at, or shortly before, the first appearance of the depression, or became greatly intensified in its action about that time; and yet again, that it has continued in action for several years, or is still acting.

These conditions are satisfied, Dr. Wallace thinks, by certain causes which he points out, and which, moreover, in their combined effect are "adequate to account for the existing depression in all its wide extent and almost unexampled persistence." The most important of these are Foreign Loans, Increased War Expenditure of Europe, and Agricultural Depression in England, due chiefly to a bad land system, resulting in rural depopulation; whilst among minor causes are Millionaires, Speculation, and Adulteration. Each of these causes is examined in some detail. The two former affect our foreign trade by impoverishing our foreign purchasers. Great loans create at first an abnormal demand for our manufactures, but as soon as the money is spent, this abnormal demand ceases, while the normal demand is permanently diminished, if, as usually happens, the loan has been spent unproductively, and the borrowing country has to pay interest and perhaps a sinking fund. At home, a bad land system, combined with the predominance of bad harvests and a fall in prices, has caused a serious diminution in the numbers and the purchasing power of the population. Coming to remedies, the Government should do all it can to discourage foreign loans, and should avoid all wars, except for self-defence. But the remedy to which Dr. Wallace looks for the richest and most permanent results is reform of our land system, directed to securing to the farmer fixity of tenure at fair rent, with ownership of

his improvements; and to the labourer, not an "allotment," but as much land attached to his cottage as he can cultivate in his spare time. The remarkable facts mentioned by Dr. Wallace as to the increased produce that land so cultivated has yielded are at least worth careful consideration. Quitting for a moment his rôle of economist and assuming that of the moralist, Dr. Wallace claims that "in every case in which we have traced out the efficient causes of the present depression, we have found it to originate in customs, laws, or modes of action which are ethically unsound, if not positively immoral." The whole essay is thoughtful and moderate in tone, an agreeable contrast to the majority of similar essays on the subjects it deals with.

On the other side of the land question we have a small but learned work by Dr. Birkbeck.<sup>7</sup> The Downing Professor of the Law of England has the reputation of being one of the most learned authorities on the law of real property. Knowing this, we must confess to some disappointment at the meagre little volume in which he doles out, with niggard hand, the treasures of his learning on the subject of the distribution of land—*i.e.*, property in land—in England. Why, being in such a miserly mood, he offers the public any of his treasures at all we must find out, if we can, from the nature of the offering—*i.e.*, from the text—for there is neither preface nor introduction to supply a clue. We conclude that the object of the Master of Downing is to damp the land reformers' ardour by showing, by the historical method, that in the first place they have no grievances; secondly, their grievances are as old as the Anglo-Saxon times; thirdly, they are not caused by bad laws or by lack of good ones; and lastly, that the law of primogeniture calls loudly for amendment in favour of widows and younger children, and that an efficient system of registration is both desirable and feasible. He thinks there is convincing evidence of the existence of large estates from the very earliest Anglo-Saxon days, and that peasant proprietors had much less of the land of England at that period than is usually supposed. The reforms he proposes are good in themselves, but they go a very little way towards meeting the demands of modern reformers. They are mere conveyancer's reforms, and do not touch the social problems which lie at the root of these demands.

Mr. Moffat's examination of Mr. Henry George<sup>8</sup> belongs to a class of books that are rarely satisfactory. It is a selection of excerpts of inordinate length from the writings of the American economist, pieced together according to the exigencies of Mr. Moffat's contention, and interpreted according to the same rule. We would much prefer a new edition of Mr. George's work with the substance of Mr. Moffat's comments in the form of foot-notes. Why he undertook this task is not very clear. He regrets that Mr. George's theories have been

<sup>7</sup> "Historical Sketch of the Distribution of Land in England. With Suggestions for some Improvement in the Law." By Wm. Lloyd Birkbeck, Downing Professor of the Law of England, &c. London: Macmillan & Co. 1885.

<sup>8</sup> "Mr. Henry George, the 'Orthodox.' An Examination of Mr. George's Position as a Systematic Economist; and a Review of the Competitive and Socialistic Schools of Economy." By Robert Scott Moffat. London: Remington & Co. 1885.

deemed worthy of so little notice by our leading economists; but towards the end of his examination he tells us—"It is very plain that it is not from its intrinsic merits that I have deemed Mr. George's book worthy of a formal examination." The truth seems to be that he desired to deal a blow at Ricardo through George, by showing that the latter "faithfully follows the method of Ricardo," and he intimates that Ricardo is as large a dealer in fiction as George himself. Indeed, he stigmatizes the Ricardian theory as "pure fiction from beginning to end."

It is always a pleasure to notice anything from the pen of the late Mr. Walter Bagehot. He is one of the few writers on economic subjects who have combined a scientifically trained mind with practical business experience; and to these qualifications he adds another, rarer still—a genial easy style and happy knack of illustration which make the dullest subjects bright under his handling. The little volume<sup>9</sup> now before us consists of a preface and two chapters intended to form part of a projected but never completed work on economics, by which Mr. Bagehot hoped to restore the Ricardian reasoning to its primitive purity, by clearing away the accumulated misconceptions that had gradually obscured its true outlines. That the doctrines of the Ricardian economics are by no means universally accepted, is well illustrated by the few books on the subject that lie before us as we write. No one who has any acquaintance with the economic writings of other countries will doubt that Mr. Bagehot has hit a vital defect in our English political economy in pointing out that "it has often been put forward, not as a theory of the principal causes affecting wealth in *certain* societies, but as a theory of the principal, sometimes even of all, the causes affecting wealth in *every* society." From this defective conception of economics arise two characteristics which have hindered its popularity and its progress. Economists have been too abstract, and therefore dull; and they have shrunk from verifying their abstract theories by comparison with the concrete phenomena. The first thing, in his opinion, to be done for English political economy is to put its aim right; to let it no longer "continue to seem what to many minds it seems now—proved perhaps, but proved *in nubibus*; true, no doubt, somehow and somewhere, but that somewhere a *terra incognita*, and that somehow an unknown quantity." It was his purpose to take each of the principal assumptions of political economy one by one, and show roughly where each is true and where it is not. But his purpose was only carried out in regard to the assumptions of the transferability of labour and capital. He shows, with charming ease, within what very narrow limits, both of history and geography, these assumptions correspond, even approximately, with the facts. It would take us too far at present if we ventured to follow him in tracing out these limits, but we can well understand Professor Marshall's desire that these two chapters should be in the hands of every student of English political economy.

<sup>9</sup> "The Postulates of English Political Economy." By the late Walter Bagehot. ('Students' Edition.) London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1885.

Dr. Patten's attack on the Ricardian<sup>10</sup> economics is another example of the differences of opinion on that subject to which we have alluded. There is something in Dr. Patten's little work.<sup>10</sup> The first thing that strikes the reader is that it is radically unorthodox, and that it contains a goodly number, of obvious fallacies, and some that are not so obvious. But there are also a certain number of criticisms<sup>●</sup> that contain at least a germ of truth in them; and it would be interesting to examine and develop these germs if time and space permitted. The reader who is in a hurry is at rather a disadvantage through a certain lack of lucidity in Mr. Patten's statement of his argument. His literary style is correct and clear enough, but the successive steps of his reasoning are seldom exhibited with sufficient fulness to enable the reader to follow him without effort. The omitted premise of his syllogism has too often to be supplied by the reader, and the effort is distracting. Mr. Patten's purpose is "to contest from strictly economic grounds the validity of several fundamental propositions laid down by Ricardo and other writers of the same school." He complains that owing to the historical development of economics its truths "lack symmetry, the newer doctrines not having been applied to all points of the science." Again he complains that its deductions are too often based on some one ultimate fact, the influence of other ultimate facts being ignored. Thus "the law of rent is usually discussed as though differences of soil were the sole cause of rent, and the law of population only considers the difference between the possible rates of increase of population and food; while free trade and the effects of free competition are discussed from an equally narrow standpoint." To call attention to these neglected facts, and to place them in their proper relation to the recognized facts, is Mr. Patten's aim. Examining Ricardo's explanation of the rise in the price of food as civilization advances, he finds that it is incomplete. Ricardo's physical cause—the varying fertility of soil—far from being the sole cause, is, he maintains, of quite secondary importance, the main causes being social not physical. Mr. Patten certainly hits one or two weak points in Ricardo's theory as it is commonly expounded, but most of his criticisms do not appear to touch the substantial truth of the Ricardian law. He labours very hard to disprove the current theory that consumption has no influence on production, and that demand for commodities is not a demand for labour, but simply determines the direction of labour. Here again he calls attention to certain laws of Nature on which the food supply depends, and which Ricardo has not sufficiently attended to; and he maintains that according as the demands of a community (or of all communities) are in conformity with these laws, or not in conformity with them, will food be abundant and cheap, or scarce and dear. But all that his arguments appear to prove is that if people demand food which has a high cost of production they must give a larger amount

---

<sup>10</sup> "The Premises of Political Economy. Being a Re-Examination of Certain Fundamental Principles of Economic Science." By Simon N. Patten, Ph.D. (Halle). Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company. 1885.

of labour in return for it; and that it is in their power to gain the means of subsistence at a less expenditure of labour by simply contenting themselves with food which has a lower cost of production. All this is obvious, but does not touch the Ricardian theory. He falls foul of Malthus for speaking of a "natural" rate of increase of population. But Malthus has made very clear the sense in which he uses the term, and Mr. Patten's criticisms are rather wide of the mark. As for his charge against free trade, that it diminishes the productive power of certain countries by diverting a portion of the labour of these countries to the production of things for which they are not best suited, the charge is entirely irrelevant, except on the assumption that such countries would be better off if they kept all their productions to themselves and did without imported commodities. India loses by converting rice lands into wheat lands only on the assumption that the commodities which India receives in return for the wheat so grown are of less benefit to India than the rice which could have been grown on these wheat lands would have been; and Mr. Patten offers no evidence in support of this assumption. Notwithstanding the innumerable errors into which Mr. Patten has fallen, we readily acknowledge the shrewdness of many of his remarks, and the not unimportant bearing on current theories of certain facts to which he calls attention. It might not be a wholly unprofitable undertaking to examine, Mill in hand, the theories advanced by Mr. Patten.

One of the most instructive collections of facts illustrative of certain economic principles that we have seen for some time comes, like the last noticed work, from America—from the pen of Mr. David Wells.<sup>11</sup> The essays in which he describes some recent economic experiences of the United States are, moreover, so light in style as to be really entertaining. This is pre-eminently true of the paper entitled "The True Story of the Leaden Statuary"—a delicious illustration of Yankee smartness—which shows, in a manner at once convincing and comical, some of the absurdities of a protective tariff. In "A Modern Financial Utopia," Mr. Wells tells the story of the fiscal crimes and blunders of the republic of Texas—a story which points the moral of inconvertible paper money. Of course, the irrepressible "Silver Question" turns up, and so does the "Tariff Question," Mr. Wells being a strong Free Trader. Four admirable papers are devoted to describing the experiments of the United States in taxing distilled spirits. "It is safe to affirm that nothing similar, viewed from an economic and moral stand-point, ever before occurred in any country of modern civilization, or is likely to occur again." So thinks Mr. Wells, and his readers will probably agree with him. The volume ends with a well-written essay—the author's Address as President of the American Social Science Association in 1875, on

---

<sup>11</sup> "Practical Economics. A Collection of Essays respecting certain of the Recent Economic Experiences of the United States." By David Wells, LL.D., D.C.L., &c. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1855.

the Influence of the Production and Distribution of Wealth on Social Development.

Mr. Thomas Illingworth<sup>12</sup> writes from his heart, "as a business man to business men," on a question which, as Mr. Bonamy Price declares, "really rivals, in interest and importance, Free Trade"—the question of free distribution of wealth; how it can be rendered less unequal than it is. Mr. Illingworth believes that much ought to be done, and that much may be done in the way he points out. Every one will agree with the first of these propositions. To adopt the last would require a robuster faith in men's unselfishness than is often found. The social disorders caused by defective distribution of wealth are forcibly described by Mr. Illingworth, and if anything effectual can be done to mitigate them his proposals are as likely to succeed as any. But it is hard to keep one's faith amid the Babel of conflicting suggestions, from which no action follows.

We have two other books<sup>13 14</sup> on economic subjects, of which we had written at some length; but the only remark we can find space for is that neither of the authors appears to comprehend the principles he attempts to handle.

Mr. Jeans' bulky volume<sup>15</sup> contains a good deal of information of the blue-book type, which would be useful if it were correct, bearing on the economic condition of England, and, in a lesser degree, of the Colonies and America. The dry bones of statistics are served up with a sauce of the author's comments and comparisons, and the result is a fairly readable book.

We are glad to find that Mr. Lawrence's *Essays on International Law*,<sup>16</sup> which we noticed at some length in the January number of this REVIEW, have reached a second edition already. Besides some few unimportant alterations, Mr. Lawrence has added a new essay on the exemption of private property from capture at sea in time of war. He holds that such exemption is "absolutely essential to the safety of our vast commerce, and even to the continued existence of our Empire, if we should be involved in a war with any strong maritime Power."

For the second time, Mr. T. E. Scrutton wins the Yorke Prize, the subject being, "The Influence of the Roman Law on the Law of

---

<sup>12</sup> "Distribution Reform. The Remedy for Industrial Depression and for the Removal of Many Social Evils." By Thos. Illingworth. London, Paris, New York and Melbourne: Cassell & Co.

<sup>13</sup> "Circulating Capital. Being an Inquiry into the Fundamental Laws of Money." By An East India Merchant. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1885.

<sup>14</sup> "The Science of Business. A Study of the Principles Controlling the Laws of Exchange." By Roderick H. Smith. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1885.

<sup>15</sup> "England's Supremacy: Its Sources, Economics and Dangers." By J. S. Jeans. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1885.

<sup>16</sup> "Essays on Some Disputed Questions in Modern International Law." By T. J. Lawrence, M.A., LL.M., Deputy Whewell Professor of International Law, Cambridge, &c. Second Edition, Enlarged and Revised. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell & Co. 1885.



England." <sup>17</sup> This time we can conscientiously congratulate the author on his essay. Many of the criticisms we felt bound to make in April, 1884, on his "Laws of Literary Property," are inapplicable to the present essay. It has evidently cost Mr. Scrutton much labour, and we venture to think his industry has not been thrown away; for many new facts, bearing on this question, have recently been brought to light, and we now have them here collected together in one volume and in a convenient form.

Mr. Jenkins' work <sup>18</sup> is a useful practical compendium of the branches of law with which it deals.

In the author of "Scientific Meliorism," <sup>19</sup> we recognize an advanced thinker of a rare and high order. We are far from willing to adopt every suggestion contained in this book, but we may say generally that the author displays a happy facility for separating the true from the false in the chaos of conflicting solutions which envelops social problems. She is endowed with a faculty that enables her to keep touch with human nature, where great scientific thinkers, like Spencer and Galton, have lost it. This gives to many of her suggestions a completeness, and, at least, an approach to feasibility that is too often wanting in the proposals of these philosophers. Miss Clapperton's ideas are not new, although, to many of her readers, they may be so; nor does she claim originality for them. They are the common property of the age, and her task has been "the sympathetic arrangement" of them. The word "Meliorism" appears to have been invented by George Eliot, but its appropriation by a certain school of social philosophers to characterize their method appears to be due to an American thinker, Mr. Lester Ward, whose remarkable work, "Dynamic Sociology," was reviewed in the October number of the WESTMINSTER REVIEW for 1883. The only authoritative definition we have found of Scientific Meliorism is in a passage from Mr. Ward, quoted by Miss Clapperton, in which he says it may be defined as "humanitarianism, *minus* all sentiment. . . . It implies the improvement of the social condition through cold calculation, through the adoption of indirect means." In the sense in which Miss Clapperton uses it, it appears to denote a method of procedure in social reconstruction, rather than a programme of measures. In her final chapter we find her summing up in this way:—"Viewing society as a whole, we realize that there are no remedial specifics in the case: that general happiness will be attained only by a process of evolution, and that the process is one of . . . increasing adaptation of individual human life to a social environment, and of social environment

<sup>17</sup> "The Influence of the Roman Law on the Law of England." Being the Yorke Prize Essay of the University of Cambridge for the Year 1884. By Thomas Edward Scrutton, Professor of Constitutional Law and History, University College, London, &c. Cambridge: At the University Press. 1885.

<sup>18</sup> "The Laws Concerning Religious Worship. Also Mortmain and Charitable Uses." By John Jenkins, a District Registrar of the High Court of Justice. London: Waterlow Brothers & Layton. 1885.

<sup>19</sup> "Scientific Meliorism, and the Evolution of Happiness." By Jane Hume Clapperton. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1886.

to individual human life." In other places she speaks of the function of Scientific Meliorism as being the conscious guidance of evolution by the light of science towards the attainment of universal happiness. The goal of meliorism can only be reached through the improvement of man's moral nature. Man's moral nature is dependent upon heredity, training, and environment. These forces must, therefore, be taken in hand and regulated according to reason. "The policy of meliorism has to embrace and combine rational breeding, rational training, and a new order of life in which sympathy and co-operation will take the place of individual competition, and happiness, not wealth, be the clear aim of man." Scientific Meliorism lays especial stress upon the primary necessity of racial regeneration, to be accomplished by attention to stirpiculture, or what Mr. Galton calls *eugenics*, so as to ensure the birth of those only who are reasonably *fit* for the conditions under which human life has to be carried on. This *birth of the fit* would, in great measure, take the place of *survival of the fittest*, as the chief factor in racial improvement. We must here note an important point, in which the suggestion of Mr. Galton for realizing this result differs from the proposal of meliorism. For while Mr. Galton would attain his end by the compulsory celibacy of all who were judged unfit to be parents, Meliorism maintains that celibacy is "a vital evil," quite unnecessary in any case, provided parentage be avoided, as it may be. This is a point of great importance, and one on which "meliorism" is, perhaps, most in danger of shipwreck against current morality. Yet, as an alternative to existing social evils, meliorism can make out a strong case in favour of its bold suggestion. In passing, we ought, perhaps, to say that no fault can be found with the author's style of treatment of this and similar subjects. It is frank, serious, dignified throughout. However repulsive her subject may be, her treatment of it is never open to the charge of indelicacy, while at the same time it is absolutely frank and unreserved. Indeed, we may go so far as to say, that if we except her perilous doctrine of Neo-Malthusianism, there is nothing in this book which would be unwholesome for persons of either sex who approach it sober-mindedly. But this opinion, we are aware, may not be shared by all readers. The chapter on Heredity is, at all events, a valuable contribution to *Eugenics*, and we venture to think the author shows a truer insight into the emotional side of human nature than the founder of that science has done. "The object of marriage is the happiness of the two who are united—their own individual delight and tranquillity of mind—and where not this but something else is primarily aimed at (even if that something else be no mean and despicable aim, such as money or social position, but the nobler aim of bringing healthy children into the world), marriage is degraded into a mere social connection, a tie that is not normal but in a measure false." The passion of love "must *not* be thought of as subservient to *Eugenics*." But "Marriage and parentage are not necessarily conjoined. It is with the latter alone that society properly deals." We will not follow the author in her development of these propositions, but pass on to glance at what she calls the channel in

which "must flow the main remedial force of the new policy," the reconstructed family life. "The disintegration of the ancient family group, the unfitness of an archaic domestic system to achieve the great ends of rational training and the initiation of habits of rational breeding, is the central source of our wide-spread social corruption." The family of the future will be the unitary or associated home, in which a number of families will live as one. Here will be found economy, stability, freer and more varied social intercourse, earlier and better regulated marriages, and rational training under home influences. The unitary home will foster the social qualities which will make co-operation in industry easier, leading eventually to economic socialism. The attitude of Scientific Meliorism towards most of the social problems of the present time is clearly sketched by the author, but we can only allude to it very briefly. Meliorism discourages "charities that hurt the independence of the poor or relieve them of parental responsibility;" it endeavours to promote the enfranchisement of women, and to aid at every point the movement of advance to the position of social equality of sex; it inculcates a return to simplicity of manners, habits, and dress; it promotes "association of the sexes in youth, under conditions of adult control, whether the union be that of marriage, of friendship, or of simple intercourse and companionship;" it "agitates for alteration of the marriage laws (in the direction of greater facility of divorce), the laws of inheritance, and the land laws. . . . Laxity must give place to strictness in respect of parentage;" large estates and great accumulations of wealth must be pared down "so slowly as to create no individual suffering or social confusion, such legislative measures being directed to land nationalization as their final aim;" lastly, it "frankly, deliberately, relinquishes supernaturalism, and in the sphere of the real sets itself to the reconstruction of a religious *cultus*." It will now be evident to our readers that Scientific Meliorism is an eclectic system. Its most original feature is the prominence it gives to *Eugenics*, and the manner in which it incorporates this new science with familiar plans for social re-organization. The great generalization of Scientific Meliorism is that as natural selection, or the survival of the fittest, has given way throughout a great part of the human race, before sympathetic selection or indiscriminate survival, so this, in turn, must give place to social selection, or the birth of the fittest. Whatever may be thought of the conclusions at which "Scientific Meliorism" arrives, we should be hardly doing justice to its able exponent, if we omitted to acknowledge the tone of moderation and sobriety, the careful thought, which pervades this book. The reader may occasionally shake his head dubiously, but we venture to say he will not lay down the book until he has got to page 436, and that he will then see many things in a new light and some in a truer.

We have on our table two little volumes in which two schoolmasters—one Scotch, the other Irish—give us some account of their professional experiences, and offer suggestions for school reform.

Mr. Cotterill's book is,<sup>20</sup> on the whole, wholesome and stimulating. There is no doubt that the bodily health of boys at the very best of public schools requires more systematic attention, even now; and it is the boys whose minds are better than their bodies, whom the book pleases more than the fat, who require such attention. Happily, the schoolmaster of our day is growing more and more to regard it as within his duty to look to the total welfare of his pupils: to fit them for life, and not merely for the first examination they have to face on leaving school. One of his greatest difficulties is to counteract bad home influences. One boy comes of a set which cares only for sport; another learns from his elders at home to regard nothing as worthy of attention but books and art. And these are homes without any pursuits or ideas whatever; from which come the best customers of the tuck-shop, the flabby, indolent frequenters of the fire-side; for whose good mainly this book is an appeal. Chapters ii. and iii. are well worthy the serious notice of those concerned in education. In the latter chapter, which treats of the employment of time, Mr. Cotterill advocates fewer hours of study in the day. Any one who has been a master at a public school knows well what prolonged lessons really mean—not over-wrought brains; for the time during which the mind is intent is a small fraction of school hours for most boys; but under-wrought bodies, and the denial of opportunity to many boys of high calibre for the cultivation of self-chosen pursuits, on which alone they might look forward to a happy and useful sequel to their lives. It is a grave mistake, and one for ever growing more and more established at the universities, to suppose that the whole of a youth's intellectual life until he takes his degree, should be defined and prescribed by the calendar. In his chapter on "Brain Competition" Mr. Cotterill deprecates cramming. We go a long way with him. But, after all, is the mischief as great as he makes out, and does he put the blame on the right shoulders? The best men, those who succeed, are the least crammed, because they can digest the food which the less robust can extract no nourishment from. The very same lecture is genuine instruction to one boy and mere cram to another. Even Mr. Cotterill is a crammer in respect to the more stupid members of his form. Examinations intended as a means of selecting men of the highest ability must be too difficult for men of lower. The latter have themselves or their advisers to blame if they suffer from injudicious competition with stronger intellects than their own. The frog who burst in trying to be as big as the bull would have missed the whole point of the affair if he had expired complaining of the nature of things in allowing bulls to be so big.

Mr. Hime writes less as a reformer than as one who, having had great experience, has necessarily a great many valuable hints to throw out on a great many points, interesting to masters and parents.

<sup>20</sup> "Suggested Reforms in Public Schools." By C. C. Cotterill, M.A., Assistant Master at Fettes College, Edinburgh. Edinburgh and London: Wm. Blackwood & Sons. 1885.

Schoolmasters are not ungrateful, we believe, for any hints prompted by a head-master's experiences. But it is not likely they will find much to help them in Mr. Hime's slightly egotistical retrospect.<sup>21</sup> On one important point he corroborates Mr. Cotterill's complaint—viz., as to the inattention to sanitary requirements; and as a remedy he proposes that every schoolmaster should have a medical training. There is some sense in that. It will be a blessed day for boys and their parents when knowledge of the laws of health is recognized as more important for a schoolmaster than knowledge of the dry bones of theology.

"This work is a contribution to light literature, and to the literature of light," says the author of "Moon Lore."<sup>22</sup> This is epigrammatic but not very true. To speak of the work as light literature does less than justice to the extensive learning and phenomenal industry of the author, while, on the other hand, the book has nothing whatever to do with light. But if it is not exactly light literature we readily grant that it is far more entertaining than much that passes by that name. The innumerable myths and superstitions connected with the moon which exist, or have existed in every country in the world, are most diligently sought out by the author, and the authority on which he relies is always stated. "Anthropomorphism and Sexuality," he tries to prove, have been the principal factors in the custom of moon-worship. It seems a pity that he should have wasted his time in speculations about "moon inhabitation."

"Flying Leaves"<sup>23</sup> are pleasant reading, well written, thoughtful, the product of an observant mind and a facile pen. Mrs. Pfeiffer's reflections on her experiences of travel derive a peculiar interest—which belongs to a few modern books, but is seldom if ever found in older books, even when written by women—from the watchfulness with which she is ever on the look-out, wherever she goes, for indications of the present position and future prospects of the question of sex-equality. This makes her account of the ideas and practices of the Mormons highly instructive. Of course, Mrs. Pfeiffer protests with all the earnestness of her soul against polygamy. But in spite of her deep commiseration and sympathy with "plural wives," she is too truthful to attempt to conceal the strange fact that her sympathy met with no response amongst the objects of her pity. They were neither ashamed of their "peculiar institution" nor discontented with their lot, even when they found it trying. On the contrary, all with whom she seems to have conversed were filled with an exalted religious enthusiasm and a profound belief in the righteousness of all things Mormon. The preoccupation of Mrs. Pfeiffer's mind with the problem

<sup>21</sup> "A Schoolmaster's Retrospect of Eighteen and a Half Years in an Irish School." By Maurice C. Hime, Head Master of Foyle College, Londonderry. Second Edition. London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co. Dublin: Sullivan Brothers. 1885.

<sup>22</sup> "Moon Lore." By the Rev. Timothy Harley, F.R.A.S. London: Swan Sonnenschein, Le Bas & Lowry. 1885.

<sup>23</sup> "Flying Leaves from East and West." By Emily Pfeiffer. London: Field & Tuer. 1885.

of woman's position as a factor in the evolution of society is strikingly shown again when the contemplation of ancient Greek art in Athens, and the recollection of Plato, prompted by associations of the place, lead to some extremely interesting criticisms on the absence of feminine tenderness in the conception of woman as it existed in the minds of philosophers and artists in the palmy days of Athens. Her enthusiasm for the modern spirit of love as opposed to knowledge betrays her into a denunciation, more eloquent than just, of "the wisdom of Greece," which to her has become merely "foolishness." About one-fourth part of Mrs. Pfeiffer's "Leaves" have their origin in the East—Smyrna and Athens. The rest come from Canada and the United States. Familiar as we are with travellers' impressions of the West, we find something so fresh and vivid in these jottings that we have read them without any sense of weariness, though there is certainly nothing in them that can, strictly speaking, be called new.

We have a considerable number of books of travel this quarter, but none of first-rate importance. The most satisfactory work we have under this head is Mr. Lovett's "Norwegian Pictures."<sup>24</sup> The "Pictures," indeed, are not Mr. Lovett's, and they are undoubtedly the chief attraction of the volume. But the letterpress is good too, and the arrangement and general excellence of the work is presumably due to him. We can imagine no better, and perhaps in the end, no cheaper, method of teaching geography in its widest and best sense than is offered by such books as this, where really beautiful illustrations—in themselves no mean aid to art education—are supplemented and amplified by judicious accounts of whatever there may be of historical or other interest associated with the places or objects illustrated, together with well-written descriptions of the people and their ways of life and thought. Mr. Lovett has not forgotten to consult the latest and best authorities on Norse literature and antiquities, and he acknowledges his indebtedness especially to the great work of Messrs. Vigfusson and Powell. There are no less than 127 engravings from sketches and photographs—all good, many excellent. The more one contemplates the glorious scenery they represent, and the more one reads about this happy people, the more we want to see it all with our own eyes. The volume is an *édition de luxe*, and we hope will be found this Christmas in many a drawing-room and school-room library.

Larger and handsomer externally, a greater triumph of the publisher's art, but far inferior in matter, is the splendidly got up folio, "The Land of Rip Van Winkle,"<sup>25</sup> which describes in a humorous strain the summer tour of a party of New York ladies and gentlemen in the Catskills, and works in the histories and myths associated with the places visited. There are a number of illustrations, beautifully engraved, but the subjects of them are of little beauty or interest.

<sup>24</sup> "Norwegian Pictures, Drawn with Pen and Pencil. Containing also a Glance at Sweden and the Gotha Canal." With Map and Illustrations. By Richard Lovett, M.A. London: Religious Tract Society. 1885.

<sup>25</sup> "The Land of Rip Van Winkle. A Tour through the Romantic Parts of the Catskills; its Legends and Traditions." By A. E. P. Searing. Illustrated. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1884.

Mr. William Coun has performed a novel and rather doubtful kind of service to M. Victor Meignan. M. Meignan is a traveller, and has written in his own language (French) an account of his journey through Siberia to China.<sup>26</sup> Mr. Coun rightly judged that English readers might be interested in M. Meignan's experiences. But "the style of the original, though simple and unadorned, is frequently slipshod;" and so Mr. Coun decided to give English readers "a modified version rather than a strict translation." To what extent he has carried the process of "modifying" we know not; so that it is impossible to say how far any given statement rests on the authority of the traveller, and how far on that of the editor. The result is a diminution in the value of the work for any serious purpose. For the reader who wants nothing more than to be entertained, and is not particular about the correctness of his information, the book is well enough, but we advise such readers to skip the editor's preface, or they are likely to receive an impression unfavourable to the translator's capacity for managing his own language.

For a spirited sketch of life in the Australian bush in the early days, "when convicts and bushrangers abounded, and many a white man went west or north, and never returned to tell the tale of outrage and murder by *myall* Blacks," we commend our readers to Mrs. Campbell Praed's "Sketches of Australian Life."<sup>27</sup> It is full of incidents, all interesting and illustrative; some quite thrilling, like the Grant massacre; others pathetic, like the story of her friend Robina; others humorous, and all alike told with a breezy vivacity and no little literary skill. Indeed it is conceivable that a too matter-of-fact reader might object to the dramatic tone running through the descriptions of events and conversations. These, of course, cannot be taken as literally correct. But no doubt they are substantially true; and even if they are pure fiction, they have the merits of good fiction.

Mr. Wyatt Gill, whose services to New Guinea exploration we noticed in a recent number, is an intelligent observer and adventurous explorer, as well as an earnest missionary. His accounts of some of the smaller and less known islands of the Pacific in the little volume now before us<sup>28</sup> are interesting, and perhaps we might say valuable from the naturalist's and the ethnologist's point of view. There is a good deal relating to the special work of the author's mission, which readers of this REVIEW are not likely to care much about, but they can skip that part and go on to the botanical and zoological notes and the "miscellanea."

<sup>26</sup> "From Paris to Peking over Siberian Snows. A Narrative of a Journey by Sledge over the Snows of European Russia and Siberia, by Caravan through Mongolia, Across the Gobi Desert and the Great Wall, and by Mule Palanquin through China to Peking." By Victor Meignan. Edited from the French by William Coun. With Maps and Illustrations. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1885.

<sup>27</sup> "Australian Life, Black and White." By Mrs. Campbell Praed. With Illustrations. London: Chapman & Hall. 1885.

<sup>28</sup> "Jottings from the Pacific." By W. Wyatt Gill, B.A. With Illustrations. London: Religious Tract Society. 1885.

"In Southern India"<sup>29</sup> is a well written account of mission work and such other things as would naturally interest an intelligent and observant lady traveller. There are passages at which it is difficult to repress a smile; but for those for whom the book is evidently intended—the supporters of foreign missions—these will perhaps be the most precious in the book.

In "Sunshine and Sea"<sup>30</sup> we have a lively gossipy record of a yachting party to Guernsey, Jersey and the coast of Brittany. So thoroughly has the writer enjoyed the trip, so genial and hearty is his appreciation of "the sea" and "the sunshine," the scenery, the gay costumes and black eyes, that the most ascetic reader can hardly escape the influence of "the major's" rellicking good humour.

The writer who goes by the name of Count Paul Vasili, whose "World of London" we noticed in our last number, has given the world another of his clever, gossipy, Society sketches.<sup>31</sup> This time he has chosen Berlin as his sketching ground—in spite of his contemptuous remark that it is "essentially provincial." His sketches are certainly clever, but they leave on the mind, even when one is unacquainted with the subject, an impression that strict truthfulness has been sacrificed to effect. True or false, they are painted in colours not usual in the most audacious (or mendacious) Society journals in England. The Count would probably find himself exposed to a pretty crop of libel actions had he spoken of English personages as he has ventured, from a safe distance, to speak of certain Berliners.

The new edition of Buckle's "Miscellaneous and Posthumous Works,"<sup>32</sup> edited by Mr. Grant Allen, has found its way, by mistake we presume, into our section. It is in two volumes, whereas the edition of 1872 was in "three stout" ones. In the present edition the editor has judiciously omitted several unimportant notes and fragments, while retaining everything which, in his opinion, Buckle himself would have wished to submit to the world in its existing condition. In our humble judgment Mr. Allen might have gone further and omitted a good deal more of those unimportant notes and extracts from "Common-Place Books," they being in themselves of little value, while if it is desirable to preserve them for the purpose of illustrating their author's psychological processes or methods of working, they are already published and thus secured for the future student of Buckle. Miss Helen Taylor's biographical memoir is retained in the new edition.

We commend to the special attention of our readers an excellent

---

<sup>29</sup> "In Southern India. A Visit to some of the Chief Mission Stations in the Madras Presidency." By Mrs. Murray Mitchell. With Map and Illustrations. London: Religious Tract Society. 1885.

<sup>30</sup> "Sunshine and Sea. A Yachting Visit to the Channel Islands and the Coast of Brittany." By a Country Doctor. With Illustrations. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1885.

<sup>31</sup> "Berlin Society." By Count Paul Vasili. London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle & Rivington. 1885.

<sup>32</sup> "The Miscellaneous and Posthumous Works of Henry Thomas Buckle." A New and Abridged Edition. Edited by Grant Allen. Two vols. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1885.



translation of Monsieur Yves Guyot's pamphlet, "English and French Morality from a Frenchman's Point of View,"<sup>33</sup> which has reached us too late for more than a brief mention this quarter. The pamphlet consists of a review and criticism of the doings of Mr. Stead, Mrs. Butler, the leaders of the Salvation Army, and of the character, as well as probable effects, of the "Criminal Law Amendment Act." The author's views—which in our opinion are eminently judicious and correct—of the several parts of his important subject, deserve the careful consideration of every one who wishes to arrive at a sound conclusion concerning the matters in question.

We have received the following, for which we regret we cannot find space for further notice:—"The National Policy: being a Series of Addresses delivered through the Press to the 5,000,000 Electors throughout the United Kingdom, and more especially to the New Voters." By J. S. C. Morris. (London: E. W. Allen, 1885.) "A New Crusade." By Peterkin Hermit. (London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co., 1885.) "A Handbook of the Church of Scotland." By James Rankin, D.D. Third Edition, revised and extended. (Edinburgh and London: Wm. Blackwood & Sons, 1885.) "The American Caucus System: its Origin, Purpose and Utility." By George W. Lawton. (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1885.) "Art as Applied to Dress: with special reference to Harmonious Colouring." By L. Higgin, late of the Royal School of Art Needlework, South Kensington. (London: J. S. Virtue & Co., 1885.) "A Practical Arithmetic." By G. A. Wentworth, A.M., and Thos. Hill, D.D., LL.D. (Boston: Ginn & Co., 1885.) "The Insurance Blue Book and Guide to Fire Offices for 1885-1886." (London: Thos. Murby, 1885.) "Bilanci Comunali per l'Anno 1882": Introduzione. The same for 1883. (Roma: Stabilimento Tipografico dell'Opinione, 1885.) "Statistica degli Elettori Administrativi e degli Elettori Politici, Secondo le liste definitivamente Approvate, per l'Anno 1883." (Roma: Tipografia della Camera dei Deputati, 1885.)

---

## SCIENCE.

THE new edition of Phillips's "Manual of Geology"<sup>1</sup> is completed by a substantial volume upon Stratigraphical Geology and Palæontology; though why the name of Phillips should be used in connection with a work in which very few pages of his writings are to be found we are unable to discern. Compared with the work which the late

<sup>33</sup> "English and French Morality, from a Frenchman's Point of View." By Yves Guyot (Député). London: The Modern Press. 1886.

<sup>1</sup> "Manual of Geology, Theoretical and Practical." By John Phillips, LL.D., F.R.S., some time Reader in Geology in the University of Oxford. Edited by Robert Etheridge, F.R.S., and Harry Govier Seeley, F.R.S. In two parts. Part II. "Stratigraphical Geology and Palæontology." By Robert Etheridge, F.R.S. With Map, numerous Tables and Plates. London: Charles Griffin & Co. 1885.

Oxford Professor wrote a quarter of a century ago the new edition illustrates the progress which geology has made as a science better than any work available. And we are inclined to think that while the science has grown in every way, the general acquaintance with it has been diminishing for a long time. It has ceased to be a necessary element in the education demanded from candidates for public appointments, and we believe there are some public schools and certain colleges which ignore geology as an instrument for mental development. This change, which has come over the country in which geology originated, is probably due to literary causes. In the early days when the teaching of William Smith opened up a knowledge of bygone changes in the contours of lands, and succession of life on the earth, numerous able writers—Greenough, Phillips, Conybeare, Buckland, Hugh Miller, Bakewell, De la Bêche, Murchison, Scrope, and especially Lyell, made the elements of the new knowledge interesting and accessible. Under the labours of their successors the science has grown so that each department has become a science far richer in materials than was the whole field of knowledge in the days when those men wrote. And although there are no professorships in this country except those founded in the infancy of the science, it will be impossible for our universities long to delay the institution of professorships of palæontology, petrology, and other departments of geological science; and we believe that the treatment of this manual by the editors indicates that geology has already become too vast a branch of human knowledge to be successfully expounded by any one teacher. The multitudinous details in Mr. Etheridge's volume alone serve to show us that the subject has passed out of the sphere of armchair relaxation into a practical mental discipline, which can only be carried on with specimens before us. No such study of the distribution of life on the earth at the present day has ever been made as that which Mr. Etheridge gives of the distribution of life in geological time; and we believe that the work gives the student, for the first time, accurate knowledge of the distribution of fossils in the British strata. But though palæontology is the striking feature of the work, just as fossils are the impressive and distinctive products of the strata, stratigraphical geology occupies no small portion of the author's attention. The volume commences with the oldest rocks, and is divided into eight parts and fifty-six chapters. The parts treat of the lower, middle, and upper palæozoic rocks, the dyas, trias, jurassic, upper mesozoic, and the cainozoic or tertiary period. Possibly some physical geologists might group the middle and upper palæozoic and dyas together, while others might be disposed to regard the lias as a distinct division from the oolites; but the grouping will commend itself generally. About one-half the book is given to the primary strata, while the tertiary beds occupy less than one-seventh, this treatment being a consequence of the larger amount of information available concerning the older rocks. The method of treatment is essentially synoptical. After the first chapter has dealt with the divisions of geological time, succession of life, and shown in tables the succession of the strata, a chapter is given to the pre-Cambrian rocks,

briefly describing the chief areas in which they are found, the metallic and other minerals which they yield, their modes of origin, and the life they contain. With the third chapter we reach the most ancient British stratified rocks, some ten isolated masses being described as an old terrestrial archipelago, around which the newer rocks were deposited. Then the lower Cambrian rocks are described as to their geological succession and physical characteristics; and in another chapter the fossils of these earliest British deposits are enumerated under the several groups to which they belong, and the distinctive features of the life set forth in the summary. And in this way every recognised division of the geological series is described, its life occupying the larger space and giving occasion for the preparation of a large number of tables in which the distribution of all the known genera of British fossils is stated. The Cambrian rocks occupy ninety pages; the Silurian, fifty pages; the Devonian, upwards of sixty pages; the Carboniferous, over ninety pages; and the Dyas or Permian, about twenty pages. A very useful feature is the discussion of the foreign representatives of British deposits; and the plates of characteristic fossils of the different formations, and small geological map of the British Isles are attractive and useful features in the volume. No such compendium of geological knowledge has ever been brought together before, so that it becomes indispensable for reference; and by making the rich discoveries of the past quarter of a century generally accessible, must change the character of teaching as it makes its way into class-rooms. It is probable that it may do something to restore the flagging study of geological science in England, while it is sure to act as a suggestive basis for many researches in the future.

Dr. Croll's new volume<sup>2</sup> is essentially a commentary on his previous work, "Climate and Time." That remarkable and original attempt to grapple with the question of the earth's climate during past geological ages did not carry universal conviction, for though written with elaborate skill and dictated by genius of no common kind, the problems attacked were such as do not readily lend themselves to demonstration; and now, after having had the benefit of competent criticism, the author avails himself of the newest research in substantiating his views. It is needless to say that the contest is conducted with great ability, and that large stores of fact of the most interesting kind are placed before the reader. But the critics who have been thought worthy of special reply by no means exhaust the arguments which have to be met before Dr. Croll's views can claim to be an integral portion of current science. The reply to Professor Newcomb and to Mr. Alfred R. Wallace is most elaborate, and the author clears himself successfully from many misapprehensions. But we find no attention given to the views of geologists; and differences of opinion on the climate of past time, other than those which the author advocates, are boldly met by the statement that, to attribute results so striking and stupendous to such commonplace agencies as ocean currents, winds,

<sup>2</sup> "Discussions on Climate and Cosmology." By James Croll, LL.D., F.R.S. Edinburgh: Adam & Charles Black. 1885.

clouds, and aqueous vapour, is at present considered to be little else than absurd; and the view that the glacial epoch, for example, might have resulted from elevation of land, is summarily disposed of by the statement that the glaciation was much too general to be explained by such means. It seems to us superfluous for Dr. Croll to go on labouring to perfect his theory, if geologists find themselves able to dispense with it altogether. The whole history of the rocks is the history of crumpling and upheaving of the earth's crust on a grand scale. The changes of level of land which took place during the glacial period are easily demonstrated. There is the best reason for believing that during the age of the great ice-sheet, the northern portion of Europe and the North Sea were uplifted so as to present an extensive refrigerating area; and until it can be shown by detailed examination of the several areas which exemplify glacial phenomena, that changed conditions of physical geography are incapable of accounting for the observed facts, the geologist will always explain phenomena by using the powerful engines with which he is familiar in every period of past time, rather than fly to others that include the element of hypothesis. Having disposed of such critics as seemed worthy of notice, the author discusses the physical cause of mild polar climates, and fully recognises the influence of winds and ocean currents; and states that were the whole of the warm water of the Gulf Stream to flow into the Arctic Ocean, it would probably remove the ice of Greenland, and under some circumstances of physical geography would confer on the polar regions the climate suitable for plant and animal life. In this conclusion all geologists would agree. Seeing then that the polar regions are far from presenting the conditions most favourable for maximum cold, we feel entitled to ask, What low temperature could be produced by, and what development of ice might result from, altered geographical conditions? Interesting chapters are devoted to the Antarctic ice-sheet, regelation as a cause of glacier motion, the temperature of space, origin and age of the sun's heat, and probable origin of the nebula. It is a work which all geologists need to carefully consider, and which will repay examination.

Professor Stokes has exemplified in the Burnett Lectures, on *Light*,<sup>3</sup> the ease with which in the hands of a master, light lends itself to intelligible popular exposition. The present course on *Light* as a means of investigation is of extreme interest, because it briefly discusses and explains the methods used in research, and states some of the results arrived at. The first lecture treats of phenomena, of phosphorescence, fluorescence, and other properties of light. In the second lecture polarization is discussed, and the prismatic analysis of colours exemplified by a history of discoveries with the spectroscope. The third lecture treats of inferences from dark lines in the solar spectrum, and of the spectra of stars, nebulae and comets. The fourth lecture is concerned with the red prominences seen about the sun in

<sup>3</sup> Burnett Lectures. On *Light*. Second Course, on *Light* as a Means of Investigation. Delivered at Aberdeen in December, 1884. By George Gabriel Stokes, M.A., F.R.S., &c. London: Macmillan & Co. 1885.

eclipses, with the sun's corona, the motion of stars like Sirius, motion on the surface of the sun, and the constitution of the sun. The clearness of language and style with which a subject which is necessarily to some extent technical is presented, makes it desirable that these lectures should be in the hands, not only of students, but of all who are able to appreciate the methods of scientific progress.

The disadvantage under which scientific subjects labour as educational instruments is conspicuous in the deficiency of textbooks written by men who are experienced in teaching, and engaged at the same time in research, for the problem of what to teach depends largely upon the future scope of the subject taught; while the method of teaching can never be entirely imparted by any textbook. Professor Everett contributes a welcome addition to school-books in his "Outlines of Natural Philosophy,"<sup>4</sup> a handy volume divided into 34 chapters and 431 numbered paragraphs, which after the introductory chapter, treat of dynamics, hydrostatics, heat, light, sound, magnetism, electricity, and electric currents. The subject is clearly stated, is essentially experimental, is free from the technical exposition which a competent teacher would supply, and is illustrated with upwards of 200 woodcuts, which will be useful to the beginner.

Mr. Smith's "Algebra for Beginners"<sup>5</sup> differs from other elementary works, chiefly in the large number of exercises which it contains, and the small amount of exposition of the subject—the idea being very much the old-fashioned one of teaching by means of a few worked examples, and exercises which illustrate the rules. The first part treats of the first four rules; the second part contains greatest common measure, least common multiple, fractions, and some equations.

Mr. Luff's "Study of Chemistry"<sup>6</sup> does not go beyond the requirements of the Pharmaceutical Society and College of Physicians. It is clearly printed, well arranged, and includes directions for examining a salt or solution containing one metal and one acid, expressed in a series of tables for the several groups, which are perforated so as to be used in the laboratory. There is comparatively little chemistry here, for the book is small, but a good deal of space is given to the explanation of chemical formulæ, and the work is intended for the young student as a preparation for a textbook.

Mr. Levander, of University College School, sends us "Solutions to the Questions on Magnetism and Electricity set in the Elementary Science Examinations in the University of London,"<sup>7</sup> for twenty-four years.

<sup>4</sup> "Outlines of Natural Philosophy, for Schools and General Readers." By J. D. Everett, D.C.L., F.R.S. Illustrated by 216 Engravings on Wood. London, Glasgow, Edinburgh & Dublin: Blackie & Son. 1885.

<sup>5</sup> Blackwood's Educational Series. "Algebra for Beginners." Part I. Part II. Specially adapted to the requirements of the Mundella Code, also for junior pupils of Middle Class Schools, and for pupil teachers. London and Edinburgh: William Blackwood & Sons. 1885.

<sup>6</sup> "Introduction to the Study of Chemistry: specially designed for Medical and Pharmaceutical Students." By A. P. Luff, B.Sc. London, F.I.C., F.C.S. Second Edition. London: W. H. Dawe. 1885.

<sup>7</sup> "Solutions of the Questions on Magnetism and Electricity, set at the Intermediate Science and Preliminary Scientific Pass Examinations of the University of

It has already reached a second edition, and will no doubt be useful to self-taught students as giving some idea of the sort of answer that the questions imply, but we can hardly imagine such a book being of use under the ordinary conditions of instruction.

The "Ninth Report on the Meteorology of India"<sup>8</sup> deals with the atmospheric phenomena for 1863. The reporter states that since 1877 India has nowhere experienced a severe and extensive drought. An analysis of the records of the last twenty years shows that the rainfall is most variable where the average fall is smallest, as in Scinde, Cutch, and the desert of Western Rajpootana. The times of drought in the North-Western Provinces coincide with those in which dry westerly or north-westerly winds displace the east winds of the rainy season. In 1883 the snow-fall of spring was comparatively heavy and late in the North-Western Himalayas, but this was not found to have quite the anticipated effect of delaying the rains in the Upper Provinces. The Report deals in detail with all the subjects of meteorological observation, and will be found to sustain the deservedly high character of the Department.

Mr. Eliot gives an elaborate account of the "South-West Monsoon Storms" which have originated in the Bay of Bengal in the five years, 1877 to 1881.<sup>9</sup> He states that the difficulty of drawing up a list of storms arises from the circumstance that atmospheric eddies of all possible degrees of intensity pass up the Bay of Bengal towards the interior of India during the rains. A falling barometer, accompanied by rains, precedes the storm, and the fall is greatest at the north of the bay. Strong, humid southerly winds bring the water north which was evaporated in the Indian Ocean; and the author states that the energy set free during the act of condensation of this vapour "is transferred to the atmosphere, and supplies the motive power which initiates and maintains the large atmospheric motion of the cyclonic disturbance;" though it has always seemed to us that this conception of a cyclone is lacking in clearness. The storms originate before May 1 or after December 15, the intervening period being one in which the monsoon winds blow—definitely established—from June 1 to September 30, over the whole of the bay, with preceding

London from 1880 to 1884; together with Definitions, Dimensions of Units: Miscellaneous Examples, &c." By F. W. Levander, F.R.A.S., &c. London: H. K. Lewis. 1885.

<sup>8</sup> "Report on the Meteorology of India in 1883." By Henry F. Blanford, F.R.S., Meteorological Reporter to the Government of India. Ninth Year. Calcutta: Printed by the Superintendent of Government Printing, India. 1885. London: Trübner & Co. "Registers of Original Observations in 1884. Reduced and Corrected." January, March, May, September, October, November, 1884; and January, February and March, 1885.

<sup>9</sup> "Indian Meteorological Memoirs; being occasional Discussions and Compilations of Meteorological Data relating to India and the neighbouring Countries." Published by order of His Excellency the Viceroy and Governor-General of India in Council under the direction of Henry J. Blanford, F.R.S. Vol. II. Part IV.—VI. "Account of the South-West Monsoon Storms generated in the Bay of Bengal during the years 1877 to 1881." By John Eliot, Esq., M.A., Meteorological Reporter to the Government of Bengal. Calcutta: Printed by the Superintendent of Government Printing, India. 1885. London: Trübner & Co.

and succeeding transition periods, in which the wind is feebler. The period of maximum storm is between June, when the south-west monsoon is strongest, and November, when it is weakest; the storms being most frequent in August, with many in September; while October and November have about the same number as July and May; but storms are rare after the end of November, and very rare after December 15. The memoir is illustrated with charts of storm tracts, which are perhaps more instructive as to the course of cyclones than the author's explanations.

The "Annual Report of the Department of Mines, New South Wales"<sup>10</sup> is an interesting Parliamentary paper, full of information of a technical character concerning the mineral wealth and water supply of the colony. The number of applications to lease Crown lands for mining purposes in 1884 showed an increase of nearly a thousand over the applications in the previous year; and it is satisfactory to note that by far the larger number of these leases were for minerals other than gold, especially silver, silver and lead, tin, coal; while no fewer than 2,450 acres were applied for for diamonds, though this adventure does not appear to have met with countenance from the Department of Mines. During the year deposits of brown hæmatite and magnetic iron have been examined in the Fitzroy, Berrima, and Goldburn districts. Eighty-one silver lodes have already been examined in the barrier ranges, while numerous deposits of other metals, and especially of tin, have been examined by the Department. A seam of coal thirty feet thick, which lies fourteen miles west of the Vegetable Creek Tinfields, is found to be suitable for smelting purposes. One of the most interesting features of the Report is that furnished by the Superintendent of Diamond Drills. The work of boring has cost twelve shillings and tenpence a foot. Many of the results arrived at being given in appendices, which, with the aid of sections, state the thickness and nature of the strata passed through, while the wells which have been sunk in the colony and the borings for coal are indicated upon a map which shows the kind of water obtained, as salt, brackish, or fresh; and there can be no doubt that these artesian wells are destined to play a not unimportant part in the settlement of districts which at present have no water supply. The value of the minerals obtained in 1884 shows considerable decrease in tin, copper, gold, and shale, and a slight decrease in iron; but the decrease is counterbalanced by a large development of mining for lead, considerable increase in coal, and a slight augmentation in silver and bismuth. The total value of the minerals of the colony last year exceeded three millions sterling, which is a larger amount than for any year in the last ten except 1883. The increase in the output of coal amounted to 227,652 tons, valued at £101,135. An important seam of coal has been found by the diamond drill at twenty-eight miles from the Illimarra railway, which is expected to enable

<sup>10</sup> "Annual Report of the Department of Mines, New South Wales, for the year 1884." Printed in accordance with resolutions of both Houses of Parliament. Sydney: Thomas Richards, Government Printer. 1885. London: Trübner & Co.

vessels to obtain their supplies from Port Jackson instead of going to Newcastle. The present yield of coal is two and three-quarter million tons, of which New South Wales exports one and three-quarter million tons. The shales from which kerosene and other mineral oils are made are still imperfectly worked. The supply of diamonds from the Bingeria field appears to have been insignificant, eleven hundred and ninety-three stones being found weighing 254 carats, worth twenty-two shillings a carat. The small yield is due to the limited supply of water for washing the gravel. The information given in the appendices and supplementary Reports is illustrated by many tables, charts, and sections. One of the plates illustrates a valuable note by the late Rev. W. B. Clarke on fossil trees in the Lake Macquarie.

The "Inter-Oceanic Problem"<sup>11</sup> is an address delivered to the American Association for the Advancement of Science on the advantage of carrying ships bodily across the Isthmus of Panama by railway. Interesting figures are given of the pontoon upon which the ship is placed. It is estimated that three engines would drag the largest-sized vessel at the rate of fifteen miles an hour up steep gradients. There is a large amount of engineering opinion quoted in support of the author's views, but we have not heard of any corresponding amount of capital available for giving them effect.

Mr. Thomas Spencer addresses himself to a consideration of the force which imparts life and reproductive power to matter on our globe, and believes that after twenty years' search he has discovered how life is imparted.<sup>12</sup> The author finds that sub-oxide of iron exists in every germ or reproductive cellule, and that it has the power to cause oxygen to combine with carbon when moisture is present. And in this fact he sees the origin of all animal and vegetable life. Having stated this conclusion the author goes on repeating it, and finds that ozone preserves the necessary moisture in the germ in the condition of water. This is about the sum of the discovery, though if the reader travels further he will make the acquaintance of King Cambyses, the Pyramids of Egypt, and many other subjects, concluding with the author's views on creation.

Mr. Thomas D. Smellie of Glasgow, rotating a vessel containing water, finds that the water lags a little behind. He suggests that this principle should be applied to the water on the earth, and that it may be appealed to in explanation of ocean currents<sup>13</sup> like the Gulf Stream. He examines the trade wind theory and the thermal theory in explanation of the Gulf Stream, but rejects both, and ends by affirming the same principle in explanation of winds that he relies

<sup>11</sup> "The Inter-Oceanic Problem and its Scientific Solution." An Address before the American Association for the Advancement of Science. By Elmer L. Cortel. Thirty-fourth Meeting, Ann Arbor, Michigan, August 26, 1885. London: Trübner & Co.

<sup>12</sup> "Of the Origin and Reproduction of Animal and Vegetable Life on our Globe." By Thomas Spencer, F.C.S., F.R.M.S. London: Effingham Wilson. 1885.

<sup>13</sup> "Ocean and Air Currents." By Thomas D. Smellie. Glasgow: John Smith & Son. Edinburgh: Blackwood & Sons. London: E. & F. N. Spon. 1885.



upon for ocean currents. We can only compare the relation of fact to theory to the halfpenny worth of bread which Falstaff took with an inordinate quantity of sack.

To Mr. Leighton Jordan belongs the merit of pertinacity, and we are now presented with two chapters from his "New Principles of Natural Philosophy," termed "an Essay on the Winds,"<sup>14</sup> The author argues that since the trade winds, which blow towards the equator, do not blow along the surface of the earth, but are contained between warmer strata of air, and since the return trade winds passing from the warm regions over the temperate zones blow along the surface of the earth, it follows that the movement is exactly the reverse of what temperature tends to cause; and accordingly theories are propounded to make the subject clear. Because there are difficulties to Mr. Leighton Jordan in a matter of such simplicity, we hardly feel justified in expounding a well-worn tale. But if the cold current, or currents as we should more correctly say, moving south-west towards the tropics, do not blow at the sea-level, it is because the temperature of the earth and ocean, in temperate regions, is so much warmer than the current of air, that it causes an ascent of the whole atmosphere, and allows warmer air to come below the cold current, which does not reach the sea-level till it is within the tropics. Since the circumference of the earth is greater in the equatorial region than in the north temperate or polar region, it follows that if the trade winds are to preserve any force at all in the tropics, they must become divided into distinct currents. Between these currents the warm air of the return trades moves in courses which are primarily determined by temperature, which results from the existing distribution of land and water. In place of these considerations the author would have the reader consider the effect of the attraction of gravitation upon the earth's atmosphere, but only to find this cause insufficient to account for the trade winds. And so he comes to examine the centrifugal force of the earth's rotation with the result that he finds here a constant and steady cause, inducing the winds to blow from the poles to the equator, and from the equator towards the poles. The action of centrifugal force is said to be identical with the action of gravity. The influence of the earth's rotation is regarded as establishing the westerly course of the trade winds, and the easterly course of the return trade winds. But as we pass on the subject becomes more and more involved, astral and terrestrial gravitation, the revolving action of the earth's gravitation, the lagging of the moon and the planets in their orbits, come into consideration in estimating the lagging of the trade winds, but neither these discussions nor those which follow are likely to tempt any one to seek aid from Mr. Leighton Jordan in understanding the winds.

Under the title "Short Studies from Nature,"<sup>15</sup> a volume is formed

---

<sup>14</sup> "The Winds. An Essay in Illustration of the New Principles of Natural Philosophy." By Wm. Leighton Jordan, F.R.G.S. Third Edition, abridged and revised. London: David Bogue. 1885.

<sup>15</sup> "Short Studies from Nature." By various Authors. Illustrated. Cassell & Co., London, Paris, New York, and Melbourne.

of essays or lectures upon subjects calculated to interest young people in different aspects of science. Mr W. S. Dallas contributes articles on Bats and Dragon-flies; Mr. James Dallas writes on Caves; Dr. Robert Brown discusses Birds of Passage; Mr. Chisholm has chapters on Snow and upon the Glow-worm; Flame is treated of by Professor Eaton Lowe; Oak-apples, by Dr. Buchanan White; Comets, by Mr. Seabroke; and Minute Organisms, by Mr. Balkwill. All these articles are written in a light manner such as might appeal to the young. They are capital chatty discussions of the subjects treated of, Mr. Dallas's article on Bats being especially an excellent example of science popularized. A number of illustrations add to the interest of the descriptions.

Of late years a good deal of information has been systematized concerning insects which damage crops, and Mr. Theodore Wood undertakes to further popularize some of this knowledge in a volume on our insect enemies. This little work<sup>16</sup> does not aim at scientific exhaustiveness, but rather presents some types of insects concerning the life history of which people dwelling in the country may wish to be informed. Some sixty or seventy pages are devoted to the aphid or green-blight. Chapters follow on chafers and wire-worms, weevils, turnip-fleas, carwigs, mole crickets, saw-flies, injurious butterflies and moths, scale insects, &c., and various diptera. The volume is illustrated with a number of woodcuts, and brings together interesting information clearly stated.

The sixth edition of Mr. Heath's little book on Burnham Beeches<sup>17</sup> contains a portrait of the author, a facsimile letter by Lord Beaconsfield, a small map of Burnham Beeches, engravings after Vernon Heath's photographs of the Beeches in spring, summer, autumn, and winter, with well-executed woodcuts after drawings by Mr. Birket Foster, representing Stoke Pogis Church and some incidents in Gray's *Elegy*. It is a pleasant little holiday handbook, which commemorates the presentation of this open space by the Corporation of London.

The fourth part of the *Memoir on Fishes* in Bronn's "*Klassen und Ordnungen des Thier-Reichs*"<sup>18</sup> continues the account of the fins in *Elasmobranchii*, and devotes two plates, chiefly copied from Hasse and Gegenbaur, to illustration of the subject. Then commences an account of the muscular anatomy of fishes, which is first described generally, and then with a detailed description of the several muscles in the *Elasmobranch* fishes. This account of the muscular anatomy promises to be valuable when completed. •

<sup>16</sup> "Our Insect Enemies." By Theodore Wood. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. 1885.

<sup>17</sup> "Burnham Beeches." By Francis George Heath. With Portrait, eight full-page illustrations, and a Map of the Beeches. Holiday Edition. London: William Rider & Son. 1885.

<sup>18</sup> Dr. H. G. Bronn's "*Klassen und Ordnungen des Thier-Reichs*." Fortgesetzt von Dr. A. A. W. Hubrecht in Utrecht and Dr. M. Sagemehl, Prosektor an anatom. Institut in Amsterdam. Mit auf Stein gezeichneten Abbildungen. Sechster Band. I. Abtheilung. Fische: Pisces, 4 Lieferung. Leipzig und Heidelberg. C. F. Winter'sche Verlagshandlung. 1885.

## HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

WE welcome with much pleasure the publication of this well-written and scholarlike work.<sup>1</sup> Too little is known of the history of the Eastern Empire. Indeed, with the exception of Gibbon and Finlay's classic works, the subject, as far as English writers are concerned, is a blank. The advent of a writer of Mr. Pears's eminence is therefore of no slight moment. We are bound to confess that we do not entirely share in his opinion that the Latin conquest of 1204 was the direct cause of the capture of Constantinople by Mahomet II. in 1453. No doubt it took its place among other contributory influences. But assuming that the Empire had foiled the Latin assault, and had sufficient power remaining to repel the Osmanli, as it had formerly repelled the Seljukian Turks, it by no means follows that similar good fortune would have attended its arms against the terrific onset of Timur. The presumption is, on the contrary, that its fate would have been like that of Bajazet—instead of the fall of the Turk turning out, as was the fact, to be the temporary salvation of the Imperial city. Mr. Pears has done full justice to the enormous benefit conferred upon Europe by the Byzantine Empire in keeping back the barbarian swarms until her renescent civilization had acquired sufficient strength to protect itself. This was attained directly by the conservation of (1) the old Roman discipline, generalship, and military organization; (2) of its municipal institutions; (3) of its law and civil government; and (4) of its learning, arts, and manufactures; and indirectly by the reclamation of the invading nomad tribes, and their conversion into a bulwark of the State. Space does not permit us to notice more fully the various chapters in which are described the consummate ability with which, century after century, the New Rome waged an endless struggle against the countless hordes of Western and Central Asia, constantly in motion, and pressing on against Europe—from Mahomet and his Arabs, the Seljuk Turks, Huns, Avars, Comans, Bulgarians, Patchinaks, Wallachs and Slavs, down to the Ottoman Turks, not to mention the attacks of the Catalans and the Normans of Sicily. Pressed often to the verge of destruction, the Imperial city, with matchless policy, discipline and tenacity, again and again triumphs over its enemies; firm as a rock among the moving tribes, the centre and source of government, subduing by commerce, law, and civilization one tribe only to find others coming to the front. Unfortunately, when the Empire most needed its resources, dynastic struggles sapped its strength, and largely contributed to its downfall. It may be doubtful how far the crusades in general affected its stability—the establishment of the kingdom of Jerusalem and the principalities of Antioch and Edessa no doubt lessened the pressure, and enabled the Greeks to recover part of their dominion over Asia Minor—but the fourth crusade cer-

<sup>1</sup> "The Fall of Constantinople. Being the Story of the Fourth Crusade." By Edward Pears, LL.B., &c. &c. London. Longmans, Green & Co. 1885.

tainly undid the good work of its predecessors. The chapter relating to the foreign colonists and the treaties or capitulations under which they lived, is perhaps the most interesting in the book, the more so as it contains matter not alluded to even by Finlay. In the best days of the Empire something approaching a fusion of the various races into one people had taken place, but the influx of new-comers in the century immediately preceding the Latin conquest stopped the process of assimilation, and when the city passed under Moslem rule it was impossible to revive it. Mahometans by their law cannot grant equal rights to Christians; but, on the other hand, foreigners will not live where a Christian has no rights as against a Mussulman. Hence the preservation of the system which the Turks found in full vigour (*e.g.*, Calata being in 1453 a fortified city in their midst) became a necessity. The account of the Warangian Guards possesses peculiar interest, from its forming one of the many links that connected Byzantium with the present Empire of Russia. The description of the Great City of the East in 1200, and the parallel that is drawn between Constantinople of the Roman Empire and Stamboul of the Ottomans is full of point, and will be found most valuable to students of the present Eastern question. We now purpose to show how the pilgrims of the fourth crusade diverted their attack from Palestine to the Greek Empire, and how Venice succeeded to the trade and much of the dominion of the fallen realm. The fourth crusade was preached by Pope Innocent III., in 1197, soon after the death of Saladin was known, who arranged that the expedition (which was chiefly furnished from France, Flanders, and Germany) should be directed first against Egypt, as the most vulnerable point, and should start from Venice. Henry Dandolo, the Doge, enraged at the concession of trading privileges to Genoa in the Greek Empire, where Venice had hitherto practically enjoyed a monopoly of trade, agreed to provide shipping sufficient to transport the crusading army for a sum of 85,000 marks. In July, 1202, the crusaders assembled at Venice, and found a fleet ready to convey them according to contract, but so many had sailed from Flemish and other ports that the Venetian fleet would have conveyed double the number that actually assembled at the rendezvous, and only 61,000 out of the 85,000 marks promised could be raised. It was then arranged that the army should capture Zara, a city in Dalmatia obnoxious to the Venetians, and pay the balance out of their share of the spoils, and Zara was accordingly taken by the combined forces on November 24, 1202, and occupied by them as winter quarters. In the meantime Venice had concluded a treaty with the Sultan of Egypt, from whom she obtained valuable commercial privileges, and permission for pilgrims under her protection to visit the Holy Sepulchre. She had, therefore, a direct interest in turning the attack of the crusaders in another direction. Philip of Swabia, King of the Romans, in the course of a contest for the empire of Germany, had been excommunicated by the Pope, and was therefore willing to thwart him in his projects. He had married the sister of Alexis, the Greek Emperor,

who had deposed, blinded, and imprisoned his elder brother, Isaac, in 1195. Alexis, the son of Isaac, had taken refuge with Philip, one of whose principal adherents was Boniface, Marquis of Montferrat, the leader of the Crusaders, a brother of Conrad of Montferrat, titular King of Jerusalem, and himself having a claim on the so-called kingdom of Salonica. It is supposed that Boniface met Alexis at the Court of Philip, and privately arranged to restore the ex-Emperor Isaac. During the winter a proposition was made to the army that they should, on their way to the Holy Land, aid Alexis in restoring his father to his kingdom, and that in requital the latter should use the resources of the empire to assist the crusaders in the recovery of the Holy Land. In spite of the opposition of the Pope, the expedition finally agreed to restore the Emperor, there being strong reason to believe that the influence of the principal leaders had been bought. On June 23 they arrived in sight of New Rome, and on July 17 assaulted the city—the crusaders by land, the Venetians by sea. The latter were at first successful, but ultimately the assailants were beaten off. Meanwhile a revolution took place in the city, followed by the flight of Alexis III. Isaac being then drawn from his dungeon and placed on the throne, consented to confirm the agreement made by his son with the Crusaders, by which he was to hold the Empire under obedience to the Pope and pay the expenses of the expedition. On August 1 Alexis was crowned Emperor, together with his father. In consequence of difficulties in raising the sum necessary for the payment of the Latin army, quarrels arose between the Greeks, and finally Alexis was deposed; his father died on hearing of his arrest, and Alexis himself was shortly afterwards disposed of. The new Emperor, Mourtzouphlos, refused to recognise the agreement, and the Venetians to transport the Latins, unless they were paid. Finally, an agreement between the two latter was arranged—viz., the city should be attacked; that six Venetians and six Crusaders should form a committee to choose an Emperor; that if a Crusader was chosen Emperor, the Venetians should choose the Patriarch; and *vice versa*, that the Emperor so chosen should receive one-fourth of the spoil captured in the city and empire, and that the Venetians and the other Crusaders should divide the remainder; and that finally a committee of twenty-four should divide the Empire into fiefs. This precious agreement settled, the assault was delivered on the 8th of April, 1204, and repulsed, but being renewed on the 12th, was ultimately successful, and the unfortunate city given over to plunder. The scenes of unbridled violence that ensued were not to be exceeded by the worst that occurred at the sack of Rome by Alaric or Genseric, or subsequently by the army of the Constable Bourbon. The new Latin Emperors were obliged to abandon nearly the whole of the empire to various invaders, until after sixty years of incessant warfare the Greeks once more obtained possession of the capital. Venice obtained the richest reward, and her acquisitions of territory and commerce made her for a time the mistress of the Mediterranean, and the magnificence of the New Rome was transferred to Venice,

which, during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, was the most splendid of Christian cities. It is to be hoped that Mr. Pears will extend his studies and give the public his views on the decadence of the Greek Empire and the rise of its successor, the present Ottoman Empire.

The learned editor of "Records of the Reformation" <sup>2</sup> has brought out another series of papers, forming in a manner a supplement to that rather incomplete work, which stopped short before the Reformation had begun. These papers refer to a later stage. Passing over the assertion of the royal supremacy, the dissolution of the monasteries, and the Act of the Six Articles, which will be in time fully worked out in the official Calendar of State Papers, Mr. Pocock passes on to the beginning of the reign of Edward VI. and the issuing of the first Prayer-Book of 1549. This was the first attempt at absolute uniformity in religious rites in England. In mediæval times the Uses of Sarum, of Bangor, of York, of Lincoln had grown up in various parts of England, and different dioceses were as free to differ in non-essential and secondary points of practice, as different churches like those of England and France. In some places advocates of the Reformation had added English prayers to suit their congregations. But this freedom did not suit a Tudor Government. Henry VIII. had got passed an Act of Parliament for "abolishing of diversity of opinions," and his son, or his son's councillors, affected to consider variety of rites "frailty and weakness." And so first the Order of Communion and then the Book of Common Prayer were issued by the royal authority. Englishmen, especially in the country, are very conservative, though they love freedom. And the thirst for reformation, of which Strype speaks, was by no means universal. The images in the churches; the palms and ashes; the holy bread and holy water; even the sonorous unintelligible words of the Latin service, were dear to many thousand people. And in the west they rose to arms rather than lose them. In Cornwall, many of the inhabitants knew no English, so the change of language would not have been of much use to them. Visitors to Cornwall generally notice that reforming iconoclasm has not deprived all the niches on the churches of their saints, as elsewhere. St. Austell's Church is a notable example of this. The insurrection was brutally put down, and the cause of the Gospel vindicated by the executioner. In fact, the more the history of the Reformation in England is studied, the less it appears that any of the chief movers were influenced by love of religion or Christianity, but rather by a desire for plunder and power, and for freedom from inconvenient ecclesiastical restraints. The humble Christian brethren who circulated Tyndale's Testament, and encouraged each other in their simple piety, had few imitators or sympathizers among the rulers of the people. Most of the papers printed by Mr. Pocock are published now for the first time, and the editor's name is sufficient guarantee for accuracy.

---

<sup>2</sup> "Troubles connected with the Prayer-Book of 1549." Edited by Nicholas Pocock, M.A. Camden Society. 1835.

It is a pity that illness should have prevented Mr. Davenport Adams from completing his book on the times of Charles II., as he originally intended. "The Social Condition of the English People generally, of the Squire and the Citizen, the Parish Priest and the Peasant;" this would have been a more valuable contribution to our knowledge than reprinting page after page of Pepys and Evelyn;<sup>3</sup> books which are perfectly well known and accessible to every one. Repetition may be the soul of instruction, but this is hardly an excuse for giving us long extracts, and even in one case a criticism by Gosse, twice over. Really the paste-and-scissors school of history has so little to recommend it, that carelessness is an unpardonable vice, especially when it allows such misspellings as Mecænas and Cataline, sure signs of want of scholarship; and is accompanied by such ignorance of the language of the period, that the phrase "to shoot in a bow" is evidently unfamiliar. The unwritten volume in prospect, which will have to be compiled from obscurer sources, like family papers and quarter session records, will perhaps prove the truth of Mr. Adams's assertion that the drama of the Restoration is not a picture of the real social life of England, but only of a small section of it—a depraved Court. In that age all art was artificial, was imitation. Architecture had given up the true principles of progress in a national style, and laboured to raise Italian palaces in a climate totally unsuited to them. Painters disdained to paint the clothes their sitters wore, as their greater predecessors, Holbein, Zuccherò, Sir Antonio More had done, and Sir Peter Lely's fine ladies caress impossible sheep, under impossible trees, in impossible clothes. And the same is true of the drama. But *pace* Mr. Adams, the principle applies more to the manners than the morals. It is the polish of the vice that is unnatural, not the vice itself. Defoe's stories show this pretty clearly. The chapters about the stage of the Restoration are amusing enough, but they fail to show us what the acting of the period was, and how it differed from that of the present day. Of anecdotes of actors there are plenty, but not such as to give a very elevated idea either of their talents or the merit of the performances. "When Betterton produced at his own theatre Rowe's 'Fair Penitent,' the part of Lothario was played by the irascible Powell. In the last scene Lothario's dead body lies on the bier, under decent covering; and it was usual for Warren, Powell's dresser, to take his master's place, instead of a dummy. On one occasion, forgetting how he was employed, Powell called angrily for his dresser, and at last, with such a threatening emphasis, that the poor fellow leaped up in a hurry, and ran from the stage. In his flight it so befell that his cloak caught in the bier, which was overturned, along with table and lamps, books and boxes, and even the fair penitent herself. The audience broke into a peal of laughter, and the catastrophe became the jest of the town. With a proper sense of what was

---

<sup>3</sup> "The Merry Monarch; or, England under Charles II." By W. H. Davenport Adams. Two vols. Remington & Co. 1885.

due to its author, Betterton stopped the play in its full flood of success, so that the public might have time to forget the untoward incident.'—“Haines was once cast by Charles Hart for a part of a senator in Ben Jonson's ‘Catiline,’ Hart himself taking the title rôle. Disgusted with the character, Haines deliberately marred Hart's best scene by taking a seat behind him, in a grotesque costume, and, with pot and pipe in hand, grimacing at Catiline until the audience were convulsed with laughter. For this escapade he was rightly punished with dismissal.” The favour of great people and of the Court was of more importance than than popularity, and this same Haines, the “Charles Mathews of the stage of the Restoration,” as a step to securing the patronage of the Court, “announced to Lord Sunderland his conversion to Romanism, and explained that he had been led to it by a vision of the Virgin, who had said to him, ‘Joe, arise.’ For once he met his match. The earl did not believe in his would-be convert, and remarked that the Virgin, if she had appeared, would have said ‘Joseph,’ if only out of respect for her husband. Haines completed the farce by recounting his pretended conversion on the stage. Holding a taper, and wearing the penitential white sheet, he recited some *à propos* couplets with an effectiveness of delivery which deceived his hearers into thinking them witty.” The book has no index.

A “History of Ireland under the Tudors,”<sup>4</sup> by Mr. Richard Bagwell, appears most opportunely. People who take any interest in Ireland will do well to study it carefully, and they can do so with great pleasure, as the author has taken care not to fill it with the unnecessary details which Irish historians in general use. It is compiled from the State Papers in the Record Office and from other trustworthy sources carefully noted. The first eight chapters contain introductory remarks bearing upon the history of the country for some three centuries and a half before Henry II.'s accession, up to the period from which the book takes its title, when we find the Pale “fully established.” The King's territory had been defined by the Statute of Kilkenny, in 1366, and in Tudor times there was not much more of the country in subjection to the conquerors. There is an interesting account of the Irish Parliament and its growth, there is also mentioned the important part which the introduction of fire-arms, and especially artillery, played in the country. Perhaps it is to be regretted that a fuller account of the arms which were used in the beginning of the seventeenth century was not given; however, a very full account will be found in the Calendar of Carew MSS. The importance of the first Jesuit mission, under Cōdure, Salmeron, and Paschal Broet, has not been made too light of; the Jesuits undoubtedly left a good impression in Ireland, almost as much so as in America, but the long civil wars have almost, but not quite, effaced their work. The author also mentions the fact that the dissolution of the Irish monas-

<sup>4</sup> “Ireland under the Tudors: with a Succinct Account of the Early History.” By Richard Bagwell, M.A. In two volumes. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1885.



teries did not take place so rapidly as in England, and many were flourishing up till a late period of Elizabeth's reign. The Church of Ireland was placed on the same footing as that of England in Elizabeth's reign "so far as an Act of Parliament could do it." This is an especially valuable book for its complete history of the Lord Lieutenants and Lord Deputies, from those of royal blood down to the end of Sidney's time. It is a difficult task to give a true account of the tribal feuds, but in this instance, it must be said, that both their causes and effects have been impartially and clearly told. The author does not allow it to be forgotten that he is an Irishman, as every here and there we find that humour for which his country has long been famous.

Another Irish historian, Mr. R. Barry O'Brien, quotes very largely from Hansard, and gives long statistics and evidence taken before various Commissions to support his theory with regard to the concessions to Ireland from 1831-1881.<sup>5</sup> The system of National Education, Parliamentary Reform, the Tithe Commutation Act, the Poor Law, Municipal Reform, the Encumbered Estates Act, the Irish Reform Act of 1868, the Irish Church Act, 1869, the Irish Land Act, 1870, the Intermediate Education Act, 1878, the Royal University Act, 1879, and the Land Act, 1881, are the measures which he discusses. It is unfortunate that he has considered it necessary to illustrate his work by filling it with recapitulations of some of the foulest murders and maimings on record, and still more unfortunate that he tries to justify many of them by mentioning the fact that they were not committed for money, as that was always found intact upon the unfortunate victim. We cannot recognise any difference in morality between murdering for money and murdering for land. Each of these measures, he gives it to be understood, were in some degree brought about by this course of crime. The National System of education originated in 1537, and passing many obstacles, the most important of which appears to have been the attempt to restrain the speaking of the Irish language, the outcome was the establishment of parish schools, which he truly represents as being almost entirely under the thumbs of the clergy of the Reformed Church. Next came the Diocesan Free Schools of 1570, the Royal Free Schools following, under the care of James the First; and finally, the National System, which he says "affords little ground for the belief that a mixed system of education will ever succeed in Ireland." This need hardly have been put in such doubtful words, the fact being that it is already an utter failure. The education of the people of Ireland is only to be carried out properly by separating the different religions: the history of the past clearly shows that. Most of his energy has been retained for the two land measures, and into these he flings himself in a most reckless manner; he would have done well to have studied the history of the Land Laws of India, and then he might have been contented with merely stating that

<sup>5</sup> "Fifty Years of Concessions to Ireland, 1831-1881." By R. Barry O'Brien, of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-Law. In two volumes. London; Sampson Low, Marston, Searle, & Rivington, Crown Buildings, 188, Fleet Street.

England could not understand any system of land tenure except her own, consequently so much misery over this subject in Ireland. He places Sharman Crawford as being under the wing of O'Connell; Sharman Crawford worked quite independently of O'Connell, and certainly did more for the farmers. His son, James Sharman Crawford, was a miserable failure in Parliament on account of his utter inability to express himself. O'Connell most undoubtedly did upon every opportunity complain of every law made in England, but he never brought forward any practicable measure of reform.

The "Founders of the American Republic"<sup>6</sup> is a subject well worthy of a writer of Mr. Charles Mackay's reputation, but he has hardly raised his reputation by writing upon it. First, with respect to the two chapters on Washington, we find a superabundance of trivial family details and fine writing, while important events of his life are passed over almost without remark: room can be found to quote a letter of Washington's as to his servants' liveries, while (it will scarcely be believed) his services with Braddock's ill-fated army are not even mentioned. A similar haste and carelessness mark the whole of this biography. Bunker's Hill was not, as Mr. Mackay supposes, the first battle of the war; that of Lexington had previously taken place with the result of giving to the so-called rustic rabble a confidence which made their gallant resistance at Bunker's Hill a possibility. It is also stated that Washington had at Valley Forge, in the winter of 1777-8, the aid, countenance, and friendship of Lafayette at the head of a French contingent. As a matter of fact, Lafayette received his commission in the American army on July 31, 1777, having landed a few months before with twelve companions; but the treaty of alliance between France and America was not concluded until February, 1778, nor did any French force land in America before July 8, 1778. Although Washington has been herein described to be unusually unfortunate in his military career, it must not be forgotten that his reputation as a soldier owes not a little to his successful attack on Yorktown, the really decisive event of the war: this also has been passed over without remark. With regard to the essay upon John Adams, except for the fact that he succeeded Washington in the presidency, there is no reason why Patrick Henry and Alexander Hamilton had not an equally good title to be enrolled among the founders of the United States. The chapter on Jefferson, who may rightly be regarded as the civil, as Washington was the military, leader of the American patriots, resembles in its faults that on Washington; the sins of inaccuracy perhaps not so prominent, but those of haste and lack of reading are equally noticeable. To the chapter on Franklin the above remarks must also apply. The disparaging comparison there drawn between the patrician education, conduct, and public services of Washington, Jefferson and Adams, and the plebeian origin and avocations of Franklin are in very doubtful taste, and in their present place

---

<sup>6</sup> "The Founders of the American Republic." By Charles Mackay. Edinburgh and London: Blackwood & Sons. 1885.

are peculiarly inappropriate as applied to a man of such extraordinary attainments and ability, united with so much simplicity and modesty. It may be appropriate to remark, *à propos* of Madison and the early Presidents of the Republic, that their fellow-citizens owe them no small debt of gratitude for the moderate and pacific course pursued by them towards foreign nations. It is impossible to say how the ill-compacted infant republic would have borne the strain of a vigorous foreign policy. The breadth of view and modern tone of thought is exceptionally noticeable in Jefferson and Madison, who, with respect to the abolition of slavery and to free-trade, were at least a generation in front of their contemporaries. It may fairly be said that between Madison and Lincoln no President of more than moderate ability had occupied the White House. One word more upon the chapter upon ultra-democracy, which exhibits, in a far greater degree, the same absence of study and reflection so conspicuous in the earlier chapters, combined with a pro-Southern bias so violent as to blind the writer to the most patent defects of his case. He is of course right in saying that the strong point of the apologists of the Confederates was their advocacy of State rights, but he ought to be aware that many causes, in themselves just, may be ruined by the manner in which they are advocated. Now, if there is anything about which posterity is agreed, it is that the slaveholding party had years before made up its mind to impose its peculiar institution upon the free States, by force if necessary, and had years before made its preparations accordingly. It is only necessary to refer to the Fugitive Slave Law, the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, and the removal of the Federal military stores from the Northern to the Southern arsenals during Buchanan's presidency. Furthermore, it is more than doubtful, on Mr. Mackay's own showing, whether a peaceful separation between North and South might not have taken place but for the violent and unprovoked attack upon Fort Sumter. As to his attack on democracy in general, we can only say that it is extremely weak, and that the instances he adduces in defence of his position may be, with equal justice, employed in its attack. Electoral corruption has been heard of in connection with every country in Europe of whatever form of government, and we have yet to learn that it is an especial feature of democracy, ultra or otherwise. Indeed, it may be said that the most ultra-democratic country in the world, that of Switzerland, is free to an exceptional degree from the defects which our writer considers to be inherent in that form of government.

Among the few men whose lives were lit up by the enthusiasm of humanity—so few that they stand out like stars against the darkness of a selfish world—there is no brighter name than William Lloyd Garrison, the apostle of anti-slavery.<sup>7</sup> With nothing to help him but earnestness and perseverance—for he began life as a journeyman printer and never became rich—he succeeded in abolishing the curse

<sup>7</sup> "William Lloyd Garrison: the Story of His Life." Told by His Children. In 2 vols. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1885.

which America inherited from the Old World. He had this in his favour—that slavery is a curse which can be put down once for all by law, while other curses, quite as injurious perhaps in their effect on national life, can only be fought by the slow process of teaching a higher morality until evil desires pass away and are known no more. There is one feature in the anti-slavery agitation which makes it differ from any reform that the world will see in the future. It was fought almost entirely on a Biblical platform. This gives the speeches and arguments a very old-fashioned and almost insincere ring, except when such texts are appealed to as “Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them,” of which the sanction is not the Speaker’s authority, but the echo the words arouse in the human heart. Christians, of course, were as much against Garrison and his crusade as for him. There were plenty of people in America, perhaps more than in England, who sought precepts of morality in the history and laws of a cruel, half-barbarous people. What wonder that they, saturated with the thoughts of a nation which prided themselves on being the favourites of Jehovah and looked down on other peoples as outcasts and enemies, were unable to receive the truth that men of a different colour were their brothers. It is just the same now in the movement for the emancipation of women—a movement which, when successful, will do far more to purify and ennoble the world than even the abolition of slavery. It is opposed by Christians who take the words and practice of the Founders of our religion, which were in harmony with a corrupt state of society, and ignore the legitimate development of the spirit. Garrison himself at first was shocked at women doing more than help the men in an unobtrusive secondary capacity, and remonstrated strongly at the seven hundred ladies of Pittsburg who petitioned Congress in behalf of the Indians. Forty years later, however, when reminded of this at a Women’s Suffrage meeting, he replied, “Whereas I was blind, now I see.” No doubt the change was mainly due to the acquaintance of such women as Prudence Crandall, as true a hero and martyr in the cause as himself. This lady kept a school at Canterbury, in Connecticut—not a slave State be it remembered—and because she gave up her white pupils, and devoted herself to the education of the daughters of free Negroes, an Act was passed to prohibit public schools for coloured people, in accordance with which she was convicted and imprisoned. She was boycotted by shops, churches, and public conveyances, her well was filled up with manure, and finally her house was set on fire. The attack on Garrison by the mob in Boston, when he was only just saved by the mayor from savage ill-treatment and perhaps murder, was not worse than this. But stranger still than this mob violence was the systematic attempt to put down the movement by authority, though not by law. Garrison was convicted of libel for saying in print that a man was concerned in the domestic slave trade, as lawful a trade then as horse-dealing. Postmasters were supported by their superiors in destroying anti-slavery publications which were passing through their offices. The burning of Pennsylvania Hall was defended

on the ground that it was erected for the propagation of felony—that is, intermarriage between the two races. The account of two dissensions in the camp of the Abolitionists, first between the party who desired immediate abolition and those who advocated colonization by the Negroes, and a second schism fostered by sectarian religionists, are related at considerable length, perhaps greater length than English readers will care about. But there are practical lessons to be learned from this record of internal difficulties. The two volumes already published extend only to 1840, the year of Garrison's visit to England, when he sat to Benjamin Haydon for the picture of the Anti-Slavery Convention now in the National Portrait Gallery. The artist, in composing his picture, applied a very simple test to his sitters, to which Garrison alone responded.

The Rev. John Scoble called. I said, "I shall place you, Thompson and the Negro together." Now an Abolitionist on thorough principle would have gloried in being so placed. This was the touchstone. He sophisticated immediately on the propriety of placing the Negro in the distance, as it would have much greater effect.

Now I, who have never troubled myself in this cause, gloried in the imagination of placing the Negro close by his emancipator. The emancipator shrunk. I'll do it, though. If I do not, d—n me. Lloyd Garrison comes to-day. I'll try him, and this shall be my method of ascertaining the real heart.

Garrison sate, and I succeeded and hit him. I asked him, and he met me at once directly. George Thompson said he saw no objection. But this was not enough. A man who wishes to place the Negro on a level must no longer regard him as having been a slave, and feel annoyed at sitting by his side.

This exactly hits off the difference between Garrison and the Colonization Society, for which he felt a true *odium theologikum*. The book is illustrated with portraits of most of the noted men and women who took part in the movement.

The Mexican Government have printed and sent to Europe a pamphlet<sup>8</sup> in three languages, the object of which is to clear the memory of Benito Juarez, late President of the Mexican Republic, of the charge of offering to sell the territory of Sonora to the United States for £3,000,000, and of selling Maximilian's corpse to his brother. These errors are both contained in Cantu's "History of the Last Thirty Years." The author was a personal friend of Maximilian, and perhaps not impartial to his enemies. In the defence of Juarez' conduct towards Maximilian there is a curious account of the way his corpse was treated. It was disembowelled and embalmed after his execution; and when the corpse was sent to Europe the whole of the *viscera*, "the heart, the lungs, the *œsophagus*, the thoracic aorta, the liver, the stomach, the bowels, the spleen, and the kidneys," were replaced, and similarly the *cerebrum* and *cerebellum* into the head; the body was dressed in black and placed in a coffin lined with red velvet cushions. All this is described with unction to show that the Mexican Government can "act with the refinement and decorum of the nation it represents," and, though

<sup>8</sup> "Juarez and Cesar Cantu." Mexico: Printing Office of the Federal Government. 1885.

“obliged to apply the last penalty to a foreign invader, she nevertheless understood how to silence her passions in the presence of a sepulchre.”

Mr. MacCrindle, the late Principal of the Government College at Patna, has for some time devoted himself to the study of the early geography of India, and has published translations of the “Indica” of Megasthenes and Arrian, the “Periplus” and the “Voyage” of Nearchus. He now takes up Ptolemy,<sup>9</sup> a more difficult author perhaps than the others, and translates his text, giving the names of the cities, with their latitudes and longitudes, as they appear in Noble’s Leipsic edition. It has been no easy task. The corruptness of the names, which are Greek attempts to represent Asiatic words heard at second or third hand, makes it hazardous to identify places, and the imperfect nature of his data for calculating latitudes and longitudes adds to the difficulty. One source of error was that he assumed the earth’s circumference to be 180,000 stadia, thus making the length of a degree, at the Equator 500 stadia instead of 600; and another, that his distances were taken from reports of travellers, and, no doubt, given to him in days’ journeys, not miles. That many places cannot be identified at all need cause no surprise. Even in England Roman stations have been blotted out, and left only a name, and sometimes not even that, till the spade discovers the pavement of a forum or the hypocaust of a villa. But in India the greatest cities perish and their names are completely obliterated from living memory. Taxila, for instance, in the time of Arrian the most populous city between the Indus and Hydaspes, whose streets and temples reminded Apollonius of Tyana of Athens, was totally destroyed before the Mohanmedan invasion, but no one knows how or when. Its site was absolutely unknown till it was identified with the ruins at Shahdheri, which cover an area of six square miles. Ptolemy does not give many facts about the places he names, but some are still true. Arakan is still famous for its white ravens, white parrots, and bearded cocks, and his description of the Cinghalese method of doing the hair is still applicable. He places the Magnetic Islands, the Maniolai, about ten degrees east of Ceylon, which later geographers located near the mouth of the Arabian Gulf. Mr. MacCrindle ingeniously suggests that the story was invented to account for the peculiar construction of the Malay and Cinghalese boats, in which wooden bolts and cocoa-nut cords are used instead of nails. The translation from Ptolemy and the notes are distinguished only by a slightly different method of printing which is hardly sufficient to catch the eye at first.

The language of the Polynesian Islands has been hitherto considered by philologists to be quite alien to the Aryan tongues, and more akin to the Malay, but most philologists probably know no more of it than can be gathered from scanty dictionaries and grammars. Mr. Fornander, however, the historian of the race,<sup>10</sup> has a thorough

<sup>9</sup> “Ancient India as described by Ptolemy.” By J. W. MacCrindle, M.A. London: Trubner & Co. 1885.

<sup>10</sup> “An Account of the Polynesian Race.” Vol. III. By Abraham Fornander. London: Trubner & Co. 1885.

knowledge of the various dialects, having been for many years judge in the Island of Maui, and he contends that the language of the Archipelago is a survival of the primitive Aryan tongue, having separated from the parent stock while it was yet in the agglutinative stage, while formative particles were still independent words, and abstract terms had not been invented. In numerals, for instance, the first four are of undoubted Aryan origin, and it is assumed that the separation took place while the power of counting was in this undeveloped state. If, Mr. Fornander suggests, the cradle of the Aryan race was in the valleys abutting on the plateau of Pamir, in Central Asia (as many scholars believe), there may have been two streams of emigration, one to the south-west across the Hindoo Koosh to the Deccan, and the other through Laos, Yunnan, and Cambodia to the Archipelago, long before the arrival of the Mongols or Malays. The presence of Polynesian words in Malay is asserted to be no proof of a derivation of the former from the latter, but rather that the words in question were adopted by the Malays on coming in contact with the Polynesians. The subject is worked out by means of a vocabulary in which the connection between Polynesian roots and those in the chief Indo-European languages is shown.

A similar kinship with the Aryan races is claimed for the New Zealanders by Mr. Tregear.<sup>11</sup> Passing by the philological part of his argument, which is an ingenious attempt to show that the Aryan names of things never known in New Zealand survive in compound words, we come to mythology, to which a similar process is applied. All nations have stories of the slaughter of "fearful wild-fowl" by their ancestral heroes, and one of the Maori myths recounts the slaying of Hotupuku, a sort of Dragon of Wantley, covered with spines, who lived in a cave and fed on travellers. He was slain by the forefathers of the chiefs of Rotorua, by catching him in nooses and hammering him with clubs. Another feat was the dragging of Pekehaua, an amphibious monster, from his hole beneath the waters; and a third legend tells of a savage beast called Kataore, the pet of a chief, with rings round its legs, flashing green eyes, and a fearful roar, who lived in a cave at Moerangi. These, Mr. Tregear suggests, are reminiscences of the snake or crocodile, the frog and the cat, animals unknown to New Zealand, and magnified by the mists of antiquity. The old songs and incantations may, perhaps, throw additional light on this question by preserving older forms of words, and, perhaps, by containing allusions to the far-off land which was the home of the race.

In the use of Phallic images, also, the New Zealanders resemble those whom Mr. Tregear considers to be their ancestors, but that is not a coincidence of much consequence, for the nations are few, if any, where such emblems are not to be found. Some antiquaries, it is true, see a phallus in everything, from a church spire to a maypole, as others see the Cross whenever two lines intersect, or the

<sup>11</sup> "The Aryan Maori." By Edward Tregear. Wellington, N.Z.: G. Didsbury. 1885.

doctrine of the Trinity in every triple ornament. Mr. Westropp,<sup>12</sup> however, takes rather a more sober view, and a short essay by him recently edited by General Forlong contains a well-selected repertory of facts illustrating this subject, which should be read by all who are interested in the study of the growth of religions.

Somewhat ponderous and, for the general body of readers, overladen with detail, M. Lefèvre Pontalis' *Life of De Witt*<sup>13</sup> is yet a book full of interest and calculated to teach graphically many a valuable lesson for the conduct of human affairs. The politician, and perhaps the English politician especially, will find in this study of twenty years of a parliamentary republic, much food for reflection. Here is a problem of government, the factors of which can be fairly accurately appreciated and estimated, worked out experimentally, yielding results which can be noted and applied to present-day concerns. The central figure—a figure which cannot fail to excite universal admiration and respect—belongs to the number of young men who, by force of character and genius, have swayed the destinies of their country. John De Witt was only forty-seven years of age when he was tragically done to death by the thoughtless fury of the fickle populace and the not altogether thoughtless neglect of the young Stadtholder, William III., and by that time he had been, as Grand Pensionary of Holland, for twenty years the leading personage of the republic and the directing spirit of her policy. In this position he had nobly followed out the advice of an old friend and companion of his father's, given him on the threshold of his public career—"Once become Grand Pensionary, it should be a matter of indifference to you whether you are put into your coffin whole or in pieces." Nothing could show the force of his character better than his indomitable bearing in the face of adversity. In the contest with Charles II., after the overthrow of the Dutch fleet, the French ambassador writes of him to Louis XIV. :—"I saw M. de Witt immediately after the battle. I found him as proud and collected as ever. He told me he was going to the Texel, by order of the States, to recompense some and punish others, and hoped soon to be able to send the fleet to sea again, adding that they were determined to offer battle a second time." And that this was not idle bravado after-events showed. Most characteristic of De Witt himself, and of the "will that finds a way," is the incident related of him at this time in his taking out the wind-bound fleet in the Texel to meet the merchant vessels returning from the Indies.

The energetic determination of the Grand Pensionary surmounted the obstacles that were opposed to this bold move, and that seemed to make it foolhardy. Putting to use his knowledge of mathematics, and relying also on experiments which confirmed his preconceived ideas, De Witt found, in spite of the contrary opinions of the pilots of that coast, that, of thirty-two different

<sup>12</sup> "Primitive Symbolism, as illustrated in Phallic Worship." By Hodder M. Westropp. With an Introduction by General Forlong. London: G. Redway. 1885.

<sup>13</sup> "John de Witt, Grand Pensionary of Holland; or, Twenty Years of a Parliamentary Republic." By Antonin Lefèvre Pontalis. Translated by S. E. and A. Stephenson. In 2 vols. London: Longmans, Green & Co.



points of the compass from which the wind might blow, twenty-eight were favourable to the passage by three channels. He himself, too, went out to sound the channels of which the pilots warned him, and proved to them that, contrary to their allegations, the channel of the Spanjaarts Gat, a mile long, but on account of its breadth the safest, contained sufficient water for the passage of the fleet. Confident in his discovery, he gave the order for departure, and undertook the personal charge of the two largest ships. The rest followed easily; and, in remembrance of this sally, the Spanjaarts Gat was surnamed John de Witt's Channel."

John de Witt is not the only noble figure of the time. His elder brother, Cornelius, the partner in his cruel death, was a worthy comrade. And the list of the worthy by no means ends with these two. They found a fit scene of action in the "deliberative and sovereign assemblies of the States General and the States of Holland," which

recall the best days of the ancient Republic, only with slavery omitted and Christianity added to them. With them, government is neither the privilege of one man nor the right of the multitude; it is divided amongst all those who seem most capable of exercising it, and who have passed through a preliminary apprenticeship in the councils of their native towns; power belongs thus to citizens who devote their time and labour to public business almost without recompense, realizing the idea of a cheap government.

Yet, granting all this, were they not the weaker solely because, in their scheme of government, the "one man" and the "multitude," or at any rate the multitude, if not the one man, were left out?

The English world would scarcely have suffered if the series of jerky paragraphs—explosions of a literary popgun—which purport to be the secret memoirs of Madame la Marquise de Pompadour<sup>14</sup> had never been offered for its instruction and entertainment. They might very well have been left in the obscurity which followed their first publication "in Holland nearly a hundred years ago," for they are merely the disclosures of one who, by her own showing (if they be her own showing), was a shameless and heartless woman, and do not throw any new light on the history of the period. *Naive* her confessions may be, but they are also very discreditable: for they display the character of a woman who could deliberately betray a young, affectionate, and suitable husband, the father of her two children, "a gentleman charming and rich," a woman who could set before her, as the object of her ambition, an "eminent, but not very honourable post, far less honourable than she supposed it to be," and who, "amid the *éclat* of festivities and the caressing murmurings of a crowd of flatterers" assembled around her in her luxurious home, could allow "her mind to be turned towards the residence of the woman who possessed the *unique* and *ineffable privilege* of being loved by"—Louis XV.; being able afterwards with brazen impudence, to justify her conduct to her husband with such a speech as this:—

Sir, I swear to you that I have always preserved for you the respect and esteem deserved by the most gallant man in France, and that I should have

<sup>14</sup> "The Secret Memoirs of Madame la Marquise de Pompadour." Collected and Arranged by Jules Beaujoint. London: Remington & Co.

looked upon myself as worthy of contempt and uttermost punishment if I had succumbed to your equal or your inferior. But, sir, before I became your wife I was the subject of the King. ●

The laxity of her time may have had something to do with the twist in her moral sense; her education by her mother undoubtedly had, for it appears that it was this high-principled lady who conceived the "insane" ambition (insane, we may remark, for other reasons than that given—namely, that its realization at the moment seemed impossible) of raising her daughter to the bad eminence which she afterwards attained. "As happens with women who know and love each other, the mother and daughter understood each other without any interchange of impressions even under their breath," and so, as a note of the editor puts it, on certain critical occasions "the mother was admirable." The object of the attention and affection of these two virtuous, high-souled ladies—his Most Christian Majesty, King Louis XV. of France—is here presented in an aspect as disagreeable as could possibly be imagined, and one wonders how a nation of men for one moment suffered him, and the like of him, and does not wonder at later events in France, but can only regret that he himself escaped with a whole skin. However, to found such reflections as these upon the memoirs under notice is to take them seriously—a course which is scarcely to be justified, as they are most probably based on apocryphal memoirs of Madame de Pompadour, such as those published at Liège in 1763.

The late Reform Bill is producing a crop of books on parliamentary history. That by Mr. Murdoch<sup>15</sup> gives a useful sketch of the contests between the three estates of the kingdom, on the position of the country in 1688, and the balance of power between the King, Lords, and Commons then established; but it is chiefly concerned with the circumstances attending the passage of the three Reform Bills of 1832, 1867, and 1884. As to the period between 1688 and the first of these Bills, a period during which the treatment of the people was worse than that under the most despotic of monarchs—a class tyranny under the sanction of law—the very moderation with which Mr. Murdoch puts his case invests it with additional strength, and it does not require the long list of tyrannical statutes which he cites, to cause us to wonder equally at the sublime patience of the masses in so long supporting so arduous a burden, and the extreme good temper and moderation displayed, both in the heat of the conflict and in the hour of victory, under extremely trying circumstances. The story of the conflict, that has now lasted for three generations, and which bids fair to be at last ultimately successful—the story of the three Reform Acts—is once more told, and well told. The effect of the first was to change a nominal representation of the people into a real one, and to put an end to the disgraceful traffic in boroughs. The direct and immediate result of the first success of the people was, within five years, to render the Ministers responsible to the

<sup>15</sup> "A History of Constitutional Reform in Great Britain and Ireland," &c. By James Murdoch. Edinburgh: Blackie & Son. 1885.

country; to abolish the slave trade; to initiate national education; to purify the municipalities; and, later, to pass the Factory and Public Health Acts; and, above all, to secure sound finance by the abolition of Protection and the Navigation Laws, and thereby to establish our present commercial prosperity, extraordinary even in this period of temporary depression. It is not too much to say, also, that but for this change, never too greatly to be praised, civil war, which had spared scarcely any other nation in Europe, would have arisen amongst us also, and the Chartist movement might have resulted in a mighty revolution. The first Reform Act admitted the middle classes to the suffrage, and the subsequent admission of the urban artisans by the second, and of the mining and agricultural classes by the third—a question of time only—has at last made the House of Commons in reality the People's House. It must not, however, be supposed that the battle of Reform is over; and Mr. Murdoch does us no slight service in pointing out that the House is not yet a perfect representation of the people. It is only a question of time when all taxpayers, of whatever sex, must be admitted to the suffrage—when proportional representation (in the cause of which Mr. Hare has for so many years carried on an apparently hopeless battle) will give the most perfect expression to the will of the people—and when the member must, by his liability to be recalled if his conduct should not meet the approbation of his constituency, become the true servant of those who have elected him. It may be necessary even to secure more perfect sympathy between the governors and the governed—to introduce the practice of the *referendum*, at present only in use in Switzerland. Whether this nation will eventually prefer a republican government will, of course, depend upon the good sense of our rulers. Every one of our readers, however, will echo Mr. Murdoch's wish, that the entire system of government may be directed to one end—viz., the progress, security, and happiness of the people.

Here is another new book on the same subject, by Mr. Heaton, which differs from Mr. Murdoch's, just noticed, in this—that the former is written by, and in the style and manner of, a professed publicist; the latter by a shrewd, observant man, who has probably grown up among the events which he describes, in good nervous colloquial English, not without a strong sense of the ludicrous. One at least of the quotations is worthy of repetition:—

. . . . A charge made by Sir Stafford Northcote against Mr. Chamberlain, that he had "a spite against the House of Lords," . . . drew from the latter the . . . reply:—"I have always thought the House of Lords a very picturesque institution, attractive from its connection with the history of our country. I have no desire to see a dull uniformity of social life, and I am thankful rather than otherwise to gentlemen who will take the trouble of wearing robes and coronets, and who will keep up a certain state and splendour which it is very pleasing to look upon. They are ancient monu-

<sup>16</sup> "The Three Reforms of Parliament," &c. By William Heaton. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1885.

ments, and I for one should be very sorry to deface them. But I cannot admit that we can build upon these interesting ruins the foundation of our government; I cannot allow that these antiquities should control the destinies of a free empire."

The book concludes with an Appendix containing an abstract of the Reform Acts for the three kingdoms of 1832 and 1868, and of the Franchise and Redistribution Acts of 1884 and 1885.

Mr. King, an American journalist,<sup>17</sup> is a man who, like Ulysses, "mores hominum multorum vidit et urbes," though driven only by a professional stimulus and not an angry god. He knows Europe well; was in Paris during the Franco-Prussian War and the reign of the Commune, in Spain during the revolution, and then far in the East, looking on at the insurrection in Herzegovina, and with the Russian army before Plevna. The "Storm" considerably outweighs the "Calm," and in fact England is almost the only country of which he has not to paint scenes of bloodshed and strife. His narrative is graphic without being sensational, the style of the special correspondent being a little toned down, and remodelled to suit the handsome get-up of the book, which is printed in the best American style, and adorned with numberless engravings. It is just the book to lie on a library table to amuse and instruct casual half-hours.

Printed in large clear type, on excellent paper, with a few admirable illustrations by Edward Whymper, and a dedication to his Grace the Duke of Bedford beneath a reproduction of the ducal arms and coronet, appears the *Life of John Bunyan*,<sup>18</sup> the illustrious brazier, or, as some say, tinker, of Bedford. The author is Mr. Brown, minister of the Bunyan Meeting church, sixth only in succession to Bunyan himself; for the ministers of Bunyan Meeting have enjoyed exceptional longevity. Mr. Brown seems to have displayed great industry in ransacking every possible depository of information concerning his hero, and although, after reading his 482 pages, it may be felt that the gist of the matter is contained in Bunyan's own "Grace Abounding," yet the incidental information introduced by the author contains so much which is of historical interest that a careful perusal of the whole book is well repaid. Almost at the outset (p. 6) we have an account of the "Act Books of the Court of the Archdeaconry of Bedford," a source of information hitherto almost unexplored. The Archdeaconry Court of Bedford has long since lost its peculiar jurisdiction—a fact which few will be found to regret, for it must be confessed that its proceedings savoured of oppression. Nevertheless, amid the records of citations and punishments there are some which the most ardent Nonconformist will admit were well deserved. Such, for instance, were the presentment of Harman Shepherd, the curate of Woburn, in 1612, for baiting a bear in the parish church; of the

<sup>17</sup> "Europe in Storm and Calm." By Edw. King. Springfield, U.S.: Nichols & Co. 1885.

<sup>18</sup> "John Bunyan: his Life, Times, and Work." By John Brown, B.A., Minister of the Church at Bunyan Meeting, Bedford. London: Wm. Isbister, Limited. 1885.

churchwardens of Knotting, because that on three successive Shrove Tuesdays they and their sons, and Mr. Alvey, the rector of the parish,

“permitted and were present at cockfightings held in the chancell of the said church in or about the sacred place where the communion table stands, many persons being there assembled and wagers laid;” also of the clerk of a parish not named, “for that he singeth the psalmes in the church with such a jesticulous tone and altisonant voice, vizt., squeaking like a pigg, which doth not only interrupt the other voyces, but is altogether dissonant and disagreeing unto any musicall harmonie.”

Truly Archbishop Laud had a wide field open for his restless energy had he confined himself to the remedy of abuses reprobated by all Christian men, and left his Nonconformist brethren to work out their own salvation, undisturbed, according to the peculiar methods which they loved. In early life Bunyan was a soldier, some have supposed a Royalist, but this is an error, as Mr. Brown has succeeded in proving pretty conclusively. His conversion took place, after the close of the civil wars, in the way familiar to most people. Still, the story is one which may be told many times without wearying the reader, and we only wish that Mr. Brown could have given us, with the story of the man's internal struggles so eloquently told by himself, an objective account of his hero as he appeared to others; but this is unfortunately impossible, for Bunyan is mainly his own biographer, and wrote with a far different object than the gratification of the curious. It must not, however, be supposed that Bunyan was a fanatic. On the contrary, he seems to have always inclined to toleration and the avoidance of division. The objection of Nonconformists to the Book of Common Prayer, so hard for a Churchman to understand, sprung, in all probability, not so much from an objection to forms of prayer as to the prohibition of all other public prayers but those the Church has approved. To check the natural outflow from the heart of a Christian to his Maker seems to people of the earnest emotional kind little short of profanity; and to compel attendance at prayers or ministrations when the heart is perforce absent, a constraint to which prison is preferable. So at least thought Bunyan, and twelve years of prison failed to convince him that he was in error. And yet he was a man who seems to have possessed strong common-sense and the other qualities which make what is called “a man of business.” The place of Bunyan in literature has given rise to considerable difference of opinion. The taste of the present day is comprehensive, and conspicuous merit of any kind is pretty sure to be acknowledged, but among the learned of our forefathers literary work was judged by rules as narrow as those which limited dramatic authorship among the Greeks. With the people at large certain works of Bunyan have always been popular, and his “Pilgrim's Progress” has been translated into more languages than any other work except the Bible. Foreigners cannot appreciate the simplicity and force of the language, but all are captivated by the dramatic interest of the narrative and the vivid humanity manifest in his clearly drawn characters. When he in-

roduces his pilgrims on the scene, we seem to see them in the flesh walking on the road. His angels and saintly characters reflect the light of heaven, and his devils and hobgoblins are redolent of the pit. Passing from his best-known book, it may be admitted that much of Bunyan's work was of transitory interest. He was not either a profound or a learned theologian, and he was too humble a man to let his own judgment lead him far from the limits of his form of Calvinism. He was, as his successor points out, peculiarly successful in illustrating and enforcing admitted truths. His power as a preacher must have been great, for we find Dr. John Owen telling Charles II. that he would willingly exchange his learning for the tinker's power of touching men's hearts. His speech was fervent, full of illustrative analogies, and occasionally quaint, as the following example drawn from a work called "Solomon's Temple Spiritualized," no doubt originally delivered as a lecture or sermon, may show. Speaking of the snuffers in the Temple, he says (p. 380) :—

For if our snuffs are our superfluities of naughtiness, our snuffers, then, are those righteous reproofs, rebukes and admonitions, which Christ has ordained to be in His house for good. As who should say, "the lights of the Temple must be trimmed withal if they burn not well." Only, the snuffers must be used wisely. It is not for every fool to handle snuffers at or about the candles, lest, perhaps, instead of mending the light, they put the candle out. And, therefore, Paul bids them that are spiritual do it. Watch man, watch, and let not your snuffs be too long, nor pull them off with your fingers, or carnal reasonings, but with godly admonitions. Use your snuffers graciously, curb vice, nourish virtue; so will you use them well, and so your light will shine to the glory of God.

Mr. Brown concludes with a Bibliographical Memoir of "The Pilgrim's Progress" which is not without interest, an Appendix containing a list of the languages into which the book has been translated, and a fairly good Index. To inhabitants of Bedford the book will be of especial value as a contribution to the history of their town, and on account of the notices of many Bedfordshire worthies which it contains.

"Homo sum; humani nihil a me alienum puto." Even the study of breeches and boots and ladies' head-dresses is interesting to the sociologist, as well as to the artist, for whom, of course, it has a practical bearing, whether he be actor, painter, novelist, or poet. And the public is getting so well educated in such points, since Benjamin West refused to paint General Wolfe dying in a Roman cuirass or a mediæval corslet, that no artist can afford to be ignorant. Fairholt's "Costume in England,"<sup>19</sup> a convenient and tolerably correct handbook, has become scarce, the last edition being more than twenty years old, and the Hon. Harold Dillon, whose knowledge of English dress, and especially armour, is unrivalled both for scope and accuracy, has just brought out a new edition. The additions to the Glossary are especially valuable, as many Early-English texts and other mediæval authorities have been laid under contribution which have only

<sup>19</sup> "Costume in England." By the late F. W. Fairholt, F.S.A. Third Edition. By the Hon. H. A. Dillon, F.S.A. In 2 vols. London: Geo. Bell & Sons. 1885.

recently been printed. The new illustrations also, thanks to the skilful draughtsmanship of the editor, are of much greater value than those reprinted from earlier editions, in which the character of the originals has not always been very faithfully preserved. As an instance of the manner in which literature is elucidated, the author happened to find a shoe in the paintings formerly in St. Stephen's Chapel, which exactly tallies with Chaucer's description of the young clerk Absolon, who had

Powles wyndowes corven in his shoes,

the device on the instep being curiously like the rose window in the transept of the old Cathedral in Dugdale's view. As to boots, there is a top-boot of the time of Edward IV., with a light-coloured top, just like those of the present day, except in the extra length of the toe. "Tottenham in Boots," the Irish member of the House of Commons who acquired the name "because he on a sudden went to the House in boots, and, by his vote, turned a question against the Court," is alluded to as an exception to common use; but there was a time when these articles of dress were not singular in the House, and Disraeli mentions incidentally in one of his novels that members were the only persons who were allowed by society to dine out thus dressed. The chapters on armour are so carefully written, with such well-selected examples, that it will be easy for any one, with a little study, to date monumental effigies and brasses within a few years by the style of the helmet, the shape of the pauldrons, or the length of the sollerets. Ladies' fashions must have given the editor a world of trouble, and the obscurity of some of the definitions is, perhaps, unavoidable. The explanation of a "jardine," for instance, as "the single pinner next the burgoigne," is *obscurum per obscurum*, if not *obscurum per obscurius*; but in absolute darkness there is no comparison. Would any lady like to know what "plumpers" are which their fair ancestors used at the Court of the Merry Monarch? "Certain very thin, round and light balls, to plump out and fill up the cavities of the cheeks, much used by old Court Countesses." And now hair-powder is coming in again, it is well to note the disagreeable effects of its employment. One thing is noticeable in male dress—the gradual tendency towards simplicity and cheapness. There never was a time, fashion be thanked, when men's clothes were more convenient in shape and more inexpensive in material. Though artists sigh for furred robes and satin doublets, let us hope that tailors will never induce us to leave off broadcloth and tweed; and the only reform that comfort could propose is the abolition of the tall silk hat.

We congratulate Mr. Mackenzie Bell on the success of his sketch of the life and works of Charles Whitehead,<sup>20</sup> the author of "The Solitary" and "Richard Savage," which was noticed in these pages last year. A second edition of the book has just appeared, and, if any of our readers did not see it when it first came out, they could not do better than read it now.

<sup>20</sup> "A Forgotten Genius: Charles Whitehead. A Critical Monograph." By H. T. Mackenzie Bell. New Edition. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

## BELLES LETTRES.

**T**HE motive of the remarkable and ingenious treatise, "Milton and Vondel," is to show that, unapproachably great as Milton is, he is not unassailable on the score of more or less wholesale borrowings from a contemporary poet. For this startling arraignment, which Mr. Edmundson decorously styles "A Curiosity of Literature," the plea runs thus: "In the year 1654, four years before Milton commenced his 'Paradise Lost,' the great Dutch poet, Vondel, published a drama entitled 'Lucifer,' whose main theme deals with the story of the rebellion of the angels and their overthrow by Michael, at the head of the armies of God." Not only so, but in 1660, Vondel published the drama of "Samson; or, Divine Vengeance;" in 1661, an epic poem in six books, on the Life and Death of John the Baptist, and a poem named "Reflections on God and Religion;" and again in 1664, a drama entitled "Adam and Banishment." "Paradise Lost," be it remembered, was finished in 1665, published in 1667, and "Paradise Regained" and the "Samson Agonistes" not till 1670. That Milton had learned the Dutch language is proved by the statement of Roger Williams, the founder of the State of Rhode Island; that he was conversant with Dutch affairs is certain from his position as Latin Secretary to Cromwell, and from his literary controversies with continental professors; and that most probably he was acquainted with Vondel's writings may be inferred from the circumstance of his having been introduced to Grotius, in Paris, in that very month of May, 1638, in which that scholar had received and acknowledged the dedication of Vondel's play "Gysbrecht van Aunstel." A comparison of numerous selections from the several works of Vondel with parallel passages taken from the first nine Books of the "Paradise Lost," and from the "Samson," affords proof that Milton was largely indebted to Vondel for what may be fitly described as poetic material. A literary problem of so difficult and complex a character may not be disposed of in a few sentences, but we need hardly say that a contrary plea is to be urged. In the first place, although it may be conceded that Milton probably was acquainted with Vondel's writings, and that some of Vondel's images and terms of expression fell on the good soil of his memory, yet it is inconceivable that Milton ever consciously delayed his own royal progress to certain victory for the sake of a hundred petty pilferings. Secondly, two great poets, born in the same age, both of them steeped in classical literature, are writing on the same subject—a subject, the original treatment of which Time and an especial sanctity had already made impossible, and will they not, like neighbouring timepieces, strike in unison? Thirdly, Mr. Edmundson has translated, and, we should imagine, well translated, Vondel's rhymed Alexandrines into Miltonic blank verse, and

<sup>1</sup> "Milton and Vondel: a Curiosity of Literature." By George Edmundson, M.A., Vicar of Northolt. London: Trübner & Co., Ludgate Hill. 1885.  
[Vol. CXXV. No. CCXLIX.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. LXIX. No. I. T



thus having Miltonised Vondel, he places him alongside of Milton. Apart, however, from the failure or success of his argument, Mr. Edmundson has written a most interesting essay, the contents of which no lover or student of Milton should fail to master.

To the "Literary Remains of Charles Stuart Calverley"<sup>2</sup> is attached a Memoir by Mr. Walter Sendall. We do not think that the Latin verses and fugitive pieces will add much to the fame of their accomplished author, and the Memoir is of that decorous and reticent type which leaves little or no impression on the mind of the reader. By far the most amusing piece of writing in the volume is a description by Mr. Walter Besant of the ascent of "a low pass" in the Tyrol. Charles Stuart Calverley, whose memory must ever be sweet and honourable, may best be described as a latter-day Præd, a Præd converted from Dandyism to Muscular Christianity. If he did not enter, as Præd did, the ranks of lesser poets, he equalled, if he did not surpass, his prototype in wit and scholarship and finish. Both writers were academic, and drew their inspiration from school and University sources; but we are inclined to think that to the next generation Calverley's verses will speak less than Præd's. Of the many good stories of which Calverley was the hero but few are given in the Memoir. Surely it was "Blaydes" who, on being reminded by the Master of Balliol that the "garden quad" was a place intended for "quiet study," and not for smoking short clay pipes, proceeded to erect a Druidical circle of Liddell and Scott's, to entrench himself in the midst, and there and then to "quietly study" in the presence of a delighted and admiring audience.

"Gathered in the Gloaming,"<sup>3</sup> a collection of poems by T. Westwood, contains much that is suggestive of the greater poets of the day, and something that may be called original. The "Quest of the Sanc-Greall" is little more than an echo of the "Idylls of the King." Such lines as the following—

And all night long, above the sleeping town,  
The white dove hovered in a silver haze,  
Nor ceased the hallelujahs until dawn;

Or as these—

At Lammas-tide across the windy fells  
Rode the good knight, and wore the enchanted shield,

bear the image if not the superscription of the Laureate. Among the shorter poems, "Falling," "A Vision between Leaves," "The Pet Lamb," and others have a tune and melody of their own. From the stanzas and sonnets in honour of the gentle craft we quote "The Bicentenary" (of Walton's death):—

<sup>2</sup> "The Literary Remains of Charles Stuart Calverley." With a Memoir by Walter J. Sendall. London: George Bell & Sons, York Street, Covent Garden. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell & Co. 1885.

<sup>3</sup> "Gathered in the Gloaming: Poems of Early and Later Years." By T. Westwood. London: Printed at the Chiswick Press. 1885.

Father of Anglers ! when, two hundred years  
 Agone, Death sealed thine eyes, his visage frore  
 Was touched—the legend tells—with pity sore.  
 He closed thine eyes and sealed them safe from tears,  
 With touch of frosty finger on their spheres,  
 But spared thy heart, and let its pulses beat  
 Unchecked. “Not Death, but dreams,” he said, “O sweet  
 Soul, be thy portion; dream of woods and meres,  
 Trout-dimpled pool, bright beck, and sighing sedge—  
 Dreams of old faces, comrades dear, that throng  
 About thee, with gay gossip, laugh and song,  
 In hostel, or by honeysuckle hedge.  
 Such dreams be thine, with endless morn and may !”  
 And ceasing, the gaunt shadow went his way.

All that Mr. Westwood writes is pleasant, wholesome, and of the nature of poetry. In “Turncoats” he exhibits a keen sense of humour.

In “Julian : a Tragedy,”<sup>4</sup> Mr. J. M. W. Schwartz displays facility of versification and an agreeable play of fancy rather than dramatic power. In truth the characters are somewhat commonplace, and the movement is slow and wearisome. Julian mistrusts himself too soon, and at too great length, and Irene, the early Christian maiden, resembles her kind all too closely. Your playwright is your only true Conservative, nor does he ever dream of placing new puppets on his mimic stage. The following description of approach of dawn argues a capacity for poetical narrative of a high order :—

No longer can I make a feint of sleep,  
 And watch with half-closed eyes the darkness grow.  
 Less dark in slow and soft enlightenment,  
 Since last I raised me on my restless couch,  
 A cool, calm breeze hath crept into my room,  
 Which gently stirs my curtained solitude,  
 And shoots in little spies of vague, grey light  
 As harbingers of day, while in the far,  
 Still distance I can hear the chirp of birds,  
 Which herald his approach, Welcome bright day !  
 Welcome, O happiest day !

In “Orpheus, and other Poems,”<sup>5</sup> Mr. Alfred Emery proves that he can write pleasant verse on the graver aspects of Nature. There are some lines in “A Midnight Effusion,” “The Birth of Music,” and in “Stanzas to Night,” which display some originality and perhaps justify publication.

“Poems,”<sup>6</sup> by Jamnin Willsbro, are of that bolder kind which are contentedly and unblushingly non-poetical. In a long poem on “International Copyright,” Mr. Willsbro compares publishers to

<sup>4</sup> “Julian : a Tragedy in Five Acts.” By J. M. W. Schwartz. London : Remington & Co., Henrietta Street, Covent Garden. 1886.

<sup>5</sup> “Orpheus, and other Poems.” By Alfred Emery. London : T. Fisher Unwin, 26, Paternoster Square. 1885.

<sup>6</sup> “Poems by Jamnin Willsbro.” Philadelphia : Benjamin F. Lacy. 1885.

pirates. Let him take heart of grace. No British publisher will ever pirate *him*.

We can make nothing of "Vagrant Viator"<sup>7</sup>—Erin go Bragh. The author must be the proverbial *mad* Irishman.

"Election Lyrics,"<sup>8</sup> and "During Twelve Years of Gladstone's Leadership,"<sup>9</sup> by R. L. Clough, are well-meaning exponents of Radical sentiment. They have little or no literary merit.

We hardly think that it falls within our province to notice publications which are literary only in the sense that they contain printed matter. "Frolicsome Girls,"<sup>10</sup> a comedy by Dr. W. H. Benson, may be suitable for travelling companies in the United States, but in that case the long-suffering of provincial audiences must be great indeed. It is perfectly harmless, but, oh, how dull!

"Miscellanies in Prose and Verse,"<sup>11</sup> by William Maginn, will help to make known to the present generation a writer, once prominent in the world of letters, now chiefly remembered as the author of the Lives affixed to Maclise's Sketches, which were published in *Fraser's Magazine*. "Bright, Broken Maginn," the original of Thackeray's Captain Shanden, was a man of much promise and some performance. He could write an essay something after the manner of Elia. He could knock off a parody, a drinking song, a copy of Latin verses, *stans pede in uno*—that is, so long as he could stand. A Tory of the Tories, he was not ashamed to lament "£20,000,000 spent on the greasy Blacks," that is, the emancipation of the Jamaican slaves, or to celebrate in loyal stanzas the visit of George IV. to Ireland. He passes from a receipt for morning sickness after a debauch to an encomium on the Government for spending half-a-million on the building of churches. He discourses dogmatically on the puerilities of Shelley's "Adonais," and the mysteries of runi-punch and toasted cheese. To the modern author who prefers Apollinaris water to steaming jugs of toddy, and confines his literary assaults to a few acid sneers, men of the type of Maginn are more or less of an enigma. His conviviality is no doubt often tedious, and sometimes offensive, but a fade and pessimistic generation would have been none the worse had it inherited a share of his high spirits and good-nature. To writers of the dismal school these volumes may be recommended, whether as a certain punishment or a possible remedy.

A translation of "Master Thaddeus,"<sup>12</sup> the work of Adam Mickie-

<sup>7</sup> "Vagrant Viator," &c. Printed and Published for the Author by Wyman & Sons, 74-76, Great Queen Street, Lincoln's-Inn-Fields, London, W.C.

<sup>8</sup> "Election Lyrics." By R. L. Clough. London: Chapman & Hall (Limited). 1885.

<sup>9</sup> "During Twelve Years of Gladstone's Leadership." By R. L. Clough. London: Chapman & Hall, Limited. 1885.

<sup>10</sup> "Frolicsome Girls: a Comedy." By Dr. W. H. Benson. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1884.

<sup>11</sup> "Miscellanies: Prose and Verse." By William Maginn. Edited by R. W. Montagu. Two volumes. London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle & Rivington, Crown Buildings, 188, Fleet Street, E.C. 1885.

<sup>12</sup> "Master Thaddeus." By Adam Mickiewicz. Translated by Maude Ashurst Biggs. In two volumes. London: Trubner & Co., Ludgate Hill. 1885.

wicz, the illustrious Polish exile, by Miss Maude Biggs, may be studied with interest. This work, which, we are told in the preface, is to the Pole what the "Iliad" is to the Greek, the "Niebelungen" to the German, &c., gives a picture of provincial life in republican Poland previous to Napoleon's invasion in 1812. Whether it be due to the untranslatable character of the Polish idioms, or to the subject-matter of the original, we cannot say, but the picture of manners presented to the reader has a strangeness and a peculiarity compared with which the "Odyssey," or the "Book of Ruth," are modern and commonplace. We are reminded now of "Wilhelm Meister," now of the "Pickwick Papers," and now of "Alice in Wonderland." A critical essay, with a few passages done into English, would enable the uninitiated reader to form a better judgment of the original than a literal version of the entire epic. The translator has grappled manfully with the difficulties which beset her path, but she has not overcome them.

We cannot say that we have read with any lively pleasure "Translations from the Poems of Victor Hugo,"<sup>13</sup> by the Dean of Bocking. Possibly, the great French master defies translation, and in that case it is worse than useless to present him bald, graceless, and ridiculous to readers who know of him as a glorious poet. "Take care," we were going to say of Wordsworth, but "take care" of Mr. Browning himself. A Frenchman who can appreciate Victor Hugo knows that there is a great English poet called Robert Browning. He cannot read him in the original, but by the help of an enlightened criticism he obtains some idea of what his writings consist of. Of a sudden he is presented with, *horrendum dictu*, a French translation of the "Christmas Eve," or "Bishop Blougram's Apology," and he very naturally concludes that the great English poet is less than he had imagined. So it is with these translations. They are all very well, but they uncrown Victor Hugo.

If Edgar Poe's "Raven"<sup>14</sup> be not "the most popular lyrical poem in the world," it is one of the most remarkable poems of the age, and well deserves all the honours of a classic. Mr. John H. Ingram devotes an entire volume to a commentary on the "Raven," in which he includes a history and critical examination of the poem, translations into French (Et le corbeau répond: "Never more"), German, Hungarian, and Latin, and numerous parodies of very varying merit. We deprecate the white vellum binding with its smart red lettering. Surely the "ungainly fowl" should croak between sable covers. \*

A "Handbook of Poetics"<sup>15</sup> will be read with pleasure by lovers of

<sup>13</sup> "Translations from the Poems of Victor Hugo." By Henry Carrington, M.A., Dean of Bocking. London: Walter Scott, 24, Warwick Lane, Paternoster Row, and Newcastle-on-Tyne. 1885.

<sup>14</sup> "The Raven." By Edgar Allan Poe. With Literary and Historical Commentary by John B. Ingram. London: George Redway, York Street, Covent Garden. 1885.

<sup>15</sup> "A Handbook of Poetics for Students of English Verse." By Francis B. Gunnere, Ph.D. Boston: Ginn & Co.; London: Trubner & Co. 1885.

poetry, and may be of service to critics. This little work, which betrays an intimate knowledge of English poets, contains much useful information, and is singularly free either from dogmatism or affectation.

We have to acknowledge a laborious work on the "Iliad," of Homer,<sup>16</sup> from the pen of Professor August Fick. A reconstruction of the "Iliad" is attempted on the original lines of the "Wrath of Achilles," together with a reproduction of the original Æolic text.

From America we have a revised edition of Messrs. Allen & Greenough's excellent edition of "Cæsar's Gallic War."<sup>17</sup> The Maps, the Illustrated Notes, and the ample Vocabulary are distinguishing features.

Messrs. Macmillan add to their Classical Series an edition of Livy,<sup>18</sup> Books xxiii. and xxiv., by G. C. Macaulay, M.A. A triple introduction on the text of the edition, the sources of the narrative, and historical position will be of value to the advanced student. There are critical notes at the end of the volume.

To their series of Elementary Classics, the latest addition is the "Prometheus Vincituo"<sup>19</sup> of Æschylus, with Notes and a Vocabulary, edited by H. M. Stephenson, M.A. A clearly worded analysis of the play is also given. We do not admire the black and closely printed Greek type.

From Macmillan's Primary Series we have received "La jeune Sibérienne," et "Le Lépreux de la Cité d'Aoste,"<sup>20</sup> by Xavier de Maistre, with Introduction, Notes and Vocabulary by M. Stéphane Barlet. The two narratives selected are well chosen, both as specimens of the style of Xavier de Maistre, and for their intrinsic interest. M. Barlet's Introduction and Notes are very good.

We have also received from the same useful series, "The Brothers Grimm," "Kinder und Hausmärchen,"<sup>21</sup> with Notes and Introduction by G. Fasnacht.

Messrs. Macmillan are also issuing a series of educational works which they name "Classical Writers."<sup>22</sup> The aim is to supply the student with full information as to the lives of classical writers, the circumstances under which they wrote, and the general object of their

<sup>16</sup> "Die Homerische Ilias nach ihrer entstehung betrachtet und in der ursprünglichen sprach form wiederhergestellt." Von August Fick. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht's Verlag. 1885.

<sup>17</sup> "Cæsar's Gallic War." Edited by J. H. and W. F. Allen and J. B. Greenough. Revised by H. P. Judson. Boston: Ginn & Co. 1885. London: Trubner & Co.

<sup>18</sup> "Livy, Books XXII. and XXIV." Edited with Introduction and Notes by G. C. Macaulay, M.A. With Maps. London: Macmillan & Co. 1885.

<sup>19</sup> "Æschyli Prometheus Vincituo." Edited with Notes and a Vocabulary by Rev. H. M. Stephenson, M.A. London: Macmillan & Co. 1885.

<sup>20</sup> "Macmillan's Primary Series." French and German Reading Books. Xavier de Maistre, "La jeune Sibérienne," et "Le Lépreux de la Cité d'Aoste," Stéphane Barlet.

<sup>21</sup> "The Brothers Grimm." "Kinder und Hausmärchen, with Notes and Vocabularies by G. Eugène Fasnacht, Ed. Macmillan's Series of Foreign Classics." London: Macmillan & Co. 1885.

<sup>22</sup> "Classical Writers." Edited by John Richard Green. "Sophocles." By Lewis Campbell, M.A., LL.D. London: Macmillan & Co. 1879.

writings. Sophocles was entrusted to Professor Lewis Campbell, and we need not say how admirable a treatise he has compiled. The translations from the fragments of the lost plays will be read with especial interest.

We have also to acknowledge an admirable translation of Corneille's "Polyeucte"<sup>23</sup> into English blank verse, by Walter Federan Nokes. The translation is interleaved with the French text; and "Select Poems of Goethe,"<sup>24</sup> with Notes by Professor E. A. Sonnenschein and Professor A. Pogatscher. The Notes are scholarly and interesting, and display wide literary knowledge.

From the Clarendon Press Series we have selections from Sainte-Beuve's "Causeries du Lundi,"<sup>25</sup> edited by Mr. G. Saintsbury, whose name is a sufficient guarantee for the wisdom of the selection and the insight and appreciativeness to be found in the introductory notice. For Sainte-Beuve himself, heretical as such a confession will be deemed, we must own that we do not altogether share the enthusiasm which his critical writings generally awaken. If we dared, we should qualify him as a *phraseur*. His criticisms are at once "yea" and "nay." He knocks his author down with one hand, and with the other places him on a pedestal. The whole of his long "Causerie" on Sir Walter Scott really contains less of definite criticism than was compressed by Carlyle into half a dozen words:—"Scott was a supremely healthy man." We shall be told that, in thus recapitulating the evidence for and against, without summing up, Sainte-Beuve did but follow his method, and that his was the best of all methods in criticism. For our part, with all due deference to Mr. Saintsbury, we infinitely prefer Taine to Sainte-Beuve, both as a critic and as a writer.

Mr. Chisholm's "Pronouncing Vocabulary of Modern Geographical Names"<sup>26</sup> is a most useful little work. It is impossible to glance over a daily paper without meeting with many names of places that are, to most readers, utterly unpronounceable. By the help of Mr. Chisholm's little book, most of these puzzling 'outlandish names may be easily, fluently, and, for all practical purposes, correctly sounded.

Annandale's "Concise English Dictionary,"<sup>27</sup> based on Ogilvie's "Imperial Dictionary," is a well-arranged and compendious work,

<sup>23</sup> "Corneille's Tragedy Polyeuctus." Translated into English blank verse by Walter Federan Nokes. London: Librairie Hachette et Cie., 18, King William Street, Charing Cross, W.C. 1886.

<sup>24</sup> "Select Poems of Goethe." Edited by Edward A. Sonnenschein, M.A., and Alois Pogatscher. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co., Paternoster Square. 1886.

<sup>25</sup> Clarendon Press Series. Sainte-Beuve. "Causeries du Lundi." Selected and Edited by George Saintsbury. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1885.

<sup>26</sup> "A Pronouncing Vocabulary of Modern Geographical Names, nearly Ten Thousand in number, with Notes on Spelling and Pronunciation," &c. By George Chisholm, M.A., Fellow of the Royal Geographical Society. London, Edinburgh, and Dublin. Blackie & Sons. 1885.

<sup>27</sup> "A Concise Dictionary of the English Language, based on Ogilvie's 'Imperial Dictionary.'" By Charles Annandale, M.A., LL.D. London, Edinburgh, Glasgow and Dublin: Blackie & Sons. 1885.

containing more full and varied information than could reasonably be expected within the compass of a single volume.

The "General Principles of the Structure of Language,"<sup>28</sup> by the Very Rev. the Dean of Clonfert, is a work revealing not only great erudition and vast research, but great ability, and unusual powers of sustained and complex reasoning. It addresses itself, almost exclusively, to a comparatively small class of readers. For it would be idle for any but a professed philologist to offer an opinion as to the value of the theories which it unfolds, or the weight of the arguments by which they are sought to be demonstrated. Dean Byrne's work may be said to end where that of other philologists begins. For whereas such writers as Professor Max Muller, Professor Sayce, Professor Whitney, &c., are content to accept the varieties of human speech as they find them, and occupy themselves with grouping and affiliating them by their affinities with each other, the object of the Dean of Clonfert is to ascertain the causes of their variation, and explain their several peculiarities by considerations of varying mental power and activity, circumstances of life and surroundings, climate, and other differentiating causes, operating on the diverse races of mankind. The work is divided into two parts. The first, which is prefaced by certain necessary definitions and explanations, contains "The deductive study of the action of the causes which tend to affect the structure of language." This the author admits to be purely hypothetical. But in the second book, entitled "Inductive proof of the causes which have determined the structure of language," he submits his hypothesis to the stringent test of the law of concomitant variations. To this end he gives a sketch of the grammars of nearly all the known languages of the world, and, so far as such knowledge is attainable, appends notes of the habits, surroundings, and mental development of the widely diversified races by whom they are spoken. It is to be regretted that in a work which is, in truth, an almost unbroken succession of arguments on subjects which, though familiar to the learned author, are necessarily unfamiliar to most of his readers, he has not illustrated his propositions by more frequent and copious examples. Wanting these, his inductions lose much of their force.

Mr. Shepherd's "History of the English Language"<sup>29</sup> is not only an admirable textbook for advanced students, but a mine of instruction and entertainment for the general reader. Facts the most diverse, bearing on the origin and development of our language, are here brought together from multifarious sources, presented in a thoroughly acceptable and popular form, and enriched by scholarly and enlightened comment. The introductory chapter gives a short outline of the principal divisions of the Indo-European linguistic

<sup>28</sup> "General Principles of the Structure of Language." By James Byrne, M.A., Dean of Clonfert. Two vols. London: Trubner & Co., Ludgate Hill. 1885.

<sup>29</sup> "The History of the English Language from the Teutonic Invasion of Britain to the close of the Georgian Era" By Henry E. Shepherd, M.A., LL.D., President of the College of Charleston, S.C. New York: E. J. Hale & Son; London: Trubner & Co. 1885.

amily. In tracing the ramifications of the Mæso-Gothic, the immediate ancestor of the Old Saxon, the Low German, the Dutch, Flemish, &c., the author falls into two rather curious errors with regard to the last-named language. "The Flemish," he says, "in the thirteenth century was the speech of the Court of Flanders, and has its own records; it is now almost entirely supplanted by the Dutch." As a matter of fact, the literary language of Holland and Flanders is one and the same, whilst the many vernacular dialects of Flemish are neither supplanted by Dutch nor any other language. On the contrary, in each of the old Flemish cities its ancient dialect lives and thrives. In Ghent and Bruges, "Gantois" and "Brugeois" are still the language of every-day life, even among burghers of good condition and education. Entering on the more immediate subject of his work, Mr. Shepherd proceeds to examine the origin and affinities of the Anglo-Saxon. It cannot, he says, be identified with any continental speech, past or present, though its nearest congeners are the Dutch, Low German, and the Friesian. It was, in truth, a blend formed in England itself, "by the fusion of many dialects and clans, in proportions which cannot be accurately determined, and whose geographical position comprehended all that part of Germany between the Rhine and the Eider, with the contiguous countries, Holland and Denmark." We have always felt convinced that the speech of the conquering Teutons suffered deeper and more important modifications from admixture with the Celtic tongue of the conquered Britons than it has been the fashion among English and German philologists to admit, and we are glad to find our opinion shared by so eminent an authority as the author of the present work. He says: "It is a prevalent misapprehension that the Kelts, the primitive inhabitants of Britain, were almost extirpated by the Saxon invaders, and that the language and the people faded away without leaving a perceptible impression upon the tongues and the nationalities by which they were supplanted. But this is at variance with the facts. Many local names in England, and some in America, attest the influence of the Keltic races, and remind us forcibly of their long sway in those lands in which English is now the dominant speech; while the number of designations of the most common articles, occurring in every day's ordinary intercourse, strikingly recalls their memory and their presence." From them, too, the Anglo-Saxon received its first tincture of Roman words and ideas. "We discover," says Mr. Shepherd, "that a considerable number of words, names of trees, herbs, designations of weights and measures, and of the ordinary appliances of daily life, were introduced into the Keltic tongue from Rome, transferred to the Anglo-Saxon invaders by the Romanized Britons, and are thus perpetuated in the vocabulary of the English language." Of the more copious Latin stream which subsequently flowed into our language through the Norman-French it is needless to speak. The fact is patent, and admitted on all hands; but we think it will be new to most readers who are not professed students of language, that in modern English the Romance words



far outnumber those of Anglo-Saxon origin, and that, among the monosyllabic words which constitute a striking feature in our speech, a large proportion come, not from the Anglo-Saxon, but from Latin, either directly or through the French. In the slow and gradual evolution of English out of Anglo-Saxon, all things seem to have worked together for good. The Norman Conquest, by removing from the Anglo-Saxon the conservative influence of culture, greatly facilitated the process of phonetic decay. Its use being confined to the illiterate masses, it quickly lost both its fixity of pronunciation, and, what was of far greater importance, its terminations, so that when, about the middle of the fourteenth century, it awoke from its long sleep of obscurity and neglect, and became once more the dominant national speech, it had changed from an inflectional into an analytical language. And now the amalgamating process, which, out of two hitherto hostile elements—Saxon and Norman—produced modern English, may be said to have begun. The new-born tongue, while still in an unstable and semi-fluid stage, was moulded and fashioned by the master hands of Wycliffe, of Chaucer, and of Gower. Its vocabulary was continually enlarged and enriched by contributions from the most diverse and heterogeneous sources, till now there enters into the composition of modern English (to quote once more from Mr. Shepherd),

a greater diversity of languages than has ever entered into the formation of any other speech. . . . Thus, while it is the cause of its comprehensiveness, versatility and far-reaching adaptation, affords also the satisfactory explanation of its complexity, its anomalous orthoepy, its discrepant orthography, its seeming transgressions of grammatical prescriptions. They constitute part of the exuberant wealth of our tongue; they have resulted from the peculiar historical conditions under which it was developed and matured.

Dr. Codrington's book on "The Melanesian Languages"<sup>30</sup> is a modest and unpretending contribution to linguistic science which will be duly prized by philologists. Melanesia is defined in the "Encyclopædia Britannica" as comprising "that long belt of island groups which, beginning in the Indian archipelago at the east limits of the region there occupied by the Malay race, runs south-east for a distance of some 3,500 English miles—*i.e.*, from New Guinea at the equator in 130° E. longitude to New Caledonia, just within the tropic in 167° E. longitude, and eastwards to Fiji in 180°." Dr. Codrington, as a member of the Melanesian Mission, has had unusually good opportunities for studying and comparing the languages and dialects of the widely scattered group of islands of whose speech he treats. He claims for the Melanesian languages (1) that they are homogeneous, and (2) that they belong to a common stock with the Ocean tongues generally—those of Polynesia and of the Indian archipelago. His contention must be left to specialists to decide; but to us it seems that in the present volume Dr Codrington has brought together a formidable mass of evidence in its favour.

<sup>30</sup> "The Melanesian Languages." By R. H. Codrington, D.D. Oxford: The Clarendon Press. 1885.

The central idea of "Introductory Studies in Greek Art,"<sup>21</sup> by Jane E. Harrison, is ideality in art, as contrasted with realism on the one hand, and symbolism on the other. The earlier chapters give an *aperçu* of Egyptian, Assyrian, and Phœnician art, with some hint as to the manner and degree in which Greek art has been affected by their influence. Thence we follow the rise and development of Greek sculpture in its two branches, decorative art, and fine art (the author prefers the term "expressive art"), from its rude beginnings, as seen in the Metope of Selinus Temple in the museum of Palermo, to its culmination in the matchless creations of Phidias of which, unhappily, no perfect and well-authenticated example remains to us. For of the pediment sculptures, the metopes, and the frieze of the Parthenon, our author bids us remember "that there is no single figure, no particular slab; on which we can lay our hand and say, 'This is the work of Phidias.'" After a minute analysis of the qualities which have made the sculptures on the Parthenon at once the admiration and the despair of all modern artists, the author proceeds to develop her theory of what we have said is the central idea of the book—ideality in art. Plato is quoted at considerable length, and his theory of ideas and faculties surviving as reminiscences from a previous existence translated into modern scientific terminology by the more widely diffused idea of inheritance. Miss (or Mrs.) J. Harrison's book is pleasantly written without affectation of style, unless indeed its sedulous simplicity is itself an affectation. The manner of treatment is more that of a lecturer addressing an audience, or, to speak more exactly, a professor lucidly explaining to a class, than that of an author writing for a more or less instructed public.

We have received from Messrs. Kegan Paul a very elegant parchment-bound volume entitled "Specimens of English Prose."<sup>22</sup> The name of Mr. George Saintsbury on the title-page is a guarantee for the excellence of the selection. His endeavour "has been," as we learn from the preface, "to provide, not a book of beauties, but a collection of characteristic examples of written style." The collection extends from the introduction into England of printing down to the middle of the present century, and includes nearly all the great names in English prose literature within that period. Each example is headed by a short biographical notice, from the pen of Mr. Saintsbury, of the writer from whose works the example is taken, and the text, wherever obscure, is elucidated by footnotes. Not the least interesting portion of the volume is Mr. Saintsbury's Introductory Essay "on English Prose Style." It is a masterly exposition of the principles on which excellence in prose composition depends. A sound theory of English prose writing is greatly needed in the present day, and Mr. George Saintsbury is eminently qualified to supply it.

<sup>21</sup> "Introductory Studies in Greek Art." By Jane E. Harrison. With Map and Illustrations. London. T. Fisher Unwin, Paternoster Square. 1885.

<sup>22</sup> "Specimens of English Prose Style, from Malloy to Macaulay, with an Introductory Essay, by George Saintsbury." London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1885.

"Modern English Sports: their Use and their Abuse,"<sup>33</sup> by Mr. Frederick Gale, is a pleasant, genial, sensible book—just such a book, in fact, as one might expect from the owner of the well-favoured, manly face which looks out on us from the frontispiece. Mr. Gale is not one of the *empêcheurs de danser en rond* of whom there are too many nowadays. On the contrary, he would have every one enjoy himself in his own way, with the one proviso, that he shall allow the same privilege to his neighbours. Thus he has not a word to say against *battue*-shooting, though, for his own part, he greatly prefers shooting over a well-trained dog to having the game put up in droves by a serried line of beaters. But he protests most emphatically against two abuses which have sprung from *battues*, the systematic sale of game by land-owners, and the closing of old-established footpaths. Of every sport he knows something—at many he is an adept—and of all he has some pleasant anecdote to relate, or some wise word of warning to bestow against the jealousy, selfishness, and, above all, the commercial spirit which are the bane of all true sport.

"That very Mab"<sup>34</sup> is rather a bewildering book. For the first few pages it seems to be intended for a serio-comic modern fairy tale, or perhaps a grave and grandiloquent book of nonsense. But it is, in reality, an universal satire on every phase of modern life. We confess we do not see much good in such books; they are not likely to reform any of the errors, abuses, or absurdities which they satirize, nor are they amusing. They may form for their writers a comfortable outlet for those sub-acid humours from which, we are told, Mr. Shandy habitually suffered. But their effect on the reader is unmistakably depressing. No doubt "That very Mab" is clever *jusqu'à un certain point*, but unless the author could make it a great deal cleverer and more brilliant than it is, we should have preferred his leaving it unwritten, for as it stands, it is a weariness unto the flesh.

Dr. Fothergill's book on "The Will Power"<sup>35</sup> is written with a good purpose, and the truths which it teaches are, without doubt, useful truths. It is, moreover, copiously illustrated by examples drawn from history and from fiction, and this makes it pleasant reading. Yet, as a logical treatise, it is not without defects. It is rambling in its treatment, and, from this cause, often seems confused. As examples of will power, men are chosen, who, though they possessed strength of will, owed their success to other qualities quite independent of it. Some confusion seems to exist in the mind of the author between the power of imposing one's will on others, and the power of sternly repressing one's own appetites and desires. These two qualities are quite distinct, and are, indeed, more frequently found separately than in combination. The one goes to the making of saints, of martyrs, of

<sup>33</sup> "Modern English Sports: their Use and their Abuse." By Frederick Gale (The Old Buffer). Sampson Low & Co., Crown Buildings, Fleet Street. 1885.

<sup>34</sup> "That very Mab." Longmans, Green & Co. 1885.

<sup>35</sup> "The Will Power: its Range in Action," By J. Milner Fothergill, M.D. London: Hodder & Stoughton, Paternoster Row. 1885.

ascetics; the other creates great leaders, great rulers—masterful men. Yet another point on which Dr. Fothergill is not quite at one with himself is the overpowering influence of heredity, which he fully endorses, while telling us in the next chapter that “a man may not have great talents, but he can take pains if he chooses.” We venture to think that, on the author’s own showing, even though a man did possess great talents, he could not “take pains” unless he had that especial talent. In other words, a man cannot stubbornly persist in the face of difficulties, unless he is gifted with a stubborn will. Notwithstanding these slight flaws in its dialectical completeness, “The Will Power” is both a pleasant and a useful book.

Among the “Dramatic Essays”<sup>36</sup> of Charles Lamb collected and commented on by Mr. Percy Fitzgerald, by far the pleasantest is that “On some of the Old Actors.” It is full of personal reminiscences of actors such as Bentley, Dodd, “Dicky” Suett, the two Palmers, &c., only the echo of whose fame has come down to us. The next essay is also very bright and *spirituel*; it is on “The Artificial Comedy of the last Century.” Lamb cleverly and amusingly defends the comedies of Congrève, Wycherley, and Farquhar from the charge of immorality. He says, with some truth, that it is not so much that they are contrary to morality as that they float in an unreal world where morality and immorality are alike unknown. But this shocks Mr. Fitzgerald. Not even from “Elia” can he endure such licentious sentiments. As most of our readers will remember, the greater part of Lamb’s dramatic criticism turns on Shakespeare. Some of his remarks show considerable insight; others seem to us to be hypercritical and unreal. We suspect that all the critical writings of “Elia” owe more to their form than to their substance. In any case, his paradoxical, though occasionally brilliant, lucubrations form but a flimsy text for Mr. Fitzgerald’s somewhat matter-of-fact commentaries. But the case is worse when the commentator, releasing Lamb, himself lays hands on Shakespeare, treating Hamlet’s advice to the players like a mathematical problem to be demonstrated by the help of alphabetical sections, extending from “a” all the way down to “f.” Shakespeare’s text seems to turn limp under such heavy handling. A little of the same laborious care would not have been ill-bestowed on the correction of the press. It is rare to see an English book so disfigured by typographical errors as is this volume of Mr. Fitzgerald’s.

With the exception of the stories for children from which it takes its name, Mr. Ainger’s volume<sup>37</sup> consists of selections from the writings of Charles Lamb, mainly taken, as we learn from the introduction, from a volume published at Boston in 1864 by the late Mr. J. E. Babson, under the title of “Elia, being the hitherto uncollected

<sup>36</sup> “The Art of the Stage as set out in Lamb’s Dramatic Essays; with a Commentary by Percy Fitzgerald, M.A., F.S.A.” London: Remington & Co. 1885.

<sup>37</sup> “Mrs. Leicester’s School, and other writings in Prose and Verse.” By Charles Lamb. With Introduction and Notes by Alfred Ainger. London: Macmillan & Co. 1885.

writings of Charles Lamb." But Mr. Ainger does not take the view of editorial responsibility set forth by Lamb's transatlantic admirer. Mr. Babson went on the principle of publishing every obtainable scrap and fragment of his author's writing. Mr. Ainger wisely holds that "every writer of mark leaves behind him shreds and remnants," some worthy of preservation, and others not. He has, we think, made a judicious choice in the present volume, both as regards what he has rejected and what he has retained.

"Fresh Fields,"<sup>38</sup> by Mr. John Burroughs, is a welcome addition to Mr. David Douglas's series of American authors. Mr. Burroughs is *sui generis* as a writer. Many men write about pleasant things, and discuss them more or less pleasantly. But we know no one who has at once such thoughts to express as Mr. Burroughs and such a meticulous power of expression. His thought is infinitely varied. He is by turns philosophic, descriptive, critical, whimsical, and humorous; and his language is an instrument of the most astonishing flexibility, compass, power, and sweetness. It is like the violin in the hands of a master. He has the enviable gift of expressing his exact thoughts even to the finest *nuance*, and always in a manner that charms a critical reader. His chapters on English rural scenes are inimitable; his topographical descriptions are almost like seeing the places described. The latter part of the volume ("A Sunday in Cheyne Row") is devoted to a critique on Carlyle, which, while glowing with enthusiastic admiration, is yet the closest, the most truly critical, and the most adequate of any we have seen. Of course Mr. Burroughs is in honour bound to defend American democracy from the scathing attacks of Carlyle, and he does it with great skill. But we are sure that he must see, as we do, that Carlyle, who was not a philosopher but a seer, often reached the right conclusion, though when he came to give a reason for the faith that was in him his reasons and reasonings were detestable. One who, like Carlyle, could see to the very depths of human character—who "could judge a man as a jockey does a horse"—had, we cannot but think, a wondrous insight into all human affairs, and a strange weird instinct as to whither they were tending. We believe, with Carlyle, that the majority will ever be ruled, under whatever form of government. Indeed, Mr. Burroughs shares this belief. The danger in an unchecked democracy is, to our mind, that they may be ruled rather by flattery and appeals to self-interest, than through their convictions or their moral sense. Lord Chesterfield said that all assemblies—even the House of Lords of his day—were mobs, and the man who desired to sway them must address himself not to their reason, but to their eyes, to their ears, to their prejudices, and their pockets.

"A Social Experiment,"<sup>39</sup> by A. E. P. Searing, is a clever little story, but profoundly sad. It is the history of a girl transplanted by the caprice of a fine lady from a humble sphere, superficially educated,

<sup>38</sup> "Fresh Fields." By John Burroughs. Edinburgh: David Douglas. 1885.

<sup>39</sup> "A Social Experiment." By A. E. P. Searing. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1885.

and introduced to all the glitter and luxury of New York fashionable society. When, as is inevitable, the plaything becomes a rival, she is quickly restored to her native atmosphere of poverty and squalor. But she fails to become acclimatized, and sinks under the hardships and drudgery of a life for which she has become entirely unfitted. The working people who figure in the story are well drawn, but the artistic and fashionable fine ladies and gentlemen are, as is so often the case in American society novels, *superfine* rather than really refined.

"The Rise of Silas Lapham,"<sup>40</sup> seems a misnomer for the narrative of a rapid descent from the height of prosperity to hopeless insolvency. In any case, whether rightly or wrongly named, "Silas Lapham" is a charming book—almost as charming as anything Mr. Howells has written; certainly quite as clever. Silas himself is a most interesting creation; not that he is an invention, like some of Dickens's creations—a mere eccentric character part. No doubt Silas Lapham is a well-known American type, just as the "Nabab" was a type; but both are, nevertheless, creations of no common kind. There is a certain resemblance between them, and Mr. Howells's hero is not unworthy of comparison with Daudet's. There are other characters in the story any one of which might make the fortune of an ordinary novel. The eldest daughter, Penelope, is a most artistic and fascinating study. There are few like it in fiction. The whole of the *dramatis personæ* are admirable, forming, as it were, a gallery of illustration of various phases of transatlantic life and manners; and, what is more difficult to do and even better worth doing, throwing light on many an obscure corner of human consciousness. The story does not seem to us nearly so good as the delineation of character. Each individual scene and incident is natural in itself and naturally brought about; but it is with the general structure that we are dissatisfied. It is like a landscape with a mountain on one side and nothing on the other to balance it. The grouping is defective. We are promised an ascent—"The Rise of Silas Lapham"—and as a matter of fact the story's course is all down hill, ending in gloom and bankruptcy. This cannot be an inadvertence on the part of such an artist as Mr. Howells. No doubt it is intended, and contains a subtle lesson, but our eyes are sealed and we cannot see it.

Anglo-Saxon scholars will welcome a new edition of the "Andreas; a Legend of St. Andrew,"<sup>41</sup> edited, with critical notes and glossary, by Mr. W. M. Baskervill, Professor of English at the Vanderbilt University.

We have also received "A Handy Anglo-Saxon Dictionary,"<sup>42</sup> edited by Professor Baskervill in collaboration with Mr. J. A.

<sup>40</sup> "The Rise of Silas Lapham." By William D. Howells. Edinburgh: David Douglas. 1885.

<sup>41</sup> "Andreas: a Legend of St. Andrew." By W. M. Baskervill. Boston: published by Ginn & Co. 1885.

<sup>42</sup> "A Handy Anglo-Saxon Dictionary." By James A. Harrison. Trubner & Co., Ludgate Hill. 1885.

Harrison, Professor of English and Modern Languages in Washington and Lee University, Virginia.

"Only a Girl"<sup>43</sup> is an interesting tale in one volume. Several of the characters are overdrawn and improbable. The villain is all but impossibly villainous, and his sister is little better, though in the interest of the *dénouement* she most unexpectedly turns over a new leaf and ranges herself on virtue's side, to the utter discomfiture of the poor villain, who is finally disposed of by the breaking of the ice during a skating party. Still, though some of the incidents are inartificial, and the delineation of character not altogether artistic, it is a pleasant and amusing story. The heroine herself, and her true lover, Major von Edelstein, are highly sympathetic personages.

"Commonplace Sinners"<sup>44</sup> is the somewhat unhappily chosen title of a novel which treats of some of the most wildly eccentric characters who ever issued from the brain of a young authoress, whose personages are the result of invention rather than observation. There are flashes of cleverness scattered over the book, but it is a most unequal and faulty performance.

"A Strange Marriage"<sup>45</sup> has the merit of an entirely unhackneyed plot, well worked out. The characters are but slightly sketched, for it is a short story; but they are, nevertheless, interesting and sympathetic. There are some extremely pretty and natural scenes, especially the whimsical yet touching love scene which is the culminating point of the story, and the immediate cause of the "strange marriage." The minor parts are well sustained, and both the dialect and turn of thought and expression of the Scotch lower class are admirably rendered.

"Adrian Vidal"<sup>46</sup> is a clever, well-written book, but it cannot be called a good novel. The author, Mr. W. E. Norris, manages to eliminate every scrap of romance from whatever he touches. He depicts life, under many aspects, with considerable fidelity. But he depicts it as, in all probability, he sees it, and, as seen through his eyes, life wears the *terne*, dreary colouring of a landscape viewed through the medium of blue spectacles. Such a writer may produce telling essays, all the more useful in that they are dispassionate; but without romance to throw its glamour over this work-a-day world, it is impossible to write a good novel. It is owing to this radical defect that the characters, one and all, fail to interest. We are told that the hero and heroine are unusually handsome, and, in their several ways, attractive, but their fascinations leave the reader cold and indifferent. The heroine excites hardly any feeling but one of mild disapproval,

<sup>43</sup> "Only a Girl. A Novel." By Miss Emma Mary Ross. One vol. London: Remington & Co., Henrietta Street, Covent Garden. 1885.

<sup>44</sup> "Commonplace Sinners: A Novel." Two vols. By the Author of "My Heart and I." Remington & Co., Henrietta Street, Covent Garden. 1885.

<sup>45</sup> "The Story of a Strange Marriage." By Helen Falconer. Two vols. Remington & Co., Henrietta Street, Covent Garden. 1885.

<sup>46</sup> "Adrian Vidal" By W. E. Norris. Three vols. Smith, Elder & Co., Waterloo Place. 1885.

THE  
WESTMINSTER  
AND  
FOREIGN QUARTERLY  
REVIEW.

JULY, 1886.

ART. I.—THE ENDOWMENTS OF THE CHURCH OF  
ENGLAND.

1. *Disestablishment and Disendowment: What are they?* By EDWARD A. FREEMAN, D.C.L., LL.D., Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford. Reprinted, with additions, from the *Pall Mall Gazette*. Third Edition. London: Macmillan & Co. 1885.
2. *Disestablishment and Disendowment*. By the DEAN OF WELLS. The *Contemporary Review*, December 1885.

FROM the ancient cathedral city of Wells two voices have recently spoken to us upon the subject of Church Endowments—the voice of a Professor, and the voice of a Dean. Both speak with the object of guiding us to a right opinion upon those preliminary matters which we must consider before approaching the practical details of any scheme of disestablishment. Professor Freeman has published in pamphlet form a third edition of his well-known papers upon this burning question. Dean Plumptre has written a very temperate and a very excellent article in the *Contemporary Review*.

Mr. Freeman's object, as he tells us in his preface, "is simply to clear away confusions on both sides, and to enable both sides to discuss more easily the really simple ground of controversy between them." Captious critics might, perhaps, cavil at the idea of *discussing a ground*, but it is with Mr. Freeman's arguments only that we are concerned. Mr. Freeman lays down



his pen with the air of a man whose thought may be thus imagined: "There, I have cleared away the brambles and nettles at the root. The ground is clear. Now decide, upon full view, whether the tree shall stand or fall." And yet, with the most unfeigned respect for so high an authority, and with sincere appreciation of the spirit in which he deals with his subject, we venture to think that some little confusion will still remain upon the mind of the reader of this pamphlet, unless he takes the trouble to examine the statements and propositions therein contained with more than ordinary care.

Mr. Freeman's purpose is to clear the question from the fallacies which beset the arguments of loose thinkers on both sides:—

One side [he writes, p. 12] says that the State may meddle with Church property, because it is "national property;" the other side says that the State may not meddle with Church property, because it is something too sacred to be meddled with. Yet it is perfectly certain, on the one hand, that Church property is not national property in the sense which the disputants mean; and it is equally certain, on the other hand, that no power can so tie up or dedicate anything as to bar the *right* of the supreme power to deal with it. Both these misconceptions on opposite sides must be got rid of before the question can be fairly argued.

Mr. Freeman therefore proceeds to lay down a principle, and it is this: "The one true principle is, that the State—meaning by the State, King, Lords, and Commons—has the same *right* to deal with the Church which it has to deal with anything else."

We have italicized the word *right* in both these quotations. It is a word freely used by Mr. Freeman. For example (p. 13):

Whenever the State deems the *rights* either of individuals or of corporations ought to give way to the general interest of the whole community, it has a *right* to decree that they shall give way to it.

Or again (p. 24):

The supreme power has freely exercised a *right* which is inherent in it as the supreme power, the *right* to deal with ecclesiastical property as it may deal with anything else.

And (p. 23):

This *right* of disendowment—as of doing anything—is inherent in the supreme power.

And (p. 46):

The supreme power, on good cause being shown, may legislate about [the Church establishment] in any way, as it has often legislated already. But the supreme power has the *right* so to do, not because of any particular bargain or agreement or special act of any kind, but simply because, being the supreme power, it has, within the limits which we spoke of before, the *right* to do anything.

Now with the exception of the word *nature*, there is, we suppose, no word which has been such a fertile source of confusion and misconception as this word *right*. Mr. Freeman does not define what he means by it, but it is clear that he has in view a *legal* as distinct from a *moral* right, for he speaks at the outset (p. 10) of

the simple principle that, in every political community the supreme power of the State, wherever that supreme power may be placed, may do whatever it thinks good. We say this [he continues] of course, with the necessary limitations, both physical and moral. A law may be, as we hold, unjust; this means that, if we were members of the assembly in which that law was passed, we should vote against it. Or, at the outside, it means that we should deem it our duty to resist the law in obedience to some supposed higher law. . . . Disestablishment and disendowment are therefore acts which may be either just or unjust. If they cannot be shown to be for the common good of the nation, they are unjust acts; but they are acts which, if done by the supreme power, are perfectly lawful. They are acts which it is open to King, Lords, and Commons to do whenever they think good.

Little exception can be taken to this, so far as it goes; but will it do much towards clearing away the cobwebs? To say that the supreme power has a legal right to disestablish and disendow the Church is no more than saying that the legislative body may lawfully make laws. When we say that a man has a legal right to do anything, we simply mean that the State, with all the powers at its command, will support him in doing the act in question, and will secure to him a remedy against anybody who interferes with him in so doing; and when we say that the supreme power has a right to do whatever it thinks good, we mean no more than that the supreme power, being the supreme power, is able to make what laws it pleases, and to enforce them. A legal right is found to rest ultimately upon force. But that is not the kind of right which is intended by those who affirm or deny that the State has a right to disestablish and disendow the Church. It is the *moral* right to which they appeal. If we are asked what we mean by a moral right, it is quite sufficient to answer that, in our view, the State acts in accordance with moral right so long as it acts for the welfare of the community at large. Laws which tend to promote the greatest happiness of the greatest number are made in accordance with moral as well as with legal right. Mr. Freeman, in reply to the question, "Has not the State a right to deal with corporate property which it has not to deal with private property?" (p. 15) answers:

In strictness there is no difference as to the right itself, but there is a difference of great importance as to the exercise of that right. That

the owner," will probably be the reply of the orthodox disputant. Very well, we answer; then, tell us what you mean by "the Church." Now, upon carefully considering Mr. Freeman's pamphlet, it will be found that the distinguished author uses the term "the Church" in three distinct senses—viz., (1) a number of ecclesiastical corporations, sole and aggregate; (2) the nation ecclesiastically organized; (3) one religious body among many. Thus, to give an example of No. (2) and No. (3), Mr. Freeman writes (p. 39):

*"The Church, then, was established—or, more truly, the Church grew up—because it was the nation in one of its aspects. The ministers of the Church were national officers for one set of purposes, enjoying the rights and privileges, and subject to the responsibilities, of national officers. The Church was strictly the nation."*

And again (at p. 48):

By disestablishment must be understood the repeal of all laws which, whether for purposes of privilege or for purposes of control, make any difference between the Established Church—that is, the religious body which once was co-extensive with the nation—and those other religious bodies whose growth has caused it to be no longer co-extensive with the nation. The argument in favour of such a course would seem to be this:—*As long as the Church was co-extensive with the nation, it was no more than reasonable that the State should legislate about ecclesiastical matters in the same way that it legislates about any other national institution. It was not more than reasonable that the members and ministers of the Church—that is, the nation, and its office-bearers in its religious aspect—should enjoy such privileges and be subject to such control as the wisdom of the Legislature might from time to time think fit. But now that the Church is no longer co-extensive with the nation, now that it has ceased to be the nation in its religious aspect, now that it is only one religious body among many, there is, it may be argued, no longer any reason why it should enjoy any privileges which are not enjoyed by other religious bodies, or why it should be subject to any control to which other religious bodies are not subject.*

But it is not in sense (2) or in sense (3) that, as we are told by Mr. Freeman and the Dean of Wells, "the Church" is the owner of the ecclesiastical endowments. These, says Dean Plumtre, "were not, with the actual exception of the fractional portion that came directly by gift from the Crown or by grant from Parliament, and the possible exception of tithes, given *in any sense* by the nation, or to the nation, or to the Church as a society, then conterminous with the nation." And after referring Liberationist advocates to Mr. Freeman's pamphlet, he proceeds: "In regard to all land endowments the facts are so plain that he who runs may read them. They were

given or bequeathed by the Crown, or individual proprietors, not to the Church at large, for the Church at large has never been a corporate society capable of holding property, but to abbeys or cathedrals, which were corporate bodies with that capacity, or to the rectors and vicars of parishes as corporations sole."

Similarly Mr. Freeman (p. 16) :

Church property is not "national property," except in the same sense in which all property is national property. . . . People talk as if "Church property" was the property of one vast corporation called "the Church." In truth, it is simply the property of the several local churches, the ecclesiastical corporations, sole and aggregate, bishops, chapters, rectors, and vicars, or any other. The Church of England, as a single body, has no property; the property *belongs* to the church of Canterbury, the church of Westminster, the church of little Peddington, or any other. . . . We must fully take in the fact that Church property is not the property of one vast body, but of various local bodies scattered up and down the country. These local bodies, forming corporations sole or aggregate, hold estates which have been acquired at sundry times and in divers manners from the first preaching of Christianity to the English till now.

Here, then, is the answer to our question. The *owners* of Church property are the ecclesiastical corporations, sole and aggregate. This is, of course, perfectly accurate up to a certain point. But let us examine still further. In what sense are these corporations *owners*, and in what manner and for what purpose do they *hold estates*?

Take the case of a corporation sole—the rector of a parish. Are the parish church and churchyard, the glebe and the tithes, *his* property? No doubt the freehold of these things is legally in him, but does *he own* them in the same sense as John Doe, who has recently purchased the freehold of Blackacre, owns his property? Are the parish church and the parish churchyard no more "national property" than Blackacre?

Let us put another question. Did the "pious founders" of these parochial endowments intend them for the benefit of a series of parsons? \* As well might it be said that the founder of a college at one of the universities intended it for the benefit of the Fellows. But let us put aside the "pious founder" (for we confess we care but little what were the intentions of the *τεράπαλαι σποδίη*), and let us look at things as they now exist. It is certain that the parochial endowments do not exist

---

\* We use the term with all due reverence, for "the appellation of parson, however it may be depreciated by the familiar, clownish, and indiscriminate use, is the most legal, most beneficial, and most honourable title that a parish priest can enjoy." (Blackstone's Commentaries.)

for the personal benefit of the parson. For whose benefit, then, do they exist? For the benefit of all persons in the parish who choose to avail themselves of these things, and as anybody may come into the parish, it follows that they exist for the benefit of the community. In other words, we conceive it to be indisputable that all the parochial endowments, and, we may add, the ecclesiastical endowments generally, exist for the benefit of the nation.

Here, then, is the distinction between the ownership of John Doe, tenant in fee simple of Blackacre, and the ownership of the rector of "Little Peddlington." John Doe holds his estate as private property, for his own private uses; whereas, the rector, as corporation sole, holds the parochial endowments for public uses. Similarly, all Church property is held by corporations for public uses. It is held for the benefit of the entire community. It is virtually held *in trust*. The very fact of its being held by corporations is sufficient to show this, for, as it is put in Wharton's "Law Lexicon," "the duty of a corporation is to answer the end of its institution; to enforce which it may be visited, if spiritual, by the ordinary, if lay, by the founder or his representatives." \* A rather remarkable instance (we may note in passing) of the manner in which the State endeavours to enforce these duties in the case of spiritual corporations sole may be seen in the recent Pluralities Acts Amendment Act, 1885 (48 & 49 Vict., c. 54). By this statute, "Ecclesiastical duties" are made to include "not only the regular and due performance of divine service on Sundays and holidays, but also all such duties as any clergyman holding a benefice is bound by law to perform, or the performance of which is solemnly promised by every clergyman of the Church of England at the time of his ordination, and the performance of which shall have been required of him in writing by the bishop;" and under this and former Acts a commission may be issued by the bishops to inquire into any alleged inadequate performance of the ecclesiastical duties of any benefice.

Now, the Dean of Wells himself adopts "the trust theory of church property," which he says "is obviously the only tenable one." "All corporations," he writes, "virtually hold their property in trust," and he states his opinion that "the people of each parish, and especially its poor, are the *cestui que trust* in the case of every endowment—those whose interests, rather than the interests of the trustee, have to be considered." In the

---

\* We are, of course, aware that in early days it was held that a corporation could not be made a trustee for others, since that "which had not a soul" could not be capable of confidence; but this exploded doctrine of law does not, it need hardly be said, affect the proposition that the members of a corporation are virtually trustees of the corporation property.

aggregate, therefore, the *cestui que trust* of all these ecclesiastical corporations is, according to Dean Plumptre's view, the nation;\* and it does seem extraordinary that one holding these views should write in the strong terms which we have quoted concerning those who express the opinion that the endowments of the Church are "national property." The Dean of Wells himself admits that the beneficial owner is to be considered rather than the trustee. And if the beneficial owner is the community at large, then the community for whose benefit these corporations exist (and not the corporations themselves) is to be considered the owner of the property. In other words, the property of the "National Church" is "national property," which strikes one as being not a very unnatural conclusion.

Professor<sup>o</sup> Freeman, however, is found to be in disagreement with the Dean of Wells with regard to the "trust theory," which he dismisses with the following brief and contemptuous notice: "Nor, as we have before now seen it put, is the Church 'trustee for the nation,' surely the oddest notion of *cestui que trust* to be found anywhere." It is, we think, to be regretted that the professor did not condescend to examine the arguments of those who differ from him in this matter, or to state his own; for assuredly a theory which was adopted and upheld by, amongst others, John Stuart Mill, is not to be demolished by the mere *ipse dixit* of any authority, however eminent. It is not, of course, concerning the technical accuracy of the legal terms *trustee* and *cestui que trust*, as applied to the ecclesiastical corporations and the nation, that we are contending. We merely assert that the endowments of the Church are *national* endowments; that they exist, under parliamentary sanction and parliamentary control, for the benefit of the nation, and not for the benefit of the members of certain corporations, sole or aggregate, in whom, as corporations, the freehold of all this property is vested by law. But, further, it seems to us that this "notion of *cestui que trust*" is by no means so "odd" as Mr. Freeman appears to think. The professor has doubtless heard of the division of trusts into *public* and *private*. What are *public* trusts? They are

such as are constituted for the benefit either of the *public at large* or of some considerable portion of it, answering a particular description.

---

\* In the eye of the law it is as true now as it was in the days of Hooker, that "there is not any man of the Church of England but the same man is also a member of the commonwealth, nor any member of the commonwealth which is not also of the Church of England;" or, as Lord Eldon put it, there is "no difference, as to the persons of whom they are composed, between the Church and the State—the Church is the State, and the State is the Church."

To this class belong all trusts for charitable purposes; and indeed *public* trusts and charitable trusts may be considered in general as synonymous expressions. In *private* trusts, the beneficial interest is vested absolutely in one or more individuals, who are, or within a certain time may be, definitely ascertained. . . . A *public* or charitable trust, on the other hand, has for its objects the members of an uncertain and fluctuating body, and the trust itself is of a permanent and indefinite character, and is not confined within the limits prescribed to a settlement upon a private trust. (Lewin on "Trusts," ed. 1885, p. 20.)

Now, we must remember that the word "charity" is, at law, a very comprehensive term, and includes (under 43 Elizabeth, c. 4)

relief of aged, impotent, and poor people; maintenance of sick and maimed soldiers and mariners; schools of learning, free schools, and scholars in universities; repair of bridges, ports, havens, causeways, churches, sea-banks, and highways; education and preferment of orphans; relief, stock, or maintenance for houses of correction; marriages of poor maids; supportation, aid, and help of young tradesmen, handicraftsmen, and persons decayed; relief or redemption of prisoners or captives; aid or ease of any poor inhabitants concerning payment of fifteens, setting out of soldiers, and other taxes.

Thus, gifts for the advancement of religion or connected with religious services or places, as bequests for the good, or reparation, or furniture, or ornaments of a parish church; or to a minister for preaching; for a pension for a perpetual curate; bequests to Queen Anne's Bounty; for the advancement of Christianity among infidels, &c., have always been held to be "charitable": nay, it is said that a gift towards payment of the National Debt would be considered a charitable gift.

Who, according to Mr. Freeman, are the *cestuis que trust* in these cases of public trusts? Let us take the case of such a bequest as the following:—"Residue to the Queen's Chancellor of the Exchequer for the time being, and to be by him appropriated to the benefit and advantage of my beloved country, Great Britain." That has been held to be a good charitable bequest. (*Nightingale v. Goulbourn*, 2 Phillips, Chancery Reps. 594.) Now, who is the *cestui que trust* here? If that term is to be applied at all in such a case, it must surely be applied to the nation; but the fact is, that we confine its use to private trusts, and in cases of public trusts we speak of *beneficiaries*, or classes to be benefited, and, in the words of Mr. Lewin, "the public at large" may stand in this position. Take another example. A bequest to trustees "for such charities and other public purposes as lawfully might be in the parish of Tadmarton." This is a

good charitable gift (*Dolan v. Macdermot*, L.R. 3 Ch. App. 676), and the beneficiaries are those of the nation who are or become parishioners at Tadmarton, and if such an endowment were given to every parish in the kingdom the beneficiaries would in the aggregate compose the nation. Such gifts are in fact gifts to "the public at large"; they are national endowments; and nobody would think of calling the trustees *owners* of such property, although they might be a corporate body, and although they might be paid for their services.\*

Similarly, it is our contention that the nation is to be considered as the "beneficiary" in the case of the endowments of the Established Church, and that if the State deems it expedient to deal with such endowments it should in so doing be guided by those principles and considerations which are applicable in all cases of State interference with *public trusts*.

The truth of this proposition has already received parliamentary sanction, as has been frequently pointed out, by the establishment of the Ecclesiastical Commission. Thereby, according to the pathetic lament of Sir John Inglis, "for the first time in respect to England, by an Act of the Legislature, unsanctioned by the Church, it (Parliament) recognized the principle that Church property is public property;" and it does seem to us absurd to maintain that the property dealt with by this State Commission is no more national property than the five-and-twenty acres in which Brown has recently invested his savings. Therefore in discussing the question, *Is it right—i.e., is it expedient—with a view to the welfare of the community, that the Church should be disestablished and disendowed*, we shall give due weight to the consideration that the property of the Church *is* "national property," in the sense which we have indicated above. At the same time we must remember that to describe the parsons as trustees does not, without addition, accurately represent their position. They are also stipendiaries. As Mill wrote in the *Jurist*, "The same person who is a trustee is also a labourer. He is to be paid for his services. What he is entitled to is his wages while those services are required, and such retiring allowance as is stipulated in his engagement. It is, however, the fact that in the majority of cases, and particularly in the case of the Church and the Universities, the incumbents hold their emoluments upon an implied contract, which entitles them to retain the whole amount during the term of their lives." Therefore, as stipendiaries, they would, of course, have to be

---

The British Museum is a public trust, and in the eye of the law "charity." Who is the *cestui que trust*, if not "the nation"?



compensated in any scheme of disendowment which should deprive them of their life interest, whatever might be the uses prescribed by the State for the future regulation of the property whereof they are now trustees.

One word as to tithes. The Dean of Wells refers to Bishop Stubbs's assertion that "the famous donation of Ethelwulf has nothing to do with tithe;" but he quotes Stubbs only through the medium of Dorington's "Endowments of the Church," and does not tell us what the learned Bishop of Chester *does* say upon the subject. We are quite content to abide by this high authority, who writes as follows:—

The recognition of the legal obligation of tithe dates from the eighth century, both on the Continent and in England. In A.D. 779, Charles the Great ordained that every one should pay tithe, and that the proceeds should be disposed of by the bishop; and in A.D. 787 it was made imperative by the Legatine Councils held in England, which, being attended and confirmed by the kings and earldormen, had the authority of witenagemots. From that time it was enforced by not unfrequent legislation. ("Constitutional History," vol. i. ch. viii. p. 228.)

And again, as to these Legatine Councils, the Bishop writes :

The Legatine Councils of A.D. 787, which in their very nature were entirely ecclesiastical, were attended by kings and earldormen, as well as by bishops and abbots, and must therefore be numbered amongst true witenagemots. Amongst the ecclesiastical articles which come most naturally within the scope of secular confirmation are the enforcement of Sunday and festival holidays, the payment of tithe, &c. &c. (*Ibid.* ch. vi. p. 128.)

As might have been expected, therefore, Bishop Stubbs lends no countenance to the theory (surely a most futile and impossible one) that tithes must be looked upon as voluntary gifts granted by "devout landowners," who charged their estates in perpetuity with the payment thereof. No; these payments, commuted into rent-charges by 6 & 7 Will. IV. c. 71, are simply a species of tax imposed by the State for the maintenance of the Church establishment. We may note, too, that we have Bishop Stubbs's authority for the original threefold (if not fourfold) division of tithes in England, as on the Continent; since he tells us that in early days the tenth part, which was contributed for the use of the Church, was usually divided by the bishop "between the Church, the clergy, and the poor." Indeed it is, we believe, unquestionable that tithes originally, in this country, represented "church rates, poor rates, and parson rates;" but in course of time the clergy contrived that the third use should, like Aaron's rod, swallow up the others. (See, amongst other authorities,

Phillimore's "Ecclesiastical Law," vol. i. p. 266; Blackstone's "Commentaries," vol. i. book i. ch. ii. § 385.) These matters may have, as the Dean of Wells says, little more than an archæological interest, but it is well to remember them in days when a large number of the clergy have been preaching the "pious founder" argument from the pulpit—that coign of vantage whence they speak, as a living legal luminary has expressed it, "six feet above the possibility of a reply." As to the "pious founder," if his intentions are to be considered at all, they will be found, in the case of our ancient parochial endowments, to be of no assistance to those who are so fond of appealing to them; for persistent denial cannot alter the historical fact, that the Church in England, previously to the Reformation, was but a branch of the great Church of Christendom, and, as such, subject to the Roman hegemony. Even if the Reformation did no more than purge away the errors of a pre-existing Church, yet it is pretty certain that the old pious donors would not have given endowments for the use of a religious organization whose Articles declared that doctrines which they had been taught to revere as divine truths were no better than "blasphemous fables and dangerous decoits." But the truth is much stronger than this. The truth is, that the Church in England, which the labours of Aidan and the victories of Oswald and Oswi seemed to have annexed to the Irish Church, was won for the Pope and lost to Ireland at the Synod of Whitby in 664, after which victorious Rome sent over the monk Theodore of Tarsus, as Archbishop of Canterbury, to consolidate her success by organizing the Church which she had secured to her sway. In the picturesque words of Mr. Green, "Strangers who knew not Iona and Columba entered into the heritage of Aidan and Cuthbert. As the Roman communion folded England again\* beneath her wing, men forgot that a Church which passed utterly away had battled with Rome for the spiritual headship of Western Christendom." Thenceforward the Church in England was, as we have already described it, but a branch of the great Church of Rome, which in all spiritual matters made laws for Christendom. The clergy recognized the King as supreme in matters temporal, but the Pope as supreme in matters spiritual; and the only questions which arose were as to the exact limits between the spiritual and the temporal, and

---

\* But "when Theodore came to organize the Church of England, the very memory of the older Christian Church which existed in Roman Britain had passed away." (See Green's "Short History of the English People," pp. 25-31.)

as to the precise relations which ought to subsist between the Crown and the Papacy.\* The Popes, too, through their legates, exercised a visitatorial jurisdiction over the Church in England, and when the Archbishop of Canterbury secured for himself a commission as legate, with authority over the whole island of Britain, the kings were unable to dispute the supreme jurisdiction of the Pope, vested as it was in one of their own counsellors; and even the ordinary metropolitan authority came to be regarded as a delegated authority from Rome. At the same time the country was at intervals visited by special legates—legates *a latere*—who represented the Pope himself, and superseded the authority of the resident legates. It was this system which was overthrown at the Reformation.

It was the legislative commission of Wolsey, unexampled in its fulness and importance, which under the disingenuous dealing of Henry VIII., who had applied for the commission and granted licence to accept it, was made the pretext of his downfall, and which, after involving the whole Church in the penalties of *præmunire*, resulted in the great act of submission which made the king, "so far as allowed by the law of Christ," supreme head of the Church of England. The combination of the ordinary metropolitan authority with the extraordinary authority having thus for ages answered its purpose of giving supreme power to the Pope, and substituting an adventitious source of strength for the spontaneous action of the national Church, brought about a crisis which overthrew the papal power in England, and altered for all time to come the relations of Church and State.

From this period must be dated the birth of our Established Church as it now exists.†

We assert, therefore, without pursuing the historical argument further, that if our ancient endowments are to be kept

\* See Stubbs's "Constitutional History," vol. iii. chap. xix. p. 291.

† Stubbs's "Constitutional History," vol. iii. p. 301. See also the recent Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Courts. It is of course true, as Mr. Freeman says, that at the Reformation "there was no taking from one religious body and giving to another," simply because the Church was the nation. There was, however, an entire and fundamental change in the religious government of the nation—*i.e.*, in the constitution of the "Church" in sense (2). "The nation ecclesiastically organized" no longer looked to Rome for spiritual legislation, but was in all things to be subservient to King and Parliament. Those who doubt this should consult the statutes of Henry VIII. and Elizabeth. It is an old saying that a man does not become a different man because he has washed his face. Neither does he become a different man because he has dirtied it again. If, therefore, it should please our sovereign Parliament to enact that from henceforth none but those who will subscribe to Popish doctrines shall be ministers of the Church, and that the services shall be conducted according to the Roman Catholic Ritual, &c., the Church would still remain the same Church! Those who find comfort in this argument may be made a present thereof.

for the uses which the pious founders contemplated, they should be handed over to that Church with which the Church in England was originally incorporated. But, further, we maintain that the intentions of the founder, pious or not, have little or nothing to do with the matter. The State considers that, in the interest of the community, a man should be allowed to give property for public purposes, and to some extent to dictate from his tomb the manner in which that property shall be administered; but it seems to us that the State has the right—the *moral* right, as we have explained it above, and not merely the power—to disregard that dictation when it deems it expedient to do so. It is on this condition only that the State allows the gift to be made. The power to make such gifts is a privilege granted to the individual for the public advantage, not a natural, inherent right, as some people appear to imagine. Nay, so far from thinking that any right ought to be recognized for the individual to prescribe uses in accordance with which his property is to be administered for all time, we hold, on the contrary, that in the case of all such gifts, the presumption is, that after the lapse of years—say, of half a century from the donor's death—these uses will require very considerable modification in order to adapt them to the changed circumstances of the times. In other words, the *onus*, in our judgment, lies upon those who wish to adhere to the conditions laid down by the dead hand. This of course applies *à fortiori* to gifts made hundreds of years ago. And if the uses are to be altered, it is for the community, through its representatives, to determine the public purposes to which the property in question shall for the future be applied. So much, then, for the “pious founder”; but these observations, of course, affect such only of the ancient endowments of the Church as can be said to owe their origin to private sources.

Such seem to us some of the most important principles and considerations which ought to be borne in mind by those who approach the question, Is it expedient to disestablish and disendow the Church of England? We have endeavoured to show that to regard the ecclesiastical endowments as “national property” is not by any means such a proof of invincible ignorance as Professor Freeman and Dean Plumptre suppose, inasmuch as those endowments must be regarded as being in the nature of public trusts, whereof the beneficiaries are, in the aggregate, the people of England and of Wales. As to the question of expediency, it must be decided by that people upon arguments which it is not within the scope of this article to consider.

ART. II.—THE GENIUS AND CHARACTER OF  
CHARLES LAMB.

1. *The Works of Charles Lamb, with a Sketch of his Life.* By Sir THOMAS NOON TALFOURD, D.C.L. London: George Bell & Sons. 1876.
2. *Mary Lamb.* By Mrs. GILCHRIST. W. H. Allen & Co. 1883.
3. *Charles Lamb.* By ALFRED AINGER. Macmillan & Co. 1882.

THE opposite extremes of opinion which it is possible to hold about the author of the "Essays of Elia" may be represented by a short sentence of Carlyle's and a recent utterance of Mr. Swinburne's—"There was a most slender fibre of actual worth in that poor Charles:" and "The most beloved of English writers may be Goldsmith or may be Scott; the best beloved will always be Charles Lamb."

It is interesting to consider which of these opposite opinions comes nearer to the truth, that of the poet or the moralist. Conduct was Carlyle's great standard of worth, as beauty seems to be that of Mr. Swinburne. The one preached eloquently the religion of work, of actual doing, as against mere speech; while the other has sounded the praise of all things lovely, and demanded that they should acknowledge as the only law of their life the right to be free.

Was Charles Lamb, then, a man who atoned by his personal charm for a careless and pleasure-seeking life, and thus won the love of the poet? Was he a man who was lax in his fulfilment of duty, and selfish in his dealings with his fellow-men, that he should so miss the approbation of the sage? Let us look in his life and works, and see.

To begin with, we perceive, on turning over the pages of his essays or his letters, that he was not a man to invite, by any harshness of speech concerning others, severe criticisms on himself. He did not know how to say a really ill-natured thing. He was always laughing at the world—a world which included himself—but it was with a genial, kindly laughter. He abounded in sympathy, and the more so because he had a keen consciousness of humour. A smile was ever on his lips at the droll inconsistencies of human nature, but the smile was often akin to the tear of compassion, and the ready hand of fellowship was never far away. While he laughed he was willing to help; he

offered to others the assistance which he never asked for himself; he was ever ready to lend for the service of others—for the fulfilment of their pleasures, or the solace of their weakness—from the limited stores which his own strong self-denial and privation had secured.

Charles Lamb had no weapon with which to meet a man who struck him severely. He was never angry, never indignant, never truly argumentative. His harshest sayings were full of a friendly mirth, and he never did more than smile at a man who was unjust to him. His severest retort was a jest, his most vigorous onslaught an outburst of wit that was as stingless as brilliant. His very breadth of perception and depth of sympathy disarmed him, because he always perceived the points in himself which must displease an opponent, as clearly as he perceived the points in an opponent distasteful to himself. He could not feel indignant at criticisms levelled against him, because his instinctive perception compelled him to say, "Sir, I clearly see how odious I must appear to you; from your point of view you do well to dislike me."

He had the misfortune always to see two sides to a question, his adversary's as well as his own; if adversary is not too strong a word to use regarding a man who never engaged in any serious contest. He was aware of his own limits, and sympathized with an opponent's objections to him. He might have had an intuitive prescience that the harshest word to be uttered of him must come from the mouth of a Scotchman, because in an essay (which he calls, with the delicious moderation and kindness characteristic of him, "Imperfect Sympathies," when another man might have called it "Instinctive Aversions"), he tells us, "I have been trying all my life to like Scotchmen, and am obliged to desist from the experiment in despair. They cannot like me; and, in truth, I never knew one of the nation who attempted to do it."

This is not true to-day. North as well as South Britain contains its admirers of the gentle Elia, and acknowledges the charm of his style and the vigour of his wit. Why it was slower so to do—if, indeed, it was—may be explained by his own remarks on the "imperfect sympathy" existing between the sturdy, vigorous Northern nature and his own:

There is an order of imperfect intellects (under which mine must be content to rank) which in its constitution is essentially anti-Caledonian. The owners of the sort of faculties I allude to have minds rather suggestive than comprehensive. They have no pretences to much clearness or precision in their ideas, or in their manner of expressing them. Their intellectual wardrobe, to confess fairly, has few whole pieces in it. They are content with fragments and scattered

pieces of truth. She presents no full front to them—a feature, or side-face at the most. Hints and glimpses, germs and crude essays at a system, is the utmost they pretend to. They beat up a little game, peradventure, and leave it to knottier heads, more robust constitutions, to run it down. The light that lights them is not steady and polar, but mutable and shifting; waxing, and again waning. Their conversation is accordingly. They will throw out a random word in or out of season, and be content to let it pass for what it is worth. They cannot speak always as if they were upon their oath, but must be understood, speaking or writing, with some abatement. They seldom wait to mature a proposition, but e'en bring it to market in the green ear.

This is an admirable description of his own literary characteristics, of the way he went through life, making sketches of odds and ends of truth that caught his fancy, leaving others to work them up into finished pictures. In this manner he provided for the more ambitious artists many a scrap of truth which would otherwise have escaped observation; he brought to the front many an obscure fact which was lying on one side unnoticed. And the manner of his sketches was so excellent that they are cherished by connoisseurs to-day with a love and admiration which few pictures, however carefully wrought, can hope to awaken.

After being severe on himself, he proceeds, in all fairness and friendliness of spirit, to be severe on his typical Scotchman too:

The brain of a true Caledonian, if I am not mistaken, is constituted upon quite a different plan. His Minerva is born in panoply. You are never admitted to see his ideas in their growth—if, indeed, they do grow, and are not rather put together upon principles of clockwork. You never catch his mind in an undress. He never hints or suggests anything, but unlades his stock of ideas in perfect order and completeness. He brings his total wealth into company, and gravely unpacks it. His riches are always about him. He never stoops to catch a glittering something in your presence, to share it with you, before he quite knows whether it be true touch or not. You cannot cry *halves* to anything that he finds. He does not find, but bring. You never witness his first apprehension of a thing. His understanding is always at its meridian; you never see the first dawn, the early streaks. He has no faltering of self-suspicion. Surmises, guesses, misgivings, half-intuitions, semi-consciousness, partial illuminations, dim instincts, embryo conceptions, have no place in his brain or vocabulary. The twilight of dubiety never falls upon him. Is he orthodox—he has no doubts. Is he an infidel—he has none either. Between the affirmative and the negative there is no border-land with him. You cannot hover with him upon the confines of truth, or wander in the maze of a probable argument. He always keeps the path. You cannot make excursions with him, for he sets you right. His tastes never fluctuate.

His morality never abates. He cannot compromise or understand middle actions. There can be but a right and a wrong. His conversation is as a book. His affirmations have the sanctity of an oath. You must speak upon the square with him.

No man of such a temperament could be an appreciative companion to Charles Lamb, who did not follow Truth as a scientist, but rather loved her as an artist. He never marched straight on in his pursuit of her, in order to study her seriously, or to make a commonplace photograph of her; he was always stopping, like a lover, to look at her in some new or unexpected attitude, or running round a corner to make a sketch of a side view. While the practical man was classifying her or relating her history, Charles Lamb would burst into the argument with apparent flippancy to remark: "Do look at that dimple in her chin!" or, "Have you ever before observed the turn of her elbow?"

It was not only, however, with over-practical and too-literal Scotchmen that Lamb confessed "imperfect" sympathies. So fine a mind as his must, in spite of liberal kindliness, possess its own form of fastidiousness. He liked the Quakers, but not, he says, "to live with them." He remarks, with one of those happy touches which give life to old tradition, and link the living present as by a swift electric current with the dead and half-forgotten past, "Some admire the Jewish female physiognomy. I admire it; but with trembling. Jael had those full, dark, inscrutable eyes."

He acknowledges that he would not like to share his meals with negroes, for no better reason than that they are black; yet he says: "In the negro countenance you will often meet with strong traits of benignity. I have felt yearnings of tenderness towards some of these faces—or rather masks—that have looked out kindly upon me in casual encounters in the streets and highways."

This is characteristic of the gentle Elia. Other men deny their prejudices, or justify them. He does neither. He cannot shake himself free of them; they cling to him like old habits; but his sympathies overleap them. "My friend," he seems to say, "I cannot help disliking you and shrinking from you, but when I look over the stupid wall of my instincts, I perceive on the other side all the admirable and lovable qualities which are yours."

No other man ever had the same sincerity and frankness, the same sympathy and fairness, combined with such a distinct and consciously persistent personality. He was humble, yet not unreasonably so; the love of fair play, which compelled him to



do justice to an opponent's good qualities, forbade him to deny his own. He never put himself forward as a claimant for your regard, being convinced that, if your perception did not discover his merits, his assurance would not help you in the matter. There was to his delicate and critical mind something droll in the pretensions of self-important people; as if they should put up glass windows of conceit to keep out the sun of criticism.

Was he then a mere trifler, a jester? One who helps in the laughter of life as he goes through it, and when the smile is gone and the noise of mirth passed away, dies from the memory of men and is forgotten?

If indeed it were so, and only so, there would be something heroic in the gentle laughter which forbade society to be saddened by his afflictions; in the genius which turned the wild vagaries of fancy (trembling in the balance between lunacy and wit) into beautiful and genial humour; in the unpretending strength and patience which transformed his own pain into sympathy, and thus made of it an instrument for the use and gladness rather than the hindrance and sorrow of the world.

But it was not only so. The fool who followed Lear through the storm was none the less faithful because he met his master's enemies with a laugh rather than a curse; and virtue—a difficult virtue of self-denial and patience—was the Lear whose footsteps Lamb followed through the tempests which early troubled, and the clouds which ever darkened, his painful life. Strength masquerades sometimes before us in strange disguises; and wisdom laughs triumphant in the mouth of a jester, while sages and anchorites are afflicting themselves vainly in the search for it.

Charles Lamb never preached, never gave forth doctrines, and hardly ever denounced wrong-doing; but he loved virtue and made her lovable; he had lived with her until she was familiar to him; the words he uttered were her words; and the influence he used was her influence.

Never throughout his writings—in spite of extravagance of fancy, vagaries of the imagination, where he plays at wrong-doing and pretends to take the side of the wicked—do we find a sentiment that does not help us to love virtue more and vice less, that does not make it easier to be good and less tempting to do evil.

His delicate perceptions often enabled him to perceive points of morality as well as of taste on which the public judgment had gone astray; and the agile weapon of his wit sometimes struck untruth and prejudice in places difficult to be reached by the heavier hand of the moralist. His strokes of criticism often, by their very lightness, awake serious thoughts on the tritest cus-

toms, and give new life to those which have become meaningless to us from much familiarity.

I own [he writes] that I am disposed to say grace upon twenty other occasions in the course of the day besides my dinner. I want a form for setting out upon a pleasant walk, for a moonlight ramble, for a friendly meeting, or a solved problem. Why have we none for books, those spiritual repasts: a grace before Milton—a grace before Shakespeare—a devotional exercise proper to be said before reading the “Fairy Queen”?

On the treatment of women in society his opinion was considerably before his time. Of “modern gallantry” he says:

I shall believe it to be something more than a name when a well-dressed gentleman in a well-dressed company can advert to the topic of *female old age* without exciting, and intending to excite, a sneer; when the phrases ‘antiquated virginity,’ and such a one has ‘overstood her market,’ pronounced in good company, shall raise immediate offence in man or woman that shall hear them spoken.

On this subject he says further: “What a woman should demand of a man in courtship, or after it, is, first, respect for her, as she is a woman; and next to that, to be respected by him above all other women.”

This was no mere theory on paper; it was the rule of his own life. He treated the woman who stood nearest to him, his sister Mary, with all the delicate consideration which he believed a man owed to his wife, a lover to his mistress, or any man to the woman who held the chief place in his life. He had little sympathy with that prejudice of his day which regarded an unmarried woman as a social failure. Speaking of his sister under the disguise of Cousin Bridget, and of the manner of her education, he remarks: “Had I twenty girls, they should be brought up exactly in this fashion. I know not whether their chance in wedlock might not be diminished by it; but I can answer for it, that it makes (if the worst come to the worst) most incomparable old maids.”

It was part of his self-denial that, with the taint of madness in his brain, he never permitted himself to marry, and was content to be regarded as an odd and eccentric bachelor by preference. Yet no one who reads his essay of “Dream Children” can doubt that he was capable of love and fatherly affection. In this as in other acts of abnegation he abstained from lamentation or self-praise; he was content to be laughed at for the very circumstances which other men would have regarded as giving them a claim to admiration or pity.

Although he always kept his temper in argument, and was

never led into the expression of serious anger, yet he was one of the few who protested against the popular fallacy, that "of two disputants the warmest is generally in the wrong:

Our experience would lead us to quite an opposite conclusion. Temper, indeed, is no test of truth; but warmth and earnestness are a proof at least of a man's own conviction of the rectitude of that which he maintains. Coolness is as often the result of an unprincipled indifference to truth or falsehood, as of a sober confidence in a man's own side in a dispute. Nothing is more insulting sometimes than the appearance of this philosophic temper.

Another "popular fallacy" to which he objects is the one which gives a false motive for rectitude in the belief that "ill-gotten gain never prospers."

This species of encouragement to virtue is sure to produce disappointment, and to be unsatisfactory in its results. If we are to face the troubles of life on the side of righteousness, it is best to know exactly what our position is, and what efforts will be expected from us. It is poor preparation for a battle, and a poor way of putting courage into the hearts of the soldiers, to offer the false assurance that the arms of the opponents will be turned against themselves. "The weakest part of mankind have this saying commonest in their mouth. It is the trite consolation administered to the easy dupe, when he has been tricked out of his money or estate, that the acquisition of it will do the owner *no good*. But the rogues of this world—the pruder part of them at least—know better."

It is evident that he loves truth for its own sake, and not only when it fits in with convenient theories. He takes it wherever he finds it, and leaves us to make it tally with our own preconceptions if we can—that is not his affair.

He has little tender touches of feeling and pangs of conscience unknown to other men; as when he repents the ingratitude which beguiled him—under the guise of charity—into giving away the cake made with love and care, for his own enjoyment, by a good old aunt. Abnegation was so much a part of his daily life that he had no need to practise it as a separate virtue. He even found it advisable to check his instincts of self-sacrifice, and came at last to perceive a certain selfishness in the refusal of a good thing offered by a friendly hand. He was kind and considerate even in his self-denial. It was as if he said to himself: "I have twenty opportunities a day of denying myself without distressing any one who loves me; why, then, should I greedily and ostentatiously seize this one?"

He loved indeed to point out small shades of justice or

kindness which escaped the general observation : he often represented things a little crooked, a little awry, a little out of focus, as it were, to get the advantage of a new light on them, and to trick us into looking at them in a new spirit of observation. But his perversity is never misleading ; it is indeed the only quality in which he was obviously and purposely *insincere*. We do not for a moment imagine, when reading his letter to Bernard Barton, that he wants to hang the bankrupts, any more than we believe, while studying his essay on the subject, that he thinks it nobler to borrow than to lend. His was a nature to which forgiveness came as necessarily as the air he breathed ; and at the same time one which denied itself and exerted itself to the utmost rather than add the weight of a grain to the burdens of others.

His literary excellences are so mixed up with the charm of his character that it is difficult to separate them. His quaint and old-world fancies made him an admirable critic of the older poets and of many out-of-the-way subjects and things. He is often poetical on his own account—even when writing prose—in a tender, fugitive, touch-and-go fashion, as in “The Defeat of Time,” in which he has offered one of the most charming of the many tributes to the genius of Shakespeare.

The perusal of his works can only make us delight in him and all his wayward fancies. We may turn over his pages in the hope of finding something at which to scoff or to sneer, and either they remain to us an uninteresting and harmless blank, as the best writing seems to do to some excellent people, or they charm us more and more deeply by the attraction of their style and the subtlety of their wisdom.

If we turn, however, from the author to the man, if we seek to find in his life all the rectitude which we meet so quaintly disguised in his writings, all the sympathy so delicately touched with humour which there abounds, shall we turn away disappointed? compelled to confess that with him, as with so many others, to see the truth was not to follow it? to love virtue was not to be faithful to her? His style might be exquisite, his perceptions might be delicate, and the flavour of his originality absolutely unique ; yet the man himself might not be what we could approve or like : a “very slender fibre of worth” might be left to pervade the actions of this “poor Charles.”

When we look beyond the veil of kindly humour behind which he hid the secrets of his life we perceive at the first glance that his experiences were not those of a jester, and that his laughter concealed sufferings of a tragic intensity. Pitiful indeed he would have been if perpetual anxiety, hopeless affliction, continual need of self-denial, gave him claims upon our compassion

only ; if the manner in which he bore his trials did not oblige us to put aside pity in favour of admiration, and compel compassion to give place to reverence. He was known as a jester—a man who made puns and loved laughter ; but his cheerfulness was the supreme courage of one who bore a terrible burden so that the world should be no sadder for it.

His life was one of abnegation ; he lived in the shadow of perpetual sorrow. Terrible memories haunted him from the past ; melancholy ever tracked his footsteps in the present ; and dread shapes of the future sat with him on his hearthstone as familiar friends. So tragic was the story of his early days that it closed to him the houses of some cheerful people, who objected to the harbouring of incipient tragedy, and hunted him from lodging to lodging at a time when he needed rest and quiet. Nevertheless, he never asked for help from outside ; he bore his own burden and the burden of his family without appealing to the world for assistance ; and he did not pose as a hero—rather did he, as we know, pass with the undiscerning for little better than a laughter-loving clown.

One of the darkest of curses rested upon his family, the curse of madness—that curse which, while demanding abnegation and self-control from those who dwell in its shadow, unfits them, or at least weakens them, for the exercise of the very qualities it calls for. There is no nobler picture in social history than that of Charles and Mary Lamb bravely facing their fate and helping each other so to live that their own misfortune should not injure their fellow-men. Mary, as the elder, sooner began the bitter struggle of existence. The faculties of the father of the Lambs and the health of the mother failed early. The elder brother, John, was of a disposition which loved ease, and sought it before other things. In his own day of difficulty he remembered family ties, and made his claim for help ; at other times he remained aloof, and left the weight of the household trouble to rest on any one who might be willing to take it. There was also an infirm aunt—the one who made the cake—who became a care and burden to the family. Poor Mary early ruined her health in labour for the general good ; she contributed by her needle to the scanty funds of the establishment, and had also to nurse her mother night and day.

When Charles Lamb was twenty years old this gloomy struggle with poverty was intensified by tragic circumstances. His father had already sunk into premature dotage, and his mother was a helpless invalid : then the family malady of madness seized Charles himself, and he was for six weeks of this miserable year in a lunatic asylum. Mary was eleven years older than he, and she had been for some time the

chief strength and support of the afflicted family. But the strain on her strength was too great and lasted too long: later on in the same year, when Charles was again at home, an outbreak of madness seized her also—an outbreak worse than his own, sudden and terrible in its actual attack, though premonitory symptoms had not been wanting, if they could have been attended to; and the devoted daughter, who had tended her parents so long, stabbed her mother to death.

The horrors of that terrible time were enough to drive a sane man mad. What must they have been, then, to one who had recently suffered himself from an attack of insanity, and who must have dwelt in the fear of a possible recurrence, who must have known that the awful deed just perpetrated by his sister's hand might some day be repeated in another form by his own?

The absence of anxiety, the cheerful influence, the tender care, all the extraneous circumstances adapted to aid in the recovery of mental health were wanting here. The mother of Charles Lamb lay dead, murdered by his beloved sister; his sister was in a madhouse; his father, with his forehead plastered from a wound given by Mary in her frenzy, sat in the unconsciousness of dotage, playing at cards while the inquest was being held on his wife's body; his aged aunt lay insensible, to all appearance dying; Charles, the delicate young man of twenty, the recent inmate of an asylum, was the only one in the unhappy household who remained conscious and responsible; on him rested all the care of these helpless invalids and the burden of supplying their needs: he was left alone, to control himself, to face the world, to guard, to help, to provide for these afflicted ones: "I had the whole weight of the family thrown on me; for my brother, little disposed (I speak not without tenderness for him) at any time to take care of old age and infirmities, had now, with his bad leg, an exemption from such duties, and I was now left alone."

His courage and kindness were equal to all the demands made upon them. He abandoned, without complaint, and as a simple social duty, all thought of love and marriage for himself. He prepared to devote himself to his stricken family, and, by hard work and personal self-denial, to provide for them every necessary care.

When we think of this son and brother, who had hardly reached manhood and was still an "infant" in the eyes of the law, whose own recent illness would have excused some weakness and self-indulgence, so bravely and simply putting aside his sorrows to help those around him, we cannot pity, we must reverence—and love. The more we know of Charles Lamb, the

more admirable does he appear; the more we compare him with others, the brighter do his virtues shine. When we read of Anthony Trollope—who had seen his mother's bitter struggles to work for the family support while nursing her husband and son—marvelling that his friends should have expected him to live on a clerk's salary without running into debt; when we remember Carlyle's insistence that—at the cost of his wife's ease and although a poor man—he should be protected from the personal discomforts of poverty, we perceive in all its fulness the beauty of the conduct of Charles Lamb. Hardly, in literary history, do we meet with the record of any life in which the sacrifice of self was so complete and so protracted as his. Other men were generous and other men were frugal; but no one else, so weighted in the struggle, bore himself as bravely from beginning to end, asking nothing from the world, acting always with resolute self-denial, and enduring without complaint.

His self-suppression and self-control had their reward in the fact that he himself was never visited by a return of his malady. Mary's relapses were frequent, and a cause of ceaseless trouble and anxiety to herself and her brother; but she faced her fate with courage worthy of them both, scorning to consider herself in her healthy moments a subject for compassion or indulgence. She was, when sane, full of strong sense and clear views of life; and her literary talent was of no mean order. There was nothing morbid or unhealthy in her way of looking at any subject. Her advice to her friend Sarah Stoddart, as to the treatment of an insane person (her friend's mother), is admirable from any point of view, and surely unique as spoken from a lunatic's own experience:

Do not, I conjure you, let her unhappy malady afflict you too deeply. I speak *from experience* and from the opportunity I have had of much observation in such cases, that insane people in the fancies they take into their heads do not feel as one in a sane state of mind does under the real evil of poverty, the perception of having done wrong, or of any such thing that runs in their heads.

Think as little as you can, and let your whole care be to be certain that she is treated with *tenderness*. I lay a stress upon this because it is a thing of which people in her state are uncommonly susceptible, and which hardly any one is at all aware of; a hired nurse *never*, even though in all other respects they are good kind of people. I do not think your own presence necessary, unless she *takes to you very much*, except for the purpose of seeing with your own eyes that she is very kindly treated.

Nevertheless, the shadow of these periods of insanity, which recurred continually and at lessening intervals, could not fail to darken the lives of herself and her brother. They kept this

trouble as much as possible from the eyes of their friends, but little postscripts or brief sentences in the correspondence of Charles touch us by their simple significance. When he says, "Mary sends her love *from home*," we know to what melancholy place she has been away.

It was inevitable, from the nature of her malady, that she should become helpless and irresponsible at the most trying and difficult moments of their lives, and that she should then, after a period of added anxiety to them both, be compelled to leave him alone. Charles writes to Coleridge in 1800: "Mary, in consequence of fatigue and anxiety, is fallen ill again, and I was obliged to remove her yesterday. I am left alone with nothing but Hetty's dead body to keep me company. To-morrow I bury her, and then I shall be alone, with nothing but a cat to remind me that the house has been full of living beings like myself."

This was the sort of experience to which he was especially liable, because he was a man to whom it never occurred to get rid of servants or companions when they fell into sickness or old age. Rather did he cling more closely to them at such a time, considering them more certainly part of his family and household inasmuch as they were no longer of any service there.

He was more than kind to his afflicted sister; he was devotedly fond of her. "My poor dear, dearest sister," he wrote of her again and again. In a letter to Coleridge, written during one of her absences, he speaks of the best sort of person for her to live with, and refers to himself as "a young man of this description, who has suited her these twenty years, and may live to do so still, if we are one day restored to each other."

When he spoke of "quietness and a patient bearing of the yoke," he used no empty words; his patient endurance had no limit, and lasted as long as his life.

Besides being a devoted son and brother, he was also a faithful friend and a conscientious fulfiller of all social duties. Generous to others, he was frugal himself, and careful always, by means of personal self-denial, to incur no liabilities which he could not meet. He never made ill-health, poverty, and the pressure of many burdens upon him, the excuse for running into debt. He indulged in no leisure which he could not rightly afford, he permitted himself no pleasure which he could not pay for without interfering with his self-imposed duties to others. When Mary was first taken to an asylum, and there was a question of her going to an inferior place, for economical reasons, and at the desire of the older brother (who was afraid of being called upon for funds), Charles wrote to Coleridge: "If my father, an old servant-maid, and I, can't live, and live comfortably, on £130 or



£120 a year, we ought to burn by slow fires, and I almost would that Mary might not go into an hospital."

Charles had at this time been relieved (by a wealthier relative, who was aroused to help by the tragic condition of his family) from the care of his infirm aunt; but she was very soon returned upon his hands, as too troublesome and unattractive a burden for any one else to put up with. The old servant was, as he himself explains, necessary to look after his doting father in his absence, otherwise he might have done without her. But then Charles Lamb did not, like some authors of lesser mental calibre and larger self-conceit, see the necessity of living "like a gentleman." His ambitions were nobler than this, and his fine simplicity saved him from that modern vulgarism which contributes to so much social dishonesty, and adds an unnecessary burden to so many lives.

For this indifference to appearance as for all his other self-denials, he took to himself no credit, and he asked for no compassion. He practised, while others preached, the religion of silence. He never wailed to the world nor tormented his friends with the knowledge that he had a grievous burden to bear. His mental attitude was that of a man who has put his own trouble out of sight, and has room, in his large heart, for the trouble of others.

The silence with which he bore his great and peculiar trials may well be permitted to rest on the one weakness of his unselfish life. It was but a consequence of—and the effort to find a remedy for—that constitutional irritation or nerve suffering which was in his case part of the family curse. Its indulgence was never allowed to interfere with any duty to others, or followed to the degradation of his own character. Neither the righteous Southey nor the austere Wordsworth had ever a word of severity to utter on this particular habit. It was only those men who knew little of his character and less of his life, who, mistaking its origin and ignorant of its limits, could magnify this one pardonable weakness into a serious fault.

Pitiable Charles Lamb might seem to an observer whose truth of vision had been marred by his own narrowing sympathies and absorbed self-consciousness; to all of us who know and love him—and who ever did the first thoroughly without doing the second completely?—he must ever stand as one of the most admirable and heroic figures in literary history.

## ART. III.—THE COLONIAL AND INDIAN EXHIBITION.

1. *Official Catalogue.* William Clowes & Sons. 1886.
2. *Her Majesty's Colonies.* A Series of Original Papers issued under the Authority of the Royal Commission. William Clowes & Sons. 1886.

THE opening of the Colonial and Indian Exhibition at South Kensington by the Queen in person, cannot fail to recall to memory that great and never-to-be-forgotten ceremonial in 1851, when, in the heyday of her popularity, with her husband by her side, and her young children around her, she inaugurated the first Universal Exhibition, conceived and perfected by the lamented Prince Consort.

Thirty-five years have passed since then ; the prime mover and originator has long since vanished from the scene of his labours and his triumphs, and the great monument erected by the Queen and her people, stands to commemorate his success in calling together from the four corners of the world, all that was beautiful in art, and of use and value in commerce, to adorn the palace of his creation, causing the nations to vie with each other in a peaceful rivalry, which it was fondly hoped was to usher in the millennium. How far that hope was from being realized is testified by the many wars of the past thirty-five years ; but the series of Exhibitions then inaugurated, have been pregnant of great results commercially, and this, the latest of the series, teaches a deeper lesson than any of its predecessors, if we can but read it aright.

As we saw the Queen, escorted by her eldest and youngest surviving sons, and followed by her daughters and grandchildren, passing through the long line of thousands upon thousands of her subjects, gathered together from every clime, and including natives of every shade of colour, and of every grade of civilization, we could not help being struck by the fitness and significance of the spectacle, and how well it represented the changes of the past thirty-five years.

Here was the monarch of a vast empire, presiding over the first gathering together of her colonial subjects, come, by invitation of her son, the heir of that vast empire, to show to each other and to those *at home*, what they had done, and could do, to add to the wealth and power of that Empire to which they all owe allegiance. And the colonists thus brought together from

the ends of the world, some of them representing communities which had no existence when the first Exhibition was opened, but which have already attained to the full prime of lusty manhood; others full of that pride which comes of a civilization dating far back in the "night of ages," yet all alike testifying by their eagerness to obtain places, and by their patient waiting of many hours for a momentary glimpse of their Sovereign, their readiness to regard her as the natural symbol of that union which is strength—the visible head uniting these heterogeneous elements into one harmonious whole—testifying, too, their willingness to join in the sentiment of "Home, sweet home," and their determination to uphold the unity of the Empire of which they form a part. *Cor unum via una.*

One life, one flag, one fleet, one throne.

It was a noble sight and full of suggestiveness; we must not, however, linger over ceremonial, but hasten to glance through the various courts of this grand Imperial display, and point out, as far as we may, the abundant signs of life and progress displayed by our brethren from over the seas.

It must be confessed that the Exhibition buildings at South Kensington are sadly wanting, both in grandeur and architectural beauty; there is none of that fairy-like lightness which distinguished Paxton's palace of 1851. The buildings are mere sheds, put up for convenience only, and separated from each other in places by ugly nooks and untidy corners; but all that art can do to remedy these radical defects has been done, and in most cases the effect is pleasing, whilst the wealth and variety of the exhibits prevent the eye from examining the surroundings too critically.

The place of honour is of course given to India; that vast conglomeration of States, forming together a priceless possession which has accumulated since 1600, the date of the formation of the first East India Company—started with 125 shareholders and a capital of £70,000, to trade direct with India—the first territory acquired, consisting of a strip of land six miles long, and one mile inland, on the Madras coast, purchased from one of the Rajahs in 1639. Who could then have dared to prophesy the outcome of this small acquisition? The story of the growth of this, our stupendous Indian Empire, is well and succinctly told in the "Historical Retrospect" of the Official Catalogue, the concluding paragraph of which may be quoted, as showing the rapidity of that growth.

In 1786, when Lord Cornwallis landed at Calcutta, as Governor-General, the British Empire in India comprised only Bengal and Behar, in Eastern Hindustan, a very little area round Bombay, in the

Western Dekkan ; and a somewhat larger area round Madras, in the Eastern Peninsula. In 1886 the British power is paramount over an area of more than a million and a half of square miles, containing upwards of two hundred and fifty millions of inhabitants.

This enormous population consists of numerous races and tribes, including every imaginable shade of colour—from the purest white to more than negro blackness—and every type of countenance, a fact which is hardly realized by the majority of Englishmen, but which is most clearly placed before us in this Exhibition, by a series of life-sized models in native costume, commencing with the diminutive unclad Andamanese, negroid in colour, and the Nicobarese, taller and lighter, but almost equally savage, and passing on through tribes decidedly Mongoloid in type, from the North-west Provinces, to the tribes of the Punjab, among whom we find a pale yellow type, and also the very tall, dark Sikh, with naked legs, and hat adorned with a perfect armoury of weapons of all kinds, commencing with those metal rings or quoits which Siva the destroyer is always represented as twirling upon one of his fingers. Then there are the Nagas from the hills, tattooed, and wearing large shell and cornelian bead necklaces of native manufacture, and other hill tribes. Some of these types we see again in the vestibule, arrayed as soldiers of native regiments, and fine fellows they are too, although here also we are struck with the great diversity in size and colour, and if we go a few steps farther, we find a glass case containing a collection of heads from Jeypore, seeming to represent every imaginable type ; and everywhere we are confronted by the same diversity of race, and that which of necessity follows, radical differences of character, custom, and religion. It is this which makes the government of India a herculean task, requiring the greatest firmness and most consummate skill and discretion, lest perpetual strife should reign among these jarring elements. With an empire so vast and so varied in natural productions, as well as in race and in climate, it is easy to imagine that the exhibits would also be rich and varied, but we may fairly say that they exceed all our preconceived ideas.

Every one associates with India, rich shawls, jewellery, carpets, and carvings in wood and ivory, and these have from time immemorial, been so perfect, that it would be hard to expect *progress* in these arts, and indeed one great idea of the present Exhibition was, that these wonderful works of native art should become better known in this country, so as to help to educate our artificers, rather than to receive education from them, hence the vestibule has been draped with chintzes from Kashmir, and a series of art courts has been formed, each adorned with a carved

screen of native work, and containing the different works of art of the several provinces. These screens are perfect marvels of carving of different kinds, some of which have been manufactured on the spot, and erected by Indians sent over for the purpose, a special grant having been made by the Commissioners for carrying out this design. The entrance gateway to these art courts was contributed by the Maharajah of Jeypore, and is a magnificent work of art, surmounted by that which is called a drum-house, in which, in palaces and temples, musicians in India are accustomed to play, in honour of the sovereign or the god. On this gateway is carved the motto of Jeypore, in Sanscrit, Latin, and English, "Yato dharm stato jaya;" "Ubi virtus ibi victoria." "Where virtue is, is victory," and at the back "Ex Oriente lux," a motto exemplified by the Shamsa, or picture of the sun, on one side, from which the Rajahs of Jeypore trace their descent, and on the other side the moon, claimed as an ancestor by others of the Rajput race, and overlooking the court is a curious object difficult to distinguish, but which is the *Mahi maratib*, or golden head of a fish, and two gilt balls, being the symbol of the highest nobility given by the Moghal emperors.

Glancing up and down these art courts, the eye is dazzled and bewildered by the variety and beauty of the wares displayed. The richest and most delicate jewellery, in silver and gold, tea and coffee services in the same precious metals elaborately chased, pottery painted and gilt, lacquer work, damascened arms, enamels, and that curious green glass or enamel inlaid with gold so peculiarly Indian, as also that well-known inlaid work in ivory and metal, with innumerable other works of art of every description, all set off by a background of the richest textile fabrics, carpets, curtains, silks, shawls, muslins, chintzes, and cotton goods of all descriptions, in the greatest profusion, the gold and silver laces of Lucknow deserving especial notice. The variety and beauty of the various screens which serve as a framework for the display of the exhibits of the several provinces, baffle description, and each province has its especial art, some being in sandal wood, some in red stone, some in marble; some painted and gilt, some of delicate trellis work, and in the centre of the south gallery rises a magnificent pigeon-house from Baroda, of carved woodwork, far too beautiful for use. The Kashmir screen is especially noteworthy, as having been copied from the verandah of an old ruined mosque; it was made in four months by eight carpenters, working at a wage of  $5\frac{1}{2}d.$  to  $8d.$  a day, their only tools being the small native chisel and a heavy adze. In some of these screens Saracenic influence is plainly visible, but others are strictly Hindu. The British occupation does not seem to have seriously affected the art work of the

natives, although in two or three manufactures, deterioration due to European influence, is noticed; as, for instance, in the carpets, which in some cases are more gaudy in colour and less beautiful in design than formerly; this is attributed to European designs and aniline dyes having been introduced, chiefly through work done in the gaols, but Government is now endeavouring to restore the native art to its pristine beauty. The celebrated Dacca muslins, known as "woven air," seem also to have suffered; the piece of fifteen yards, which formerly only weighed 900 grains, now weighing 1600 grains, consequent upon the use of English twist, the value being only £10 as against £40 for the older fabric; but, as a rule, the art work of India maintains its ancient reputation, and the native artificers, who, in the court of the Indian palace, pursue their various callings in native fashion, are eagerly watched by crowds daily; but they can never be rivalled by English workers, for their work requires not only delicacy of manipulation, but patient labour, only possible in a land where workers are numerous and wages extremely low. The Indian palace, constructed opposite the entrance to Old London, is remarkable for the great stone gateway presented to the South Kensington Museum by the late Maharaja Sindhia, which, in its rich decoration, contrasts well with the sombre gateway opposite; to this has been added a courtyard such as is common in India, with the various workshops of the native artificers. The edifice is in the Hindu-Persian style, and consists of a vestibule with a fountain in the centre and a mosaic floor, the walls draped with a variety of beautiful cotton prints, and from this a staircase leads to the Durbar Hall overlooking the courtyard; this hall is a marvel of wood carving, and was made in the Exhibition by two natives of Bhera in the Punjab, brought over for the purpose.

It is, however, to the Imperial or Economic Court that we must turn, if we wish to see the progress made in India under British rule. Here are displayed the chief articles of commerce, the vast extent of which will certainly surprise those who have not heretofore studied the subject, and here we may be allowed to quote the official catalogue:—

The magnitude of the foreign trade of India enables it to rank as the fifth great commercial Power in the world. The total value of the external sea-borne trade of India may be said roughly to be 155 millions of pounds sterling, of which seventy millions represent exports, and eighty-five millions imports. Of this, the commerce between India and the United Kingdom claims eighty-six millions sterling, of which thirty-six millions represent exports and fifty millions imports. To form a complete estimate of the foreign commerce of India, we may

add to this the land trade across the frontiers, which amounts to about twelve millions sterling.

These exports consist of various grains, such as rice, wheat, barley, oats, maize, and millet, the produce of 119,400,000 acres of cultivated land, of which 60,000,000 are devoted to rice and 20,306,464 acres to wheat. The development of the export trade in the latter during the last fifteen years is, says the catalogue, "one of the most remarkable facts recorded in the Reports of the material progress of India." Sugar, both from the sugar-cane and the date-palm, is largely manufactured and exported; vegetables also are grown and exported to the amount of £21,963, the potato and egg-apple having been introduced from America. Of drugs and medicines more than a hundred indigenous plants are shown as valuable, but the natives place 1300 in their herbals; the best known in this country is the cinchona, but this is not an indigenous plant, although it has become acclimatized, having been introduced from Peru in 1860. It is largely cultivated at Darjeeling by the Government, and its value as an export in 1884-5 was estimated at £100,000. Of vegetable fibres, cotton, jute, rhea, coir, and other plants, are represented in a great trophy in this court, but they form only a small part of the fibre-bearing plants of India, which are reckoned at 300. The export trade in cotton, raw and manufactured, was estimated last year at over £41,000,000 sterling, chiefly from the Bombay Presidency; whilst in jute, the trade has risen from £62 in 1828, to £6,241,568 last year, chiefly from Bengal. Rhea is looked upon as likely to do great things in the future, but it is at present difficult and expensive to prepare. Paper is now manufactured in considerable quantities from the bark of two sorts of daphne; there are paper mills in Calcutta and Lucknow, and it is also made in the gaols. The paper manufactory of Nepal is, however, considered to have been derived from China at a very remote period. Oil seeds and prepared oils form a very large item in the Indian exports, linseed yielding over £1,000,000; rapeseed, £2,000,000; castor, £2,000,000; sesame, £1,928,112; poppy, £409,159; and earth nuts, £361,400. There are also many dyes, of which indigo is the principal, a very interesting model of an indigo factory (of which there are thousands chiefly under European management) being exhibited; and a great number of gums and saps, including camphor, catechu, caoutchouc, gutta percha, assafœtida, and, lastly, *lac*, the product of an insect.

In narcotics, opium holds the first place, Government deriving from it a revenue of £9,000,000; the cultivation and mode of preparation of this is well illustrated. Bhang, or Indian hemp,

is also exhibited; and tobacco is exported to the value of £150,000, but this is exhibited in another court, with that which has risen to great importance of late, and seems destined to become one of the chief exports of the empire—namely, tea. The first samples of this much-esteemed product, consisting of twelve chests, were shipped from Assam in 1838, and now it is estimated that 266,286 acres are under cultivation as tea plantations, 188,000 in Assam and Cachar, 60,000 in Bengal, 8000 each in the North-west Provinces and the Punjab, and 5551 in Madras, the yield having risen from 25,500,000 lbs. in 1876, to 60,000,000 lbs. in 1881, representing over £4,000,000 sterling. Coffee has decreased in value, consequent upon the leaf disease, but it still represents £1,250,000; and cocoa has been introduced from South America and is thriving; whilst that which seems a new industry will be found in the exhibits of beer from Madras and the Punjab, and wines and spirits from Kashmir, exhibited by the Maharaja, one of which was awarded a gold medal at the Calcutta Exhibition.

The geological survey of India exhibits maps illustrative of the mineral wealth of the empire, and by them we are surprised to find, in addition to gold, silver, and other metals, very extensive coal fields, and we are told that eighty coal mines are worked in India, seventy-eight of which are in Bengal, one in Central India, and one in Assam, yielding together 1,315,776 tons in 1883, and employing 23,172 labourers.

The timbers and woods from the Indian forests form a very important branch of commerce, and are represented in the Exhibition by a trophy containing 3000 specimens, whilst the bamboo trophy illustrates the uses of this most useful *grass*, of which thirty species are represented.

By this long but far from exhaustive list of the products of India, it will be seen that the British Government, whilst fostering and encouraging the arts handed down from a remote civilization, has not failed to develop the resources of the empire in accordance with modern social requirements. This is not the display of an effete nation sunk in Oriental lethargy, with no thought save of luxury and repose, neither is it the tribute of a conquered nation laying its best gifts at the feet of the conqueror, but it is the work of a Power acting the part of a regenerator, guiding the myriad hands in paths of reproductive industry, making the most of natural gifts, and supplementing them by all the appliances of modern science, developing the resources ungrudgingly yielded by a tropical climate, and adding to them, those dependent upon human labour and skill; constructing iron roads and water-ways, whereby all these products may be brought together, and finding for



them, by means of its many ocean transports, markets in far distant lands, for ever unattainable by native effort. These are some of the benefits which India has derived from British rule; but the Exhibition tells us more than this, it shows that the dominant Power is not unmindful of the educational, moral, and social needs of its subjects, and we are shown in the Administrative Court the governmental machinery, by which the State is kept in working order; there are exhibited the coinage and the stamps, the railways and irrigation works, the military, naval, and police organization, the mode of distributing the 184 millions of letters delivered yearly, in a country still insufficiently traversed by public roads, and teeming with snakes and beasts of prey. The educational work of the Empire is illustrated by the model of a Bombay school, and by the various means and appliances adopted for the education of the 2,790,061 children inspected in 1883 in the 111,237 Government schools. As we study these things, and endeavour to take in the statistics brought before us, we see more plainly than ever, not only the vast importance of the numerous States and dependencies which go to make the great Indian Empire, but also the enormous responsibility resting upon its rulers. Even the seasons must be watched and anticipated, or famine following upon drought will claim its million victims, ere the relief ungrudgingly sent can be distributed to the sufferers. That our rule hitherto, if not faultless, has yet been fairly successful, we believe this Exhibition will testify; but there is no room for *experimental* government. Tried and approved methods must be continued with a firm hand, till the discordant elements are fairly amalgamated, and the prejudices of religious differences and social caste yield to the enlightenment of education; and the length of time requisite for this may be estimated by what we have pointed out regarding the multitudinous races which go to make up this mighty empire.

The exhibits from that which was formerly British Burmah, but which is now a portion of the Burmese Empire lately added to the British possessions in the East, are displayed amongst those of India, and include very elaborate carvings, jewellery, lacquered ware, and cloths of native manufacture; and doubtless the commercial activity of India will soon extend itself over the newly acquired territory.

The great Island of Ceylon, which, with its dependencies, the Maldivé Islands, form a Crown Colony, exhibits its wares in a court divided from India by a porch, or gateway, copied from the Buddhist temple of the Sacred Tooth in Kandy, and carved in Ceylon by native workmen, and facing this, at the end of the court, is a large figure of Buddha, thus demonstrating to all, the

religion professed by the Sinhalese. Ceylon has long been noted for its pearl fishery, which is still an important industry, and pearls, with other gems, form a portion of the exhibits, which include gold and silver wares, carvings in ebony, satin-wood, and other native woods; but agriculture is the chief industry, and Government not only encourages the production of rice and cocoa-nut, which form the chief food of the natives, but has also introduced the cultivation of tea and coffee, the former of which is increasing so rapidly that 100,000 acres are now under cultivation as tea gardens, and the exports have reached 3,700,000 lbs., and are confidently expected to rise to 26,000,000 within six years. Coffee has been cultivated for centuries, although not to any great extent until 1874-5, when the export reached nearly 1,000,000 cwt., valued at nearly £5,000,000; but since that time disease has so injured the coffee plantations that many of them have been turned into tea gardens. Cinnamon and other spices form also a large portion of the exports of the island; and plumbago is one of the chief mineral products, having been exported to the amount of 240,000 cwt. in 1882.

It is gratifying to find that the great tanks, erected centuries before the Christian era, are being repaired and maintained by large Government grants annually, for these cannot fail to add to the prosperity of this most interesting island, by securing to the rural population a constant supply of that prime necessary—water.

It is impossible here to dwell upon those exhibits which, both in the Indian and Ceylon sections, will most interest the general public, such as the great Indian jungle, illustrative of the fauna and flora of the country, the models of natives in every variety of costume, the shops, with their Indian buyers and sellers, the photographs of native princes and of the splendid ruins and temples of India and Ceylon, the paintings of scenery, and the utensils, weapons, ornaments, and religious emblems of the wild tribes in the interior. The complex Hindoo mythology is illustrated by images of the various gods of the Pantheon, and the gods of the Nicobarese, and the masks of the devil dancers of Ceylon, form conspicuous objects; but these do not illustrate *progress*, we therefore leave them to be studied by the anthropologist and archæologist, and pass on to the great colonies which are so well represented, and which, from their comparative youth, show more clearly the effects of modern enterprise.

The Dominion of Canada, stretching right across the American continent from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and embracing an area of 3,500,000 square miles, with a population of about 5,000,000, was ceded to Great Britain by the Treaty of Paris, in 1763; but it was only in 1867 that the several provinces—Ontario, Quebec,

Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick—were united into one Dominion. In 1870 Manitoba and the North-west, which had until then been held by the Hudson's Bay Company, and in 1871 British Columbia, were added to the Dominion. This then may be looked upon as a new colony, and as such its progress will appear marvellous. In 1884 the revenue amounted to upwards of £6,000,000, whilst the imports were valued at £21,000,000, and the exports at nearly £19,000,000. These exports consist largely of timber, which in 1884 produced nearly £6,000,000; of cereals and dairy produce, the latter now well known everywhere; and of furs, which were at one time regarded as the chief or only product of the North-west; but the land of that wide region is now found to be excellent for agriculture, and every year sees the settler pushing his way farther and farther to the North-west, opening up fresh tracts, and carrying with him the plough and the railway almost simultaneously; for Canada, almost more than any of the colonies, has devoted herself to the construction of railroads, and the great line recently completed, which runs right through the Dominion, uniting the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, is not only a magnificent example of colonial energy, but is also a work of Imperial importance, since it provides an alternative route to our Eastern Empire, besides opening up great tracts of agricultural land still awaiting cultivation, and fields of coal, gold, silver, copper, lead, and iron of great importance, but hitherto only partially developed. The fisheries of Canada are of immense value, but Newfoundland, so long famed for its cod fisheries, has not yet joined the Dominion, and forms a separate colony.

The show made by Canada, in the present Exhibition, is very extensive, but not so varied in character as that of some of the other colonies; it consists chiefly, as may be supposed, of agricultural products and machinery, and is too *shoppy* in appearance to be attractive, but as the outcome of nineteen years of commercial progress it is magnificent. The agricultural implements strike us as far superior to our own, the cereals appear to be of splendid quality, and the vegetables and fruits are such as would certainly take prizes in the old country; they also exhibit honey and fish, dried and tinned, particularly lobsters, in profusion. Timber, and furniture manufactured from the principal woods, also make a grand show, but these are not the only things demanding notice, there are exhibits from the various schools, universities and scientific institutes of the colony, maps and drawings, displays of minerals, ethnological collections (very meagre), and a grand trophy of furs and the wild animals from which the hunters and trappers of the North-west have so long supplied the European markets, and which

still form the largest item in the exports of the Dominion, amounting to upwards of £5,000,000; the forests ranking next at about £4,000,000, and agricultural products about £3,000,000. Full statistics would here be impossible, but sufficient has been said to show that the Canadian Dominion is one rapidly increasing in prosperity, developing her boundless resources, agricultural and mineral, the latter including gold, coal, copper, iron, antimony, lead, silver and other minerals of less value; and with the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway and its extensions, it is confidently expected that new openings for commerce will be found, and a traffic commenced with India, China and the Pacific coasts of South America.

The population of Canada has increased rapidly. In 1871 the total was 3,687,024; in 1881 it had risen to 4,321,810; of these the larger number are of British blood, but there are 1,298,927 of French origin, many Germans, and about 100,000 Indians, the feeble remnant of the aborigines; of these the portion settled in the older provinces have become civilized and contented, and the present Exhibition contains many specimens of their handicraft, but in Manitoba, the North-west, and British Columbia, many tribes still remain in a state of savagery; they are, however, gathered into reserves, and their property is protected by the Government. On the whole, they are loyal and contented, but the half-breeds are sometimes turbulent and rebellious, as was shown last year in the outbreak under Riel, which was so promptly and easily quelled.

We must here say a few words on Newfoundland, the first of our possessions in this part of the world, although long since outrivalled by newer and more fertile lauds. Newfoundland was discovered by Cabot on Midsummer Day, 1497, and it soon became known to the world as a great fishing station, and was taken formal possession of by Sir Humphrey Gilbert in the name of Queen Elizabeth. The cod fishery is still the chief industry, but it also exports cod-liver oil, seal skins and oil, and copper ore, the whole amounting to nearly £2,000,000, but varying according to the season. Of late years the copper mines have been worked very successfully, and bid fair to add largely to the exports of the colony. The population is estimated at 180,000, but the aborigines, the Beothucs, have died out, the last seen alive was in 1829.

The colony of Newfoundland includes Labrador, very valuable as a fishing station for seal, cod and salmon, and the island of Anticoste, at the mouth of the river St. Lawrence; this island has only a few inhabitants, but the fisheries in the surrounding seas are very extensive. Newfoundland, although not so progressive as Canada, is yet very valuable on account of its

command of the fisheries, and it is a pity that it is not represented in the present Exhibition.

Geographically, thousands of miles separate Canada from the great group of colonies in Australasia, but in the Exhibition they are near neighbours, and although unlike in natural features, there is a strong family likeness, distinguishing all as the children of one mother, alike in energy, though differing in age, size and strength. The Australasian colonies include New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, Queensland, Western Australia, Tasmania, New Zealand, to which may be added Fiji and New Guinea, a wonderful group occupying the whole of the great sub-continent of Australia, with the adjoining islands of Tasmania on the south, Melville and other small islands on the north, New Guinea, Fiji and New Zealand in the adjoining seas. Here then we possess an empire of no mean size, containing within itself all the necessary elements of wealth, power and stability, but united to the mother country even more than any of the other colonies of Great Britain by the ties of blood; for whereas in India the foreign element far outweighs the European, and in Canada the French, Germans, and Indians almost balance the British in numbers, in the Australasian colonies, except in New Guinea and Fiji, the population is almost wholly of British descent, and the rapid progress made by these Antipodean lands speaks volumes in praise of the energetic character of the Anglo-Saxon race, and its power of seizing every coign of vantage, and developing it into something great and profitable, spite of difficulties and dangers.

The first of our colonies in these distant southern seas was New South Wales. To the Dutch or Portuguese belongs the honour of the discovery of Australia, in the seventeenth century, but it was the famous navigator, Captain Cook, who took possession of Botany Bay in 1770, a name which for many years became a by-word, owing to the use of that region as a penal settlement; that reproach has, however, been long removed, and for the last thirty-five years the progress of the colony has been marked, although not unvarying. A constitution was granted to New South Wales in 1843, Port Philip was separated from it in 1851, and formed into a distinct colony under the name of Victoria, and in 1859 another portion separated itself and is now known as Queensland. These secessions, as they may be termed, have not, however, weakened the parent colony, but have rather added to her power, by enabling her to concentrate her strength in developing her own vast resources; in this she has been greatly assisted by the foresight of some of her governors, and foremost among the benefactors of the colony must be named Captain John MacArthur, who introduced the merino sheep and

the vine, two of the principal sources of her present wealth ; the export of wool in 1884 being 319,477 bales, valued at nine and a half millions sterling, whilst Australian wine is fast growing in public favour, the area of land occupied by vines in 1883 being 4374 acres, producing 589,604 gallons of wine and 4162 gallons of brandy. Sugar is also cultivated extensively, and fruits are grown with great success, many of them, especially apples, pears, and grapes, having found their way to South Kensington in good condition, and, as we can testify, of excellent flavour, although at present not sufficiently low in price to compete with nearer markets. The fauna and flora of the colony are also well represented in the Exhibition, the various beautiful native woods being exhibited both in the natural and manufactured form, whilst the fine arts are represented by splendid photographs, by paintings and engravings, some on shell ; by one very fine group of statuary in marble—Jephthah and his daughter—by pottery, and by art needlework done by pupils of the several schools.

But, after all, the mineral wealth of Australia is the main source of its prosperity ; this perhaps is less apparent in the New South Wales court than in that of Victoria, although the yield of gold from 1851, the date of its first discovery, to 1883 is estimated at over £35,000,000 ; and there are also large exhibits of silver, copper, zinc, and tin, besides a large quantity of coal.

The pastoral and agricultural products of the colony are represented by wool and different kinds of grain, and there are also exhibits of preserved fish and oysters. There are besides exhibited in the New South Wales court many curiosities from New Guinea, and photographs of the country taken during the expedition of General Scratchley last year, when a protectorate was proclaimed over a large portion of that very interesting, but little known, island.

Perhaps, of all the Australian colonies, Victoria is the one of which the remarkable progress is the most distinctly seen in the present Exhibition. The growth of this colony since 1851, during the thirty-five years of its separate existence, is simply marvellous. At one end of the court is displayed a group of natives in the condition in which they were when first discovered, with their bark huts, or rather shelters, their boomerangs, spears and shields, surrounded by the fauna and flora of the country, and we are told that this represents the spot, forty years ago, upon which Melbourne with its 325,000 inhabitants now stands. If we look at the great town as represented on one of the panels in the entrance hall, and compare it with this wild scene, it seems like the transformation scene in a pantomime rather than a fact of the world's history, and if we examine the products of this wonderful colony, we are more and more

astonished at the development displayed in every branch of industry. This enormous and unprecedented progress is doubtless due mainly to the extensive gold fields of Victoria. "In 1850," says the Official Catalogue, "only fifteen years after its settlement, Port Philip had a revenue of £230,000, its exports amounted to nearly £1,000,000 sterling, and its population had increased by rapid strides to 76,000." This was a year before the discovery of gold, which "uplifted the colony in a night to the position of a nation and a power in the world, and advanced her destinies hundreds of years at one bound." As may be supposed, gold holds a prominent place in the exhibits of the colony. A huge gateway of gilded blocks represents the yield of gold, estimated at £216,000,000 sterling, and near to this is exhibited models of the most remarkable nuggets discovered; also maps of the gold fields, geological specimens of the various minerals found in the colony, and a beautiful model of a quartz-crushing machine.\* The wealth extracted from the soil does not, however, end with gold and other minerals; its forests of timber yield abundantly, and its soil produces an unlimited supply of grain; wine also is made of excellent quality, and sheep and cattle yield meat (tinned for export), as well as wool and leather. The exports are now valued at upwards of £16,000,000, and its imports at £20,000,000; exports of pastoral produce yielding £10,000,000, those of agriculture £6,000,000, whilst the yearly value of manufactured goods is estimated at £13,500,000. The wealth thus accumulated, aided by loans from the mother country, has been largely expended in public works, and the country is traversed by 1700 miles of railway, whilst schools and universities have been established and subsidized by Government. Victorians may well be proud of their colony, which is nearly as large as Great Britain and Ireland combined, nor do they devote all their energies to the useful labour of developing their fields of gold and of corn, for in art their progress is as marked as in agriculture, and some of the paintings, both landscapes and flowers, in this court, are extremely beautiful, whilst there is a piece of tapestry done by the pupils of a ladies' school, which could not be equalled in our modern art needlework exhibits; and the pottery is making rapid strides towards our best works.

South Australia is a much older and more extensive colony than Victoria, comprising not only the southern part of the great island, but all the central portion, right through to the Indian Ocean. It was first observed and partially explored by Captain Sturt in 1831, and was formed into a colony by Act of Parlia-

---

\* A full sized machine is at work in the grounds crushing quartz and producing gold from tons of ore sent for exhibition.

ment in 1834, the Act providing that no criminals should ever be transported to any part of the colony.

The mineral wealth of South Australia consists rather of copper than of gold, although the latter has been found within its limits. In the Exhibition a great gateway of copper ingots has been raised, not particularly elegant, but a substantial proof of the amount of metal smelted by the company which erects it; there are also exhibits of gold, silver, copper, and iron ores, and in agricultural products, cereals, fruits, jams, pickles, and a very large display of wines of different kinds, also vinegar, cordials, and aerated waters. There is also a curious exhibit of stuffed sheep, to show the breed (which is merino), and a great number of fleeces, one of the exhibitors announcing that he sheared last season 75,000, whilst other flocks are noted, consisting of 65,000, 31,000, and other large numbers. Ostriches and ostrich feathers are also exhibited, whilst in the fine arts, there are paintings, sculptures, photographs, and some beautiful ornaments of emu eggs mounted in silver. All this is very creditable to a colony which, notwithstanding its vast territorial extent, is very sparsely populated, the inhabitants at the last census numbering only 279,865, exclusive of aborigines, who are estimated at 6346. An Australian Gully, illustrating the fauna and flora, and the mode of life of the aborigines, is a very attractive feature in the South Australian court. The exports of South Australia in 1875 amounted to £1,805,050, and in 1884 to £6,623,701, and the imports at the latter date were £5,749,353, the United Kingdom supplying £2,983,296. The wheat crop in 1884 was upwards of 14,000,000 bushels, the wool was valued at nearly £3,000,000 sterling, and the wine produced was 473,535 gallons; there were 1035 miles of railway open for traffic, 227 public schools, 287 private schools, and 112 country institutes with libraries attached. Such is progress in Australia, and the same tale is repeated in Queensland, which has only been in existence as a colony since 1859. With a tropical climate and a population of only 325,000, she has yet succeeded in distancing some of the older colonies; her wool amounts to 50,000,000 lbs. annually, her cattle number 4,250,000, and her sheep 9,300,000, whilst her imports and exports, which in 1860 was £1,267,500, in 1884 reached a total of £11,055,840. There are 1407 miles of railway, and 11,636 miles of telegraph wires in the colony, and there are 425 State schools. Maize, rice, wheat, sugar, arrowroot, tobacco, coffee, cotton, and various fruits are among the products, and many of these are exhibited, as also a trophy denoting that gold, to the amount of £17,623,284, has been found; beautiful pearls, including one black, and enormous shells to show the product of mother-of-pearl; there are also some



beautiful specimens of opal, splendid cedar woods, marbles, and tin; whilst in manufactures, leather, ropes, vegetable oils, chiefly prepared from the various eucalypti, dyes, sugar, wine, and a great many others are exhibited; but as yet the exports consist largely of raw material, and the sugar industry has been checked by want of labour, the importation of Polynesians and of Indian coolies having been forbidden, whilst European labour is too dear and too scarce to be employed with profit; but immigration is encouraged, and in time doubtless this difficulty will be overcome. Western Australia, formerly known as the Swan River Settlement, occupies the whole of the west of Australia from north to south, an immense territory 1,000,000 square miles in extent, but very thinly peopled, the whole white population numbering only 32,000. Yet this handful of Europeans has contrived to increase its revenue from £157,775 in 1875 to £291,317 in 1885, its exports having risen during the same period from £391,217 to £105,693, the chief items being lead ore, pearls, and mother-of-pearl, horses, sandal-wood, guano, wool, and timber; of the latter some magnificent specimens of the *Jarrah* (*Eucalyptus marginata*) are exhibited, as also of the *Karri* (*Eucalyptus diversicolor*), almost equally beautiful; there is also a display of furniture made from native woods of various kinds, the timber of this colony appearing of extraordinary size and value. There are exhibits of wool, a great trophy of mother-of-pearl shells, and the very remarkable pearl called the Southern Cross, valued at £10,000; cereals (wheat, barley, oats), preserved and tinned fish and fish oils, raisins and other dried fruits, preserves, wine and beer, and in art-work some very creditable paintings and photographs; there are also some flags made in the colony of native silk, and honey from bees which were first imported, but have become wild and very abundant. The mineral wealth of the colony has not been thoroughly explored, but specimens of gold, copper, lead, and iron are sent, and even as we write the rumour comes of the discovery of rich gold fields, which, if authenticated, will cause this young colony to forge ahead like the other Australian colonies, and perhaps even more rapidly, since railways are in course of construction, which will facilitate migration.

Tasmania—one of the oldest of the Australian colonies, and not a whit less prosperous than its neighbours, with great mineral and agricultural wealth, and a peculiarly favourable climate—from some unexplained cause is not represented in the present Exhibition. We will therefore pass on to the very important colony of New Zealand.

New Zealand consists of two large islands and a smaller one, called Stewart's Island. It is almost the antipodes of Great Britain, which it more nearly resembles in size and in climate than any of the other colonies; but it is far more

mountainous and picturesque than the mother country, and contains within it greater mineral wealth, gold to the extent of £1,780,992 having been exported in 1872, and although since then the output of the precious metal has decreased, it is probable that it will improve when machinery is brought to bear upon the gold-bearing quartz; and at all events the export of gold since 1857 has amounted to £41,000,000. It has, besides, very extensive coal fields, and also copper, iron, and petroleum; but farm products form the chief source of wealth of the colony, the export of wool in 1884 having reached £3,267,327; the frozen meat trade, only recently developed, produced in 1884, £345,129; and Kauri gum, a specialty of New Zealand, is quoted at £342,151; whilst wheat produced £436,729; oats, £267,286; and timber, £152,932.

New Zealand has been a British colony since 1840, in which year Auckland and Wellington, now large and flourishing towns on the North Island, were founded. The population is estimated at 576,234 whites, and about 40,000 Maories; there are also about 5,000 Chinese. Woollen manufactories have been established, as also dairy factories and boot factories; agricultural implements, carriages, and machinery of various kinds are made, and eighty-three steamers have been built and their machinery supplied by New Zealand workmen. Tobacco, beer, paper, and a variety of other useful articles, are also made in the colony.

Specimens of all these things, and many more, appear among the exhibits, but that which especially calls for notice is the great advance made in art. The pictures exhibited in the Albert Hall, and those of Maories in the New Zealand Court, are not only delineations of scenery and apparently faithful portraits, but they are something more—they are works of art of no mean order. The same may be said of the photographs, which in all the courts—perhaps because of the warmer and brighter sun—show to great advantage beside those of our own leaden skies. The furniture made of the beautiful colonial woods is also tasteful and apparently durable.

The comparatively small Crown colony of Fiji is included in the Australasian group, but is as yet too young to call for much comment, having only come under British rule in 1874; nevertheless the trade of the islands has increased considerably since that date. Sugar, cocoa-nuts, and copra form the chief exports. The population is much mixed, owing to the introduction of Polynesian and coolie labourers. The natives number 114,891, and Europeans 3513; other races bringing the total up to 127,444. Fiji has a small space allotted to it in the Exhibition, and makes a fair display, chiefly of native curiosities, mats, tappa cloth, pottery, kava bowls, &c. &c.; but there are also

various products of cultivation, such as coffee, tea, arrowroot, rice, preserved fruit, &c.

Turning to the African colonies, which next present themselves to our notice, we find in South Africa a group of States which have gradually been formed into two great colonies—the Cape of Good Hope and Natal. The former has been under British rule since 1806, but has grown gradually by the annexation of native States, consequent upon wars, or the necessity of protecting the natives from various enemies, until it has come to include British Kaffraria, Transkei, Walvisch Bay, Griqualand West, St. John's River Territory, Tembuland, Gcalekaland, and other small States, most of which were long under British protection before it became necessary to incorporate them with the Cape Colony. Here, as in India, natives of various races form by far the largest portion of the population, and, as in Canada, there are two European peoples which have from time to time striven for mastery, and are even now in a state of ferment, greatly aggravated by Mr. Gladstone's policy of yielding to armed rebellion. The numbers of each at present occupying Cape Colony are given as whites, chiefly British and Dutch, 310,000; coloured, including Kaffirs, Hottentots, Bushmen, and Malays 900,000. Its revenue for 1883-4 was £2,949,950; its exports in 1884 amounted to £6,945,674, imports £5,249,000. At the beginning of the century the exports only amounted to £15,000, consisting chiefly of grain, cattle, and wine, but the imports have doubled, and the exports trebled, since 1860, and the latter now include wine, brandy, coffee, aloes, argol, bones, buchu leaves, copper ore, ostrich feathers, dried fruits, guano, angora hair, hides, horns, skins, wool, tobacco, and, last but not least, diamonds. It was the discovery of the latter in Griqualand West that gave the great impetus to trade which is shown in the large increase of imports and exports. Diamond mining was commenced in 1868, and the various mines have yielded since then no less than £31,772,476 declared value, and this immense sum does not represent the entire yield, as there is a great deal of illicit diamond dealing. From these figures it will be readily understood that the diamond industry forms one of the chief features in the Cape section of the Exhibition. There is a beautiful model of the Bultfontein mine, with all the machinery in working order, sections and maps of other mines, a large diamond washing machine, in which the real *blue ground* from various mines is washed and sorted daily, and in which several good sized diamonds have already been found, *à propos* of which, a curious fact may be mentioned, which is, that the diamonds are so distributed in the matrix as to average so many carats to the load of blue ground with almost mathematical certainty. There is also an enor-

mous number of diamonds in the rough exhibited, some specimens being very curious in shape and colour, two or three sometimes appearing as if welded together, and remarkable to relate, the two halves of one diamond were found several feet apart. The whole process of cutting and polishing the gem is also illustrated by Messrs. Ford & Wright, who have established diamond cutting works in rivalry of the celebrated Amsterdam works. Another new mineral production from the Cape, likely to come greatly into fashion for ornamental purposes, is *crocidolite*, a form of asbestos somewhat resembling the gem called cat's-eye. Another article of luxury forming a great feature in the South African exhibits is ostrich feathers. Ostrich farming, which a few years ago was the most productive industry in South Africa, has fallen very low, owing probably to over-production, but it is still profitable, and may revive when the present depression has passed away, and when luxury may again be indulged; for of all ornaments the ostrich feather is the most elegant. Cape wines are now beginning to find favour in the English market, and, with brandy, are exhibited, the produce of the 70,000,000 of vines planted in 1875, being 4,500,000 gallons of wine, and 1,000,000 gallons of brandy, and among the progressive industries of the Cape may be mentioned gold and copper mining, tobacco planting, and the cultivation of maize, wheat, and other cereals. Wool and mohair are also increasing in export value. It may fairly be assumed that notwithstanding the great wave of depression which is now passing over the whole of South Africa, there are still many signs of progress, chief among which may be mentioned the development of the railway and telegraph systems, and the construction of harbours and other public works. Of railways there are now 1603 miles in the colony, and 4219 miles of telegraph. South Africa is still *par excellence* the hunter's paradise, and there is at the Exhibition a trophy of heads and horns quite bewildering in number, size, and variety. One portion of the exhibits in the Cape section must not be overlooked, which is the various handicrafts of the natives educated at the Lovedale Institute, the object of which is to raise and elevate the native by means of industrial work. The great success of the plan adopted may be seen in the furniture, blacksmith's work, waggon-making, printing, book-binding, and needlework exhibited. Nor must we omit to mention the beautiful oil paintings of scenery, photographs and drawings of flowers, and a fine collection of paintings by the late Thomas Baines, illustrative of historical scenes, native habits, &c. &c.

Natal became a British colony in 1843, having previously undergone many vicissitudes. It was at first united to Cape

Colony, but in 1856 was formed into a separate colony. There have been many wars with Zulus and Dutch, but the country appears now tolerably settled, although the Zulus in Zululand, and the Dutch in the Transvaal, are still unquiet neighbours, especially as the population consists of such a large proportion of Zulus and other natives, the Europeans numbering only 35,453, to 361,766 African natives, and 27,276 Hindoo and Chinese coolies. The latter are employed in the cultivation of tea, sugar, coffee, cotton, and tropical fruits, also maize and indigo, all of which form profitable articles of commerce. Sheep and ostrich farming are also carried on successfully, as well as the breeding of cattle, in which latter occupation the Kaffirs are largely interested. The exports in 1884 amounted to £957,918, whilst the imports were estimated at £1,675,850. Among the exhibits in the Natal section, the maize (locally mealies), owing to its splendid size, is especially striking, whilst the tea, sugar, coffee, and tobacco, appear of excellent quality. In minerals, coal seems the most prominent, specimens from several mines being exhibited; there are also specimens of gold and copper ores, plumbago and asbestos, and the woods, both of Natal and the Cape, are very varied and beautiful. We are glad to see that Natal has sent to the Exhibition not only jams, dried and preserved fruits, chutneys and cayenne pepper, but also fresh ripe fruits. As Natal has a fine climate, an abundance of sun, and constant steam communication with England, its colonists might, we think, do more than they do in supplying English markets with the natural produce of the soil, and that an attempt might also be made to send over oysters, with which the seas abound, and perhaps to supplement the diamond and gold industries by a pearl fishery.

The other group of African colonies is to be found on the West Coast, and includes four small colonies, with a stretch of country on the Niger recently added to the empire. These colonies, named severally the Gold Coast Colony, Lagos, Sierra Leone and Gambia, are little known, and as their climate is very unhealthy, the inhabitants are almost entirely natives, but judging by the exhibits from these countries, they have made a considerable advance in civilization under European guidance. Native cloths and embroideries in silk and cotton, baskets, mats, and pottery, gold, silver, and brass ornaments, coloured and embroidered leather work—these are the chief manufactures, and all of a barbaric type, although the various cloths are very beautiful. Formerly this portion of the African coast was the great mart for slaves from the interior, but now the inland trade consists chiefly of ivory and monkey skins, whilst the products of the colonies themselves include gold, palm kernels and oil,

cotton, india rubber, beeswax, and various grains and seeds. The gold shown at the Exhibition consists largely of the indemnity paid by King Koffee after the Ashantee war, and is extremely interesting, being mostly of ancient manufacture, strongly resembling that in our museums from Ireland and ancient Etruria, as also that discovered by Dr. Schliemann in Mycenæ. The gold ore exhibited is very rich, but the mines have to depend upon native labour, and consequently their development is slow, nevertheless a great deal of gold has found its way to Europe from this coast ever since the fifteenth century, and it is estimated that altogether as much as forty or fifty millions has been thus obtained. But the principal revenue from exports is derived from palm oil and rubber, the latter having increased from 6½ cwt. in 1882 to 1552 cwt. in 1884. Some of the most interesting of the exhibits are illustrative of the Fetish worship of the natives, consisting of masks and figures of men and animals, with charms of various kinds, also a great variety of uncouth musical instruments and implements of agriculture. Mahometan influence is plainly seen in many of the ornamental designs, but the whole display is that of a savage people struggling into civilization. The Gambia was taken over by Queen Elizabeth, but the advance of the colony has been slow. Sierra Leone was ceded by a native chief in 1787, and served as a depôt for freed negroes, and Lagos was also ceded by a native chief in 1861, whilst the Gold Coast was ceded by the Dutch in 1871.

St. Helena, Ascension, and Tristan da Cunha may properly be included among the African colonies. They are chiefly important as points of call for British vessels, but can hardly be cited as progressive colonies, although they each contribute something to the Exhibition. Ascension is, however, important from its turtles, which supply our aldermanic feasts.

Once more crossing the Atlantic, we find a group of colonies of considerable importance, consisting of Jamaica, the Bahamas, the Bermudas, the Virgin Islands, the Leeward and the Windward Islands, Barbados, and Trinidad, with British Guiana on the South American continent, and British Honduras in North America. Taking these West Indian colonies as cited above, we first turn our attention to Jamaica. Discovered by Columbus, it was conquered from the Spanish in the time of Cromwell, who encouraged emigration to it with success, and it long deserved the name of the "brightest gem in the British diadem." But it has fallen upon evil days, the sugar industry has declined greatly since the manumission of the slaves, and is still further injured by the unjust foreign bounty system; nevertheless, the colony has been striving to regain some of her former prosperity by developing

her great natural resources, and the present Exhibition shows not only sugar, rum, and coffee, but also woods, spices, cocoa, arrowroot, cinchona, oils, and preserved fruits as products of Jamaica. The population of the island is estimated at 580,000, of which the whites number only 14,432, and the exports in 1884 were valued at £1,614,583.

The Bahamas consist of twenty-nine small islands in the Atlantic, off the coast of Florida, the largest, New Providence, being about twenty-one miles long by seven in breadth; the population in 1881 was 44,000, of whom 14,000 were whites, and the remainder the descendants of emancipated slaves. The Bahamas have been nominally under British rule since the days of Queen Elizabeth, but have only had a settled government since the American War of Independence. The chief exports are sponge, shells, pearls, corals, tortoiseshell, ambergris, trepang and turtle, of which the latter is valued at £600 per annum, whilst shells realized £1200 per annum, pearls £3000, and sponge in 1885 £55,000. In 1874 the value of this export was only £16,000, but in 1883 it rose to £60,000. In the present Exhibition the products exhibited, in addition to those named, consist of native woods, ropes made of fibres of various plants, turbot skins, preserved fruits, perfumery, and some cameos and carved ornaments, made at the Nassau Art School.

The Bermudas were taken possession of by Sir George Somers in 1609, whence they are sometimes called "Somers' Islands." The trade of these islands is chiefly with America, the imports in 1884 amounting to £251,110, and the exports to £88,622, having declined from £109,155 in 1882; whilst the population increased from 12,121 in 1871 to 14,588 in 1884, of whom 8931 are coloured. They are not represented in the Exhibition.

The Leeward Islands, with which the Virgin Islands may be included, form the northern portion of the lesser Antilles. The chief of these islands are Antigua, St. Christopher, St. Kitts and Nevis, Dominica, and Montserrat. The latter has lately become well known from its various preparations of lime-juice, which form a conspicuous portion of its exhibits. The Virgin Islands send corals, minerals and preserves, with some interesting native coins. Dominica supplies a large number of ancient and modern Carib implements and curiosities, also cocoa, coffee, lime-juice, quassia cups, cinnamon and other spices, and cassava meal and cakes, which might, we think, be more extensively exported, as also cassareep, which is an excellent sauce, and forms the basis of most of those in use; whilst from Antigua we find rum, sugar, pickles and preserves, ginger, arrowroot, honey, limes, and a variety of other useful products.

The Windward Islands include Grenada, St. Lucia, St.

Vincent, and Tobago. Grenada, after having been ceded to Great Britain by the Treaty of Paris in 1763, was retaken by the French in 1779, but again yielded to Great Britain in 1783, and in 1877, with Barbados, St. Vincent, Tobago, and St. Lucia, became a Crown colony. The estimated population of Grenada is 16,425; the chief article of produce is cocoa, which last year yielded 5,500,000 pounds, and also excellent fruits of all kinds. St. Lucia produces sugar, cocoa, and spices; St. Vincent is famed for its arrowroot; and the chief exhibits of all these islands consist of these products, with fruits, cassava and sugar, which, notwithstanding the great depression, remains the staple manufacture of the West Indies. It is worthy of remark that Tobago, which is the least prosperous of these islands, is yet the most fully represented in the Exhibition, and sends, besides sugar, rum and molasses, a large collection of food products, oils, gums, dyes, medicines, and vegetable fibres, and also woods and minerals. Barbados was taken possession of in 1605, and the first Governor was appointed in 1625, since which time it has always formed a portion of the British Empire, and is therefore one of the oldest of our colonies. It is very thickly populated, the whites numbering 16,000, and the coloured 155,806; the latter appear more industrious and content than elsewhere, and sugar is still the chief product; the fisheries are also a great source of wealth. Among the exhibits may be noticed cocoa, coffee, spices, and tobacco.

Trinidad was captured from the Spaniards in 1797, and ceded to Great Britain by the Treaty of Amiens. Although Trinidad, like all the West Indies, has suffered from the abolition of slavery, it may be looked upon as a prosperous colony, the revenue having risen steadily till last year, and the exports and imports having increased also; coolie immigration has been of great benefit; and although sugar continues to be the chief product, it is supplemented by many others, especially coffee, cocoa, and chocolate, fruits, seeds, oils, and vegetables, which all find a place in the Exhibition.

British Guiana has belonged to Great Britain since 1803, and is almost wholly dependent upon the sugar industry. In 1885 the quantity produced was 106,532 hogsheads; the population numbers 264,000, and consists of Europeans, aborigines, West Indians, Portuguese, Africans, Chinese, and East Indians, reckoned at 92,000 in 1885. Besides sugar, British Guiana exhibits various fine woods, more than one hundred in number; also a number of vegetable fibres, gums, oils, and barks, fruits, cassava bread, cassareep, and a variety of fruits.

British Honduras, on the North American continent, although settled at least 200 years ago, only became a colony in 1862; its



chief wealth lies in its beautiful mahogany and logwood, but fruit is grown for the American markets, and also sugar; many valuable fibre plants are indigenous, as also the cocoa-tree and the vanilla bean. The labour question is the chief difficulty here as in all the West Indies, but coolie labour has been introduced, and is found to be satisfactory.

Crossing the American Isthmus, and voyaging over the North Pacific, we come to a group of Asiatic colonies, and to several islands scattered through the Indian Ocean, which must by no means be omitted in treating of the British Colonial Empire; and first the island of Hong Kong, ceded to Great Britain in 1841. It is essentially Chinese in the character of its manufactures, its inhabitants consisting mainly of natives of the Flowery Land. Hong Kong is of great importance as a shipping port, being the fourth largest in the world.

British North Borneo is also highly important from its numerous fine harbours; it has only been a British colony since 1877, but may be looked upon as prosperous and progressive. It exhibits timber, jungle and sea produce, and native manufactures, arms, and curios, all highly interesting.

The Straits Settlements consist of the islands of Singapore, Penang, a strip of territory on the mainland, Malacca, and the native States of Perak, Selangor, and Sungei Ujong, under British protection. The population is mixed, consisting of Europeans, Malays, Chinese, and natives of India, numbering together 420,384. The chief products are tin, sugar, spices, rice, tapioca, sago, hides, horns, gum, coffee and tobacco, and the united exports and imports have risen from £14,821,300 in 1859 to £39,077,809 in 1884, whilst the revenue is £629,921. The exhibits are numerous and very interesting, but cannot here be enumerated; amongst them are numerous ethnological collections. The importance of these colonies may be judged from the shipping, the number of vessels entering the various ports in 1884, exclusive of native craft, being 5448, with a burthen of 3,634,174 tons.

Mauritius, including the Seychelles Islands, and about seventy other small islands, scattered over the Indian Ocean, is a Crown colony, and produces sugar, rum, vanilla, and aloe fibre. Mauritius was captured from the French by the East India Company in 1810, and England was confirmed in its possession by the Treaty of Paris, in 1814; it is of great use as a shipping port. It sends to the Exhibition a great variety of native woods, as also sugar, drugs and medicines, whilst the Seychelles contribute woods, tobacco, soaps, arrowroot, vanilla, &c.

Taking the Red Sea route homewards, we come to Aden, Perim, and Socotra, the former on the Arabian coast, the two latter being

islands lying at the entrance to the Red Sea, and therefore of great importance as safe-guarding the passage of the Straits of Babel-Mandeb. Aden is also a coaling station, and exports coffee, dyes, feathers, gums, spices, &c., to the annual value of £1,448,890. Entering the Mediterranean by the Suez Canal, we come to our last group of colonies—Cyprus, Malta and Gibraltar. Cyprus, ceded to England in 1877, has risen rapidly in prosperity under British rule, as may be seen by the exports and imports, which together, in 1878, were valued at £334,979, whilst in 1884-5 they amounted to £591,896. The island sends to the present Exhibition a variety of cereals, cotton, wool, silk, very fine embroideries, tobacco and wine, also minerals and woods, implements of agriculture of an Old World type, but extremely interesting, and that which is of the greatest importance to the island, the invention for destroying locusts, whereby this pest has been almost exterminated in Cyprus. Malta, a small but very important colony, from its use as a military and naval station, sends to the Exhibition samples of its well-known and very beautiful lace and jewellery, but, in addition, exhibits some exquisite lace-like carvings in stone; there are also some beautiful musical instruments and models of ships and boats, as well as life-sized models of the old knights of Malta, in their antique armour, gold and silk embroideries and tapestry, with the method of restoring ancient Gobelin work. In economical and agricultural products, we find potatoes, jams and preserves, cigars and cigarettes, cotton stuffs, mule cloths and hosiery, candles, soaps and leather works; and also baskets, brooms and mats made by the prisoners and lunatics.

In this hasty sketch we have omitted Gibraltar, the key to the Mediterranean, the Falkland Islands in the South Atlantic, valuable as a coaling and fishery station, and which export to England wool, hides, tussac grass, horns, bones and tallow, valued at £98,468; Heligoland, in the North Sea, with its fisheries of haddock and lobsters; and Port Hamilton, occupied only since 1884, commanding the entrance between the Yellow Sea and Sea of Japan, and which, when the route to India across the Pacific is established, may become extremely valuable.

We have in the foregoing pages presented a very imperfect sketch of the various British colonies with their chief products, their progress under British rule, and their vast capabilities as shown in this remarkable Exhibition, and have in so doing journeyed on paper twice round the world, taking the two principal routes, *via* the Cape and the Suez Canal, to find on each route colonies of vast importance, most of them growing with the force and rapidity of youthful giants, bidding fair at no distant date to be ready to go forth "conquering and to conquer," yet all at present

willing to yield allegiance to the small, yet vigorous, fatherland, which they still fondly regard as *home*. Varying in size, in climate, in natural resources, in mode of government, they all have this bond in common, for in each, the dominant class, though sometimes small in number as compared with the natives, is composed of sons of Britannia, and a rising against British authority in any one of these dependencies, would be of the nature of civil war. That our rule has on the whole been beneficent, and productive of peace and prosperity, the figures we have given sufficiently demonstrate; the exceptions to the rule of progress are few and far between, and the varied systems of government, from the strict imperial and military rule of India, and the severe type of Crown colony resembling an autocracy, to the almost perfect freedom of Canada and the Australias, seem fairly suited to the exigencies of the governed; for whenever a colony has been found ripe for self-government, the boon has been ungrudgingly bestowed, and never again, we may be sure, will the faults be repeated, which deprived us of the United States, our most vigorous offspring. At the present time, politicians of all shades seem desirous of strengthening the bonds of amity which exist between the mother country and her colonies. Few, if any, would now dare to say, "Perish India;" and if any one should still doubt the value and importance of our colonial possessions, let him follow us from court to court of the Exhibition, and see how in every instance trade follows the flag; and, in confirmation of this, let him examine the statistics of Captain Colomb, and the very instructive diagrams of Sir Rawson W. Rawson, appended to "Her Majesty's Colonies," from which we extract a few of the most astounding figures. We find, then, first, that the area of the British colonies in 1884 was 7,938,122 square miles, containing a population of 213,918,000, whilst the Portuguese colonies, next in area, only extend over 705,778 square miles, with a population of 3,723,967, and the Dutch colonies, which have a population of 26,811,597, only extend to 682,792 square miles. The general trade of the United Kingdom, including imports and exports, amounted to £715,371,000, of which £186,358,000 was with its colonies. The trade of France at the same period was £425,160,000, and the trade with its colonies was £21,056,000. The value of British and Irish produce exported to foreign countries in 1884 was £150,000,000, and to our colonies £80,000,000. Of the latter sum India took more than £30,000,000, Australia nearly £20,000,000, Canada £9,000,000, and the other colonies £22,500,000. In the case of India, this shows a rise of £6,000,000 since 1871, and nearly the same may be said of Australia; but in the other colonies there is a decrease

of from £1,000,000 to £3,000,000. The imports from India and the colonies to Great Britain during the same year (1884) were estimated at—India, £34,000,000; Australia, £22,000,000; Canada, £10,000,000; New Zealand, £6,000,000; Cape of Good Hope, £5,000,000; and so on down to Newfoundland and Natal, the imports from which were only a little over £500,000 sterling each. In most cases there was a very considerable rise from the year 1874, amounting in Australia to upwards of £7,000,000, in India to £1,000,000, in New Zealand to £2,500,000, in the Straits Settlements and the Cape of Good Hope to £2,000,000; but in a few, as in Ceylon and the West Indies, there was a decline of nearly £2,000,000 in the same period. Probably, the statistics for last year would show a decline almost all round, but it may be safely prophesied that any decline will be only temporary, consequent upon the universal depression, and it is, at all events, abundantly evident that the Colonies, India, and the United Kingdom are mutually dependent upon each other for the larger portion of their commercial prosperity, and, it may be added, that there is not an article, either of utility or luxury, which cannot be supplied to our markets by India or our Colonies, and in almost every instance the supply would or could be increased to meet the demand, so that, in any emergency, as in the case of war, we might be wholly independent of foreign trade, if only we could secure the safe convoy of stores from our colonies; but in order to this it is necessary to provide not only a strong convoy, but also for the defence of the colonies themselves, which in many cases lie open to attack from an enemy. For this and for other reasons a federation of the whole Empire has been proposed, and is earnestly desired by the more thoughtful politicians both in the mother country and the colonies, where the idea of foreign domination would be regarded with horror and aversion, not only on account of the loss and ruin it would occasion by the sudden stoppage of trade, but also because of the severance of home ties and associations it would necessitate. They therefore are willing and even anxious for such a bond of union as would include mutual aid in time of war, and a system of defence for their ports against the attacks of an enemy's cruisers.

But the federation and defence of a vast empire, of which the component parts are so widely scattered, and which differ so greatly in size and in power, are not easily accomplished; they require statesmanship of no mean order, and unless some sudden emergency should arise to dispel the doubts and quicken the fears of the waverers, it may not be carried out for generations to come. The Royal Colonial Institute, of which the Prince of Wales is president, has worked long and earnestly in this great

cause, and has taken advantage of the present Exhibition, in which all parts of the empire are represented, to hold frequent conferences on this and similar subjects of Imperial importance, and especially emigration. At one of these Mr. Labilliere ably expounded the principles of a scheme of federation which he said "should combine on an equitable basis the resources of the empire for the maintenance of common interests, and adequately provide for an organized defence of common rights." This is the language of the Imperial Federation League, formed for the express purpose of promoting federal union between Great Britain and her colonies, which Mr. Labilliere went on to say must include "equitable representation in an efficient Imperial Parliament, equitable system of taxation to raise Imperial revenue, equitable guarantee of all existing rights of provincial self-government, including control of fiscal policies." But it is just here that difficulties apparently insuperable show themselves, and although the speakers who followed Mr. Labilliere were all in favour of the *principle* of Imperial federation, yet they brought out clearly the differences of opinion existing on the subject in the various colonies. Sir Alexander Stuart (since deceased), speaking for New South Wales, a colony naturally proud of having sent a contingent to the help of the mother country in the Soudan campaign, said, "Many of us have an extreme desire that the British navy should be strengthened in our respective seas, and some of us have offered to pay the additional expense involved in doing so. We do not wish to see England bear the expense of that which is for our good and not theirs specially, and we are, therefore, quite prepared to pay the additional expense; but we would never dream of parting with the right to tax ourselves, in order that the British Admiralty might strengthen its resources by putting its hands into our pockets. We say we will find the money. It is no matter to you how we find it." Then other speakers made it plain that some of the colonies, in agreeing to a scheme of federation, would expect some sort of protective tariff to enable them to compete successfully with foreigners, and this would certainly be the case with the West Indies, which have suffered so severely from the bounty system; but the majority of Englishmen would never consent to a return to protection in any form, and thus it will be seen that the fiscal difficulties would be great. As to the Parliamentary Council, there would not seem to be much objection to be urged against the representation of the colonies in a separate chamber, but it would hardly be possible to incorporate colonial representatives in the present House of Commons, since it is obvious that they could not vote in anything relating to the internal affairs of the United Kingdom. It is, however, of good augury that there is

an almost unanimous desire on the part of the colonies for some firmer bond of union with the mother country, and it is well to take advantage of the present gathering to foster and encourage a desire which is so evidently for the good of all parties. That it is no longer considered beyond the bounds of possibility may be seen, by its having been brought before the House as a question; and we give the answer of the Prime Minister, which was to the effect that, "The examination of such a question, instituted or promoted by voluntary effort, might probably be very useful; but the same thing promoted by the Government is a serious affair." Mr. Gladstone then went on to say that, "Important proposals are at present under the consideration of the Australian Colonial Governments, in conjunction with the admiral of the station, for the establishment of united Imperial and Colonial action for defensive purposes. But no general scheme with the object mentioned in the question has met with the acceptance of the colonies down to the present time." Nevertheless, we cannot fail to see in these negotiations an approach to the desired federation in some of the most important of the colonies, and once commenced, doubtless the scheme will grow and widen, till it eventually embraces the whole empire.

The occasion for the question of Mr. H. Vincent in the House was the lecture delivered at the Royal United Service Institution on May 31 by Captain Colomb upon "Imperial Federation, Naval and Military;" and some of his remarks as well as his figures\* are so pertinent to our subject that we must quote a few words: "What Imperial Federation really means," says Captain Colomb, "is not 'spread-eagleism,' not a declaration of 'defiance' to the world, but business-like arrangements between the colonies and the mother country for the discharge of the responsibilities and the duties of 'defence.'" It is, in truth, *defence not defiance* that is desired; but to be prepared for defence is, in fact, to defy our enemies, and the knowledge of our preparedness for all emergencies would go far to prevent all attacks. If, therefore, the present Exhibition should be the means of advancing Imperial Federation for defensive purposes, it would go far towards bringing about that millennium so fondly hoped for, from the first great Exhibition. Then it was expected that

---

\* Captain Colomb, who, like ourselves, has taken 1851 as his starting-point, shows that the aggregate trade of the Empire exceeds by 100 millions sterling that of thirty-five years ago; and, to prove the progress of the colonies, he says that, whilst in 1851 the annual revenue of the United Kingdom was nearly double that of the empire beyond the sea, now, that of the colonies and India exceeds that of the mother country by £22,000,000; and the tonnage of shipping to our ports abroad is greater by 13,000,000 tons than to our home ports.

“swords would at once be beaten into ploughshares, and spears into pruning-hooks;” but now it is rather proposed to use the sword and the spear to protect the plough, to call forth all the arts of war, in order to ensure peace and security for the husbandman, the merchant, and the many myriads who depend upon them for all the necessaries of life.

It is a significant fact, that in all the magnificent display of arts and manufactures from our colonies, engines of war have no place, although in the Canadian exhibits there is to be found under the head of *firearms* (having a class all to itself) a *Kentucky rifle!* The defence of these vast possessions appear to be left entirely to the mother country; their manufactures are not those of great guns and weapons of offence, but those of peace only. There are plenty of agricultural implements, railway plant, quartz-crushing machinery, and other proofs of engineering skill; but weapons of war, excepting those of savages, exhibited as curiosities, are conspicuous by their absence.

It is generally supposed that *colonial* federation must precede Imperial federation, and it is indeed to be desired that the various groups of colonies should combine not only for defence, but also for commercial purposes, and that one set of customs dues, &c., should prevail over each group, but hitherto it has not been found possible to make the colonist see this. It is well-known that the late Sir Bartle Frere, earnestly desirous as he was of promoting federation in South Africa, was unsuccessful in that which may be called his mission, and the cause has been still further retarded by the unwise and, as far as British interests are concerned, disastrous retrocession of the Transvaal. The members of the Australian Heptarchy also remain apart, although united by many ties. Canada alone has joined in a close federal union, which has largely increased her prosperity and national importance. We do not, however, think that it will be found necessary to await the federation of all these coterminous States before commencing the greater and far more important work of Imperial federation, for delay in that may mean peril and disaster, and the greater union may, and probably would, precipitate the less, by emphasizing the truth that *Union is Strength*. The minds of men are now fixed upon this vital question; the threatened disruption of the empire has made union appear more than ever desirable; the Colonial and Indian Exhibition in showing the extent, the wealth and the abundant resources of the Empire, and the desirability of a common bond of union for defensive and commercial purposes, has done much to knit the colonies more closely to each other and to the mother country, as well as to show to Englishmen the use and value of the Colonies and India, especially as a field for the

employment of our congested population, and the time appears favourable for the growth of that public feeling, which cannot fail to result in uniting in an indissoluble bond the greatest Empire the world has ever seen. Victoria, the most prosperous and progressive of the colonies, the age of which corresponds with the age of Exhibitions, as inaugurated in 1851, has also been the first to agitate for federal union, and the words of Mr. Thomson, the secretary to the Royal Commission for Victoria on this subject, deserve to be recorded. Although he says—

“they claim Victoria to be the most prosperous, and the most energetic of all the Australian colonies, yet Victorians were the first to raise their voices for the federation of the colonies, the political unity of Australia. Then the peoples of all the provinces, at present divided by local prejudices and jealousies, will be joined together; and some day in the future, following out the manifest destiny of the British race, with the dear old mother-country, and her eldest born, the United States of America, will be linked together in a strong bond, ruling lands and seas, and giving laws to all the world.”\*

It appears to us that the fruit is well-nigh ripe. Where is the great statesman who will dare to pluck it ere it fall, and present it to the world as the true antidote to that pestilent apple of discord, fostered and cultivated by those who would fain see Great Britain and her colonies scattered and divided into a number of petty States, ready to fall a prey to the first invader? Surely accursed to all time in the pages of history shall be that statesman who, pandering to sedition, shall begin to dismember this great Empire; for in a far higher sense, and to an extent undreamt of by Napoleon, *l'Empire c'est la Paix*.

---

#### ART. IV.—ERNEST, KING OF HANOVER.

*Reminiscences of the Court and Times of King Ernest of Hanover.* By the Rev. C. ALLIX WILKINSON, M.A., his Majesty's Resident Domestic Chaplain. In two volumes. London: Hurst & Blackett. 1886.

**T**HIS is a book written to whitewash the memory of a man who, in his day and generation, was, above all his fellows, odious to the people of this country. It would have been wiser if Mr. Wilkinson had allowed the memory of Ernest Augustus, Duke of Cumberland and King of Hanover, to remain in the

---

\* “Official Handbook,” pp. 177.



oblivion into which it had fallen. It was said of an earlier Duke of Cumberland, the brother of George III., that he was a man "of depraved character, a vicious and ill-conditioned prince;" and his nephew, Ernest Augustus, not only bore his title, but his character also. He himself told Mr. Wilkinson that he had been accused of every crime in the Decalogue.\* The well-known midnight onslaught on him by his valet, Sellis, was always associated by the public with some mystery never revealed.† The Duke of Wellington once asked George IV. why his brother, the Duke of Cumberland, was so unpopular; and the King said: "Because there never was a father well with his son, or husband with his wife, or lover with his mistress, that he did not try to make mischief between them."

George IV. seems to have hated and feared his brother Ernest, and yet endeavoured to cajole him. Lord Ellenborough records in his "Diary": "The King, our master, is the weakest man in England. He hates the Duke of Cumberland. He wishes his death. He is relieved when he is away; but he is afraid of him and crouches to him."‡

When George IV. was dying he absolutely refused to see his brother of Cumberland.§ William IV. took a milder view of his brother: "Ernest is not a bad fellow; but if any one has a corn he is sure to tread on it"—a truth of which Mr. Wilkinson's "Reminiscences" afford copious illustrations. But William IV., on his accession to the throne, deprived his brother of the command of the Household Cavalry, which he had held under George IV. Lord Ellenborough's own opinion of the Duke was: "He is a Mephistopheles, and sure, wherever he can, to do any mischief." In another entry he says: "The suicide of — on account of his wife's seduction, will drive the Duke of Cumberland out of the field."¶

Sir Robert Peel in 1829 wrote to the Duke of Wellington this unflattering opinion of the Duke of Cumberland: "He has no sort of influence over public opinion in this country, or over any party that is worth consideration. I do not believe that the most violent Brunswickers \*\* have the slightest respect for him or slightest confidence in him." The Duke of Cumberland's own opinion of Peel was not more flattering. "When," he writes to

\* Vol. i. pp. 6, 8, 9.

† As to the Sellis case, see "Reminiscences" pp. 8, 9, 10. The whole literature about this case forms one of the volumes of the papers of the late Francis Place, now in the British Museum.

‡ "Diary," vol. ii. p. 41.

§ *Ibid.* pp. 229, 253.

¶ "Reminiscences," vol. i. p. 18.

¶ "Diary," vol. i. p. 174.

\*\* In reference to the Duke's leading the Brunswick Club's opposition to the Roman Catholic Relief Bill.

his friend, Lord Strangford, "you have not been born or bred a gentleman, you cannot expect noble ideas or feelings; and great as Peel's talents are—and no one is readier to admit them than myself—you will always see the jenny; the manufacturer's blood will show."

The Duke married a German Princess who had been divorced from a former husband, and Queen Charlotte absolutely refused to receive her.\*

The dislike of the country to him was shown in a very marked way on the marriage of his three brothers after the death of the Princess Charlotte, when allowances were made to them by Parliament. It was proposed to increase the Duke of Cumberland's allowance to £6,000 a year. The House of Commons negatived the proposal. Another proof of his unpopularity is shown by the advice given him with cynical if not brutal frankness by the Duke of Wellington. When it was clear that William IV. was dying, and that the Duke would succeed to the Crown of Hanover, the Duke of Cumberland consulted the Duke of Wellington as to his setting out at once to Hanover. "I told him," said Wellington, "the best thing he could do was to go away as fast as he could. 'Go instantly,' I said, 'and take care that you don't get pelted.'" †

He was quite aware of his own unpopularity. Charles Greville tells this story of him:—"One day, at Buckingham Palace, he proposed to Prince Albert to go out and walk with him. The Prince excused himself, saying he could not walk in the streets, as they should be exposed to inconvenience from the crowds of people. The King replied: 'Oh, never mind that; I was still more unpopular than you are now, and used to walk about with perfect impunity.'" ‡

As a young man, it was said of the Duke of Cumberland that his behaviour and conversation "was of a nature as to coarseness that would have disgraced one of his own grooms;" and such continued to be his habit throughout his life.§ When the Roman Catholic Emancipation Bill was before the House of Lords it was opposed by Archbishop Howley with becoming dignity and even eloquence. "The Duke of Cumberland," we are told, "was so delighted with the Archbishop's performance that, when entertaining a small party at his own table, he emphasised his sentences by the interlarding of such expressions as at length to elicit from the Duchess the observation: 'Why,

---

\* See Fitzgerald's "Royal Dukes and Princesses of the Family of George III.," vol. ii. p. 256.

† Greville's "Journals," part ii. vol. i. p. 42.

‡ "Memoirs," part ii. vol. ii. p. 192.

§ Fitzgerald's "Life of George IV." vol. ii. p. 15.

my dear, the Archbishop did not swear.' When he replied, evidently unwilling to concede his position: 'Well, if he did not say that, he said something very much like it.'\* He thus described himself to his friend, Lord Strangford: "You know me too long and too well not to be fully persuaded that I am neither a Methodist, saint, or psalm-singer; but I trust I have a sound foundation of true religion, which my father possessed in the highest degree, and which I inherited from him."†

The Duke's creed may be thus summed up: A firm belief that bishops should be aristocrats, and wear wigs and cocked hats. Referring to the appointment of a living member of the Episcopate, he writes to his confidant, Lord Strangford: "His father was a Taylor (*sic*), and measured Wilkinson here (the remiscient), and made his breeches; consequently you will agree with me he is neither born nor bred a gentleman, and cannot know what thereunto belongs. . . . Westmorland confirms this information, and also employed him as a breeches-maker! Now, I ask you, is that a man fit to sit upon the bench."‡ On another occasion he wrote: "I maintain that the first change and shock in the ecclesiastical habits was the bishops being allowed to lay aside their wigs, their purple coats, short cassocks, and stockings, and cocked hats, when appearing in public;" and after telling that his father refused to receive a bishop's homage because the new prelate came without his wig, "Times are changed," he continues. "I have seen a bishop attend the committee-room in the House of Lords in a black Wellington coat, with top-boots, and coming in with a hat like a butcher or coachmaster. Would to God," he piously concludes, "all the old forms had been studiously and sacredly kept up."§ "In church, his Majesty," Mr. Williamson tells us, "was most attentive and devout, from the beginning of the service to the end, making every response in a loud voice, and so by this good example carrying the little congregation with him."|| This reminds us of the "Spectator's" advice to the members of a country congregation: "Remember, he who bawls the loudest may be the wickedest fellow in the parish."

The Duke regarded with particular aversion the present Queen, whom he looked on as an interloper who had kept him from the throne of England—a fact for which the people of this country cannot be too thankful. With still greater aversion he regarded the late Prince Consort, whom he describes to Lord

\* Lord Teignmouth's "Reminiscences of Many Years," vol. ii. p. 207.

† Fitzgerald's "Royal Dukes and Princesses," vol. ii. p. 286.

‡ Fitzgerald's "Princesses and Dukes," vol. ii. p. 297.

§ *Ibid.* p. 293.

|| "Reminiscences," vol. i. p. 89.

Strangford as "a handsome, comely youth, but from all those who know him he is a terrible Liberal, almost a *Radical*." On another occasion he writes of the Prince: "He is represented as impertinent, full of pretension, a man totally ignorant of what are the common usages of the world." Again: "If I am correctly informed, I hear he (the Prince Consort) is still more dangerous than a Roman Catholic, being a sort of freethinker and very light in his religious principles. Mind you, I only tell what I have heard; but one thing is perfectly certain, that there is no decided religion in any of them."\* We do not know to whom the Duke here refers, but he himself was certainly in the same category.

The late Baron Bunsen the Duke speaks of as "that great and egregious fool." He disliked fully as much as did George IV. the late King Leopold of Belgium; while of Baron Stockmar he writes to his confidant:

I will tell you an anecdote of the origin of this worthy. He was what is called a company-surgeon in a Russian regiment, which is neither more nor less than a man employed in shaving the company, and preparing plasters and dressings in the regimental hospital; and this he was in 1816, when Leopold was sent for to England by the late Lord Castlereagh. Leopold had the misfortune of having a malady, for which Stockmar attended him, and he accompanied his patient to London; and Leopold, having used him to write his letters when not employing him as a surgeon, persuaded him to stay, and he became his major-domo, and by degrees his privy councillor; and being very intriguing, he employed him upon any business, and perhaps, as, you know, Leopold was always a great admirer of the fair sex, he may have employed him in that branch of affairs.†

The recently published "Memoirs of Karoline Bauer" prove that his Majesty was perfectly right in his supposition.

In short, the character of the King of Hanover (as we will henceforth call him) is accurately summed up by Charles Greville: "There never was such a man, or behaviour so atrocious as his—a mixture of narrow-mindedness, selfishness, truckling, blustering, and duplicity, with no object but self, his own ease, and the gratification of his own fancies and prejudices, without regard to the advice and opinion of the wisest and best-informed men, or to the interests and tranquillity of the country."‡

It is significant of the estimation in which the King of Hanover was held by all ranks and classes of his countrymen, that fifty years ago, when the University of Oxford was still Protestant

---

\* Fitzgerald's "Royal Dukes and Princesses," vol. ii. p. 287.

† *Ibid.* p. 293-7.

‡ Quoted by Fitzgerald, *ibid.* p. 272.

and Tory, notwithstanding the King's staunch Toryism and his impassioned opposition to Catholic Emancipation, the University refused to include him in the list of persons on whom the honorary degree of D.C.L. was conferred on occasion of the installation of the Duke of Wellington as Chancellor of the University.\*

Although the King has been in his grave for thirty-five years, his evil reputation survives. Of this we have had proof in our own experience. Within the last four years the King's granddaughter, the Princess Frederica of Cumberland, visited West Cornwall and spent a few days at St. Michael's Mount. Parenthetically we may remark that her Royal Highness went from the Mount to worship in a Cornish village church, being, so far as we know and believe, the only member of the House of Hanover who had done so from the accession of George I. until the time at which we write. The present writer happened to join the train which conveyed the Princess from London, and was surprised to find the talk of the carriage into which he got was wholly of the sins and iniquities of her grandfather, especially the Sellis mystery; and he experienced the same thing in inns and other places of public resort.

King Ernest succeeded to the throne of Hanover on the death of William IV., in 1837. Shortly afterwards an occurrence took place which gave him an opportunity of showing his ill-conditioned nature and gratifying his antipathy to the Queen.

The story is thus related by Charles Greville:—

Lord Duncannon showed me the correspondence between him and the King of Hanover about the apartments at St. James's. The case is this: When the Queen was going to be married the Duchess of Kent told Duncannon she must have a house, and that she could not afford to pay for one (the greater part of her income being appropriated to the payment of her debts). Duncannon † told her that there were no royal apartments unoccupied, except the King of Hanover's at St. James's, and it was settled that he should be apprised that the Queen had occasion for them, and be requested to give them up. Duncannon accordingly wrote a note to Sir F. Watson, who manages the King's affairs here, and told him that he had such a communication to make to his Majesty, which he was desirous of bringing before him in the most respectful manner, and that the arrangement should be made in whatever way was most convenient to him. Watson informed him that he had forwarded his note to the King, and shortly after Dun-

---

\* Lord Teignmouth's "Reminiscences," vol. ii.

† Lord Duncannon was at this time First Commissioner of Works, and the arrangements with reference to the royal palaces fell within his department. The Duchess, for particular reasons, objected to going back to Kensington. (Editor's notes in Greville, "Memoirs," second part, vol. i. p. 280.)

cannon received an answer from the King himself, which was neither more nor less than a flat refusal to give up the apartments. Another communication then took place between Duncannon and Watson, when the latter said that it would be very inconvenient to the King to remove his things from the apartments without coming over in person, as the library particularly was full of papers of importance. Duncannon then proposed that the library and the adjoining room, in which it was said the papers were deposited, should not be touched, but remain in his possession; that they should be walled off and separated from the rest of the suite which might be given up to the Duchess for her occupation. This proposal was sent to the King, who refused to agree to it, or to give up the apartments at all. Accordingly the Queen was obliged to hire a house for her mother at a rent of £2,000 a year. I told Duncannon they were all very much to blame for submitting to the domineering insolence of the King, and that when they thought it right to require the apartments, they ought to have gone through with it, and have taken no denial. It was a gross insult to the Queen to refuse to give up to her an apartment in her own palace, which she desired to dispose of, and they were very wrong in permitting such an affront to be offered to her; so Duncannon himself was of opinion, but Melbourne, who is all for quietness, would not allow matters to proceed to extremities, and preferred knocking under—a mode of proceeding which is always as contemptible as it is useless.\*

So the King kept his apartments until the day of his death, twelve years later; during all which time he, so far forth as we remember, never but once occupied them, on occasion of a three months' visit to England, when he complained bitterly to Lord Strangford that he was only once invited to dine at Court and to one great ball.† It is significant of the relations between the King and Queen Victoria that his name is only once mentioned in "The Life of the Prince Consort," and that merely in a footnote referring to his disagreeable conduct about the Prince Consort's precedence.§

Such was the man whom the Rev. Mr. Wilkinson, a clergyman, delights to honour; but even he admits that "the noted, stern, unbending Tory Duke, honoured as such by his political party, was the subject simply of execration to all on the opposite side, and indeed to people in general who did not know him personally."||

\* Greville's "Memoirs," *ubi supra*.

† "London, that a little time ago seemed so dull that the shopkeepers were in despair, is suddenly favoured by the most animated season, for which they are indebted to the King of Hanover, now the most popular man in town, for the first time in his life." ("Lord Beaconsfield's Correspondence with his Sister," p. 198.)

‡ Fitzgerald's "Royal Dukes and Princesses."

§ "Life of the Prince Consort," vol. i. p. 62.

|| Vol. i. p. 6.

[Vol. CXXVI. No. CCLI.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. LXX. No. I.

E

We deny that the Tory party in general honoured King Ernest. His position is accurately stated by Sir Robert Peel in the letter from which we have quoted. Mr. Wilkinson further admits that when the chaplaincy was offered to him he was indeed taken aback. "The stories that were current of the King made my hair stand on end. Knowing all this," he continues, "could I, dare I, accept the appointment of his Majesty's domestic chaplain?" Again: "I knew his Majesty patronized some clergymen for whom the world had little respect, and acquaintances of their own college had no respect. Indeed it was always supposed that his Majesty's intimacy and familiarity with these clergymen were purposely shown to lead them to excess, and amuse himself by making fools of them."\*

Another anticipated evil was a peculiarity in the royal family, inherited from George III., of "even during service giving vent, quite loudly, to the thoughts current in his mind." A friend of Mr. Wilkinson had been compelled to give up the curacy of Kew on account of the annoyance given him by the inveterate addiction to this practice of the old Duke of Cambridge. Mr. Wilkinson retells several of the well-known stories of the old Duke's eccentricities in church, and tells one we do not remember to have heard before: "When the clergyman read in the story of Zacchæus, 'Behold, the half of my goods I give to the poor,' the Duke astonished the congregation by saying aloud, 'No, no; I can't do that; that's too much for any man—no objection to a tenth.'†

However, Mr. Wilkinson decided on taking the appointment, and did so at an audience with the King, at which the following conversation took place:—

I ventured to say there was one point I felt bound to mention, as it might alter his Majesty's gracious intention towards me, and that was that I might be called back to England any day, and be obliged to give up my service at a short notice, as I was to succeed to a living in my own county, the incumbent of which was a man advanced in years, somewhat above seventy, and in a bad state of health. "Ach, Gott!" said his Majesty, laughing; "is that all? Old parsons are always tough: you come with me. God-day—good-day." And his Majesty bowed me out.

I may mention [continues Mr. Wilkinson] apropos to this supposed old-fowl quality in parsons, his Majesty said to me some time afterwards in Hanover, "Doctor" (his Majesty always called me Doctor, I suppose because he was used to it by having Dr. Jelf so long as his domestic chaplain), do you see in the papers that my old friend Dr.

\* Vol. i. pp. 6-10.

† *Ibid.* pp. 10, 11.

Blomberg is dead? I wonder what the deuce he died of." "Well, sir," I said, "I think he was ninety-six, and so we may say it was small blame to him." "Oh yes," said the King; "but he was as tough as a board, and seemed quite well when I saw him in London about a fortnight ago.\*

A kind of charge was given to the new chaplain by the clerical friend who had procured him the appointment.

"You are going," he said, "to an important post with your eyes open. Carry a bold front, be straightforward, and you'll get on. . . . You must speak before kings and not be ashamed or afraid. You have heard perhaps that William IV. said, 'Ernest is not a bad fellow, but if any one has a corn, he is sure to tread on it.' You must never walk as if you had a corn, and you must always remember that those who crawl are sure to be kicked. However, I am sure you will never crawl, and therefore will not be kicked." †

This manly and sensible advice was fully acted on by Mr. Wilkinson. "I had," he says, "to speak before kings in the church, and not be ashamed. I must have the respect of the King everywhere, or my occupation was gone, or indeed was nowhere;" and he very soon communicated his views on this subject to a great favourite of the King who was constantly invited to the royal table. This man having addressed Mr. Wilkinson as "Parson," he replied :

"I think, General, it will be well to tell you at once that I am not going to be the butt of any jokes from king or any one else, nor do I intend to allow any one to *parson* me. We all know that if anything is to be said in a favour, we are spoken of as clergymen, and that when blame is intended, it is the idle, the rowing, the drinking, or the larking *parson*. I would thank you, then, to grant me the respectful title as long as I try to deserve it, and to drop this opprobrious title until you find me disgracing my position by my conduct; and then it will be time for me to give up my appointment. I am quite independent enough to hold my own, and if I do not secure the common respect due to my office, and therefore to myself, I shall immediately resign, and take my departure." †

This manly and outspoken declaration was reported to the King, and had its effect. "His Majesty never tried to tread on any corns that I might have had;"§ but he admits that "his Majesty was, it cannot be denied, a bully, and often amused himself rather cruelly, like the cat with the mouse, or, as William IV. said, "treading on other people's corns;"|| and he elsewhere says that "corns were often trodden upon at the King's

\* Vol. i. p. 15.

§ *Ibid.* p. 84.

† *Ibid.* pp. 15, 19.

|| *Ibid.* p. 127.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 83.



small dinners, particularly in the case of the timid and bashful.\* Here are some specimens of the King's "jocular not to say bullying manner," which make one thankful one never had the misfortune to be his guest :

I have seen [Mr. Wilkinson relates] good old Sir John Bligh, our Minister at the Court of Hanover, writhing under the King's sharp and sarcastic remarks, particularly about the Whigs and Whigs' doings, and what his Majesty was pleased to call Whig delinquencies, which Sir John, however he would have stood up for his party in private, could not answer as he wished before company and servants, and about which, having been in the vice, and having been screwed up again tighter and tighter in agony, he used afterwards to speak in no measured terms, and abuse his Majesty for what he called cowardice in taking advantage of his own position, and running him into a corner openly at the dinner table, where he was obliged to keep his mouth shut. †

Here is another instance which is not only "sharp and cruel," but has the additional recommendation of being filthy :

I remember a remark made at dinner to an old and very dirty nobleman, high in rank and office. His house, by those who had seen the inside, was said to be the *ne plus ultra* of dust and disorder ; his face, which was wrinkled like an old walnut, was seen by those who looked at him to be grimed in by nothing less than filth. He and all his family had been ill for some time, and when the disease whatever it was, was said to have passed away, the old Count was invited to dinner. The King said, "Glad to see you out again, Count. It's something to have got a clean bill of health. Ich hore Sie haben alle die Kratze gehabt (I hear you've all had the itch.)" ‡

Soon after Mr. Wilkinson entered on his duties the King gave him several strong hints about the composition, length, and solidity of his sermons. His Majesty asked :

"Doctor, have you ever read Ogden's sermons?" "No, Sir, I have never seen them." "Oh, I'll lend them to you. They were my father's favourite sermons—indeed, we all like them much ; they are very short—none more than twenty minutes—but very pithy, without, I believe, a single unnecessary redundant word. *Multum in parvo*, we call them. No doubt they were prepared with great care ; and indeed I have always been of opinion that any clergyman who had made a sermon for forty-five minutes could always give us the real pith of it in twenty, if he would only take the trouble." And his Majesty turned to his secretary, and saying, "Desire the librarian to send Mr. Wilkinson Ogden's,

---

\* Vol. i. p. 73.

† *Ibid.* p. 127.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 128.

sermons," he struck his heels together, according to cavalry custom, and bowed us out.\*

It so happened that the first time Mr. Wilkinson preached before the King was the 5th of November. At that time the "Form of prayer and thanksgiving for the happy deliverance of King James I. and the three estates of England from the most traitorous and bloody intended massacre by gunpowder," with its atrocious libels on Romanists, disgraced the Prayer Book; and some clergymen, of whom Mr. Wilkinson was one, thought themselves bound to use it when the 5th of November fell on a Sunday. Indeed, Mr. Wilkinson highly approved of what he calls that devout and humble service, and regrets that it is expunged from the Prayer Book. He accordingly read every syllable of it, and followed it up with a full-bodied, highly flavoured no-popery sermon. When the service was over he relates :

The King again waited my time. When my prayer was finished, his Majesty again motioned me to lead the cortége back, and he and the Court followed to the ante-room, where I made my bow, to allow all to pass; and his Majesty said, "Doctor I am delighted to find that your opinions, political and divine, coincide exactly with my own. Come and dine with me, and we'll talk more about it." I do not know that I felt the full compliment, but no doubt I had made a hit—indeed I may say a *grand coup*; and my royal master's favour was secured from that very moment.†

Here is a specimen of royal criticism on clerical elocution. Mr. Wilkinson being ill, a stranger volunteered to take his Sunday duty for him. The man finding himself for the first time in the presence of royalty, quite lost all nerve, and hemmed and hawed, and stammered and stuttered, and stopped and rushed on again, in a way that was lamentable to see and hear. This occurrence led to this conversation between the King and his chaplain :

As soon as I reported myself well, I was honoured by an invitation to dinner. "Well, Doctor," said the King, "glad to see you out again. You sent me a pretty fellow last Sunday. I hear he was no clergyman at all." I was quite taken aback, and answered, "Indeed, sir, I am very sorry." "Oh! dear no. I find he was a jockey from Newmarket; in fact, nobody could have gone the pace he did but a jockey." I began to see the twinkle in the old King's eye, and, greatly relieved, carried on the joke. "Well, sir," I said, "I gave notice, and your Majesty did not say 'No.' I was obliged to take his word, and time pressed. He said he had a sermon with him; I wish it had

\* Vol. i. p. 77.

† *Ibid.* p. 94.

been one of Ogden's." "Egad," his Majesty added, "you couldn't follow him; he distanced Ogden easily. The race was over in a few minutes!" I said, "I was sorry I could not move on Saturday, or I would have had him out to 'show his paces.'" "You must look him up, Doctor, and tell me more about him, and see if he has got his colours." "Oh, sir," I said, "I have inquired, but find he bolted off the course next morning!" The King was so amused that I verily believe, had the man been still in the town, his Majesty would have asked him to dinner for the fun of the thing, and would have "reverend-jockeyed him, and trod on his corns all dinner, in face of the guests and servants."\*

His Majesty's way of dealing with an Irishman—an army surgeon much given to exaggeration—is another specimen of royal courtesy and good feeling :

The fact of the little man's presence in Hanover, and his amusing stories about his army career, were reported to the King, who told the Hof-marshal that, if the Doctor had a uniform, he was to be invited to dine at the palace. He had got his surgeon's cocked hat and feather, &c., and so he duly appeared. The King was in one of his jocular, not to say bullying, moods. "Well, Dr. Popkins," said the King. "I beg your Majesty's pardon—Hopkins," said the little man. "Oh! Hopkins," said the King. "Well, Dr. Hopkins, I hear you have seen men with tails, and with heads under their arms." "Not quite that, your Majesty; but I have seen what would astonish many people," and he went off at a tangent with some extravagant story. "Stop, stop; not so fast, Dr. Popkins." "I beg your Majesty's pardon—Hopkins, sire." "Well, Dr. Hopkins-Popkins, or Popkins-Hopkins, it's much the same——" "I beg your Majesty's pardon; we are the Hopkins of Ballymacrea, closely connected with the O'Briens and the O'——" "Ah! no doubt," interrupted the King; "and the O'Flynn's and the O'Flahertys, and all the lot of them," &c. And so the banter, not to say baiting, went on. All were in fits of laughter, but the little man did not see it was at him. When the King had well thrashed out the Hopkinses and Popkinsees and all the pedigree, he cut the matter short by turning to speak to the lady at his side, and this of course shut up the little doctor. The King had seen and heard enough of him, and never addressed him again, and in fact never saw him again, much to the little man's bitter disappointment.

Another illustration. In this instance the victim was a would-be young old lady, who appeared at a ball dressed as a girl—all in pure bridal white :

The old king came down the ranks, with his hands in his pockets—as was his wont—bending and spying with his one eye, pretending to

be very blind, but really seeing everything that was wrong, whether it was a button on or off an officer's uniform, or an unsuitable dress in which an old woman was making a fool of herself. His Majesty as he went along spoke a few words here and there to some favoured lady, but when he came to this great white figure, drawn up still and motionless, he bent his piercing one eye forward, satisfied that it was the white porcelain stove, and, veering round, turned towards it that part of his body which an Englishman is said never to expose to friend or foe, and deliberately pretended to warm himself.\*

It would be impossible to exceed the coarseness and brutality of this proceeding. This is the way in which his Majesty dealt with his physicians :

The doctors—or at least one of them—came every morning to feel his Majesty's pulse, as was their duty, for which they were paid. They prescribed if they thought it necessary, but their prescriptions were little heeded. The King let them have their own way, and took his. "Put it in the cupboard" was the order when any physic came. Once his Majesty was ill for several weeks—really ill, seriously at his age. The doctors came, of course, every day, sometimes twice or more, and they prescribed as usual. Any one who has been ill for any length of time, and has been attended in an ordinary way once or twice a day by one doctor, well knows what various medicines are prescribed and changed again and again under each phase of the disease; and he would, I believe, be astonished to see all the medicine he had drunk during his illness. Any one may then conceive what a quantity was likely to be ordered, and what changes were likely to be rung by a bevy of doctors, with such a precious personage as a king for a patient. As any bottle or powder was brought, his Majesty said "Put it in the cupboard;" and again and again it was "Put it in the cupboard." Not one drop was touched. Starving and patience were the only remedies resorted to. At last his Majesty got his good turn, and began to feel he could eat again with a relish, and by degrees Nature flung off the disorder, whatever it was, which had run its course. His Majesty was up and dressed, early at business. "Get all those bottles, powders, and pill-boxes out of the cupboards," he said, "and range them in a row round the room." It was a very small room, and they almost made a circle round the walls. The doctors came in smirking and smiling, and congratulated the King upon being up again, and looking so well. "Yes, doctors," said his Majesty, "thank God it is so. But look there—count it up. Don't you think, if I had drunk all that d——d stuff, I should have been dead long ago?" †

One more illustration of kingly blackguardism will suffice :

I remember [writes Mr. Wilkinson] a remark made once openly and loudly at dinner, on one of the days when the company was small,

\* Vol. i. pp. 144-5.

† *Ibid.* pr. 148-50.

about twelve persons at a round table, and so every word spoken was plainly heard by guests and servants. The Duke of Altenberg, father of the Crown Princess, sat nearly opposite the King. During a pause his Majesty called across the table: "Joseph, a glass of champagne—you don't get that every day at home." The Duke had been a reigning sovereign, but had abdicated in favour of his nephew, and the King's remark was true, but it could not be pleasant. It was a corn that was trodden on.\*

Once, indeed, his Majesty met with his match from one of his servants.

I think [says Mr. Wilkinson] he had been seventeen years with the King, when something displeased his Majesty, who seemed that morning to have got out of bed the wrong way. "What the devil are you doing there?" said the King. "You're a fool, K——, you're a damned fool!" "Yes, your Majesty," answered K—— sharply; "I am a fool, I know I am a fool, and a d——d fool; and if I hadn't been a fool, and a d——d fool, I never should have been so long with your Majesty." They both had their say, and his Majesty was beaten for once. No warning was given; the dressing was concluded in silence, and the little Bohemian appeared as usual the next morning.†

The chaplain also acted as secretary and reader to the King, whose literary tastes appear in the following excerpt:

When letters were done, I read parts of the debates in the Houses of Lords and Commons; and often and often, in the middle of a speech, I saw his Majesty's eyes close and head nod. I then at first used to stop, when it was a case of "the silence awoke the little judge," and his Majesty, pretending he was shutting his eyes to listen, used to say "Go on"; so, after one or two instances of this I used to continue to read Lord So-and-so's speech, even though my royal master began to snore. When I came to an end, and was silent, he always said "Go on"; and if I answered "That's all, sir," he used to say, "Ah, very interesting. Now see what's o'clock. I think it must be time for the commandant!" If I told him "No sir, it's only half-past ten, or it wants twenty minutes to eleven," his Majesty would say, "Well, doctor, now let us have a look at the police reports; there's always something striking there—there one sees life and character." And I must say his Majesty was really interested, and, often as I found him go to sleep over a debate, I never remember him to have napped over a police report.

But we think our readers have by this time had enough of this kingly old blackguard, his spitefulness and brutality, though we have made a very small selection out of the mass of like stories with which these volumes are filled.

---

\* Vol. i. p. 160.

† *Ibid.* pp. 162-3.

There are in these volumes many anecdotes of less distinguished persons than those to whom we have referred. Several very amusing ones are told of King Ernest's body-coachman, Richard, commonly called "Lord," Temple, who gave the imperious comptroller of the household "more trouble than all the other members of the royal service put together." He is verbally photographed by Mr. Wilkinson:

He was short, round, portly, and dignified; and when he was on his high box of office, with his gold-striped State livery, his three-cornered cocked hat, his full-bottomed wig, his silk stockings, broad plated buckles in his shoes, and large nosegay on his breast, handling the ribbons of the four magnificent English grey horses, still and immovable on his hammercloth, absorbed in his duty, and looking neither to the right hand nor to the left, he was pomposity personified.\*

Here is a specimen of the man's consummate coolness, if, indeed, impudence be not the better word:

Temple was summoned to the Hof Marshal's office, and was told, as the King went out so seldom, it was quite a farce to suppose they should continue to give him so many liveries a year. The State coat alone cost £30. He could not possibly wear them.

"Well, I know that," said Temple, "but I can sell them."

"Then," said the Hof Marshal, "they should reduce his wages."

"Contract's a contract," said Temple again.

"Oh, but we shall now have a new contract." And one was produced that had been already drawn up, and signed and sealed officially.

As Temple would not come to terms about his liveries, his salary would be reduced a hundred thalers (£15). If he did not agree to this, the King now required him so little, he would be sent back to England.

The paper was handed to him to write the reduced figures, and to sign his name. Temple was not a bit abashed or afraid. His idea was that, as he had been seven years with the King, and from various tokens knew he had given his Majesty satisfaction, his salary ought rather to be increased than reduced, and so in the blank space in the paper handed to him he inserted fifty dollars *more* than he had before, signed his name, and gave it back.

He told me [continues Mr. Wilkinson] you should have seen their faces: "Sir, they scuttled about from one to another, laid their heads together, and bolted out of the room and back again, like rabbits in a burrow." †

The officials naturally and properly told Temple his conduct was an impertinence, and they threatened him with condign

---

\* Vol. ii. p. 198.

† *Ibid.* pp. 203-4.

punishment. They brought the matter before the King, who sympathized with his English servant, and gave his Hanoverian officials a rap on the knuckles. "They were not," he said, "to bother him; they were not to interfere with Temple, but to let him have his own way, and be answerable for his own duty." "And so," adds Mr. Wilkinson, "he did have his own way, and chuckled, as may be supposed, over his increased salary."\*

On another occasion, Temple, after receiving "an extraordinarily valuable present" from the then Empress of Russia, whom he had driven during a visit she paid to Hanover, went to the Royal Hotel, and ordered the best dinner they could give him. Just as he was in the middle of his third or fourth course and his second bottle of champagne, in came his official chief, the master of the horse, to have his dinner, and one may conceive his disgust at finding the coachman at the head of the table where he was about to dine. "Temple," continues Mr. Wilkinson, "did not budge before the great man of his department. He coolly, in dignified silence, ate on and drank on, and the great man himself was the one to give way, and walk out in disgust to get his dinner elsewhere."†

Perhaps the most amusing of these Temple anecdotes is a transaction between him and Mr. Wilkinson. We give the story in Mr. Wilkinson's own words:

Temple lost his wife. Of course, I, as chaplain, had to perform the funeral ceremony. A few days afterwards, old Temple, in deep mourning, called upon me. He was very much upset, and evidently had something on his mind which he found a difficulty in expressing, for he stood there for a few moments in silence, and then turned his hat round and round, and looked mournfully into it, and brushed it with his hand, and at last he got out, though stammering—

"I've called, sir—I've called, sir—as I wish to ask—and don't like to put it off—what I've got to pay you for that 'ere job?"

"Oh!" I said; "nothing, of course. I have no fees, Temple; but I remember now I am in your debt, and I must ask you what I have got to pay for the two pots of ointment you made for my horse's cracked feet?"

"Oh!" said Temple, "Lord bless you, sir, don't mention it. Nothing, sir, nothing; 'one good turn deserves another' all the world over." I am sure [is Mr. Wilkinson's kindly comment] he meant nothing disrespectful, for he was doatingly fond of his 'old woman' as he called her; but one could not help thinking it was a queer *façon de parler*.‡

We have, as is our use and wont, spoken freely of King Ernest; but in justice to his memory we must say as a ruler he turned

\* Vol. ii. p. 205.

† *Ibid.* pp. 207-208.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 212.

out better than, from his education, his prejudices, and the first acts of his reign was to be expected. William IV. had granted a free constitution to his Hanoverian subjects, and on Ernest's succeeding him, his first act was to issue a proclamation throwing over the new constitution. He had, however, all along protested against it, and refused to sign or be a party to it, and contended that it was illegal, inasmuch as the States by which it had been enacted were illegally convoked. He also prosecuted the Liberal professors at the University of Göttingen. By these acts he incurred great odium both in Hanover and in this country.\* In fact, Mr. Wilkinson admits that he brought the country to the verge of revolution. Later on, he voluntarily made some great reforms—viz., he abolished the Baronial Court of Justice, at which the people were highly pleased, saying, "Now they had one king; formerly they had twenty." Another important reform was universally hailed by the middle class with deep thankfulness, though really it was but the concession of a right; that was the opening of the office of chief Ministers of State to the burgher class.† During the revolutionary year of 1818 he made some popular concessions, and Mr. Wilkinson relates that

afterwards, when the tide had turned, and the great Powers of Austria and Prussia had won their day and re-established the supremacy of the law, and had retracted many of the concessions made in the time of their terror and weakness; and when they urged upon the King of Hanover to do the same, his Majesty answered: "He had pledged his royal word, and it was not his idea of justice or equity to retract; that what was done was done, and his Ministers must act accordingly."‡

A statue to his memory in the Railway Square in Hanover, with the following inscription, testifies to the high estimation in which he was held by his subjects:—

"Dem Landes Vater  
Sein treues Volk." §

---

\* As to these proceedings, *vide* Greville's "Memoirs" (second part), vol. i. 12, 42; and Mr. Wilkinson's "Reminiscences," vol. i. c. iv. *passim*.

† *Ibid.* p. 60.

‡ Vol. ii. p. 239.

§ "To the father of his country, from his faithful people."



ART. V.—A NEW VIEW OF REGISTRATION OF TITLE  
TO LAND.

- 1 and 2. *Returns on Registration of Title in the Australasian Colonies.* House of Commons Blue Books. 1872 and 1881.
3. *An Essay on the Transfer of Land by Registration.* By Sir ROBT. TORRENS, K.C.M.G. Published for the Cobden Club by Messrs. Cassell.
4. *Statement on the Land Laws.* By the Council of the Incorporated Law Society of the United Kingdom. Spottiswoode & Co. 1886.
5. *Land Transfer.* Published by order of the Bar Committee. Butterworths. 1886.
6. *Etude sur l'Act Torrens.* By CHARLES GIDE, Professeur de la Faculté de Droit de Montpellier. Paris: Libraire Cotillon. 1886.

“WHEN I buy a horse, or a picture, or a bale of goods, I have no trouble, no lawyer, no delay, no expense. Why should it be different with land?” We select this as the first and commonest of the ingenious confusions that come to us in the garb of simplicity whenever the subject of land transfer is discussed. If anybody will take the trouble to consider for a moment the most obvious characteristics of land—its immobility and immutability, and the most obvious characteristics of goods, their mobility and mutability—he will perceive that a far greater amount of caution must always be necessary in buying land than in buying goods, quite independently of law, lawyers, and legal distinctions. Suppose goods are stolen: the first process is for the thief to run away with them, or otherwise *hide* them from the injured owner, and the next process usually is so to cut them up, or melt them down, or otherwise *destroy their identity*, that the owner would never recognise them again, even if he were to see them, and if this cannot be done they are at any rate removed to such a position and disposed of in such a roundabout manner that the owner may try in vain to find them again as long as he lives. Therefore, when we buy goods, we do not as a matter of precaution inquire into the history of their previous owners, because we know very well that even if questionable dealings have occurred in connection with them, the chances are so small that the rightful

owner will be able to trace his property into our hands (which if he could do we should assuredly have to yield them up to him) that they may be neglected. Of course, most people do not so question the customs they live under as to be able to give this account of why they act as they do, but the reason is there nevertheless. But how is it with land? Suppose land is wrongfully held or wrongfully disposed of by some one, a more enlightened civilization than any yet known is required to invent the means by which a wrong-doer may so remove or alter an ordinary piece of landed property as to interpose difficulty in the way of the rightful owner in finding or recognising it. And therefore when we buy land it is a matter of common prudence to satisfy ourselves that there have been no questionable dealings with it for a considerable time, for if there have, we may be certain that the injured parties will find us out with the greatest ease, and probably deprive us, sooner or later, of what we have bought. *Hinc illæ lacrymæ.* The process by which the vendor of land satisfies his purchaser that there have been no questionable dealings with it for a considerable time, is called "proof of title," and amounts to a little history (seldom more than forty years old, often not so long) of the changes of ownership that have occurred during a given period, evidenced as far as possible by the original documents.

"But where would be the difficulty of having a register of land like the register of stock? When I buy stock, it is all done in ten minutes. Why cannot land be treated in the same way?" Put in this form, the question admits of an easy answer, for some of the difficulties of adapting to the transfer of land the principle upon which stock registers are based cannot fail to be obvious the moment they are stated; while others remain not so obvious, but still equally cogent. The principle upon which the stock register is based is this. The entry of a person's name opposite to a given sum of stock confers the absolute ownership of that stock upon him. Stock is transferred by erasing the name of the former owner and entering the name of the new owner. If a mistake occurs, if the bank (which keeps the register) is imposed upon, and enters a transfer without the authority of the true owner, he nevertheless loses his stock. The bank, however, is obliged in such case to repair its mistake by buying a like sum in the market, and placing it in the injured owner's name. As there is always plenty of stock to be bought, and as one £1,000 worth is exactly the same as another, this mode of compensation answers all the requirements of the case. But if the same system is applied to land, it by no means answers the requirements of the case. For in the first place land is not always to be bought, and in the second place, even if it were,

it is not altogether satisfactory for an owner and occupier who has been living for years in the "Hill Farm" suddenly to be turned out of his home owing to somebody else's mistake, and politely requested to accept "compensation" in the shape of, say, "the Valley Mills," situated in a neighbouring county. Again: there is never any difficulty about the description of the registered property in the case of stock. Suppose we have an entry made in 1846 that A is the owner of £1,000 Consols. B, wanting to buy of A in 1886, sees at a glance that he will get exactly what he wants if A's name is scratched out and his own put in its place. But now suppose we have an entry made in a land register in 1846 to the effect that A is the owner of the "Hill Farm." B, a new neighbour, wants to buy the "Hill Farm" of A in 1886. It is by no means clear that he will get exactly what he wants by having his name written in the register in place of A's; for the existing Hill Farm that B knows may be a very different holding indeed from the land to which A's registered title applies. Since the registration took place parts of the Hill Farm have been gained by encroachment, other parts by informal adjustment of boundaries with neighbours, parts by exchange, parts by the inclusion of bits of A's other adjoining estates, parts by inclosure of waste lands; and so it may happen that the special little corner of that farm, the very Naboth's vineyard that B is principally desirous to obtain, is not included in A's registered title at all, and that in order to get it safe, B must investigate, and hunt up evidence, and in short satisfy himself about it just as he does now.

The truth of the matter is, that the adaptation of the registry principle to the transfer of land is a matter of immense difficulty, and if it be true that at last a system has been devised by which it can be done, it is only as the result of great labour, great ingenuity, and a history of experiments fruitful in disheartening failure. Having thus cleared the ground of one or two preliminary obstructions, we will proceed to recount in order the various phases through which the subject has passed so far as is necessary to the right understanding of the substantive scheme we have to propound.

There are two very different sorts of "registration of land"—namely, "registration of deeds" and "registration of title." In the counties of Middlesex and York, in Ireland, in most English colonies, in Scotland, in India, in most of the United States, in France, Belgium, Italy, and many other parts of the Continent, there exist *registries of deeds*. The object of a deed registry is to prevent fraud. It does nothing of itself to simplify, or cheapen, or quicken transfer. Its leading idea is to provide a purchaser of land with the means of satisfying himself that no

material document in the history of a title is being concealed from him by his vendor, and the means usually taken to effect this end is to provide an office where all deeds may be registered, and to enact that registered deeds shall prevail over unregistered ones. Therefore if a purchaser finds all the deeds submitted to him by his vendor satisfactory, and then consults the register, and finds they are all registered, and that there are no other deeds registered relating to the property, he may be almost certain that the deeds he has seen are genuine, and that if any other deeds exist they will not prevail against him, if he registers his own conveyance. Of course a great variety of modifications are introduced into the practical working of the system, by which various difficulties are obviated with differing degrees of success. Also it may be stated that under favourable conditions a deed registry may be made the indirect means of considerably simplifying and cheapening conveyancing as well as preventing fraud. A very conspicuous instance of this is afforded by the Scotch registry. But still, when all is said and done, a deed registry does not pledge the State to any assertion beyond this, that *certain documents have been registered*: however much it may help the inquiry as to their ultimate effect, the need of a lawyer is hardly ever obviated, as the final responsibility of interpreting them remains with the party himself, and if he misinterprets them the loss is on his own head.

In England and Ireland (to an almost inappreciable extent, however), in the Australasian and in some other colonies, in Iowa, U.S.A., in the Hanse Towns, in Prussia, Hesse, and some other districts in Europe, and in the French colony in Tunis, *registry of title* has been established. The object of this system is to provide both for safety and for ease; the leading principle is that of the stock register above described, but with a vast amount of exception and reservation owing to the difference in the subject matter to which it is to be applied. Some of the details will appear later on; but at present it is enough if it is seen that under such a system the government commits itself to a most distinct statement of fact—namely, that A is the owner of the Z estate; it absolves the purchaser from all obligation to make up his own mind about it; it affords an escape in a vast number of cases from the necessity of engaging professional help; and if a mistake occurs, it is not the purchaser who has to suffer.

Before proceeding to consider this new system, one very prevalent misconception as to the effects of the present system must be touched upon.

For it is often supposed that great *insecurity* exists at present. That landowners do not know whether their land is their own;

with the result, one would suppose, that a good deal of loss must be occasionally incurred by unwary purchasers owing to defective title. It may accordingly be somewhat of a surprise to many to learn that the following decisive statement has recently been made by a very high authority :\*—

With regard to the safety of purchasers on absolute sales, the existing system of conveyancing, so far as mere safety is concerned, approaches as nearly to perfection as any system which has ever existed in any country. The voluminous evidence appended to the various Parliamentary Reports above referred to (1857, Registration Commission; 1870, Land Registration Commission; 1878, 1879, Mr. O. Morgan's Committee) shows that witnesses with the widest experience of the relevant facts were unable to specify any example which had ever occurred to them in business of a purchaser on an absolute sale who had been evicted by reason of a concealed flaw in his title.

A few of these witnesses are then quoted. To select two :—Mr. Barber, Q.C., says : " In the course of a very large experience, I cannot at this moment recall a single instance where on a purchase and sale transaction the purchaser has been ousted because of a fraud in the execution of a deed." Mr. E. W. Rowcliffe, of the firm of Gregory, Rowcliffe & Rawle, says :

I have never known a purchaser lose his property or suffer any loss from a concealed incumbrance or liability on account of the shortness of the title he had taken. Indeed, I may say that during nearly twenty-five years of litigated business arising in all parts of England, I have never known a purchaser lose his property from any unknown defect of title. I have known cases in which purchasers have been ejected, but the defect has been known and guarded against either by absolute covenants or deeds of indemnity.

What these are we need not explain ; it suffices that they are adequate.

But when from safety we come to consider *speed* or *cheapness*, the tale is very different. So far as we are able to discover, there is no civilized country in the world where sales and mortgages habitually take so long a time to transact as they do here. While in some highly civilized countries—France and Prussia, for instance, not to speak of our own Colonies—land is habitually sold and mortgaged in a day, or even in an hour, including everything, from the commencement of the negotiation to the completion of the transaction, in England a month or two is a very fair average time for such transactions to occupy ; they

---

\* " Land Transfer," pp. 68, 69.

have been known to extend over years ; in small matters they are occasionally pulled through in a week or a fortnight, and when this period is shortened to three or four days, the feat is pointed at and remarked upon as an instance of marvellous expedition. The legal charges too (though much improved by the recent introduction of a "scale," which fixes a large proportion of them according to the value of the land dealt with) are far higher in England than anywhere else in the case of small properties ; though in the case of great estates our charges compare favourably with a few (but only a few) of the continental States—France and Belgium, for instance. It must be remembered, however, in looking at totals taken from continental experience, that they include a very high Government duty chargeable on sales in most of those countries. In France and Belgium the duty alone amounts to seven per cent. on the value of the land, whereas in England only one-half per cent. is thus charged. This is not a law expense at all, but a tax, and care should be taken that it is deducted when law expenses are being treated of. But in Scotland, in our own Australasian Colonies, the United States, Prussia, Bavaria, Austria, and other German States, Holland and Greece, and probably many other places too, the expenses of sales and mortgages of ordinary landed property are utterly insignificant in comparison with our own. The lowest legal charge for a deal with land in England is £6, for there must be at least two parties concerned, and each of them may be charged £3. This is considerably above the *maximum* charge in some States. In practice these charges are no doubt lessened very much ; solicitors, especially in the country, being willing to do work for a guinea or two, or even less, to oblige their poorer clients, but probably similar allowances are made in other countries too, and however this may be, the principal fact remains as stated—that the legal charges of land transfer in England will almost invariably be found to be the highest in the world.

The Council of the Incorporated Law Society\* claim that the idea of registering title to land originated with solicitors. It was certainly suggested by Mr. T. G. Fonnereau, a London solicitor, to the Real Property Commissioners of 1828, and was afterwards worked out in different ways by Mr. R. Wilson, another London solicitor, a member of the Council of the Incorporated Law Society, Mr. W. S. Cookson, Mr. E. Field, and Mr. W. Williams, who is still a member of the Council. But the barristers were not behindhand either : the most distinguished among them were

\* Statement of the Land Laws, p. 8.

Mr. Duval in 1829, and later Lord Cairns when Attorney-General, and Sir Henry Thring.

When it is considered that all law reform is expected to come from the lawyers; that the only ones that are competent to the task are the busiest and most hard-worked in other ways; that every bit of the labour such persons bestow upon the herculean task is performed gratis; and that the only immediate personal result of its successful conclusion is the increase of trouble necessarily incident to all changes, and a prospect of speedy diminution in professional gains, the wonder is, not that we have so little law reform, but that we have so much.

Before proceeding to the Acts themselves, a word or two of general explanation will be useful. Under all Acts establishing registration of title, two principal classes of operations have to be provided for, which may be respectively termed "first registrations" and "subsequent dealings." They may be shortly (though rather imperfectly) described thus:—

**First Registration.**—A person applies to be registered as owner of given lands. The registrar inquires as to his claim to such lands, and as to the correctness of the description of their boundaries furnished by him. When both are satisfactory the applicant is registered. The entry in the register confers an absolute title upon him.

**Subsequent Dealings.**—The registered owner wishes to sell. He sends an order to the registrar (somewhat unhappily termed an "instrument of transfer"), requiring him to enter the purchaser as registered owner in his place. The registrar satisfies himself that the order is a genuine one, and makes the required entry. This confers an absolute title on the purchaser.

There is no essential difference between the act or the effect of registration in these two cases: in both cases it results in the same thing—namely, that the registered owner for the time being has the equivalent of a fresh Crown grant made to himself, annulling all former grants, absolute, unimpeachable. But the difference in the preliminary duties of the registrar in the two classes of operations justifies their separation for purposes of practical discussion.

Registration of title was first instituted in England by "an Act to facilitate the proof of title to and the conveyance of real estates" (25 & 26 Vic. cap. 53), carried by Lord Westbury in 1862. Under that Act any person owning a fee simple, or a leasehold for years of which fifty were unexpired, or a leasehold for lives of which two were still subsisting, was at liberty to register his title if he could satisfy the registrar that it was unimpeachable, or, in technical language, "marketable." After first registration of any property, a purchaser's inquiries

as to title would be confined to the ascertainment of subsisting interests entered on the register, and the process of conveyance might be the comparatively inexpensive process of a "registered transfer." In the year 1863, eight titles were registered; in 1864, eight more; in 1865, forty-eight; in 1866, one hundred and five—slow but steady progress; and it appeared as though the scheme would eventually succeed. But after 1866 dissatisfaction began to be felt by those who had tried the system; titles were removed by their owners from the books, entries fell off; in 1870 there were only twenty-nine titles registered: in 1871 only four.

A great many suggestions have been made as to the probable causes of the failure of Lord Westbury's Act. But life is short, and as only two of them are in any way supported by facts, we do not propose to enter into any but these two. The first is, that the difficulty of proving an unimpeachable title to the registrar, and the difficulty of overcoming the objections of neighbouring owners to the registration of disputable boundaries, were so great that few landowners were in a position to face the combined dangers of expense and delay and risk of total or partial failure, for the mere possibility of benefit on future sales and mortgages. A few details will help us to realize what these dangers were.

Mr. Butt (Evidence, Land Transfer Commission, 1870) told the story of the only three registrations he had himself conducted. The first was a title which the Court of Chancery had accepted on behalf of suitors. Before the registry could accept it, eighteen months were spent in additional inquiries. In the next case the private negotiations on a purchase, including a delay, owing to the purchase money not being forthcoming, had been completed in ten months. Registration, commenced immediately afterwards, occupied two years and five months in additional inquiries. The costs of the purchase, including duty, were £79. The registration cost £134. The third title was exactly the same as the first, but though the registrar was informed of this, the rules obliged him to go through the whole process over again, which surely ought to have been unnecessary. Among other cases mentioned to the Commissioners were these: A title accepted in two months at a cost of £78 on a private purchase was taken to the registrar directly afterwards. It was still pending at the end of two years and a half, and the costs up to date were £90 (Evidence Nos. 627-666). Another title which was accepted on a purchase in four months, at a total cost (including conveyance and duty) of £56, registered immediately afterwards, cost £124, and one year and eight months delay, and was even then compelled to have the following note endorsed upon it:—"By the will of A, proved 31 December 1831, the



hereditaments were, with the other real and personal estate of the said testator, charged with a moiety of a sum of £2,000 for the benefit of D, one of the two only children who attained twenty-one; of C, widow, deceased, the daughter of the testator; D died intestate, and was buried 24th April 1847. No administration has been taken out to D, but the whole of the sum of £2,000, together with interest thereon, was on the 20th February 1862 paid to E, his only brother and sole next of kin, and sole executor of C" (Evidence, Nos. 667-681). We shall not attempt the task of translating this into the vulgar tongue—suffice it to say that it is a suggestion of a risk of incalculable remoteness, to which no lawyer would give a second thought; but to a plain man it is certainly unintelligibly ugly.\*

The professional reader will wonder how the time was spent. The following example will enlighten him. One of the former owners of an estate to be registered was John Harrison, of Reigate, farmer, who bought it in 1830, and died in 1850. The registrar required proof that a judgment against one John Harrison, of Newcastle-on-Tyne, beerseller, and another judgment against one George Harrison, of Cockermouth, ironmonger, did *not* affect the estate. (Appendix, p. 56.)

The second failing of Lord Westbury's system seems even worse than the first. When all the months and years had been spent, and the title proved and the bill paid, and the time for mortgage or sale had arrived, and the reward of ease and expedition and cheapness was evidently expected, it nevertheless constantly happened that the hope turned out entirely a delusive one: more time, more trouble, more money being spent over the *simplest transactions* with registered property than would have been incurred in the like operations under the private practice. For instance, it appears from the evidence given to Mr. O. Morgan's Committee in 1878 that Mr. Joshua Williams, Q.C., bought a registered property, and afterwards mortgaged, and then sold it. He experienced "a great deal of delay, and a great expense, more I think than would have been incurred if the property had not been on the registry" (1878, No. 384). Mr. H. W. Elphinstone purchased registered land, and incurred £11 extra expenses, and three months' extra delay, owing to its being registered, he says: "I had formed a very strong opinion in favour of registration of title at first, but now I have had practical experience of it, and my experience has been very painful" (1879,

---

\* The Registrar furnished details of twenty-five cases of first registration as "a fair illustration." The average time for each was two years and five months; one case came within nine days of five years; and only three took less than twelve months each. The shortest time on record was four months twenty-seven days. (Appendix, p. 78.)

Nos. 359-367). Other cases were also mentioned. No single witness examined by the Committee mentions a case of money or trouble or time being saved by registration; and many more instances of well-grounded dissatisfaction can be collected by any one who asks questions from those who have had experience. It need not be pretended that in no instance has benefit been derived from the registry (though it is certainly remarkable that no instance was mentioned in evidence); but it is abundantly clear that the net result of experience of the office practice was this: that solicitors, having to consider whether they should, as a rule, advise their clients to register their titles, came to an almost unanimous decision that they could not do so. The absolute title conferred by registration was practically *no advantage* at all, for, as we have seen, owners and purchasers of land are already quite safe enough: the *immediate expense* was enormous: the *ultimate promise* of easy transfer and mortgage had proved a *delusion* in many cases—the Act had absolutely nothing to recommend it, and it so fell into neglect.

But matters were not allowed to rest here. A Royal Commission, consisting of law lords, members of Parliament, barristers, and solicitors, was appointed in 1868 to examine into the causes of this failure. The Report of that Commission was most discordant; several of its most influential members dissenting on many points. Why these Commissioners should have been so much more impressed by the first of the above mentioned causes of failure than by the second, it is very difficult to see, but so it was; and accordingly their suggestions for remodelling the registration scheme all proceeded in one direction—facilitating the process of first registration.

These suggestions were followed out, more or less faithfully, by our second Registration Act, which was carried by Lord Cairns in 1875. Lord Cairns's Act facilitates the process of first registration in three principal ways. The registrar is given power to accept less than a "marketable" title wherever he may think it safe to do so; the attempt to guarantee boundaries is abandoned (which alone diminishes the expenses of first registration by one-third) and a new sort of registration—"possessory registration"—was offered. Possessory registration does not warrant the title of the first registered owner, and therefore dispenses with the need of inquiries on first registrations. Its operation may be thus summarized:—A person applies to be registered as possessory owner of given lands; the registrar makes no inquiry as to his title, but registers him on his own and his solicitor's declarations. The registration confers no more title upon him than he possesses already. This owner wishes to sell. He sends his order to

the registrar, and the registrar satisfies himself that the order is a genuine one, and enters the purchaser's name. This confers on the purchaser an absolute title to whatever the first registered owner has to dispose of. This will be sufficient or not for practical purposes according to circumstances. For instance, it will probably be insufficient if the sale takes place very soon after the first registration, and proof will then be required, in the old way, that the owner's title was a good one at the time of the first registration. If, however, a good long time—say twenty or thirty years—has elapsed since the first registration, the purchaser will probably be quite content; for by this time it will be practically certain that the first registration *was* a correct one—that the first registered owner was then truly entitled to the estate registered—or that, if he was not, all likely claims against him have been barred by lapse of time; and thus a practically absolute title is obtained by the cheap process of sitting still, without the need of an official examination to begin with. Hardly any possessory titles have been registered. The surprise which this announcement will probably produce may be diminished by the statement of four bills for possessory registrations—the only ones we have been able to obtain. They are £18 12s. 6d., £16 1s. 9d. (for a property worth only £105), £15 17s. 2d., £28 4s. 10d. Remembering that the possible advantages for many years after first registration are absolutely *nil*, these disclosures alone go some way towards accounting for the phenomenon. No serious attempt was made to improve the office practice on the registration of subsequent dealings, nor do the framers of the Act seem to have been at all aware of the necessity for improvement in this particular. Notwithstanding the above-mentioned and other high bids for popular favour which it contained (some of which are open to very serious censure on the ground of laxity), Lord Cairns's Act never succeeded in obtaining the small share of public notice that its predecessor did. Only 113 titles have been registered under it in ten years.

The truth is, that the same defects which we observed under Lord Westbury's Act continue to prevail under Lord Cairns's, mitigated only to a slight degree in respect of first registrations.

To prove a title to the registrar remains a much more formidable undertaking than to prove it to a private purchaser, and as long as this is the case it is impossible to make any progress. "A landowner has to prove his title to the official—practically in the country we never prove a complete title on a sale—and his solicitor has to obtain a much larger mass of information than is usually rendered to purchasers" (Evidence, 1878,

Nos. 2349, 2350). To register under Lord Cairns's Act "would cost as much again" as an ordinary purchase by a member of a building society (Evidence, 1878, Nos. 2953, 3028). "The public officer is beyond all question more particular than an ordinary solicitor" (1879, No. 1356). The expenses of the purchase of a particular estate were £62; registration under Lord Westbury's Act cost £131. A careful expert estimated that under Lord Cairns's Act it would cost £100, the reduction being due to the omission of all guarantee of boundaries—that is, by a proportionate diminution in the usefulness of the registered title (1879, Nos. 388–394). Passing, again, from first registrations to the after-experiences of those who have used Lord Cairns's Act, we find the same complaint as we noticed in sales under Lord Westbury's. "You not only incur an expense of transferring within the office which amounts to a sum exceeding what the members of building societies pay, but in order to approach the office you have to pay a professional agent his fees to get the thing done for you" (1878, No. 1782). "The delay takes place in every transaction, and that is a very serious thing in small transactions; there is no reason why the transaction should be anything but a simple one, and very uncostly; but practically it is not so" (1878, 3001, 3034). The minimum cost to the owner appears to be somewhere about £8 all told; therefore it is clear that in small transactions, such as selling a plot off a large estate, the expense cannot fail to be greater than it usually is under the unregistered practice; and as Lord Cairns's Act does not allow titles to be removed from the register, a very small property has *no escape* from law charges which may absorb its entire income for years, *however willing* all parties may be to act easily and liberally to each other.

It is strange that, with these later facts before them, the next Parliamentary Committee on the subject (Mr. O. Morgan's Committee of 1878, 1879) should again have failed to perceive the damning character of the blot they disclose, and should have suffered the Australian experience—which they consulted on a variety of less important topics—to escape them as to the one point by which a safe and easy remedy for the faults here emphasized is disclosed, with which remedy we propose to acquaint the reader before long.

For it must be known that side by side with this discouraging series of failures in England there has been going on a series of great and uniform successes in the Australasian colonies ever since 1857, when the first Registration Act was introduced into South Australia by the late Sir Robert Torrens. With no learned Chancellors to frame it, as with us—on the contrary, in the teeth of so strong a professional opposition that lawyers

appear to have been excluded from certain offices under the Act, for fear of their ruining it in practice—the framer completely succeeded in hitting such an exact middle line between rashness and timidity as to enable all the business of the office to be conducted with ease and despatch, without incurring any appreciable risk from fraud or error. Also, after a year or two, certain most important alterations were seen to be necessary in the nature of the absolute title granted; alterations which advanced jurists in England are at last independently inventing over again, about thirty years in arrear.

As many people in England are quite unaware of the success which the Australian “Torrens” system has achieved, a few facts from original sources may be usefully submitted here. The measure was introduced into South Australia first in 1857, as already stated. In the course of the first eighteen months more than 1,000 applicants to register titles came forward voluntarily out of a population of 100,000. (Looking at the population of England, it would appear that a similar enthusiasm in this country would produce 200,000 applicants, or thereabouts, in the same time.) The Act was so successful in South Australia that it was copied in Queensland in 1861 (where now over 98 per cent. of the whole land of the colony is registered), in Tasmania in 1862, in Victoria in the same year, in New South Wales in 1863—in spite of some misgivings lest the greater antiquity of that colony (founded 1788) might render it less suitable, which misgivings soon proved groundless. New Zealand and Western Australia followed in 1870 and 1874, thus completing the entire list of Australasian colonies. As to its results, Sir Arthur Blyth, K.C.M.G., Agent-General for South Australia, says: “Registration of title is now almost universal—for one transaction under deeds now there a thousand under the Act. [To a person wanting to borrow money on mortgage] I should say, first, ‘Real Property Act, I suppose?’ Then the next thing would be, ‘You do not want a lawyer, I suppose? I do not.’ He would probably say ‘No.’ I should go to the Registry Office, and draw out a mortgage upon the counter, have it witnessed, and hand it to the clerk, and say to him, ‘It will be ready to-morrow afternoon, I suppose?’ Bankers and merchants have a clerk who looks after these things and gets mortgages on property made. There is no necessity for the intervention of a lawyer; such a thing is never thought of.” (Evidence, 1879, Nos. 1778, 1792). Sir Robert Torrens has had people mortgaging their land for £7, because a man gets his mortgage for 5s., and in a quarter of an hour (1878, No. 3235). In Tasmania it is an every-day occurrence for parties to come to the office, sign the proper forms, filled up by the clerk according to their instruc-

tions, pay over the purchase money, or the amount lent, then and there at the counter, and walk off with their business completed. (1872 Return, p. 137.) From New South Wales we learn "the public generally have become so accustomed to our certificates as in many instances to decline accepting a property except the title is registered." In New Zealand "a large proportion of land transfer business is transacted by unprofessional persons licensed as land brokers, and who readily acquire the necessary familiarity with the system" (1881 Return, p. 99): their fees are about 5s. or 6s. 8d. "The broker is sometimes a solicitor, sometimes a land agent, sometimes a merchant." (1879 Evidence, No. 1947). Even where a lawyer is employed the work is so simple that the total expense seldom exceeds £3. (Hon. R. C. Baker: *London Chamber of Commerce Journal*, Dec. 1885, p. 298.)

Business men conversant with the actual process of sale and mortgage and lease of land will be curious to know how provision is made under the registry system for various matters of detail. Space does not permit of our entering into these, but it must suffice to assert here that the Torrens system has been so developed as to meet all exigencies of everyday business requirements, including especially temporary "equitable mortgages" to bankers without publicity, the transaction of business at a distance from the registry, the protection of secondary interests, alteration of boundaries.

Besides the Australasian colonies, the Torrens system has spread into British Columbia, Iowa, Fiji, and Tunis. It is about to be adopted in Singapore and Malacca, and has lately attracted a great deal of notice in France, both in the newspapers and in the works of jurists.

We must now ask the attention of the reader to what we consider to be the chief cause of our failure in England to realize this success.

The Torrens system makes adequate provision for the possible occurrence of a mistake; the English systems are absolutely silent on the subject. To appreciate the gravity of this omission it is only necessary to consider for a moment the irresistible force of the engine employed wherever registration of absolute title is applied to land. To take two extreme cases that might occur under the English Acts:—Lord F. lets his family mansion to Mr. B. for twenty-one years, and goes to live on the Continent. Mr. B. after a while registers himself as owner in fee simple by means of forged documents of title; and afterwards sells the place by a registered sale to a genuine purchaser. Lord F. and his family have lost their seat, and no provision is made for their compensation in any way. Again, suppose Mr. Brown is the registered owner of the "Hill Farm" and is

living on it in peace and quiet. Mr. Jones, an adept in personation and forgery, pretends to a stranger, Mr. Robinson, that he is Brown, and purports to mortgage the "Hill Farm" to the said Robinson, forging Brown's signature, producing a forged copy of Brown's certificate of title, and forging the necessary "verification." The mortgage is registered—Jones absconds. In this case, unless Brown by hook or by crook can satisfy that fraudulent mortgage (of which he now hears for the first time), he is entirely at the mercy of Robinson, and liable to be sold out by him. In such a case, if his property had not been registered, Brown would have been safe, but actually *because it is registered* he is liable to lose it, without a chance of redress, although he knew nothing, and could not by any means have known anything, of Jones's fraudulent proceedings, which were all carried on behind his back. Persons who go and laugh at the delicate situation of the too zealous Koko and P'oooh Bah in "The Mikado" are probably not aware that the Japan of Mr. Gilbert is by no means the only place where personation on the part of another, coupled with a "stupid Act saying nothing about a mistake," may involve innocent persons in very unpleasant consequences.

Now although experience is gradually tending to show that such occurrences are in the last degree unlikely to happen, yet their bare possibility casts a serious impediment in the way of progress for any voluntary registration scheme, and that in two ways. For one thing, solicitors, who realize these dangers as far more serious than any that exist under the present system—for they are dangers which no vigilance can provide against, whereas all the dangers of the present system can be provided against by vigilance—solicitors scruple to advise their clients to put themselves under a system in which they are possible. While, on the other hand, the apprehension of such occurrences introduces such a nervous timidity into the framers of the Rules of Procedure in the office, that the precautions insisted on to guard every initial registration and every subsequent transaction from the least loophole of fraud, or possibility of mistake, are such as to impede the progress of every-day business to a most inconvenient extent, and in fact, as we have seen, to produce the absurd result that in England a first registration costs two or three times as much as an ordinary sale, and a registered sale will often cost more trouble, more money, and—worst of all—more time, to carry through than an unregistered dealing of the same character.

Now let us turn to the Torrens system. In the first case that we put, Lord F. would receive the full value of the land he had been deprived of out of an "assurance fund" raised for that purpose by a percentage charged on all registrations (though in

Australia it is likely enough that this arrangement meets all the requirements of the case, probably in England it would be better to put it the other way—namely, to make the first registration inoperative altogether against Lord F., and to award the compensation to the purchaser from Mr. B.). In the second case, Brown would be left in peace, and Robinson would be compensated for his loss out of the same “assurance fund.”

Passing to the Australian office procedure on first registration and on subsequent dealings, we find that this excellent provision for mistake induces a freedom from timidity in accepting fair titles, and an absence of official interference on sales and mortgages which those who conduct business in our office may well envy, which turns every registered owner of land into a walking—and talking—advertisement of the advantages of the system, and at the same time is shown, by an experience of nearly thirty years, to furnish far more than adequate protection for the assurance fund against excessive loss. In 1880 (the date of the last report) the various assurance funds amounted to over £150,000; the sum total of all the compensations that had been paid was only £2,500; and the several funds of Tasmania, New South Wales, and New Zealand (the three oldest colonies, containing titles dating back to 1803, 1788, and 1814 respectively), and Western Australia, were actually intact. The percentage charged is one halfpenny in the pound on the value of the land (about one-fifth per cent.), except in Tasmania, where it is only one farthing, and it is paid on first registration and on every death of a registered owner.

As it is often supposed that the great difficulty in England must necessarily be first registration, owing to the confused state of all titles, it will be well to observe how, if the peculiarity of the Torrens system just pointed out were adopted here, the first registration of all titles—old or young, simple or complicated, long or short, clear or cloudy—would be equally facilitated.

For, under the wing of an assurance fund, the Australian registrars are in a position totally different from that of our registrar. It has been well remarked of our registrars’ scrupulosity under Lord Westbury’s Act, that

the precautions adopted by the Registration Office were not only justifiable, but such as could not have been neglected without the grossest dereliction of duty. The fact that some of them are often waived in practice by willing purchasers affords no reason why a dormant claim as to which the purchaser is willing to “take his chance” should be arbitrarily abolished by a public official. It should be remembered that “waiving a requisition” means only, on the part of a purchaser, voluntarily choosing, for the sake of completing a purchase, to incur a given risk; whereas on the part of



the registrar it may mean confiscating somebody else's legal rights. An application for registration with indefeasible title is not a mere application to effect a sale, in which the opposite party has a full right to waive any objection. It is an application to decide finally upon the possible rights of strangers to the proceedings, who are not only unrepresented but probably unaware of what is taking place. Nobody can question a purchaser's right to accept any title for what it is worth, relying on the probability that dormant claims will continue to sleep. But it is quite possible to question the propriety of permitting a public officer arbitrarily to bar dormant claims merely because he thinks it unlikely that they will be effectively prosecuted. ("Land Transfer," p. 46.)

Of the increased liberty allowed to the registrar under Lord Cairns's Act the same authority remarks :

The convenience of this enactment in facilitating the registration of titles is obvious; but this convenience is manifestly gained by giving power to a public official to confiscate dormant rights without compensation if he thinks them not likely to be prosecuted with effect. It has been already pointed out that in this process there is nothing analogous to the consent of a willing purchaser to run the risk of a remotely possible or dormant claim. The fact that many purchasers are willing to incur some slight degree of risk affords no reason why dormant rights which may be involved should arbitrarily be confiscated, especially without compensation (p. 55).

Practically, however,

the new registry did nothing at all to remove the main objection which experience had shown to be fatal to the old one—viz., that it inevitably saddles a landowner with a very appreciable additional expense, and (if a purchaser) with a still greater disadvantage in the way of delay in completing his purchase, for the sake of obtaining an advantage which, even if of undoubted value in itself, offers only a remote and uncertain advantage to the person himself at whose cost it is obtained. An Act may easily introduce into its practice a dangerous laxity of procedure, but no degree of laxity which could be regarded as tolerable could possibly have effected the object aimed at. If such provisions are administered with prudence and discretion, they leave the procedure, as far as the present point is concerned, practically unaltered. Some reduction may be made in the necessary expense, but the practical effect for this purpose of a mere reduction is inconsiderable (p. 61).

With all this we entirely concur, and we have quoted it at length to enable the reader to appreciate the gravity of the point we are discussing.

With the Australians, however—*mirabile dictu*—it is the avowed practice to accept all titles which appear to be practically safe, not only as freely as, but more freely than, ordinary

purchasers. With this we also concur. Why? The result is arrived at in two steps. That the Australian registrar may act *as freely* as ordinary purchasers results from the consideration that owners of dormant claims which he may overlook, or elect to "take his chance" of, are not irreparably injured by his mistakes, owing to the power of compensation afforded by the fund; that he can act *more freely* than ordinary purchasers, results from the ordinary consideration underlying all insurance business—namely, that larger risks can be prudently incurred where many cases are treated together, than where they would have to be incurred by different individuals one by one. Nobody would insure one ship or one house or one life on terms short of exorbitant; when many are taken together, the charge becomes reasonable at once. So with titles. No one would prudently accept a title with a grave *hiatus* in it if he could help it, but when they are insured by the hundred the matter is much easier. (It must not be supposed that the registrars in Australia, or purchasers in England, ever accept a title from A which indicates that B is probably the real owner. "Bad title" means for the most part "defective title" only—a title in which there is a gap—"a pig in a poke," in fact. It should not be called a chain with a *weak link*; it is a chain one of whose links *cannot be tested* except by the fact that the chain bears. Anything worse than this is never thought of for an instant.)

With the recognition of this principle, that the registrar with an assurance fund is in an easier position than an ordinary purchaser, a corollary of the utmost practical importance immediately follows, and that is, that in prospect of a sale or mortgage it is invariably cheaper to register the title than to proceed in the ordinary way; or again, that immediately after a substantial dealing a title will usually be in sufficiently "apple-pie order" to ensure its registration (if desired) without delay or difficulty, and possibly even without expense.

We have stated these results in the first instance as following logically from the premises. If this origin causes them to be regarded with any suspicion, the following extract from the report of the Registrar of Titles of Victoria in 1880 may be held to give them a more substantial value. He says:

Applications to bring land under the Act are generally made when the parties are dealing with the land, and the expenses of passing the title through the office must vary according to the business to be transacted, *but it must be much less than would have to be incurred in the investigation and making good titles between vendor and purchaser under the old system*, from the fact that requisitions are only made by the office upon questions involving some substantial interests, and the compliance with them is not required to be of such a formal character as would be the case under the old system. (1881 Return, p. 147.)

We wonder what an Australian registrar would say to the story of the Newcastle beer-seller, or the unadministered D, given at p. 84.

That the titles here referred to were not absolutely baby titles appears from the fact that the Victorian Act, having been passed in 1862, since which date all fresh Crown grants were put on the register by law, all titles coming to the office for first registration in 1880 were at least eighteen years old—an age which in the colonies would imply on the average six or eight dealings to peruse, of a highly informal character occasionally. Whatever means be adopted in England for working out the details, it is tolerably certain that if we proceed on this principle it will yield the same broad practical result that it has yielded in Australia—that is to say, that the occasion of sale or mortgage will offer a favourable opportunity for the registration of titles in all cases, and that when this is made clear by a few examples the public will not be slow to avail themselves of it.

First registration is only half the difficulty, however. Unless we take efficient means to prevent the subsequent disappointments which so many have experienced as the result of registration, it will be of no use to open ever so easy a door to applicants for first registration. The well-advised fly does not hasten to avail himself of the “facilities” for entrance afforded by the breadth of the spider’s lintel. Now, as to this, whatever opinions may be entertained as to the differences between English and Australian titles before registration, there can be little doubt that after registration the same methods of dealing would be equally applicable to both. Our advice, therefore, on this head is exceedingly simple, and we have reason to believe it would be efficacious. Instead of racking our brains to *invent* new modes of registering dealings, why should we not simply *copy* the Australian methods? They are quite different to ours, and not nearly so cumbrous. For instance, in England, before a registered estate can be dealt with, before the purchaser can cross the threshold of the office, or the registrar dip his pen in the ink, a solicitor *must* be employed. He must know the parties, must see them sign a paper, and must make an affidavit: this is thought to be an indispensable protection against fraud. If it be so it is rather humiliating to our national honesty, for it is unnecessary in Australia. (The suggestion has been made, that notoriety in a small community enables precautions to be dispensed with that are needed in a large one. But does it really appear that any appreciable difference can exist in this respect between England and Australia, with its 3,000,000 of inhabitants scattered over a territory as large as Russia?) The success or failure of a system of this kind may most easily depend on points of detail (witness the different results, well known to

lawyers, obtained from the identically constituted Deed Registries of Middlesex and Yorkshire), and why in the world we should risk a fresh *fiasco* over official procedure when there is a complete body of procedure ready to hand, which has stood the test of nearly thirty years' experience under very severe pressure of multifarious business, it is difficult to see.

If the new registrar were sent over to Australia, he would learn the business better in a month than in studying the fruits of years of labour spent in compiling reports and returns. If this be thought expensive, let it be observed that our failures have cost the treasury between £50,000 and £90,000 already; that for some years back we have been losing over £1,000 a year by them, and that until the office rights itself by gaining the confidence and patronage of the public, we are pledged to go on in the same extravagant fashion.

The question of finance is an exceedingly important one. The Australian registries are all self-supporting, and have long since recouped the initial outlay. Their fees are uniform, and rarely exceed 30s., including everything; an ordinary simple mortgage usually costs 5s. Detailed accounts of receipts and expenditure have not come to us, but this much at any rate appears from Queensland. In that colony they have over 40,000 titles on the register, and the total gross expenses of the maintenance of the office are less than £5,000 a year—less, that is, than we have been paying in England for an office which has a bare 3,000 titles now on the books. If it be fancied that the work per title in England is heavier than that performed in the colonies, we may mention that, according to returns from Victoria (the Queensland returns are silent as to this point), property in that colony appears to be dealt with to the extent of its entire value at least *once in every two years*; and in Queensland mortgages are occasionally so complicated as to necessitate 1,500 entries each. (This figure is startling, but we take it from the Parliamentary Return of 1881, p. 89.)

It would be a great mistake to fix the fees chargeable in the English office as low as the Australian fees at first. They may be lowered as time goes on, but it is a matter of great importance to obtain a safety surplus as soon as possible. They should be based upon the present scale of fees for private conveyancing, and, if possible, no "extras" should be allowed of any sort or kind—the present schedule of registry office fees is a veritable wasps' nest of unexpected three-and-sixpences. We may state it as the result of calculations, of which we shall be happy to furnish the details to any one desirous of testing them, that if our registration fees are fixed at one-tenth of the minimum total costs of conveyancing according to the *ad valorem* scale issued under

the Solicitors' Remuneration Act of 1881, and the gross office expenses per title per annum be reckoned at *double* those incurred in Queensland, then, on the modest assumption that on the average all registered property will bring in the above fees only *once in every twenty years*—a considerable annual surplus will accrue.

The subscription to the guarantee fund requires consideration, both as to its amount and as to the occasion on which it should be paid. As to its amount, the statistics of the Australian funds already given seem to show that the risk from fraud in registered dealings subsequent to first registration is quite inappreciable; and, as to first registration, the ordinary experience of purchasers on sales in England—who are often not only willing and even eager, but positively reckless, as to the titles they will accept—would show that the risk to be incurred from even the most liberal acceptance of ordinary titles is more nominal than real. On the whole, it seems that the Australian charge of one-fifth per cent. would be ample in amount. The extreme desirability of charging no extra expenses on first registration beyond what are barely necessary suggests the expedient of postponing the moment of subscription to the fund until the occasion of the first registered dealing *for value*. (A dealing “for value” is a dealing by way of sale, mortgage, or lease, or a settlement on marriage; it is opposed to a “voluntary” transaction, such as a gift by deed or will, a succession on an intestacy, or a settlement not made on marriage.) This occasion is more appropriate in reality than that of initial registration, because neither under the Torrens system nor under any other system that we are aware of, except Lord Cairns's Act, does the Government guarantee become absolute until that moment. Considering the increased inducement offered to fraud by giving an absolute guarantee to the first registered owner, it seems a most undesirable course to adopt. If the figures are worked out, it will be found that even when the one-fifth per cent. assurance charge is added to the office fee above suggested for registering the dealing, the total will not nearly approach the present costs of the same transaction.

With regard to placing estates on the register for the first time, it seems that the most easy and economical way to act would be to accept any title which a purchaser actually has accepted on a sale, whether under conditions or not, and which his solicitor reports to the office as free from substantial risk. To discuss this suggestion would be a long matter, but considering that the first registered owner does not get the Government guarantee, but only *power to offer it to a genuine purchaser*, and that the former of course, as in Australia, can be made to remain primarily liable for mistakes to that purchaser,

just as he now remains liable according to the existing practice of conveyancing, it is difficult to see what combination of persons or circumstances could and would involve the fund in liability, from which same combination private purchasers are not also equally liable to suffer loss under the present system. If this be a just observation, it seems to follow from the fact already noticed that purchasers do not suffer loss now, that the fund would not suffer loss then.

The last point of principle to which we intend to advert is this. If we abandon the "absolute indefeasibility" system, and substitute for it an extension of the Australian system sufficient to justify the description of the new system as one of "pure guarantee," then registrations are divested of their "judicial" character, and may with perfect propriety be conducted *privately*. In systems where the registered title is made absolute or indefeasible, if a mistake occurs, some one loses his land. But under the guarantee system no one is hurt; the old owner retains his rights, while the fund compensates the deceived party. Thus all those advertisements and notices to all sorts of persons likely to have claims (which proved so prejudicial to progress under the old Acts, and which still entail some expense to applicants in Australia) are avoided, and boundaries can be guaranteed exactly in the same way as titles, without any prejudice to adjoining owners. Here again the present experience of purchasers on sales will be found, on reflection, to afford a perfectly trustworthy guide to the risk of loss incurred by the fund if this course be adopted.

In the preceding pages we have endeavoured to show in outline our reasons for believing that all but a very few titles may be speedily guaranteed, as under the Torrens system, at no cost to the State, and little or no cost to the individual; and also we have indicated the particular respect in which such an improvement of our every-day office procedure on sales and mortgages may be made as will speedily induce the great majority of vendors and purchasers of land and houses to accept the offer thus held out to them.

It may be interesting to the reader to learn, by way of conclusion, what are the alternative schemes which have been proposed. They mostly assume that no voluntary system has a chance of being adopted, and therefore propose compulsion in some form. They all omit the one improvement which alone will suffice to make compulsion unnecessary, and the omission of which will render compulsion intolerable—the reform of the office procedure on registered sales and mortgages in conformity with the Australian practice. The alternatives are as follows:—

1. The compulsory registration of every *prima facie* title as absolute, with indemnity, either by the State alone, or with the aid of an insurance fund, to persons injured. Considerable expense and an unknown risk would result to the State from this, together with considerable hardships to individual owners, especially those out of possession, and any whose titles are liable to attack, which such a measure would at once precipitate.

2. The compulsory registration, at the next sale of every property, of a "possessory title," as under Lord Cairns's Act. That is to say, to force every landowner (for his own good merely, and apparently at his own expense) to do that which not one landowner in 20,000 has yet been persuaded to do of his own accord; it would add some expense to every sale—how much we have already seen; it would cost the State a good deal to inaugurate, and its benefit would not accrue for a long time.

3. To curtail the present wide power of disposition which owners of land possess, so as to bring all titles to any easily registrable state. As to this it seems enough to point out that no facility of transfer seems worth the sacrifice of liberty of disposition.

4. The establishment of a Landed Estates Court. This would perhaps be a safe system, but it would probably be very costly both to the State and to the suitors, and much more dilatory than the present system. The circumstances which caused it to be welcome in Ireland do not exist here. We do not apprehend that any such project as this last is being seriously entertained by the authorities.

The two great evils of resorting to compulsion in a matter like this are, first, that in case the system should not work well, a most awful obstruction will be placed upon the transaction of all the business of the country till it is abolished—a very serious thing to contemplate; and second, that a great press of work will commence all at once, thereby largely increasing the expense of inauguration and the risk of failure, instead of the business being allowed to extend itself by degrees, in which case increasing demands can be easily met as they arise. Besides which, unless we believe that purchasers, mortgagees, and lessees of land or houses are very feeble or very stupid, it is incredible that any system *really beneficial* to them will need any such aid as compulsion; the demand for which, on the part of legislators, sounds to us far more like a confession of weakness than an assertion of strength.

The project we have unfolded is designed to effect the desired object with the least possible change of existing law, and only the most gradual modification of existing practice. It is hoped that it may commend itself to the not inconsiderable number of

well-informed persons who believe in registration of title in the abstract, but, thinking its establishment impossible without resort to compulsion in some form, naturally shrink from the aid of so treacherous an ally. To escape all censure we cannot hope. "The expectation of ignorance," says Dr. Johnson,\* "is indefinite, and that of knowledge is often tyrannical. It is hard to satisfy those who know not what to demand, or those who demand by design what they think impossible to be done."

---

ART. VI.—WHAT AND HOW TO READ.

1. *Pall Mall Gazette "Extra,"* No. 24. *The Best Hundred Books.* By the Best Judges. London: *Pall Mall Gazette Office.* 1886.
2. *The Pleasures, the Dangers, and the Uses of Desultory Reading.* By the Right Hon. the EARL OF IDDESLEIGH. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1885.
3. *The Choice of Books; and other Literary Pieces.* By FREDERIC HARRISON. London: Macmillan & Co. 1886.
4. *The Pleasures of a Bookworm.* By J. ROGERS REES. London: Elliot Stock. 1886.

"THE choice of books," says Mr. F. Harrison, "is really the choice of our education, of a moral and intellectual ideal, of the whole duty of man."† If we of the present day go wrong in our choice, it is not for want of warning, for we are deluged with advice as to what books we should read, and how we should read them. This deluge began in November last by Lord Idedesleigh's "desultory discourse," as he calls it, delivered, as Lord Rector of Edinburgh University, to the students. It is published, with a few additions, under the title named at the head of this article. Sir John Lubbock in the December following made the choice of books the subject of his address, as President of the Working Men's College, to the members of the College, and followed it up by publishing in the *Contemporary Review* a list of "The Best Hundred Books," which he afterwards revised. Mr. Frederic Harrison also gives us his advice on the choice of books, "founded on the basis of Auguste Comte's library;"‡ and lastly, Mr. J. Rogers Rees in the

---

\* Preface to Shakespeare.

† "The Choice of Books," p. 20.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 92, note.



course of the spring gave to the world the interesting little volume which he calls "The Pleasures of a Bookworm." When Sir John Lubbock's list came out, the Editor of the *Pull Mall Gazette* gratified his passion for curious investigation, and undertook the task of submitting Sir John's list to a variety of men eminent in society and literature, and asking for their opinions and criticisms, and for a list of what each of them considered the hundred best books. These opinions and criticisms now form the pamphlet entitled "The Best Hundred Books." Sir John's list, as finally revised by himself, stands thus:—

1. The Bible.
2. Marcus Aurelius, "Meditations."
3. Epictetus.
4. Confucius, "Analecta."
5. "Le Boudhdh et sa Religion" (St. Hilaire.)
6. Aristotle, "Ethics."
7. Mahomet, "Koran."
8. "Apostolic Fathers," Wake's Collection.
9. St. Augustine, "Confessions."
10. Thomas à Kempis, "Imitation."
11. Pascal, "Pensées."
12. Spinoza, "Tractatus Theologico-politicus"
13. Comte, "Catechism of Positive Philosophy" (Congreve).
14. Butler, "Analogy."
15. Jeremy Taylor, "Holy Living and Holy Dying."
16. Bunyan, "Pilgrim's Progress."
17. Keble, "Christian Year."
18. Aristotle, "Politics."
19. Plato's Dialogues; at any rate, the "Phaedo" and "Republic."
20. Demosthenes, "De Coronâ."
21. Lucretius.
22. Plutarch.
23. Horace.
24. Cicero, "De Officiis," "De Amicitia," "De Senectute."
25. Homer, "Iliad" and "Odyssey."
26. Hesiod.
27. Virgil.
28. Niebelungenlied.
29. Malory, "Morte d'Arthur."
30. "Maha Bharata," "Ramayana." Epitomized by Talboys Wheeler in the first two vols. of his "History of India."
31. Firdusi, "Shahnameh."
32. "Sheking" (Chinese Odes).
33. Æschylus, "Prometheus," "House of Atreus," "Trilogy," or "Persæ."
34. Sophocles, "Œdipus Trilogy."
35. Euripides, "Medea."
36. Aristophanes, "The Knights."
37. Herodotus.
38. Xenophon, "Anabasis."
39. Thucydides.
40. Tacitus, "Germania."
41. Livy.
42. Gibbon, "Decline and Fall."
43. Hume, "England."
44. Grote, "Greece."
45. Carlyle, "French Revolution."
46. Green, "Short History of England"
47. Bacon, "Novum Organum"
48. Mill, "Logic."
49. "Political Economy."
50. Darwin, "Origin of Species."
51. Smith, "Wealth of Nations" (part of.)
52. Berkeley, "Human Knowledge."
53. Descartes, "Discours sur la Méthode."
54. Locke, "Conduct of the Understanding."
55. Lewes, "History of Philosophy."
56. Cook's Voyages.
57. Humboldt's Travels.
58. Darwin, "Naturalist on the *Beagle*."
59. Shakespeare.
60. Milton, "Paradise Lost" and the shorter poems.
61. Dante, "Divina Commedia."
62. Spenser, "Faerie Queen."
63. Dryden's Poems.
64. Chaucer: Morris's, or (if expurgated) Clarke's, or Mrs. Haweis' edition.
65. Gray.
66. Burns.

- |                                                        |                                                          |
|--------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| 67. Scott's Poems.                                     | 85. Molière.                                             |
| 68. Wordsworth: Mr. Arnold's selection.                | 86. Sheridan.                                            |
| 69. Heine.                                             | 87. Voltaire, "Zadig."                                   |
| 70. Pope.                                              | 88. Carlyle.                                             |
| 71. Southey.                                           | 89. Goethe, "Faust" and "Wilhelm Meister."               |
| 72. Goldsmith, "Vicar of Wakefield."                   | 90. White, "Natural History of Selborne."                |
| 73. Swift, "Gulliver's Travels."                       | 91. Smiles, "Self Help."                                 |
| 74. Defoe, "Robinson Crusoe."                          | 92. Miss Austen: either "Emma" or "Pride and Prejudice." |
| 75. "The Arabian Nights."                              | 93. Thackeray, "Vanity Fair."                            |
| 76. Cervantes, "Don Quixote."                          | 94. "Pendennis."                                         |
| 77. Boswell, "Johnson."                                | 95. Dickens, "Pickwick."                                 |
| 78. Burke, Select Works (Payne).<br><i>Essayists</i> : | 96. "David Copperfield."                                 |
| 79. Bacon.                                             | 97. George Eliot, "Adam Bede."                           |
| 80. Addison.                                           | 98. Kingsley, "Westward Ho!"                             |
| 81. Hume.                                              | 99. Bulwer Lytton, "Last Days of Pompeii."               |
| 82. Montaigne.                                         | 100. Scott's Novels.*                                    |
| 83. Macaulay.                                          |                                                          |
| 84. Emerson.                                           |                                                          |

In the outset of our remarks we wish each of our readers to ask himself or herself two questions—(1) Have I read, not these hundred books, but any hundred books? (2) Do I know any one who has read a hundred books? With regard to Sir John's list, it has been mischievously suggested, "Why not send a confidential interviewer to ask Sir John Lubbock whether he has read all his hundred books; and if not, why not?"†

Mr. Frederic Harrison makes some true remarks on the readers and reading of the present day: "Even those who are resolved to read the better books are embarrassed by a field of choice practically boundless. . . . Systematic reading is but little in favour even amongst studious men; in a true sense, it is hardly possible for women." What follows is, we fear, but too true:

If any person given to reading were honestly to keep a register of all the printed stuff that he or she consumes in a year—all the idle tales of which the very names and the story are forgotten in a week—the bookmaker's prattle at so much a sheet, the fugitive trifling about silly things and empty people, the memoirs of the unmemorable, and lives of those who never really lived at all—of what a mountain of rubbish would it be a catalogue? ‡

We have not at hand Sir John Lubbock's address at the Working Men's College, but we presume his list is intended for working men, and if so, we agree with Mr. Quaritch the bookseller, of Piccadilly, that "Sir John's working man is an ideal

\* "The Best Hundred Books," p. 24.

† *Ibid.* p. 23.

‡ "The Choice of Books," p. 9.

creation." "I," he adds, "have known many working men, but none of them could have digested such a feast as he has prepared for them."\* This opinion is corroborated by information supplied by the librarian of the Free Library of Darlington. His list of the books which are the favourites of the members, who are mainly of the working class, includes only nine of those given by Sir John Lubbock.†

Of Sir John's list we agree with the DUKE of ARGYLL, who writes: "Sir John Lubbock's list seems to me very good as far as such lists can possibly go." To this opinion the MASTER OF BALLIOL assents; adding—to which we also assent: "The chief fault being that it is too long." Mr. FROUDE remarks: "People must choose their own reading, and Sir John Lubbock's list will do for a guide as well as others. I, at any rate, do not wish to put myself into competition with him." With commendable caution, PROFESSOR FREFMAN writes: "I feel myself quite unable to draw up such a list as you propose, as I could not trust my own judgment on any matter not bearing on my own special studies, and I should be doubtless tempted to give too great prominence to them.‡

It is with full assent and consent that we subscribe to the remark of Professor J. S. Blackie :

No man, it appears to me, can tell another what he ought to read. A man's reading, to be of any value must depend on his power of assimilation, and that again depends on his tendencies, his capacities, his surroundings, and his opportunities.

And again :

In attempting to frame such a list as that put forth by Sir John Lubbock, it is also of the utmost importance to keep in view what sort of persons we are favouring with our advice; and here I see two large classes of readers—those who have large leisure, and have gone through a regular process of severe intellectual discipline; and those who can only redeem a few hours daily, if so much, to fill up the gaps left in the hasty architecture of their early attempt at self-culture.

And again :

To a political student, on the highest platform of course, Aristotle and Thucydides are supreme authorities; but it would be unreasonable to expect that the mass of intelligent young men in our great cities, untrained in intellectual gymnastics and unfurnished with scholarly aids, should set themselves systematically to grapple with severe thinkers of this type, or with metaphysics or metaphysical theology. §

Mr. Carlyle has somewhere said that "books are, like men's

\* "The Best Hundred Books," p. 20.

† *Ibid.* p. 23.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 25.

§ *Ibid.* p. 18.

souls, divided into sheep and goats ;” and probably there is no better advice on the choice of books than that which, in his pithy manner, he gave to the students of Edinburgh University: “Learn to be good readers, which is perhaps a more difficult thing than you imagine. Learn to be discriminative in your reading—to read all kinds of things that you have an interest in, and that you find to be really fit for what you are engaged on.”\* Of this opinion was Dr. Johnson—“A man,” he says, “ought to read just as inclination leads him, for what he reads as a task will do him little good.”† “You see,” says Professor Max Müller, “the best books are not the best books for everybody.”‡

Sir John Lubbock is surprised at the great divergence of opinion as to the best books which has been expressed. “Nine of your correspondents,” he writes to the editor of the *Pall Mall Gazette*, “have favoured us with lists of some length. These lists contain some 300 works not mentioned by me (without, however, any corresponding omissions), and yet there is not one single book which occurs in every list, or even in half of them, and only about half a dozen which appear in more than one of the nine.”§

We will now glance at some of the criticisms of Sir John’s “best hundred.” The PRINCE OF WALES, speaking with diffidence, expresses the opinion that the list suggested by Sir John Lubbock could hardly be improved upon. His Royal Highness would, however, venture to remark that the works of Dryden should not be omitted from such an important and comprehensive list.¶ Mr. CHAMBERLAIN does not think he could greatly improve Sir John’s list, but would inquire “whether it is by accident or design that the Bible has been omitted?” It will be observed that in Sir John’s revised list the Bible stands at the head. The political reputation and official position of Mr. Bryce, M.P., have made people forget that he first made his reputation by his book on “The Holy Roman Empire,” and that he is still an Oxford Professor and a Fellow of Oriel.

I give you [he writes to the editor of the *Pall Mall Gazette*] some additions to and criticisms on Sir John Lubbock’s list, which occur to me. I have not seen the remarks of your other correspondents, except Mr. Ruskin’s. In Greek poetry Pindar ought to be substituted for Hesiod. In Greek philosophy, Aristotle’s “Rhetoric” and “Poetic” ought not to be omitted. Of Cicero it would be much better to have some Orations than the “Offices” or “Old Age.” St. Augustine’s

\* Address to the students as Lord Rector, Hotten’s ed. p. 157.

† Boswell’s “Life,” vol. ii. p. 213 (ed. 1859).

‡ “The Best Hundred Books,” p. 17.

¶ *Ibid.* p. 5.

§ *Ibid.* p. 23.

¶ *Ibid.* p. 5.

"De Civitate Dei" is indispensable. Perhaps no book ever more affected history. The Icelandic Sagas, or some of them, ought to be added. Most of the best have been translated, such as "Njals Saga," "Grettis Saga," and the "Heimskringla." The poems in the "Elder Edda" (now admirably translated in Vigfusson and Powell's "Corpus Poeticum Boreale") ought also to find a place. For travels, add Marco Polo; for history, Machiavelli's "Prince." In Italian poetry, Ariosto and Leopardi should come in. The "Lusiad" of Camoens is one of the finest examples of a poem in the grand style, and not the less interesting because the only work of Portuguese genius whose fame has overpassed the limits of its country. Montesquieu's "Esprit des Loix" is indispensable; so is "Candide." In modern fiction "Les Miserables" and "The Scarlet Letter" may well replace Kingsley and Bulwer. The modern poets Keats and Shelley surely rank above Southey and Longfellow. Whether you put anything in its place or not (for example, Kant's "Kritik der reinen Vernunft" or Hegel's "History of Philosophy"), Lewis's "History of Philosophy" should be struck out.\*

Lord COLERIDGE, premising that since he left the university his reading has only been desultory and superficial, continues :

Generally speaking, I think Sir John Lubbock's list a very good one, as far as I know the books which compose it. But I know nothing of Chinese or Sanscrit, and have no opinion whatever about the Chinese and Sanscrit works he refers to. To the classics I should add Catullus, Propertius, Ovid (in selections), Pindar, and the pastoral writers Theocritus, Bion, and Moschus.

I should find a place among epic poets for Tasso, Ariosto, and, I should suppose, Camoens, though I know him only in translation. With the poem of Malory on the "Morte d'Arthur" I am quite unacquainted : Malory's prose romance under that title is familiar to many readers from Southey's reprint of (I think) Caxton's edition of it.

Among the Greek dramatists, I should give more prominent place to Euripides—the friend of Socrates, the idol of Menander, the admiration of Milton and Charles Fox ; and I should exclude Aristophanes, whose splendid genius does not seem to me to atone for the baseness and vulgarity of his mind. In history, I shall exclude Hume, as mere waste of time now to read ; and include Tacitus and Livy and Lord Clarendon and Sismondi. I do not know enough about philosophy to offer any opinion. In poetry and general literature, I should certainly include Dryden, some plays of Ben Jonson, and Ford and Massinger, and Shirley and Webster ; Gray, Collins, Coleridge, Charles Lamb, De Quincey, Bolingbroke, Sterne ; and I should substitute Bryant for Longfellow ; and most certainly I should add Cowper. In fiction I should add Miss Austen, "Clarissa," "Tom Jones," "Humphrey Linker ;" and certainly exclude Kingsley.†

Mr. RUSKIN has "put his pen lightly through the needless, and *blottesquely* through the rubbish and poison of Sir John's

\* *Ibid.* p. 6.

† "The Best Hundred Books," p. 5.

list," with the result of reducing it by fully one-half. He omits all the non-Christian moralists among the theological books; he retains only Jeremy Taylor's "Holy Living and Dying" and "The Pilgrim's Progress." From the historical writers he excludes Gibbon, Voltaire, Hume, and Grote; he erases John Stuart Mill's name altogether, and every writer on philosophy but Bacon, and of him would read chiefly "The New Atlantis." He strikes out Southey and Longfellow from among the poets, and Hume, Macaulay, and Emerson from among the essayists; but he would read all Plato and every word of Scott and Carlyle.

Mr. Ruskin, in a subsequent letter to the editor, says:—"The idea that any well-conducted mortal life could find leisure enough to read one hundred books would have left me wholly silent on the matter, but that I was fain, when you sent me Sir John's list, to strike out, for my own pupils' sake, the books I would forbid them to be plagued with." He adds his reasons for erasing some of the books. These judgments are pre-eminently characteristic of the man's dogmatic, self-sufficient, supercilious, and, we must add, superficial nature:

1. *Grote's History of Greece*.—Because there is probably no commercial establishment between Charing Cross and the Bank whose head-clerk could not write a better one, if he had the vanity to waste his time for it.

2. *Confessions of St. Augustine*.—Because religious people nearly always think too much about themselves, and there are many saints whom it is much more desirable to know the history of—St. Patrick, to begin with, especially in present times.

3. *John Stuart Mill*.—Sir John Lubbock ought to have known that his day was over.

4. *Charles Kingsley*.—Because his sentiment is false, and his tragedy frightful. People who buy cheap clothes are not punished in real life by catching fevers; social inequalities are not to be redressed by tailors falling in love with bishops' daughters, or gamekeepers with squires'; and the story of "Hypatia" is the most ghastly in Christian tradition, and should for ever have been left in silence.

5. *Darwin*.—Because it is every man's duty to know what he is, and not to think of the embryo he was, nor the skeleton that he shall be. Because also Darwin has a mortal fascination for all vainly curious and idly speculative persons, and has collected, in the train of him, every impudent imbecility in Europe, like a dim comet wagging its useless tail of phosphorescent nothing across the steadfast stars.

6. *Gibbon*.—Primarily none but the malignant and the weak study the Decline and Fall either of State or organism. Dissolution and putrescence are alike common and unclean in all things; any wretch or simpleton may observe for himself, and experience himself, the processes of ruin; but good men study and wise men describe only the growth and standing of things—not their decay.

For the rest, Gibbon's is the worst English that was ever written by

an educated Englishman. Having no imagination and little logic, he is alike incapable either of picturesqueness or wit; his epithets are malicious without point, sonorous without weight, and have no office but to make a flat sentence turgid.

7. *Voltaire*.—His work is, in comparison with good literature, what nitric acid is to wine, and sulphuretted hydrogen to air. Literary chemists cannot but take account of the sting and stench of him; but he has no place in the library of a thoughtful scholar. Every man of sense knows more of the world than Voltaire can tell him; and what he wishes to express of such knowledge he will say without a snarl.\*

Mr. SWINBURNE would add Mill "On Liberty," and Mrs. Gaskell's works.

Mr. WILLIAM MORRIS writes: "I hope I shall escape boycotting at the hands of my countrymen for leaving out Milton; but the union in his works of cold classicalism with Puritanism (the two things which I hate most in this world) repels me so that I cannot read him."† Mr. Morris adds: "I should like to say here that I yield to no one, not even Mr. Ruskin, in my love and admiration for Scott; also that, to my mind, of the novelists of our generation Dickens is immeasurably ahead."‡

Lady DILKE, after expressing her assent (in which we concur) to the criticisms of the *Pall Mall Gazette* on the wisdom of placing before "working men, or any men whatever, such a vast and heterogeneous course of study," adds (and we venture to express our concurrence in the opinion): "To be in a position to properly understand and appreciate the works on Sir John's list, I undertake to say that one must have spent at least thirty years in preparatory study, and have had the command of, say, something more than a thousand other volumes."§

Mr. WILKIE COLLINS, after recommending Sterne's "Sentimental Journey" as the best book of travels "that has ever been written," and "Childe Harold" as "the greatest poem which the world has seen since 'Paradise Lost,'" continues:

My own ideas cordially recognize any system of education the direct tendency of which is to make us better Christians. Looking over Sir John Lubbock's list from this point of view—that is to say, assuming that the production of a good citizen represents the most valuable result of a liberal education—I submit that the best book which your correspondent has recommended is "The Vicar of Wakefield," and of the many excellent schoolmasters (judging them by their works) in whose capacity for useful teaching he believes, the two

\* "The Best Hundred Books," pp. 8, 9.

† Our readers will remember Dr. Johnson's saying: "Why, sir, no one ever read 'Paradise Lost' for pleasure."

‡ "The Best Hundred Books," p. 11.

§ *Ibid.* p. 12.

in whom I, for my part, most implicitly trust are Walter Scott and Charles Dickens. Holding these extraordinary opinions, if you asked me to pick out a biographical work for general reading, I should choose (after Boswell's supremely great book, of course) Lockhart's "Life of Scott." Let the general reader follow my advice, and he will find himself not only introduced to the greatest genius that has ever written novels, but provided with the example of a man, modest, just, generous, resolute, and merciful—a man whose very faults and failings have been transformed into virtues through the noble atonement that he offered at the peril and the sacrifice of his life.

Mr. COLLINS is also of opinion that "the most perfect letters in the English language" are those of Byron, published in his *Life* by Moore, and he recommends a book unknown, we venture to affirm, to nine-tenths of even our middle-aged readers. "Read, my good public, Mrs. Inchbald's 'Simple Story,' in which you will find the character of a young woman who is made interesting even by her faults—a rare triumph, I can tell you, in our art."\*

At first sight there seems something incongruous in the editor of *Punch* recommending the study of Cardinal Newman's works; but Mr. F. C. BURNAND writes: "I should recommend 'The Grammar of Assent' and *all* Cardinal Newman's works. His 'Lectures on Catholicism in England' are masterpieces."† In this recommendation we thoroughly agree, especially as to "The Grammar of Assent," one of the most wonderful books the present generation has seen. The Cardinal was applied to for his opinion on Sir John Lubbock's list, but feeling at his great age unequal to the task, was obliged to decline it. It would have been interesting to have had the views of such a master of thought and expression. We gain from another source some slight information on the subject. Mr. Jennings, describing the Cardinal's library, says:

The books with which the walls are lined bear evidence that light literature is not disregarded. Miss Austen, Thackeray, Anthony Trollope, Sir Walter Scott, Mrs. Gaskell are favourite authors with the great theologian. Of modern English poets, Wordsworth, Southey, and Crabbe are highly valued by him, and constantly read.‡

Mr. HENRY IRVING writes: "Before a hundred books, commend me first to the study of two—the Bible and Shakespeare."

Mrs. LYNN-LINTON would add to the list "Pilgrim's Progress," Green's "History of the English People," Herbert

\* "The Best Hundred Books," p. 13.

† *Ibid.* p. 12.

‡ "Cardinal Newman: the Story of his Life," by Henry J. Jennings, pp. 134-5.



Spencer (every word), Lecky, and all Darwin; Carlyle's full works (no selection), and George Eliot; Miss Austen, Bate's and Wallace's and Livingstone's travels, Laing's "Travels in Norway," Kinglake's "Eothen" and "History of the Crimean War;" and to French literature, Dumas (the elder), G. Sand, and Balzac, if the reader be a man.

Archdeacon FARRAR writes: "If all the books of the world were in a blaze, the first twelve which I should snatch out of the flames would be the Bible, the 'Imitatio Christi,' Homer, Æschylus, Thucydides, Tacitus, Virgil, Marcus Aurelius, Dante, Shakespeare, Milton, Wordsworth. Of living writers I would save first the works of Tennyson, Browning, and Ruskin."\* We are surprised not to find the Archdeacon's "Life of Christ" in any of the lists.

The PRESIDENT OF THE CONGREGATIONAL UNION places in his list some books not to be found in any of the others. Amongst these are—Professor Bryce's "History of the Holy Roman Empire," Helps' "Friends in Council," "Companions of my Solitude," and "Organization of Common Life," Bossuet's "Funeral Orations," Whately's "Cautions for the Times," Newman's "Parochial Sermons," and Wraxall's "Memoirs;" and he concludes his letter with this advice: "Add to these an occasional course of reading in the *Church Times*, the *Guardian*, the *Record*, the *Rock*, the *Watchman*, the *Nonconformist*, the *Inquirer*, and the *Freethinker*, in order to see how diligently our contemporaries endeavour not to understand but to misrepresent each other; and by the aid of the books above mentioned I think the unlearned reader will find enough to instruct, amuse, and astonish him, both in England and elsewhere.†

The PRESIDENT OF THE BAPTIST UNION places Dean Stanley's "Life of Arnold" on his list, and also Carlyle's "Life of Sterling;" and would only select about half a dozen from Macaulay's "Essays." He states his preference for Miss Austen's "Mansfield Park" over her "Pride and Prejudice;" and considers "Esmond" Thackeray's masterpiece, in which opinion we concur.

The HEAD MASTER OF ETON recommends Stanley's "Jewish Church" and Ewald's "History of Israel." His historical list is as follows:—Hallam's "Middle Ages," "History of Literature," "Constitutional History;" "Green's "History of the English People;" Macaulay's "History of England;" Stanhope's "Reign of Queen Anne;" Stanhope's "Life of Pitt;" Lecky's "History of England, Eighteenth Century;" Carlyle's

\* "The Best Hundred Books," p. 14.

† *Ibid.* p. 15.

“Frederick the Great;” Thiers’ “Consulat et l’Empire;” Napier’s “Peninsular War;” Hooper’s “Waterloo.”\*

The HEAD MASTER OF HARROW is the only correspondent of the *Pall Mall Gazette* who recommends Locke’s “Conduct of the Understanding”—a book not now appreciated and studied as it should be.

PROFESSOR MAX MÜLLER writes: “If I were to tell you what I really think of the hundred best books, I am afraid you would call me the greatest literary heretic, or an utter ignoramus. I know few books, if any, which I should call good from the beginning to the end. . . . ‘I pray thee have me excused.’”\*

The list supplied by PROFESSOR BLACKIE contains two names not to be found in any other list—viz., Dr. Martineau and the late Sir George Cornewall Lewis; but he does not state which work of either author he recommends, or whether he equally recommends all their works.

Mr. R. HARRISON (librarian of the London Library) would add O’Connor’s “History of Our Own Time” to the historical section.

Mr. H. M. STANLEY (the African explorer) passes this criticism on Sir John’s list :

I observe that science, astronomy, chemistry, geology, geography, natural history, manners and customs of people, are wholly omitted by Sir John Lubbock, as well as arts, manufactures, industries, biographies, antiquities, &c. If a man knows nothing of these, he had far better throw every book on Sir John’s list into the wastebasket, except the Bible. For, supposing that he knows all about philosophy and history and the classics, if he has no ideas beyond what he has gathered from these, he is only fit to be a soldier or a mechanical copyist.”†

There are some omissions from all the lists which surprise us. The name of Dr. E. A. Freeman appears in none; neither does that of Lord Beaconsfield, and yet his “Coningsby” at least is a standard and a valuable work. Amongst other writers of fiction, no place is found for either Miss Edgeworth or Miss Ferrier. But of all the omissions the one that most surprises us is that it is only in Sir John Lubbock’s list that we find Keble’s “Christian Year.” Has it had its day?

After all this discussion about the best books, the case remains as it is stated by Lord Iddesleigh: “So great is the mass of our book-heritage that it is absolutely impossible for any one, and

\* “The Best Hundred Books,” p. 17.

† *Ibid.* p. 22.

doubly impossible for one who has other engagements in life, to make himself acquainted with the hundredth part of it. So that our choice lies for the most part between ignorance of much that we would greatly like to know and that kind of acquaintance which is to be acquired only by desultory reading.\* But the Lord Rector gave this warning to the Edinburgh students: "We are not to confound desultory work with idleness."† And with the exactness of an Oxford man of the old school he proceeds to define the word "desultory":

It is useful to look to the origin of words. The word desultory is of Latin parentage, and it was applied by the Romans to describe the equestrian jumping actively from one steed to another in the circus, or even, as was the case\* with Numidians, from one charger to another, in the midst of battle. That certainly was no idle loitering. It was energetic activity, calculated to keep the mind and the body very much alive indeed. That should be the spirit of the desultory reader. His must be no mere fingering of books without thought how they are to be turned to account. He may be wise in not allowing himself to become a bookworm, but he must take care not to become what is much worse—a book-butterfly. Whatever is worth doing is worth doing well, and it is possible to so regulate and pursue a seemingly desultory course of reading as to render it more truly beneficial than an apparently deeper and severer method of study.‡

And even in the case of those who give themselves up to strictly limited subjects, Lord Iddesleigh affirms that the intermixture of some general and desultory reading is necessary both for the very purposes of their study and in order to relieve the strain of the mind and to keep it in a healthy condition, and he tells us his own experience:

I never read so many novels in succession as during the months that I was working for my degree at the rate of ten or twelve hours a day; and in the week when I was actually under examination I read through the "Arabian Nights" in the evenings. I forget who the great judge was who, being asked as to his reading, answered that he read nothing but law and novels. But there is plenty of literature besides novels and besides the "Arabian Nights" which will be good for the relaxation of the mind after severe study, and I venture to think that the more miscellaneous our selection is, the more agreeable as well as more profitable it will be.§

And he refers to the well-known passage in Bacon's essay "Of Studies," which should be borne in mind by those, if any such there shall ever be, who set about to read Sir John Lubbock's "Hundred": "Some books are to be tasted, others to be swal-

\* "Desultory Reading," p. 17.

† *Ibid.* p. 15.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 15.

§ *Ibid.* pp. 19, 20.

lowed, and some few to be chewed and digested—that is, some books are to be read only in parts; others to be read, but not curiously; and some few to be read wholly and with diligence and attention.” Lord Iddeleigh also quotes with approval the following passage from Dr. Arnold :

Keep your view of men and things extensive, and depend upon it that a mixed knowledge is not a superficial one. As far as it goes, the views that it gives are true, but he who has read deeply one class of writers alone, gets views which are almost sure to be perverted, and which are not only narrow but false. Adjust your proposed amount of reading to your time and inclination. This is perfectly free to any man; but whether the amount be large or small, let it be varied in its kind, and widely varied. If I have a confident opinion on any one point connected with the improvement of the human mind, it is this.\*

The noble lord also gives this salutary, and in these days of competitive examination necessary, warning against “cramming”:

This I wish to impress upon you, that, regarding the matter from an educational point of view, learning is too sensitive to be successfully wooed by so rough and so unskilful a process, and that it is only to those who approach her in a reverent and loving spirit, and by the regular paths of patient and careful study, that she will open the portals of her abode and admit the student to her heart. †

Equally necessary for the times is this caution :

If modern literature has any competition to dread, it is not that of the old classical writers, but of the daily, weekly, or monthly periodicals, which fall as thickly round us as the leaves in Vallombrosa, and go near to suffocate the poor victim who is longing to enjoy his volume in peace, whether that volume be of Sophocles or of Shakespeare, or of Goethe or of Burns. Or if by chance our would-be student is one who for his sins is engaged in political contests himself, he may recall the position of Walter Scott’s Black Knight at the siege of Front de Bœuf’s castle when defeated by the din which his own blows made upon the gate contributed to raise. How, under such circumstances, he must wish that he was like Dicæpolis in the “Acharnians,” and could make a separate peace for himself! ‡

This reference to Sir Walter Scott leads us to say we rejoice to read, not only what Lord Iddeleigh, but what Mr. Frederic Harrison, says of that great man, and to express our assent and consent to their judgment of him :

We all read Scott’s romances, as we have all read Hume’s “History of England;” but how often do we read them, how zealously, with

\* “Desultory Reading,” p. 27.

† *Ibid.* p. 33.

‡ *Ibid.* pp. 43 44.

what sympathy and understanding! I am told that the last discovery of modern culture is that Scott's prose is commonplace; that the young men at our universities are far too critical to care for his artless sentences and flowing descriptions. They prefer Mr. Swinburne, Mr. Mallock, and the euphuism of young Oxford, just as some people prefer a Dresden shepherdess to the Caryatides of the Erechtheum, pronounce Fielding to be low, and Mozart to be *passé*. As boys love lollypops, so these juvenile fops love to roll phrases about under the tongue, as if phrases in themselves had a value apart from thoughts, feelings, great conceptions, or human sympathy. For Scott is just one of the poets (we may call poets all the great creators in prose or in verse) of whom one never wearies, just as one can listen to Beethoven, or watch the sunrise or the sunset day by day with new delight. I think I can read "The Antiquary," or "The Bride of Lammermoor," "Ivanhoe," "Quentin Durward," and "Old Mortality," at least once a year afresh.

Scott is a perfect library in himself. A constant reader of romances would find that it needed months to go through even the best pieces of the inexhaustible painter of eight full centuries and every type of man; and he might repeat the process of reading him ten times in a lifetime without a sense of fatigue or sameness. The poetic beauty of Scott's creations is almost the least of his great qualities. It is the universality of his sympathy that is so truly great, the justice of his estimates, the insight into the spirit of each age, his intense absorption of self in the vast epic of human civilization. . . . And this glorious and most human and most historical of poets, without whom our very conception of human development would have ever been imperfect, this manliest and truest, and widest of romancers, we neglect for some hothouse hybrid of psychological analysis, for the wretched imitations of Balzac, and the jackanapes phrasemongering of some Osric of the day, who assures us that Scott is an absolute Philistine.\*

In the same spirit and to the same effect speaks Lord Iddesleigh :

Think what a mine of wealth we possess in the novels of your own great master—what depths he sounds, what humours he makes us acquainted with! From Jeanie Deans, sacrificing herself to her sisterly love in all but her uncompromising devotion to truth, to the picture of the family affection and overmastering grief in the hut of poor Steenie Mucklebackit; or, again, from the fidelity of Meg Merrilies to that of Caleb Balderstone; you have in these and a hundred other instances examples of the great power of discerning genius to seize upon the secrets of the human heart, and to reveal the inner meanings of the events which history records upon its surface, but which we do not feel that we really understand till some finer mind has clothed the dry bones with flesh and blood, and presented them to us in appropriate raiment.†

\* "The Choice of Books," pp. 72, 73.

† "Desu'tory Reading," p. 47.

We here part company with Lord Iddesleigh, and recur to Mr. Harrison. In the outset of his essay we utter—to borrow a phrase of David Deans—this “cry of a howl in the desert”:

How shall we choose our books? Which are the best, the eternal, indispensable books? To all to whom reading is something more than a refined idleness these questions recur, bringing with them the sense of bewilderment; and a still, small voice within us is for ever crying out for some guide across the Slough of Despond of an illimitable and ever-swelling literature. How many a man stands beside it, as uncertain of his pathway as the Pilgrim when he who dreamed the immortal dream heard him “break out with a lamentable cry, saying, ‘What shall I do?’”\*

The following passage is only too accurate a description of much of our modern literature:

Who now reads the ancient writers? Who systematically reads the great writers, be they ancient or modern, whom the consent of ages has marked out as classics—typical, immortal, peculiar teachers of our race? Alas! the “Paradise Lost” is lost again to us beneath an inundation of graceful academic verse, sugary stanzas of ladylike prettiness, and ceaseless explanations in more or less readable prose of what John Milton meant or did not mean, or what he saw or did not see, who married his great-aunt, and why Adam or Satan is like that, or unlike the other. We read a perfect library about the “Paradise Lost,” but the “Paradise Lost” itself we do not read. †

With regard to the nature and extent of our reading Mr. Harrison substantially agrees with Lord Iddesleigh:

A wise education and so judicious reading should leave no great type of thought, no dominant phase of human nature, wholly a blank. Whether our reading be great or small, so far as it goes it should be general. If our lives admit of but a short space for reading, all the more reason that, so far as may be, it should remind us of the vast expanse of human thought, and the wonderful variety of human nature. To read, and yet so to read that we see nothing but a corner of literature, the loose fringe, or flats and wastes of letters, and by reading only deepen our natural belief that this island is the hub of the universe, and the nineteenth century the only age worth notice—all this is really to call in the aid of books to thicken and harden our untaught prejudices. Be it imagination, memory, or reflection that we address—that is, in poetry, history, science, or philosophy—our first duty is to aim at knowing something at least of the best, at getting some definite idea of the mighty realm whose outer rim we are permitted to approach. ‡

Mr. Harrison is as great an admirer of Homer as was Lord Macaulay:

---

\* “Choice of Books,” p. 4.      † *Ibid.* p. 14.      ‡ *Ibid.* p. 22.  
 [Vol. CXXVI. No. CCLI.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. LXX. No. I.      H

One knows [says Mr. Harrison]—at least every schoolboy has known—that a passage of Homer, rolling along in the hexameter, or trumpeted out by Pope, will give one a hot glow of pleasure and raise a finer throb in the pulse; one knows that Homer is the easiest, most artless, most diverting of all poets; that the fiftieth reading rouses the spirit even more than the first; and yet we find ourselves (we are all alike) painfully pshawing over some new and uncut barley-sugar in rhyme, which a man in the street asked us if we had read, or it may be some learned lucubration about the site of Troy by some one we chanced to meet at dinner. . . . To ask a man or woman who spends half a lifetime in sucking magazines and new poems to read a book of Homer would be like asking a butcher's boy to whistle "Adelaide." The noises and sights and talk, the whirl and volatility of life around us, are too strong for us. A society which is for ever gossiping in a sort of perpetual "drum" loses the very faculty of caring for anything but "early copies" and the last tale out. Thus, like the tares in the noble parable of the Sower, a perpetual chatter about books chokes the seed which is sown in the greatest books of the world. †

Macaulay, in his journal for 1851, notes :

I walked far, and read while walking the last five books of the "Iliad" with deep interest and many tears. I was afraid to be seen crying by the parties of walkers that met me, so I came back crying for Achilles cutting off his hair; crying for Priam rolling on the ground in the courtyard of his house—mere imaginary beings, creatures of an old ballad-maker who died near three thousand years ago. †

Lord Macaulay and Mr. Harrison concur in their judgments on two other poets.

I speak [says Mr. Harrison] of Homer, but fifty other great poets and creators of eternal beauty would serve my argument. What Homer is to epic, that is Æschylus to the tragic art—the first immortal type. In majesty and mass of pathos the "Agamemnon" remains still without a rival in tragedy. The universality and inexhaustible versatility of our own Shakespeare are unique in all literature. But the very richness of his qualities detracts from the symmetry and directness of the dramatic impression. For this reason neither is "Lear," nor "Othello," nor "Macbeth," nor "Hamlet" (each supreme as an imaginative creation) so typically perfect a tragedy as the "Agamemnon."

In each of the four there are slight incidents which we could spare without any evident loss. The "Agamemnon" alone of tragedies has the absolute perfection of a statue by Pheidias. The intense crescendo of the catastrophe, the absolute concentration of interest, the statuesque unity of the grouping, the mysterious halo of religion with which the ancient legend sanctifies the drama, are qualities denied to any modern. †

\* "Choice of Books," p. 29.  
296, note.

† Trevelyan's "Life of Macaulay," vol. ii. p.  
‡ "Choice of Books," p. 30.

The "Agamemnon" [notes Macaulay on his copy of the tragedy] is indeed very fine. From the king's entrance into the house to the appearance on the stage of Algistheus, it is beyond praise. I shall turn it over again next week.\*

Elsewhere he speaks of the "supreme and universal excellence of Shakespeare."

We have left ourselves space for only one other extract from Mr. Harrison's essay. It contains his judgment on modern writers of fiction :

Genius, industry, subtlety, and ingenuity have (it must yet be acknowledged) thrown their best into the fiction of to-day, and not a few works of undeniable brilliancy and vigour have been produced. Of course everybody reads and everyone enjoys Dickens, Thackeray, Bulwer, the Brontes, Trollope, George Eliot. Far be it from any man, even the severest student, to eschew them. There are no doubt typical works of theirs which will ultimately be recognized as within the immortal cycle of English literature, in the nobler sense of this term. He would be a bold man who should say that "Pickwick" and "Vanity Fair," "The Last Days of Pompeii" and "Jane Eyre," "The Last Chronicle of Barset" and "Silas Warner," will never take rank in the roll which opens with "Tom Jones" and "Clarissa," the "Vicar" and "Tristram Shandy." It may be that the future will find in them insight into nature and beauty of creative form such as belongs to the order of all high imaginative art. But as yet we are too near and too little dispassionate to decide this matter to-day. And in the meantime the indiscriminate zest for these delightful writers of our age too often dulls our taste for the undoubted masters of the world. Certain it is that much, very much, of these fascinating moderns has neither the stamp of abiding beauty nor the saving grace of moral truth. Dickens, alas! soon passed into a mannerism of artificial whimsicalities alternating with shallow melodrama. Thackeray wearies his best lovers by a cynical monotony of meanness. By grace a very rare genius, the best works of the Brontes is saved, as by fire, out of the repulsive sensationalism they started, destined to perish in shilling dreadfuls. Trollope only now and then rises, as by a miracle, out of his craft as an industrious recorder of pleasant commonplace. And even George Eliot, conscientious artist as she is, too often wrote as if she were sinking under the effort to live up to her early reputation. On all of these the special evils of their time weigh more or less. They write too often as if it were their publishers, and not their genius, who prompted the work; or as if their task were to provide a new set of puzzles in rare psychological problems.

We regret we cannot transcribe the passage in which Mr. Harrison pronounces a just condemnation of modern French works of fiction.†

---

\* "Life," vol. i. p. 474.

† "Choice of Books," pp. 67-9.



"The Pleasures of a Bookworm" is an illustration of the lines from Sherman which form its motto :

" For him delicious flavours dwell  
In books, as in old muscatel."

It is the production of a collector and lover of books.

Book-collecting is held up to scorn and contempt by Mr. Harrison, who describes it as "perhaps of all the collecting manias the most foolish in our day.\* Mr. Rogers Rees, on the other hand, maintains that, "carefully and judiciously pursued, the collecting of books is not expensive, and is likely to ruin no one," and he supports his position by this quotation from Mr. Ruskin's "Sesame and Lilies": "If a man spends lavishly on his library, you call him mad—a bibliomaniac. But you never call one a horse-maniac, though men ruin themselves every day by their horses, and you do not hear of people ruining themselves by their books." †

Mr. Rogers Rees loves books for themselves. We can fancy him, as he describes Charles Lamb, "greeting his best-loved books with a careful kiss," or like Southey, who was found by Wordsworth "patting with both hands his books affectionately, like a child." ‡

Mr. Rogers Rees is not a severe student. "The very sight of a *Locke* or *Adam Smith* compels one to draw his hand across his head from sheer weariness; the insinuating grace, however, and tenderness and imaginative humour which we know to be in our possession when we have our grasp upon a Lamb or an honest Isaac Walton serve at once to refresh our tired powers." § He has a great knowledge of writers and of particular editions, and even particular copies of books, and his little volume may be read with interest and amusement.

We turn from the question, what the people ought to read? to the question, what the people do read? As to this, the *Pall Mall Gazette* gives some interesting information. In nearly all the free public libraries "prose fiction" is in most demand, "religion" in least. We take Manchester as an illustration. There Homer's "Iliad" is much read through Pope's and Lord Derby's translations, and the "Æneid" of Virgil through that of Conington. Gibbon's "Decline and Fall" is read to a greater extent than many would think, though most readers seem to tire before they have got half-way through. Grote's "Greece" is

\* "Choice of Books," p. 87.

† "The Pleasures of a Bookworm," p. 2 and note.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 34.

§ *Ibid.* p. 48.

often begun, but rarely finished. Macaulay's "History" is read through more frequently than any other. His Essays also are much read; and so are those of Emerson, Montaigne, Lamb, and Addison. Green's "History" and his "Short History," and the Histories of Froude, Freeman, and Stubbs, are much studied. Kinglake's "Crimean War" and Kaye's "Sepoy War" are still in great demand. Prescott's "Mexico," D'Aubigne's "Reformation," and Ranke's "Popes" are also much read. All Smiles's books are in great demand, particularly his "Lives of the Engineers" and "Self Help." Southey's "Nelson" and the various Lives of Napoleon and Wellington have always numerous readers. All Carlyle's works are read, though not to the extent they were a few years ago. His "French Revolution" and "Frederick the Great" are the most popular. After them, "Past and Present" and "Sartor Resartus." Boswell's "Johnson" is still read a good deal in part. The works of Huxley and Tyndall are much read by working men, as well as by those more educated. Darwin's "Origin of Species" circulates almost like a popular novel. Ruskin has a host of readers amongst people of all grades. Works of modern travel are always in demand, particularly those on the Colonies. The politico-economical works of Fawcett and Mill are much read. Smith's "Wealth of Nations" is often referred to, but little read. The philosophical works of Mill and Herbert Spencer have many readers. The number of readers of Shakspeare is satisfactory, the volumes containing "Hamlet," "Othello," "Merchant of Venice," and "Richard III." being those most asked for. Of other English dramatists, Sheridan and Lord Lytton have considerable popularity. The poets most read are Tennyson, Longfellow, Burns, Moore, Scott, Byron, Milton, and Wordsworth. Dante and Goethe's "Faust" are much read, through translations. Hood continues to be a great favourite. Books on drawing and painting are increasingly consulted, and musical collections are liberally drawn upon. But the fact remains, that of all classes of readers that of the readers of prose fiction is the most numerous. It is the same at Birmingham. There, at any rate, Dickens retains his popularity. The twelve works most often borrowed during last year were :

|                             |     |                              |     |
|-----------------------------|-----|------------------------------|-----|
| Pickwick . . . . .          | 389 | Mill on the Floss . . . . .  | 217 |
| Bleak House . . . . .       | 361 | The Arabian Nights . . . . . | 211 |
| David Copperfield . . . . . | 303 | Ivanhoe . . . . .            | 200 |
| Robinson Crusoe . . . . .   | 294 | Vanity Fair . . . . .        | 195 |
| Oliver Twist . . . . .      | 278 | East Lynne . . . . .         | 188 |
| Martin Chuzzlewit . . . . . | 221 | Adam Bede . . . . .          | 181 |

We fear that librarians of all free libraries will agree with the remark of the Manchester librarian, who justifies the warning of Lord Iddesleigh and the statements of Mr. Harrison : "There is much eagerness on the part of the readers at all our libraries to see the most recently published books, and I fear that the great classics in ancient and modern literature are on this account largely taken as read." \*



#### ART. VII.—THE BASIS OF INDIVIDUALISM.

THE chain of economic reasoning, of which the first few links were wrought a hundred years ago by Adam Smith, leads us irresistibly to two main conclusions from which there seems to be no appeal. The first of these is the law of wages, as formulated by Ricardo, and which in the hands of Ferdinand Lassalle becomes the "iron law of wages" (a phrase of ominous connotation). The second is the doctrine of "laissez-faire," as taught by Bastiat and the Manchester School—a doctrine which in practice involves the minimization of State interference.

Between these two issues there is theoretically no antagonism whatever; but it is more than difficult to realize the existence of a democracy based on the eternal serfdom of the great majority of the citizens—the so-called working classes. Hence it is necessary to subject both these doctrines to a searching re-examination. The immediate object of the present article is to dissect the arguments underlying the doctrine of absolute individualism as set forth by its ablest exponents, and notably by Mr. Herbert Spencer, who in his recently published "The Man v. the State" has gathered into a focus all that is to be found scattered throughout his works bearing on the subject. The principles of personal liberty therein enunciated have been carried to their extreme expression by certain of Mr. Spencer's disciples with a thoroughness and a temerity equalled only by that of the English successors of Lassalle and Marx in their exposition of the creed of Socialism. If Mr. Auberon Herbert is the *reductio ad absurdum* of "let-be," surely Mr. Hyndman is the *reductio ad absurdum* of State interference. And it

---

\* "The Best Hundred Books," pp. 24, 25.

must be admitted by the friends of both these doughty champions that in the engagement which took place between them not so very long ago in the field of the *Newcastle Chronicle* they fairly emulated the celebrated performance of the Kilkenny cats.

But Mr. Spencer himself does not descend to details, and in meeting him it is not sufficient to point to the results of applying his principles to the concrete: it is necessary to meet him on ground which he has himself chosen, and to test his own conclusions by his own methods.

Mr. Spencer begins with the dogmatic assertion that "the great political superstition of the past was the divine right of kings." He continues: "The great political superstition of the present is the divine right of Parliaments. The oil of anointing seems unawares to have dripped from the head of the one on to the heads of the many, and given sacredness to them also and to their decrees." Whatever interpretation our fathers may have placed on the earlier doctrine, otherwise expressed in the maxim, "The king can do no wrong," it is certain that there is no general acceptance of the later doctrine in the literal sense. Indeed Mr. Spencer himself admits this by re-defining the political superstition in a form less open to misconstruction, as the belief that Government power is subject to no restraint.

Now, in one sense this is not a superstition, but a solid truth. That the group—society regarded as an organism—can through the effective majority (not necessarily the greatest number) do whatever it chooses, so far as the resistance of the minority is concerned, is a stubborn fact: whether it attains its ends through the medium of a despotism or through that of a representative Parliament elected by universal or any other suffrage. In another sense it is not true; but then neither is it a superstition, for no one believes it. That the group cannot act incompatibly with its own welfare is of course untrue. So says Austin; the writings of Bentham imply it; so do those of Hobbes. No one disputes it to-day—not even the most extreme Socialist.

The question at issue between Mr. Spencer and his opponents is simply this—Have minorities, in the sense of the weaker party, any rights which are valid against the community? The answer depends upon the definition of the term "rights." If we accept the practical and intelligible definition of Austin, the question stands thus—Are there any claims for the defence of which the minority can successfully appeal to the group or State against the superior force of the effective majority? Con-

sidering that the will of the group is known only through the act of the effective majority, the question resolves into an absurdity. And if the "rights" of the minority means the power to appeal successfully to a higher tribunal than the group itself, the answer must again be in the negative, for to admit the existence of such superior authority is to deny the existence of the group itself as an independent State.

But does Mr. Spencer mean to say that the opinion of the larger number should sometimes give way to that of the smaller—that even the effective majority should sometimes defer to the wishes of the weaker party, and that this not only conduces to the welfare of the group, but is constantly done? In that case no one denies the proposition. Every party-compromise testifies to the fact. To say that there is a moral law or a code of indefinite moral laws by which groups regulate their conduct, is simply to say that the conduct of societies is not arbitrary; which is obvious. But to contend that the State, when it has once made up its mind rightly or wrongly to act in such or such a way, is subject to restraints, is to say that which has no meaning. The group-will, once made up, necessarily manifests itself in action, and it is no more subject to restraints from within than is the will of a single human being. So that the proposition which Mr. Spencer regards as the great political superstition turns out to be a great undeniable truth, or an absurdity believed by none. In neither case can it be called a superstition.

What is the element of untruth contained in the theory of a social pact as the foundation and justification of government? It is not the mere fact that no such gathering and agreement ever took place, for even Rousseau only regarded it as a tacit contract; and writers of a very different school have based the duty of obedience to the law on the ground that all members of a community have tacitly and virtually agreed to be bound by the laws. This, then, is not the element of error contained in the hypothesis, or rather formula. It is that the formula does not represent the fact. The group will is not the sum of the wills of the individuals composing it; the two are incommensurable. Supposing that we knew the wish of every man living at the imaginary date of the "contrat social," we should be utterly unable to predict the will of the group. It is not even the resultant of the wills of the units, but the resultant of those and many other forces acting in many other directions. It is the neglect of this fact, or rather ignorance of it, which vitiates all the social philosophy of those who build upon the foundation of a real or hypothetical social compact. Hobbes, Rousseau, and Bentham, and after them Mr. Spencer, commit the error of con-

founding the group-will with the sum of the wills of the units—an error pardonable enough in the first three. The following startling passage furnishes the key to the chain of strange sophistry which goes to make up the essay entitled “The great Political Superstition,” and which is happily so unfamiliar to readers of Mr. Spencer’s works. After admitting the indefensibility of the assumption that, in order to escape the evil of chronic conflict, the members of a community enter into a pact or covenant by which they all bind themselves to surrender their primitive freedom of action, and subordinate themselves to the will of a ruling power agreed upon—after deriding the hypothesis and its authors in language neither generous nor just, Mr. Spencer proceeds to present his own alternative hypothesis :

Further consideration reveals a solution of the difficulty ; for, if dismissing all thought of any hypothetical agreement to co-operate, heretofore made, we ask what would be the agreement into which citizens would now enter with practical unanimity, we get a sufficiently clear answer ; and with it a sufficiently clear justification for the rule of the majority inside a certain sphere, but not outside that sphere.

So that, after all, the outcome of Mr. Spencer’s criticism of Hobbes and Austin results in the substitution of a hypothetical social compact made to-day for a hypothetical social compact made a long time ago. Of the two, that of Hobbes is preferable. His supposition is considerably more intelligible than Mr. Spencer’s solution. That at an indefinitely remote period wild people, hitherto living in a state of anarchy, came together, hit upon the plan of co-operation, and there and then agreed to conform to the will of the effective majority, may not be a historical fact ; but nevertheless it is a fact that somehow men formerly in a state of anarchy did come little by little to subordinate their wills to that of the effective majority, consciously or unconsciously ; in other words, the supremacy of the State came to be recognized as a fact. What men come to do, they may be said in a sense to agree to do. And if Hobbes had expressed his pact in terms to the effect that men agreed to abide by the decision of the effective majority—the State-will—he would have been very near the mark. The social compact and the divine right of kings or of parliaments are after all merely two ways of expressing a stubborn fact—namely the fact that right is transfigured might.

But Mr. Spencer’s social compact is a sort of chronic plebiscitum. The justification for each new Act of Parliament is to be found by the process of wondering what would be the result if the people were polled. This is of course the “referendum.” Carried out in practice instead of imagination, its effect is to

make every citizen a legislator in spite of the admitted fact that "there can be no fitness for legislative functions without wide knowledge of those legislative experiences which the past has bequeathed."

But perhaps Mr. Spencer would not go the length of taking a poll of the people in order to justify each new piece of proposed legislation. He would rather work the question out on paper; he would ask himself—not the people—whether they would "agree to co-operate for the teaching of religion?" and he would answer himself with "a very emphatic No." "In like manner, if (to take an actual question of the day) people were polled to ascertain whether, in respect of the beverages they drank, they would accept the decision of the greater number, certainly half, and probably more than half, would be unwilling." Now this is just what local-optionists deny. It is just what many others want to know. Mr. Spencer settles it offhand by intuition. But why should the majority be unwilling to abide by the decision of the majority? Is it that the majority has no confidence in its own judgment or rectitude? The self-regard of majorities is usually considered unimpachable. But the strangest feature in this intuition is its marvellous precision. "Certainly half," he says, "and probably more than half," would be unwilling. Surely, if we may be certain of fifteen millions out of thirty, we might venture to be certain of fifteen millions and one. This recalls the scrupulousness of the American gentleman who, having solemnly sworn to bringing down ninety-nine pigeons at a shot, refused to imperil his immortal soul by setting the figure at a hundred.

Manifestly, then [says Mr. Spencer], had social co-operation to be commenced by ourselves, and had its purposes to be specified before consent to co-operate could be obtained, there would be large parts of human conduct in respect of which co-operation would be declined; and in respect of which, consequently, no authority by the majority over the minority could be rightfully exercised.

This extraordinary passage, and the superstructure built upon it, are so unpractical, so unreal, and so visionary, that the conclusion can hardly be resisted that the whole essay containing it and developing it has been exhumed from a half-forgotten heap of the author's early writings, and published without re-examination. It must be obvious to Mr. Spencer and to everybody else that in the main those would agree to co-operate who believed their own views on the question at issue to be in a majority. Others would of course decline.

Nor does the prospect brighten when we come to the converse

question—For what ends would men agree to co-operate? To which the ready answer is, “None will deny that for resisting invasion the agreement would be practically unanimous.” Indeed! Many will deny it most emphatically. Besides, supposing that only one person held aloof, would the rest be justified in coercing that one to co-operate? If so, on what principle? Mr. Spencer himself excepts the Quakers, whom, however, he dismisses with a compliment and annihilation. “Excepting the Quakers only, who having done highly useful work in their time, are now dying out, all would unite for defensive war—not however for offensive war.” This must be another of those intuitions which only a poll of the people can verify or disprove. It is at least as probable that a majority would vote the other way. Much would depend on the definition given to “invasion” and “defensive.” Nearly every civilized nation that has gone to war in the present century has believed itself to be acting on the defensive. Onlookers might be able to inform the belligerents in the Franco-German war of 1870 as to which of them was waging a defensive war, but both sides distinctly claimed that justification. More recently, M. Ferry justified the operations in Ton-king on the ground that the French were acting on the defensive! Again, as to rebellions, were the English on the defensive when they ineffectually endeavoured to suppress the Boer rising? Were they on the defensive a century ago, when they successfully suppressed the Irish rising? Were the British the other day defending Egypt against the threatened invasion of the Mahdi, or were the Soudanese fighting in defence of hearth and home? Then, again, as to the term “invasion,” those modern Englishmen (or rather dwellers in England) who are smitten with the insular craze, may define “invasion,” so far as they themselves are concerned, as the entry of a foreign force *vi et armis* upon the soil of England, Scotland and Wales—and perhaps Ireland. Whether a German occupation of Heligoland, a Spanish seizure of Gibraltar, or an Italian attack on Malta would fall within the definition, only the late lamented Anti-Aggression League can say. It would be even more interesting to know whether a Russian advance upon India would fall within the category of invasions which Mr. Spencer would himself co-operate to repel, and at what point in the onward march the invasion might be said to begin. Putting aside the question of British frontiers, as exceptionally simple or exceptionally complicated according as we take an insular or an imperial view of them, let us ask whether a French occupation of Alsace would be an invasion of Germany in the above sense?

But why should “invasion” be construed as territorial invasion only? May not British interests and rights be invaded



which are not territorial? Was not the tearing up of the Treaty of Paris by Russia in 1870 an invasion of England in the wider sense of the term? England, at great cost of blood and treasure, had obtained a certain negative right in the Black Sea—a certain safeguard against a definite danger. May not the German occupation of Angra Pequena similarly be described as an invasion of British interests? The district had for many years been treated as the property of Englishmen, and under the protection of England; it is contiguous to regions in which Englishmen almost alone are interested; and the conflict of jurisdiction in those regions is calculated to injure trade to the detriment of the English people. Is it an invasion?

Further, we are not told whether there would be any limit to the subordination of individuals to the State in those matters in which they, “with practical unanimity,” “almost unanimously,” “omitting criminals,” “excepting Quakers,” agreed to co-operate. Take the agreement to co-operate for defensive war, and suppose that means something definite. Would the citizens thereby bind themselves to conform to the will of the majority in respect of measures directed to that end—all measures? Might not a citizen be willing to contribute money towards the expenses of the war without being willing to submit to conscription? Might he not accept conscription with power of substitution without being willing to serve? Or, assuming in the face of a growing party of sincere socialists that, “omitting criminals, all must wish to have person and property adequately protected,” is it equally certain that all would be willing to accept the decision of the majority in respect of the measures needful for that end? And what is “property?” Mr. Spencer glides over this as a phantom ship might glide over sunken rocks. Surely people will not agree to protect property until they know what it is they are pledging themselves to protect. A thief steals a watch, and sells it to a *bona-fide* purchaser for its full value. Whose property is it that the State has to protect? A journeyman tailor agrees to make a quantity of army clothing out of cloth supplied to him by a cloth merchant, who before delivery fails for ten times the amount of his assets. Whose property is the clothing? Of course it is not difficult to say what would be a fair way of treating the claims of the different parties, or what is the existing law here and elsewhere; but the question is, Whose is the property? Whose is the property in a row of houses built by a lessee under a ninety-nine years’ lease? Or in the case of emphyteusis under the Roman law? Or in a chest of gold coins dug up by a labourer in a field occupied by one man, owned by another, mortgaged to a third, and sold to a fourth under the Settled Estates Act—and before completion of conveyance?

It is when we come to the land question that we find ourselves involved in the most inextricable maze. "In one other co-operation all are interested—use of the territory they inhabit." What territory does any individual inhabit, or any determinate number of individuals? Or, if indeterminate, do the English people inhabit Ireland or India? Do Londoners inhabit Yorkshire? In what sense is it true that one is more *interested* in one's neighbour's field than in his cattle? The one supplies corn, the other beef. "But," it is urged, "we must have some security for the food of the people. If landowners conspired to grow no corn, the people would starve, and such a state of things cannot be tolerated even as a bare possibility." Likewise if the owners of cattle conspired to destroy them, the people would have no beef. If capitalists conspired to smash up all machinery, rails, ships, tools, furnaces, and mills in the country, the nation would be ruined and the people destroyed. In short, if the race went mad, it would possibly commit suicide. Practically landowners, like capitalists in general, having interests coincident with those of the whole people, refrain as a class from exercising their rights to the detriment of society, and they are never likely to do so. "But we must have room to move about; in this respect land is *sui generis*; man is material, and space is essential to his existence, and if all space in sea and earth and air is appropriated (*cujus est solum, ejus est usque ad cælum*), those who own no space are in danger of being elbowed out of existence." Quite so: then would it not be as well to find out what kind of "use" it is which the public are vitally interested in, and whether it is correctly described as a "use" at all? What kind of power the State does as a fact tend to reserve to itself, while recognizing the proprietary rights of individuals, is ascertained more readily by a reference to the land laws and customs of all countries, than by a guess as to what a majority of the people in its wisdom would in this or any other country agree to do. In all civilized countries we find that as a fact the State dispossesses the proprietor whenever such dispossession is expedient in the general interest. We have railway concessions, new roads are made and new streets cut through congested districts, without any more concern for intervening proprietary claims than is involved in allowing full compensation—that is, such compensation as satisfies the national conscience. But what is Mr. Spencer's practical conclusion from the premises that all are interested in the use of the territory they inhabit? "The implication is," says he, "that the will of the majority is valid respecting the modes in which, and conditions under which, parts of the surface or sub-surface may be utilized, involving certain agreements made on behalf of the public with private

persons and companies." It would take too long in this place to analyze in nomological terms this remarkably opaque utterance. To some it might seem to have been drafted in order to fit in with whatever view of the land question should eventually turn out to be correct. Others might be pardoned for regarding it as a pillar of cloud created for the purpose of veiling the transition from the writer's doctrine of land-nationalization as set forth in "Social Statics" (and since repudiated), to the later doctrine of Individualism as advocated in "Political Institutions." To us it appears as an arrangement of words neither having any particular meaning nor intended to have any.

At this point, in order to disarm criticism apparently, we are reminded that "details are not needful here." Why not? In other places Mr. Spencer is most painstaking himself, and most exacting in his demands upon others, as to attention to details. "Nor is it needful," he continues, "to discuss that border region lying between these classes of cases"—that border region which, as Mill pointed out, is of all regions the most fruitful in supplying crucial tests and essential differences.

It is sufficient [we are told] to recognize the undeniable truth that there are numerous kinds of actions in respect of which men would not, if they were asked, agree with anything like unanimity to be bound by the will of the majority; while there are some kinds of actions in respect of which they would almost unanimously agree to be thus bound. Here, then, we find a definite warrant for enforcing the will of the majority within certain limits, and a definite warrant for denying the authority of its will beyond those limits.

To which the reply is that, if it is sufficient for the philosopher to recognize the said "undeniable truth," it is certainly not sufficient for the statesman, who wants to know not only that there are numerous kinds of such actions, but also what those kinds of actions are; and he will not (if he be wise) rest content with the *ipse dixit* of any one who evolves the answer out of his own inner consciousness; and furthermore, he may not feel satisfied that the mere process of counting noses, even in imagination, will solve the question as to the morality of such actions.

From the position here taken up by Mr. Spencer it is but a short and easy step to "abstract rights." After a brief and, as it will seem to most, in every way unsatisfactory analysis of the "untenable" opinion of Bentham and his disciples, we are led straight back to what modern jurists fondly hoped was the exploded doctrine of natural rights; "for sundry groups of social phenomena unite to prove that this doctrine is well warranted, and the doctrine they set against it unwarranted." We are then told

that various savage races are controlled by "long-acknowledged customs," by "ancient usages," by "primordial usages or tacit conventions," by "universally recognized customs." "So sacred are immemorial customs with the primitive man, that he never dreams of questioning their authority, and when government arises, its power is limited by them." Now, premising that no one denies, or ever did deny, that State laws grew out of customs (they must have grown out of something), what are we to infer from this long string of social phenomena, many of which, being gleanings from travellers' tales, are open to doubt, while others are false on the face of them? Are we seriously asked to believe that the quaint and often ludicrous customs of savages are themselves the germs of the laws by which natural rights are sanctioned? Are we to understand that when government arises its power is limited by them in any other sense than that in which the will of a man is limited by his own desires and habits? If so, how?

The truth is, Mr. Spencer is confounding three distinct classes of so-called rights: the rights which he himself would sanction if he were the arbitrator, the rights which the claimant's fellow-citizens would individually recognize as morally just, and the rights which are as a matter of fact actually sanctioned by the law of the land. The first may be called "natural rights," or rights as they ought to be in the opinion of their advocate; the second may be called moral rights, or rights as they would be under a code of laws deduced from the morals of the day; and the third may be called legal rights, or rights which are as a fact recognized by the State, and which are a natural development.

It is perfectly true that, as the leaders of the German school of jurists assert, the State laws which are actually carried out are not in all cases and in all respects identical with the State laws as they are expressed, whether embodied in a code or in a heterogeneous heap of statutes, or in authorized or received commentaries on the law. The invariable sequences which actually tend to hold good at any given time in any country, may be called the statical laws or internal group-morals of that particular State at that stage of its development. The laws as expressed are necessarily but imperfect and often distorted reflections of these true laws, the distortion being due not only to imperfect expression and inadequacy of language, but more especially to the false generalizations of legislators or law-makers of one sort or another. Now, it is approximately the former class—the statical laws, which the German school style "natur-recht." There is another sense in which the term may

be used, and that, to denote the law as it tends to be but for disturbing causes; or, assuming those disturbing causes to be more or less evanescent, the laws as they tend to become. In neither of these senses is there any resemblance to the natural rights championed by Mr. Spencer, who is, of course, aware that although "recht" may be translated by "droit" or "jus," it cannot be translated into English by the term "right" or "rights," or any other single word; and furthermore, that although "recht" and "droit" are fairly synonymous, "naturrecht," on the other hand, cannot be rendered into French as "droit naturel." Mr. Spencer's "natural rights" are the "droit naturel" of Rousseau, the "jus naturale" of Ulpian, the "inalienable right of every man born into the world" of Mr. Henry George; but not the "naturrecht" of Savigny. So that the appeal to the "root-idea of German jurisprudence" (which is, above all, historical in method) to shore up the justly discredited card-castle of "natural rights," is, to say the least of it, unfortunate.

Mr. Spencer does not usually allow himself to be a slave to words, but his singular criticism of Hobbes' explanation of the origin of justice seems to show that for once he has fallen into this condition. "The definition of injustice," says Hobbes, "is none other than the not performing of covenants" (including the tacit compact entered into by the members of a society, upon which Government, according to him, is based); "therefore, before the names of just and unjust can have place, there must be some coercive power to compel men equally to the performance of their covenants."

Hence it is clear that by "injustice" Hobbes meant to denote the breach of legal duties. Ignoring this definition, Mr. Spencer substitutes his own, and naïvely remarks that among his own friends he could name half a dozen over whom the requirements of justice would be as imperative in the absence of a coercive power as in its presence. Possibly! The majority of Mr. Spencer's friends will hardly feel flattered by the limitation. But the question is: Could Mr. Spencer find half a dozen friends so law-abiding that they would obey the law even against their conscience without the terror of some punishment?

The truth is, Mr. Spencer is himself under the blinding influence of a great superstition—a superstition he has outlived in other departments of thought. He still believes in abstract justice, as something anterior to society or even to man—something immutable and absolute. He still holds, as he held in 1851, that the elimination of the mentally and morally inferior is in accordance with "the decrees of a large far-seeing benevolence." He has since emancipated himself from the anthropo-

morphic belief involved, and declines to be held, "committed to such teleological implications" as the passage cited contains; but, to use his own illustration, just as "Carlyle, who, in his student days, giving up, as he thought, the creed of his fathers, rejected its shell only, keeping the contents;" so his own mind is still under the sway of the metaphysical abstraction Justice. The laws, to have any validity (whatever that means), must conform to this test. He regards the laws solely as a means to an end, rather than as the products of evolution, the resultant of diverse forces acting in various directions through countless ages. His standpoint in viewing State laws is precisely that of Dr. Paley viewing the marvellous adaptations of organic forms to their surroundings. A giraffe with a short neck, argued Paley, would assuredly perish of starvation; hence his long neck is evidence of the far-seeing benevolence of his Creator. Honesty is the best policy, argues Mr. Spencer; the just tend to survive and the unjust to perish; hence the sufficient cause of good laws is Justice. Is it not remarkable that Hobbes, writing more than two centuries ago, should have examined nomological phenomena in a more positivist spirit than the great philosopher of the nineteenth century? Hobbes argued, there are certain classes of actions which tend to conduce to the well-being of society. Experience has taught us what in the concrete these are; they are detailed in the expressed laws. We find by induction they may be classified under certain heads in accordance with certain practical middle principles; there is no general principle under which they can all be subsumed; but their common trait appears to be conformity with the group-welfare. Let us denote them by the term just. The connotation of the term we cannot tell. This is not the language of Hobbes' day, but it describes with fairness the method he adopted. He then inquired what it could be which counteracted the antagonistic efforts of individuals actuated, not by group-welfare, but by self-welfare; and he saw that it was none other than the power of the State. He did not attempt to resolve that force into its elements in terms of individual force; there it was as a fact. That was sufficient. He might have asked himself how far the State force represented the will of the greater number of men, women and children in the society; whether the will of a strong man went for more than that of a weak man; of a rich than of a poor man; of a clever than of a weak-minded man; whether the wills of half a dozen children contributed as much to the State will as the will of one man or two women. But he was neither curious nor dogmatic on these points. The fact was there, and he accepted it as a *datum*. In his day he found that the channel through which this State force operated was that of monarchical government, and he lived

to see the so-called republic develop into a monarchy in all but the name, and later still to see the old monarchy restored. It is absolutely misleading to say that "Hobbes argued in the interests of absolute monarchy;" such an assertion is as unjust and as unfounded as would be the more plausible one, that Mr. Spencer argues in the interests of the Liberal party. Hobbes was, and Mr. Spencer is, far above arguing in any interests. Hobbes was unquestionably the profoundest thinker of his age—the age of Shakespeare and Bacon; and many Englishmen who cherish his reputation will bitterly resent this imputation. We have already referred to Mr. Spencer's sneer at Carlyle. Here is what he has to say of the founder of the English school of jurisprudence, probably the acutest logician of the century: "Austin was originally in the army, and it has been truly remarked that the permanent traces left may be seen in his 'Province of Jurisprudence.' When undeterred by the exasperating pedantries—the endless distinctions and definitions and repetitions—which serve but to hide his essential doctrines, we ascertain what these are, it becomes manifest that he assimilates civil authority to military authority." It is difficult to deal patiently with this passage. It is useful as showing up in a strong light the fundamental error which underlies and vitiates the whole of Mr. Spencer's political doctrines; an error he unconsciously adopted from his precursor Comte. That Austin was once in the army we know, but beyond this statement of fact, this criticism of the great jurist is as untrue as it is ungenerous. Those who attended Austin's lectures testify that, so far from having anything of the drill-sergeant about him, he was exceptionally modest and conversational in his method of teaching; he would listen attentively to all doubts, and ask the opinions of his hearers on points where he felt himself weak. But if we are to look for the traces of his army discipline in his conclusions, it is only necessary to repeat that it is Mr. Spencer himself, who, after Comte, mistakes for a difference in kind what Austin clearly saw to be merely a difference in degree; the difference, namely, between the "military and industrial régimes." As to exasperating pedantries, Austin himself attributes his own peculiarities of diction to a scrupulous anxiety to express each idea by a suitable word, and to use invariably that word to express the idea. His aim was to be not an elegant but a precise writer. From the expression "endless" distinctions, it may be inferred that the complainant has never got to the end of them; those who have, only regret that poor Austin did not possess the health and strength to add to them, containing as they do some of the finest masterpieces of logical analysis. The repetitions which are a blemish on the published editions of his

works are, as Mr. Spencer might have ascertained, the necessary result of delivering several lectures on the same subject to different audiences in different places; and the able editors of his lectures and posthumous papers have probably acted wisely in publishing them as they stand. For it is seldom that science can be caught, so to speak, in a state of growth in a great mind, as it is presented to us in Austin's wrestling writings. While, as for the definitions that glitter like crystals throughout his works, and which so vex the soul of his critic, it is enough to say that an accurate acquaintance with even one of them (the wonderful definition of property) would have saved the author of "The Man *v.* the State" pages of useless writing, the whole of the fifteenth chapter of "Political Institutions," and hours and days of anxious thought. There is nothing in the whole range of juristic literature comparable with Austin's final definition of property and the chain of masterly analysis which leads up to it. Mr. Spencer writes in complete ignorance of it

Austin and all his works having been thus contemptuously thrust aside the search is continued for a justification of the supremacy assumed by the sovereign body, or, as it has been styled, the effective majority. "The true question is—Whence the sovereignty? What is the assignable warrant for this unqualified supremacy assumed by one, or by a small number, or by a large number over the rest?" Does any one really believe that any community is or ever was subject to the arbitrary caprice of one or of any determinate number of its members? Does Mr. Spencer believe that this country is governed in accordance with the will of a numerical majority, or that any such government is even conceivable? Is it not clear that the forms of individual force which go to make up the group force are of very various kinds? Possibly brute force or muscular force contributes the least to the result. Force in the form of wealth, intellectual force, moral force, and many other and derivative and combined forms, pour into the common stream, all operating in countless directions, like the sensations and ideas and emotions in the mind of a man, and the resultant of these and other forces is the group-will. To ask for any higher warrant for the authority of the group over its units, is to rake up in a fresh place the threadbare controversy about free-will. "How comes it," asks the befogged controversialist, "that a man often refrains from doing what he wills to do? that something within him at the last moment whispers 'Don't do it,' with the effect of dissuading him?" Mr. Spencer would answer him, "My dear sir, go home and learn the meaning of the words you use." He certainly would not set about to think why the body does not move in the direction of least resistance, or why the lesser force should over-



come the greater ; or if not, by what peculiar virtue, or authority, or warrant, or justification, the greater overcomes the less. And yet when the subject of the inquiry is not the organism a human being, but the organism a society, he searches everywhere for "an assignable warrant," and bitterly complains that Austin, while admitting that a government is actuated by group morality, furnishes none. "What we have to seek is some higher warrant for the subordination of the minority to the majority than that arising from inability to resist physical coercion." "We have to find, not a physical justification, but a moral justification for the supposed absolute power of the majority." But what is meant by the majority? Does any one suppose that the numerical majority, as such, either exercises absolute power, or ought to exercise it? All that Hobbes and Austin contend is that what the group wills it does, and that those members of the community who happen to be in line with the group-act may be called the effective majority. No one pretends that any determinate person, or number of persons, ever did have, or could have the making of the group-will.

If Mr. Spencer will re-cast his question, and ask, "What is the test of the goodness or badness of group-acts?" we can cordially join in the quest. Bentham's answer was simple: "The greatest happiness of the greatest number;" but it was not true, and it was not definite. The greatest number of whom? Of living persons? or of the countless millions to come? If of the former, it is far from certain that a socialistic redistribution of wealth, accompanied by wholesale infanticide, would not be the readiest path. If of the latter (assuming that the two interests may be antagonistic), then we have to ask, "Why should the living sacrifice themselves for the sake of the unborn?" Sympathy with the unborn? A frail motor! Though Mr. Spencer evidently has faith in it. "If," says he, "we adopt the meliorist view" (not the optimist), "that life is on the way to become such that it will yield more pleasure than pain, then those actions by which life is maintained are justified." Not at all; no act is morally justified which does not conduce to the ultimate welfare of the agent. This is what Mr. Sidgwick would call Egoistic Hedonism, but it is also common sense. Evidently Bentham's answer is unsatisfactory in theory and utterly unworkable in practice. To expect the legislator to measure the million and one near effects of a proposed law with his "hedonometer," to say nothing of the remote effects, is preposterous. What, then, is the test of which we are in search? To any one who has once grasped the conception of the group as an organism—as a whole not to be expressed in terms of its component parts, any more than a man can be expressed in

terms of the cells of which he is composed—the answer is clear enough : the welfare of the group. This is the warrant, this the justification.

The group-welfare is not of course the origin of the laws, but it is the cause of their survival—of their present existence. The strong man who first deferred to the wish of a weak man was not actuated by solicitude for the well-being of his race ; but it was the compatibility of acts of the kind with the well-being of his race which enabled tribes practising them to predominate ; and by elbowing other tribes out of existence, to perpetuate the race of men actuated as a rule by like promptings with himself. What those feelings were—why one of superior strength should form a habit of giving way in certain classes of cases to one who could not otherwise prevail against him, is a question the answer to which will bring us face to face with the origin of justice—justice as it is—justice in the sense of that which is common to all actions called just actions ; not the *justice* of the transcendental moralist. In searching for the connotation of “just,” we shall find ourselves compelled to examine the concrete relations commonly alleged to embody the principle. Every attempt to lay down the principle first and then to fit it on to the rights and duties which are as a fact recognized, has hitherto ended in failure. A just action is one which deals to each his due ; but this is merely a translation into other words. What is any one’s due, whether pleasant or painful ? We must avoid the circular fallacy of defining rights and dues in terms of justice. We sometimes hear of a right to be hanged, but usually the term is used in a restricted sense to denote a pleasant relation. The word “dues” covers both classes. The first thing that strikes the inquirer is that “rights” covers two distinct classes of pleasant relations, both of which seem to involve the foregoing of the full fruits of superior power by one individual for the benefit of another individual, who but for his “rights” would be in a position of disadvantage. And the two classes of rights are distinguished according to that which intervenes between the stronger individual and the fruits of his superior strength. In the one class it is the perception of indirect advantage resulting from abstention, which operates as a motive on the individual himself ; in the other class it is the interference of the group as a whole in favour of the weaker party. The first class of rights may be called moral rights, and the second class legal rights. Let us examine them in turn.

Those who have watched the behaviour of dogs will have observed that a strong dog will seldom attempt to deprive a weak dog of a bone he is carrying. Though stronger, he hesitates to attack the dog in possession. *A fortiori*, a little dog will not

dare to attack a big dog in possession, though he will put on all his best military airs before yielding up his own bone. Now, in this instance there are two minds to dissect. There is the mental attitude of the little dog, and there is the mental attitude of the big dog. Action is the end of will, or, in other words, the resultant of motives. The strongest motive actuating the little dog is the idea of enjoying the bone in the very near future; this future is so near, and the associations engendered by the smell and feel of the bone so intensify this idea, that it borders on realization, and we have what is called an intense expectation. Hence, so far as the idea of gnawing a bone is capable of stimulating to action, we have it in its strongest form. And what is the mental attitude of the stronger dog? First, he also pictures to himself the pleasure of gnawing the bone which he sees before him; but the idea is far less intense than that of the possessor: he neither feels nor smells the bone, and the contemplated time of enjoyment is more remote. Moreover, experience has taught him (or instinct, the experience of his forefathers) that the little dog will most probably make a fight of it, in which case, though victory will be with the strong, it will not be unalloyed with pain and trouble. In short, his intensity of expectation will not be anything like so great and so urgent as that of the possessor. It is unnecessary to go further into the psychology of the position; it is enough to show that a custom will tend to develop of respect for possession. But it will be based upon fear, and among lower animals, inherited habit, rather than upon any sense of possessory right.

Here is no recognition of the expediency of proportioning satisfaction to effort, but a recognition of the inexpediency of attaining a certain good at an expense in pain or risk which more than counterbalances the probable gain; the resulting habit is called a spirit of compromise. A boy with an apple in his hand has a better chance of eating it than a man a hundred yards off. The latter must first give chase, he must then struggle for the apple, and may, even though successful, get a blow or kick; and moreover, the apple may be eaten or thrown away before he can get it. On the whole, the game is not worth the candle. The boy's *right*, his well-justified expectation of enjoyment, is recognized without any interference by third parties or the State. Again, here is a weary hunter sitting alongside a stag he has captured. One who is fresh, and perhaps stronger, comes up, impelled by hunger. Here are the elements of a fierce conflict. Both expect pleasure, and both expect pain as the result of the fight. Now, both parties argue thus: A little with peace is better than the chance of much with the certainty of bruised limbs; why not share the prize in some proportion?

The question, What proportion? is not settled by any reference to the efforts of the hunter, but by a rough calculation as to the least amount of blackmail which will be sufficient to induce the stronger man to keep the peace. Compromise is the germ of moral rights.

And now as to legal rights. Remembering that the source of all legal conceptions must be sought for in the patriarchal stage of social development, we shall find that the conception of legal rights has its origin in parental love. We need go no deeper. Further analysis would take us into the region of psychology. Parental love is a fact which nomologists must accept as a datum. A parent, perhaps without being able to assign a better reason for it than sympathy, will not permit an elder child always to take advantage of his superior strength in his dealings with a younger. An arbitrary State interference takes place. And here is the beginning of the elimination among men of brute-force. Why it is not just, parents do not trouble to inquire, but for some reason or other, based on sympathy with weakness, the possessor of superior muscular force is arbitrarily debarred from reaping the natural advantages of that superiority. It would take too long in this place to show how, one by one, other forms of superior force were eliminated—were barred in the competition. Stealth was long tolerated when violence was deprecated. Later on, when stealth ceased to be sanctioned, low cunning was admired, just as nowadays sharp practice is winked at by many who would recoil from fraud; while even among those who are accounted high-minded among us, it is regarded as a laudable exercise of intellectual superiority to buy cheap from one who is ignorant of the true value of the article, and to sell dear to another who is also ignorant of it. Where the line will eventually be drawn it is impossible to say. The Romans allowed one who had sold a thing far below its true value to come upon the purchaser for an account: we do not. Which is right?

Such, then, is in brief an outline of the history of legal rights; we find, first, sympathy for the muscularly weaker; then with the mentally inferior; then with those whom the event shows to have been temporarily overmatched owing to unavoidable ignorance or unfavourable situation; and lastly, in the case of what is called "undue influence," sympathy with those exposed to unusual temptations. And concomitantly with these we find antipathy for those who take unfair (whatever that may mean) advantage of their superior strength, cunning, knowledge, or situation.

Take as an illustration the greatest problem which modern civilization presents to us. Two men club their resources together to convert that which is valuable into something more valuable.

Let us assume that they contribute equal value. Would it not seem right or just that the new increment of value should belong to them in equal shares? And yet so unfavourably are the manual workers among us situated, that they are not in a position to make those apparently fair terms; and the consequence is that the employer of labour pockets the whole of the increment of value, leaving to the labourers only what they had to start with—viz., their own bodies, plus the cost of their maintenance during the process, and a small allowance for wear and tear. It is as if (the situation of the partners being reversed) the workers kept the whole of the profits, and handed over to the capitalist the engine he had contributed, plus the cost of the fuel with which he had supplied it, and a small sum to cover the wear and tear, sufficient to form a sinking fund wherewith to provide a new engine when the old one was worn out. Such is the modern system of wagedom. The wage-receiver gets just enough to keep himself alive for the use of his employers, plus that which is barely sufficient to rear up children to take his place when he is worn out. This is the result of free contract. True, but how are the parties situated? Is it not the free contract of the drowning man who voluntarily agrees to give up all his fortune to one who will drag him out on no other terms? Is it just?

But to return to the evolution of legal rights. When the "gens" takes the place of the family as the political unit (a change which effects a remarkable complication in judicial procedure) the head of the house is no longer swayed by quite such immediate sympathy with the weaker members. In the meantime his decisions have come to be based on principles more or less general. Again, as these compound groups are re-compounded, and the gens gives place to the tribe, personal sympathies are still further weakened, and judicial decisions are based on still wider generalizations, all of them, be it remembered, the outcome of experience, and not severally deduced from any high moral principle of abstract goodness. When at last we reach the stage in which we see nations, each containing many separate tribes all welded together into an organic State, with its *corpus juris civilis*, the ruler can have but little if any personal knowledge of the citizens, and he, or those to whom the judicial function is delegated, must be guided in his or their decisions by rules of high generality which are popularly believed to be based on what is termed justice; though what that is, not even the shrewdest of ancient jurists has been able to furnish us with the faintest notion. What is connoted we do not know; but we are now in a position to define "just" as denoting those group interferences between individual citizens which aim at more or

less equalizing the conditions of the competition, in certain undefined respects, by eliminating the exercise of certain faculties, which in a state of anarchy (or nature as some wrongly call it) would give a decided advantage to one of the competing parties. More than this can hardly be said, and even this is saying too much; for the exercise of the said faculties is not altogether prohibited, but only in certain classes of actions. For even now a strong man is permitted to take advantage of a weak man by reason of his superior muscular force—*e.g.*, a porter will snatch a situation at a railway station from one of weaker build. So a powerful navvy at piecework will earn a higher wage than one who is weaker, and what is more, will force the weaker man by competition in the labour market to accept a lower wage than he could otherwise have commanded. And so with all the other kinds of superiority. It is in only certain classes of actions that their exercise is prohibited. And he who would precisely define those classes must have recourse to induction, or be prepared to give up the problem as insoluble.

It now remains for us to decide whether by the term "rights" we mean moral rights or legal rights. The definition is optional. Usage justifies either. But having chosen, let us beware of employing the word in one sense in the major premiss, and in the other sense in the minor premiss, or the conclusion. Austin chose to define rights as legal rights: he was quite justified in doing this; and having done it, he never swerved to the right hand nor to the left. Mr. Spencer chooses to put the other interpretation on the term as used by Austin, and thus makes him appear to say that which is ridiculous. Austin knew perfectly well that usage precedes law, but he also knew that rights could not precede government in the sense in which he employed the terms; which is obvious.

It is clear from arguments based on economy of force that the State would tend in many classes of cases to sanction pre-existing moral rights; but the "justification" or "warrant" for this course would be not the moral rights themselves, but the gain to the group. Hundreds of instances will readily occur to the mind wherein the State has, so to speak, ridden roughshod over moral rights, and wisely so too. Lazarus at the gate of the rich man had a moral right (in the opinion of the narrator's countrymen) to some part of the other's wealth; but the State did not sanction that claim, and it is currently admitted that it would be inexpedient for any State to sanction such a claim. Here we have a moral right which does not tend to grow into a legal right. It is unnecessary to ascertain the basis of the moral right; it is enough to show that if law is to be based, as Mr. Spencer thinks, on "natural rights," by which he seems to mean some kind of

moral rights, then we shall have group morality (law) which is not based on group-welfare ; which is absurd.

Let us turn to the evolution of law. What is a law in the nomological sense ? It is the statement of an invariable sequence of which the antecedent is the act of an individual citizen or individual citizens, and the consequent is the act of the group or State. No amount of enacting or legislating makes a law ; it is the carrying out of the enactment, or an invariable tendency to carry it out, in the absence of disturbing causes, such as ignorance, false evidence, escape of wrongdoer, &c., which justifies the statement and verifies the law. Of course there are many so-called State laws (statutes, &c.) which are not as a fact carried out in practice. Some are obsolete, others unworkable, and others uncongenial to the conscience of the age. All such are but distorted reflections or mendacious misstatements of the true law (Nurrecht), which as a fact obtains. Such so-called State laws, statutes, decrees, edicts, &c., must continue to be called laws out of deference to popular usage ; but the true laws in the scientific sense—statical laws—are the statements of invariable sequences, by whomsoever promulged. It is the province of the legislator to discover these laws ; and more— to divine, by a study of history and his own time, the changes which are in course of being worked out ; to discover by some process not only the law as it is, but the law as it tends to become. The laws of the change and development of statical laws may in Comtist phraseology be termed dynamical nomological laws. And the first question for the nomologist to decide is as to the method to be adopted in the search. Transcendental jurists, it is needless to observe, adopt the method which, oddly enough, Mr. Spencer has followed and defended. The laws as they ought to be, must, they say, be deduced, like the propositions of Euclid, from one or a few fundamental principles, of which the chief is “fiat justitia.”

The empirical school of jurists, on the other hand, contend that there are no known truths of the highest generality, and that each law must be tested on its merits by its fitness to conduce to the well-being of the people, or some of them. And they proceed to find this out in each case by observation, experiment, or calculation—an heroic task, which does more credit to their patience than to their appreciation of the vastness of the subject. All seem alike to overlook the suitability of the method adopted in the other inductive sciences—that of making inductions from the minor social rules which have stood the test of time ; of casting the conclusion into the form of a more general rule ; of extracting, when possible, that which is common to this rule, and other general rules arrived at by a similar process, and so of arriving at a rule of higher generality. As in other departments of

science, the inquirer is then in possession of many laws of various degrees of generality, which he must verify by applying them to new or unconsidered or hypothetical cases. This process of exhaustive subsumption will either strengthen the probability of his original conclusion, or show up the weak point in it; in which latter case he will be in a position to qualify it in accordance with his widened experience. The third part of the process which is conveniently carried on concurrently with the others, is that of making deductions from the general laws reached by induction. As in other branches of inquiry, some of the greatest and most valuable truths will be brought to light by this process; but it need hardly be said that the value of a deduction depends not only on the correctness of the logic, but on the truth of the premiss. Hence it is that most of the deductions hitherto contributed to ethics and jurisprudence being deductions not from generalizations based on the actual sequences observed in the actions of men and of groups of men, but on meaningless dogmas as to Duty, Justice, Virtue, Right, and the like, have little or no value whatsoever.

The historical source of law has already been indicated; and it is evident that State laws are not, and never have been, deductions from the highest moral truths, or supposed truths. They took their rise from the generalizations which were of necessity made when questions became too numerous and too complicated to be decided, each, from beginning to end, on its merits. Precedents were cited; the *ratio decidendi* was extracted, correctly or erroneously, and the result was a State law.

In making these generalizations, either consciously or unconsciously, the law-makers or judges of old naturally made imperfect inductions, just as our lawyers do now. They seized upon some accidental feature common to a number of cases which seemed similar, instead of upon the essential feature. This accidental feature they took as the basis of the new generalization or State law. To take a modern instance of this fallacy. Of thousands of partnership cases tried in this country, community of profit and loss seems to be a common feature. Hence lawyers of high repute (see Lindley on "Partnership") have seized upon this trait as the distinctive mark of partnership; thus confounding the accidental with the essential, and entailing great injustice and hardship. The essential element in partnership is not community of profit and loss, but reciprocal guaranty. It may be said that nearly all bad State laws which are not the result of erroneous beliefs are due to false generalizations. Nearly all the confusions, the complications, and the injustice of the English laws relating to liens, to mortgages, to debts of priority,



to consideration, to bankruptcy, &c. &c., are due to blundering generalizations. Lien, for example, has never yet been correctly defined in any legal authority, simple and beautiful as the connotation is. Consequently, many true liens are unrecognized by law, whilst others are sanctioned which have no proper existence, to the great injury of the actual owner. Like remarks apply to such elementary legal conceptions as debt and security. In many cases the false generalization is too wide; it covers cases which bear only a superficial resemblance; but in others it frequently fails to cover cases to which the correct *ratio decidendi* applies.

Some State laws are repealed, or cease to be operative; others persist through centuries of social development. What is the reason for the survival of some laws and the extinction of others? Tribes whose laws conduce to the well-being of the race necessarily outlive and thrust out of existence those tribes whose laws, however apparently reasonable or just, do not conduce to the group-welfare. This becomes more obvious when we reflect that in some times and places laws are operative and conducive to group-welfare, which in other countries or in other ages would clearly lead to disintegration. No one pretends that monogamy for example, would be a desirable institution in a poultry-yard. Few would condemn polygamy among nomad tribes in a thinly-populated area. Is there a hint as to its immorality or inexpediency in the Old Testament? Again, infanticide was legally practised by Greeks and Romans, and to-day it is recognized in China. Even stealing is said to have been lawful in Sparta; and duelling is allowed and encouraged in several European countries to-day. We have only to refer to Montesquieu for numerous instances of laws and customs in vogue among peoples separated from us by space and time, which, if introduced into nineteenth-century England, would probably ruin the country. We shall easily satisfy ourselves that the fitness of a law is not to be tested by any reference to a supposed standard of justice or virtue, but by its effect on the eventual welfare of the race adopting it. If it is not conducive to the group-welfare, one of two things will happen: either the law will be dropped, or the group will perish. Thus the just and the unjust laws (regarded from any arbitrary standpoint) will survive together where they are conducive to the welfare of the group; they will perish together where they are not conducive. And so it befalls that many good laws are not just, if judged by the common-sense of a so-called just man. (For that justice has a connotation, though undiscovered, there can be little doubt; and that, in the absence of a true definition, there is no better clue to the connotation of the term, than the instinctive feeling of the multitude

in applying it to the concrete, is also tenable.) Indeed, since the widest-ranging laws are but generalizations from laws of less generality, and since every step of the process opens the door to fallacies which may become ingrained in the law, it follows that in a highly civilized and complex society hardly any of the laws, whether written or unwritten, can be regarded as just. The most that can be shown in their favour is that any alternative laws which might be proposed would probably result in even greater injustice—in a larger number of cases of hardship than the existing laws; which in many cases is not saying much. But such is the force of habit that we seem to see justice in a law of undoubted expediency in which there is not a tittle, in any sense of the term which has ever been suggested. This habit blinds us to the immense differentiation which has taken place in morals and laws. He who would deduce laws as they ought to be (*i.e.*, as they tend to be) from morals, must be capable of calculating the present position of the geological strata from a knowledge of the antecedent physical conditions of the globe.

From a very early stage we find the moral and the legal rights in collision. For instance, how came it that when the weaker child tried to take possession of a thing which the elder and stronger was using, the parent refrained from equalizing the conditions? Brute force was allowed to predominate. Here the sympathy with intensity of expectation—possession overpowered the sympathy with physical weakness. And so at the present day proprietary right prevails over sympathy with the hardships and disadvantageous position of the poor. It is in accordance with the group-welfare. It is only when man enters upon the scene that sympathy with intense disappointment after intense expectation, and antipathy for the cause of the disappointment, are manifested. From the moment when the family as a whole, through the patriarch, interferes on behalf of the holder or possessor of a thing and against the would-be despoiler, from that moment we have the recognition of possessory right.

Let us follow up the development of this recognized right. We have seen how it would come about that one who had gathered a cocoa-nut would be left in undisputed enjoyment, or that otherwise the State would interfere to ensure that result. Now suppose he had captured a stag, and could not eat the whole of it at one meal. Four courses would lie open to him: he could carry about with him as much of the carcase as he could lift, and relinquish the rest; or he could sit down alongside of it until he was again hungry; or he might hand over to a friend as much as he could not eat; or lastly, he could inform

all and sundry that the carcase was his own, that he claimed it, that he could, if he chose, remain with it, and so get his claim respected, and that to compel him to do so was a restriction on his liberty. Probably this fourth course would be the last to be adopted, but it would necessarily come into use, for the simple reason that it would be a saving of the common time—an economy of group-force. And not until the recognition of this right over a thing not in actual possession came to be assured, could the right of property in its fullest sense be said to have reached maturity. From the third course, which would be based on the possessory right of intensity of expectation, would of course spring the right of gift, transfer, or alienation.

The right to things within the grip or within the power of immediate resumption has widened into a right to things not within the grip; this presently and necessarily extends to prescriptive ownership. The claim to ownership, once put forward without dispute, lasts indefinitely. Then the right of gift develops irresistibly into a right to transfer, from donor to donee, a thing out of reach by word of mouth. And since it takes time to obtain possession of a thing at a distance, it clearly comes to pass that a future gift is regarded as valid. Meanwhile mutual gifts or exchanges have become frequent; and gifts in exchange for future services have developed into conditional future gifts, or rather conditional promises to give. It is clear that from this would arise in the most natural manner the recognition of gift contingent on the death of the donor—or, in other words, of testamentary bequest; which is the key-stone of the present system of civilization—property in perpetuity. Temporary rights over things held by others would tend to come into existence without blurring or weakening the proprietary or permanent right of the true owner; and thus the State would come to sanction the rights of hirers and lenders. It is quite needless in this place to trace the gradual growth from the original germ—possessory right—of the innumerable forms of rights over things now sanctioned by the modern State.

Thus from absolute liberty, common to man and the lower animals, tempered by sympathies and antipathies in harmony with group-welfare, spring first possession by tacit understanding, then right of possession sanctioned by patriarchal power, which is the incipient State; this extends to recognized possession of things not within the grip or immediate resumption. (No hard-and-fast line can be drawn between these stages of possessory right.) Then come prescriptive ownership, together with uses to alien property, sub-uses of several degrees; condominium, which tends to split up into property in the narrow sense, and

lien (not even yet fully differentiated); and finally, property in ideas and other more complex proprietary rights.

To sum up. If "rights" is a term with two meanings, "justice," which is used to connote that unknown principle common to all rights, must also have two meanings. Justice may be that which is common to all moral rights, or that which is common to all legal rights; and if it is the one, it cannot be the other. It is not a case of the greater including the less; the two principles are disparate. Most moderns employ the term in its ethical sense. Hobbes, as we have seen, employed the term in its nomological sense, just as Austin employed the term rights; and (so far as Mr. Spencer's criticism is concerned) with the same result—viz., that of laying himself open to misrepresentation by one who does not take the trouble to ascertain beforehand in what sense the term is used. Common usage hardly justifies Hobbes' use of the word, which, at all events nowadays, is used to express a moral abstraction; and it will be well to confine it to this purpose. To contend that the true laws (those actually carried out as an invariable rule) cannot be unjust, would be paradoxical to modern ears. That they cannot be illegal is a safer proposition, and a truism withal.

We have seen that there was a time when justice was non-existent; and by what process of evolution it was eventually brought about that certain classes of actions came to be regarded as just and others as unjust. Nothing now remains to be done but by a survey of just actions (as generally admitted at any time and place) to extract the essential common peculiarity, and the result is the connotation of justice. The definition will never be reached by laboured arguments on the model of a geometrical theorem, as may be seen from an examination of Mr. Sidgwick's able analysis of the conception in his "Methods of Ethics"—a work of great negative value, but absolutely barren of positive results. With ethics, as a so-called practical science—as a science of that which ought to be in contradistinction from that which is—we have nothing to do; neither, similarly, with jurisprudence as vulgarly defined. It is in all probability the visionary and unpractical conclusions reached by jurists which have rendered that branch of inquiry so unpopular with lawyers—that is to say, with those who may be supposed to be more than other people practically acquainted with the problems contemplated. It is not jurisprudence as hitherto treated which is the necessary preliminary to the fruitful study of politics, but rather what may be termed nomology, or the inductive science of law. Before proceeding farther, it may be as well to restate what has so far been stated only by implication as to the nature and method of this science.

Nomology, then, is the scientific study of certain of the relations subsisting between the organized group and the units or individuals of which it is composed; or, in other words, of those sequences of which the consequent is a willed act of the group following upon an antecedent act or situation of one or some of its units. This definition of the subject is no doubt technical, and at first sight not very intelligible; but it is accurate, and strictly in harmony with the definitions of other branches of science. For the scientific study of things (which term rightly includes relations) means an inquiry into their origin, growth, development past and future, and decay; and it is well, before making use of colloquial or slipshod language, to be sure that it truly represents a clear and precise idea. At the same time, a translation of the technical into homely English is also desirable in order to avoid pedantry of diction throughout, and to dispense with circumlocution. Vulgar parlance, in fine, often serves as a short formula, and combines brevity with apparent simplicity—an appearance due, however, rather to use than to logical exactness. In plain language, then, nomology treats of those acts of the State which are voluntary and which are caused by the contemplation of situations or doings of individual members of it. And indeed we may without much danger cut out the term “situations,” for by far the greater proportion of State acts are performed in response to the *acts* of individuals; while those due to the contemplation of their unchanged situation are at all times few, and in the case of developed societies almost entirely absent. Thus in this country at the present day the State punishes no man on account of his position—as, for instance, because he is deformed, or dark-complexioned, or unfit for military service, or even leprous or otherwise loathsome. Nor does the State reward or compensate men otherwise than for a change in their position, except in case of extreme poverty, and even the poor laws may be said to be rather a safety-valve against rebellion than a tribute to pity. Be that as it may, it is certain that the enormous majority of State acts follow upon a change: that change is brought about either by so-called natural causes (accident), or by the act of a member or members of the State. Thus, on the one hand, your house may be struck by lightning, or you may be kicked by a horse; or, on the other hand, your watch may be taken by a thief, or your ribs broken by a garotter. In the first of these cases the deplorable change in your situation will not induce the active sympathy of the State; but in the latter cases, where the change is due to the act of another person, then the State is moved to action. So that we may eliminate, as the causes of State action, not only unchanging situations, but also changes

caused by accident or nature (in which terms are included all causes other than the acts of fellow-members of the State). Again, those acts of members of a State which are virtuous and worthy of approbation do not in a highly developed society entail any regular recognition by the State, such as a reward. Where rewards for virtue or for public service are made, it is not according to law or regular rule, but according to the feeling of the moment. So that we may also eliminate such acts of the citizen as do not so arouse the anger or antipathy of the State as to entail State action. And this leaves us with no cause worth much consideration but the hateful acts of members of the community.

These group-acts being voluntary and following on the contemplation of the acts of members, it is clear that such contemplation must arouse feelings of pleasure and pain sufficient to serve as motives. When produced by regarding the sufferings or pleasures of others, these feelings are called sympathy or antipathy according as they are like or unlike the feelings regarded. Thus we may sympathize with one who is either in pain or in pleasure; so similarly we may antipathize (so to speak) with one in either situation. It is absolutely essential to conceive of the group or State as acting in accordance with motives of sympathy and antipathy; such acts taking the form of charity, compensation, or reward, in the one case; and of spoliation, compulsory restitution, or punishment, in the other. It will be objected that this arrangement leaves no room for the whole important class of legal rights. And this is in fact so. But it will be remembered that we are at present considering the antecedents or causes of State acts, and not the effects of such acts (which may of course be regarded as included in such acts), and it will become apparent that a legal right, as such, cannot rouse the State to action. How should it? A legal right has by implication been defined as a liberty or power which owes its existence to the recognition and guaranty of the State. So long as that right exists, the power is or may be exercised; and as soon as that power ceases to be exercised or exercisable that right is *ipso facto* dead. There no longer is any such power, whether guaranteed by the State or not. Therefore a legal right cannot serve as a cause of State action.

But the change in the situation may arouse the sympathy of the State; and if that change has been caused by the act of a citizen, then such act may arouse the antipathy of the State. Or both sentiments may be aroused simultaneously. Thus the wrong may be an antecedent of State action; and the change in the situation of the injured party may likewise so serve. And, as has already been hinted, it is only, or almost only, when the

misfortune is regarded as connected with the reprehensible conduct of another, that the State, as a fact, does take action and that probably as much for the sake of hurting the wrong-doer as of benefiting the sufferer.

It is impossible in this brief sketch to enter upon the keenly debated question of the nature of the difference between crime and injury, involving, as it does, the definition of crime. It may therefore be pardonable to express dogmatically the view that crimes are those acts of individual citizens which arouse the antipathy of the State for the wrong-doer, sufficiently to bring about a State act of the nature of punishment; while a civil injury is an act which, without necessarily arousing any State antipathy for the agent, arouses State sympathy with another citizen who is hurt by it. The resulting group-act has for its end, not the punishment of the doer, but the rehabilitation of the sufferer; though for reasons connected with group competition, the restitution or compensation or reparation resulting from the State act does, as a rule, also operate as a punishment on the doer of the injury. For example, if one who carelessly breaks a shop-window is made to pay for a new one, it is not because his act is regarded by the State with positive antipathy, but because sympathy with the owner of the window is sufficient to entail State action on his behalf. At the same time, it is clearly a painful thing (virtually a punishment) for the injurer to be compelled to pay.

A fundamental division in the study of the law is that which is based on this difference between crime and injury. And one of the first dynamical laws which the study of nomology will bring to light, is that which relates to the gradual absorption of the law of crimes into the law of civil injuries.

Seeing that both classes of laws tend to restrain rather than to impel, it is clear that the law as a whole may be regarded as restraint on liberty. In order to understand liberty, we must first understand law. Liberty is the complement of law. When we know the angle, we know its complement.

And now let us reconsider the whole question from the opposite point of view. What is liberty? We are told that in a state of nature we are all free; there is too much liberty. Take the case of the wolf and the lamb. Here we have a "state of nature"—a state of absolute liberty. The wolf is at liberty to devour the lamb; and similarly, the lamb is at liberty to devour the wolf—if it can. The poor Indian, bound to a tree to be shot at by his neighbours, is living in a state of perfect liberty—equal liberty; for he was free to tie his neighbours to the tree, and take shots at them. A state of full liberty, then, is one in which the strong are free to rob the weak, and the weak are free to rob

the strong. Clearly this is not an enviable state of things for the weak. The strong may call it liberty, but the weak call it anarchy. The two are identical. Then why all this outcry for liberty, and never a word for anarchy? We all know that in order to escape from the evils of liberty, men banded themselves together in groups, not consciously or suddenly, but by a slow process of evolution which can be explained; and virtually agreed to suppress by united action certain forms of force. In short, the actions of individuals were brought more or less under the control of the group—Society, the State. Once created and set in motion, this club or State tended from various causes to encroach more and more on the freedom of the individuals composing it, until the restraints, the exactions, and the meddlings of the governing body at last brought about a reaction in favour of a partial return to anarchy—liberty. Certain matters and things were removed from the domain of State control; and men were no worse, but all the better, for the change. The State, for various reasons connected with the structure of the ruling body, brought itself into disrepute; and each deliverance from its arbitrary interference was hailed as a clear gain to the liberties of the people. In some cases the change was for the better. In others it was again found necessary to revert to the system of State control. The reason why certain matters can safely be left to the free action of individuals, whereas others can not, may be shown in detail; but no general statement has yet been framed by which we can see at a glance beforehand whether a particular matter should be controlled by the State, or may safely be left to the unfettered action of the units. Civil liberty, then, may be accurately defined as the greatest possible freedom of the individual from State interference, compatible with the well-being of the social organism.

But to set up this definition as a practical rule of action is vain. It is like telling one who asks for moral guidance to "keep to the path of virtue. What he wants to know is, which is the path of virtue? Similarly, the practical statesman wants to know which are the matters wherein the State must here and now exercise some kind of control, in order to secure the stability of society; and which are the matters to be safely left to individual caprice.

Is it not unphilosophical, without the strongest reason, to contend that what at one time led to the elevation of mankind—viz., the substitution of organized social control for antagonistic and competitive individual free efforts, at another time leads to its deterioration?—that what was once a factor in social integration, is now a factor in social disintegration? And yet this is the position taken up by the worshippers of liberty pure



and simple, like Mr. Spencer and Mr. Auberon Herbert. Government is the cement which binds the units together into a complex whole. Moreover, the study of history shows us unmistakably that the increasing tendency has been and is in the direction of rendering the Government stronger and stronger in proportion to the individual forces opposed to it. Crime is followed by punishment more speedily and more certainly than it was of old. It is not the weakening, but the strengthening of the State to which we must look for the amelioration of society—the subordination of the will of each to the welfare of all. And this is called Socialism. Yet we do not find that even the most pronounced Socialists aim at supplanting freedom of thought by the religion of the majority, or of any ruling body; nor do they aim at reviving any of the ancient laws by which the dress and food of the various classes of persons were prescribed by government. Just as the extremest individualist would shrink from destroying government altogether, and repealing the whole of the criminal law, so would the extremest socialist shrink from subordinating the will of the units in all matters to State control. Hence we are again driven to the conclusion that “a line must be drawn somewhere.” And the question still is, where? Mr. Auberon Herbert draws it at the elimination of brute force, or what he calls “direct compulsion.” But on his own showing he is driven to some strange shifts in order to show how certain actions, which he and all men agree should be forbidden and punished by the State, are but forms of brute force. If one pours noxious vapours into the air, he is “constraining the faculties of those who are obliged to breathe the poisoned air against their own consent.” If one falsely libels his neighbour, he has “taken his own actions from him, and substituted other actions for them;” and so on. It is fair to say that Mr. Herbert has misgivings as to the soundness of these explanations. What is “direct compulsion” as distinct from indirect? Two monkeys in an apple-tree are apt to fall out—especially if the apples are few. Two hungry hyænas in presence of a fat carcass are apt to fight. Sheep on a barren hillside, on the other hand, eat away as hard as they can, and starve each other to death, indirectly, as it were. They do not seem to have arrived at a perception of the elementary truth, that the simplest way to get the better of a rival is to “remove” him. Perhaps the Carnivora find themselves better armed for the fray; and besides, if successful, they are immediately rewarded with a ready-made repast. Sheep do not care for mutton. But there is another reason for their peaceful behaviour. If the weaker or more cowardly or more peaceable of the two hyænas, glaring at the dead turkey, could see a few lean birds lying about all around, perhaps he would leave

his bigger rival in undisputed possession of the turkey. But he does not, and he is very hungry. He must fight, or starve a little longer. Now, when a strong sheep finds a weaker one browsing luxuriously on a well-covered hillock, he quietly hustles him out of the way, and takes his place; while the weaker brother retires to some neighbouring spot where the herbage is short and brown. Why the stronger do not pommel the weaker out of existence once for all, is a question of sheep sociology which is not the subject of the present inquiry.

What should be pointed out is that savage man in the hunting stage did rise, and does rise, to the far-seeing standpoint of the tiger, and, consciously or unconsciously, discerns the expedience, as an economy of force, of fighting and killing his rivals at once, rather than putting himself to the trouble of continually outstripping them in the chase day after day and year after year. One of these modes is direct, the other is indirect. In what way is the one more justifiable than the other? At all events, they do fight and eliminate one another to an extent unsurpassed even by the Carnivora; so that, as a fact, few if any of them die of starvation after the manner of their more peaceable descendants. But presently again, without any very clear consciousness of what they are aiming at, they begin to discover that although it is in the main a good thing to decimate their fellow-men, it is just as well to tolerate the competition of a few of them, with a view to co-operation against more distant rivals. There can be little doubt that the germ of co-operation is to be found in the instincts of gregarious animals. Here the instinct of competition comes into conflict with the instinct of co-operation, and thus at this early stage a line has to be drawn in practice, if not in theory, between the one province and the other. During the course of social development, when co-operation becomes conscious, organized, and compulsory, we have the State. Some classes of actions pass in and out of the domain of State control many times in the course of history; and it is only after centuries of experiment that the consensus of society finally settles down (perhaps for no clearly assignable reason) in favour of leaving them permanently in one province or the other. Thus, what may be called the group opinion in this country seems now to be settling down in favour of allowing the expression of religious and scientific beliefs to be left free from State interference. In the matter of the marriage relation, the group opinion seems for the present pretty well settled in the opposite way. Now this group opinion is tolerably clear and steady long before the advent of majorities to direct control of legislation, and it must therefore have a basis, *raison d'être*, though not necessarily a consciously recognized

one. And that basis is surely the well-being of the group as a whole. So that, although we may not be able to tell beforehand whether any particular class of actions should or should not be brought within the domain of State-control at any particular stage of social development, we can say that, whatever the group will may be on the subject, it is actuated, consciously or unconsciously by a striving after the welfare of that particular society as a whole. The group may be mistaken, just as an individual may err in honestly doing what he believes to be best for himself in the long run ; but it is surely better and safer to trust to the group instinct, and to have faith in the forward tendency of society, though its gait be a little zigzag, than to put it into a strait-jacket whenever its action does not seem to fit in with some preconceived theory of group morals.

But though liberty thus turns out to be a word without any positive meaning, it is clear that certain forms of liberty are good and other forms are bad. And the distinction between them at any stage of development is between the individual liberty which is compatible with the group welfare, and that which is not. Names are of little consequence ; but the latter may be called licence, and the former civil liberty. It may fairly be doubted whether there has ever been a restraint put upon individuals by even the most despotic of Governments, which may not at one time or another have been a necessary and beneficent concomitant of social evolution. The power of life and death exercised by the old Roman paterfamilias over his children and slaves was probably at one time an unmixed good. And the like power of the King of the Ashantees is or was probably conducive to the group welfare.

Is there, then, no discoverable rule for our practical guidance ? Is there no observable tendency, no law of social development, upon which we can build up a practical working maxim of legislation ? We believe there is ; but it is not embodied in the formula " No Government."

The first requisite for social integration was a strong central power which should effectually suppress all forms of individual activity calculated to injure the group as a whole. Tribes which developed this form of organization waxed strong ; while tribes which consisted of undisciplined and *disorderly* numbers were crushed out in the struggle for existence. Thus the tendency to centralize was brought about necessarily, and to a certain extent unconsciously, just as the gregarious habits of sheep and deer have been developed without that clear prevision for group defence which the habits seem to imply.

And just as in getting copper out of the earth we get with it many other things which are worse than useless ; so in obtaining

control of certain of the actions of its component members, the group got control of many other classes of actions which could not at the time be easily distinguished or disentangled. Having got our copper-ore and its surrounding rubbish to the surface, succeeding operations consist of disengaging the useless from the useful. Some of the substances, like sulphur, are very persistent, but in time the metal shines forth pure and bright. So it is with political institutions. The whole history of civilization is one long series of operations for the disentangling of the metal from the dross. That which is good and necessary in the law—State prevention or elimination of certain classes of actions, such as murder and assault, stealing and breach of contract, nuisance and indecence, &c. &c.—becomes more and more marked, strouger and more popular. Good citizens do not chafe under it—it even ceases to be regarded as a restraint upon liberty; while that which is bad and unnecessary is from time to time expelled from the body of the law—or, as the saying is, the people wrest from their rulers one liberty after another. To take a recent instance: it is only a generation ago that the English people wrested from the Government the liberty to buy what they wanted in the cheapest markets. To-day they are struggling to throw off the last remaining fetters in the matter of full religious liberty.

This, then, is the observed fact, that as civilization advances, the State tends to throw off one claim after another to interfere with the free action of its members, while at the same time it becomes stronger, more regular, speedier, and more certain in performing the functions that remain to it. Where it interferes it interferes thoroughly.

At the present time the tendency is one of throwing off certain forms of State control. Therefore when we see an agitation got up for the purpose of adding to the duties of the State, we may reasonably conclude, *primâ facie*, that it is an agitation in the wrong direction. This is one practical rule. And when we see the State interfering in matters having little in common with what is becoming more and more clearly marked out as its normal province, and much in common with what has long ago been relegated to the domain of private enterprise, we are again logically justified in presuming that such matters ought to be removed from the domain of State control. Upon those who maintain a contrary opinion must rest the *onus probandi*, the burden of showing why these matters should be under control, while those are left to individual freedom. This then is the ground upon which individualists can take their stand. If they aim at more they are in danger of drifting into circular arguments about rights and liberty, and the like metaphysical and

casuistical shallows, where their adversaries will have them at advantage.

But if this is the position to be taken up by those individual thinkers whose study of sociology has led them to perceive that the tendency is in the direction of the widest liberty compatible with social stability, while others have reached the opposite conclusion—namely, that the State is a great machine for doing things better than individual enterprise—what is to be the attitude of the bulk of non-thinkers towards these two parties? It is hardly to be expected that each labourer, before recording his vote for a parliamentary candidate, will make himself acquainted with the principles of sociology, nor is it likely that he will arrive by intuition at a more correct view of political questions than those who, even after some study, have embraced the doctrine of socialism. Even if he entrust his political conscience and his vote to a better-educated man than himself, is there any reason to hope that he will choose an individualist as his mentor rather than a State socialist? Not the least. What, then, is the *form* of government which both parties should concur in regarding as best calculated to lead in the end to that political system which they respectively regard as the best system? Probably every one believes in the one-man form of government, provided he himself is the one man. If individualists could get hold of the tiller, assuming always that they are on the right tack and in advance of the age, no doubt they would realize the ideal of good government more quickly than by trusting to the resultant of conflicting forces in a democratic society. But putting that on one side as out of the question, can they refuse to lend their support to a system of civil equality—a system towards which we are gradually approximating? In the conflict of opposing efforts, that which is fittest will survive. To deny this is to despair of the race. If we have not faith in the ultimate emergence of our struggling fellow-countrymen from darkness into light, then we are trying to bring about by artificial means what will not come by nature. Those who lack faith in the destiny of the race, must do what they can to keep afloat, so long as may be, by a process of patching and tinkering, and of a judicious drawing upon the group capital for the requirements of the present generation. But those who have that faith must learn to look without dread on the temporary aberrations of the people. They must bear in mind that throughout history it has marched steadily forward, not indeed without turnings and backslidings, but still, in the long run, forward on the path of civilization. Those who cling to this faith may look forward, not with fear and doubt, but with confidence, to the indefinite extension of the

franchise; for whatever may be the temptations held out by place-seekers and dishonest demagogues, there is ingrained in the very nature of Englishmen an inherited love of fairness, and an instinctive belief in the wisdom of proportioning satisfaction to intelligent effort, which will not easily be eradicated. It is this belief which underlies respect for property, and not any sublimated *à priori* "warrant" whatsoever. Thus every man who has faith in the race must ascertain by observation the tendencies in the structural development of the State, and instead of struggling against those tendencies—instead of stemming the advancing tide with his mop—he must welcome such reforms as history points to, in the confident expectation that any temporary concomitant ills will be more than counterbalanced by future gains. If his own ideal conclusions on matters political, scientific, or æsthetic are correct, they will be realized by trusting to the unimpeded advance of the democracy. If they are wrong, he will rejoice to think that his efforts will be cancelled by those of better men. Be he individualist or socialist, he will loyally accept the verdict of the people.

It is for the statesman to decide whether any given society is or is not fit for the ideal condition (as he pictures it), whether it is or is not ripe for newer and freer institutions. If he tries to force on an immature society institutions borrowed from one in a more advanced stage of development, the result will be, not to hasten, but to retard the evolution of that society. Witness the disastrous effect of thrusting the English land system upon the Irish people at a time when they had not yet emerged from the stage of tribal ownership. A like attempt has recently been made to introduce into India free institutions for which her people are not ready. The motive was generous, but the effect mischievous and cruel. Again, the Bengal settlement of a century ago was a premature attempt to supplant cumbrous and apparently unprogressive land laws by the advanced English system of individual ownership. The result is, that after a hundred years of experiment the grievances of both zemindars and ryots are such as to provoke even honest men to trifle with England's honour and credit, and to violate the solemn pledges of the nation, in the vain hope of alleviating some of the attendant ills. No dose of pure theorizing will solve these and the like problems. It is for the statesman to say whether it is better to revert to the old system, or whether the new has taken enough root-hold to render such reversion even more undesirable than the continuance of the effort to adapt the people to the system, instead of adapting the system to the people. It is for the surgeon to decide whether it is better to leave a dislocated

joint of some standing in the new socket which has been formed, or to re-set the joint in the old socket. It is a question for a surgeon; and here again theory goes for nothing. Personal liberty is the final outcome of social evolution, and not the cause. The wider the area, the greater the number and diversity of conflicting interests, the nigher will be the advent of individualism. As each class and each individual fights for his own hand, he will find that the lowest price at which he can obtain his own greatest freedom is the granting of equal liberty to others, in certain departments of activity which experience, and experience alone, can demarcate.

Whether we regard the question from a positive or a negative point of view—as the science of law or the science of liberty—we shall find that, in order to be of any value, our work must take the form of an inductive science; and it must deal with the facts of social organization, and not with high-sounding sentiments, however sublimely conceived—with the *Naturrecht* of the school of Savigny, not with the *droit naturel* of the school of Rousseau. Until this is conceded, we can have no stable foundation on which to base a sound and progressive individualism.

Since liberty is the complement of law, it is impossible to understand liberty without understanding law. If the actions of individuals were so controlled and subordinated to the group as to leave no liberty whatever, we should have a state of absolute socialism. This is actually the case with the individual cells or groups of cells which together constitute the human body. The cells have, so to speak, "lost their identity." The welfare of the human being, or other highly-developed animal, is alone the end consciously aimed at and unconsciously approached, without reference to the separate interests of the cells of which he is made up. This is absolute socialism, and we must therefore beware of reasoning too much concerning social matters by analogy. If, on the other hand, the welfare of the group as a whole is absolutely ignored, and there is no combined or organized action to interfere with the separate interests of the individuals composing it, then we have absolute anarchy. This is precisely the case with many races of wild animals, especially the Carnivora. The welfare of the race as a group or whole is ignored, and the units alone are considered. Thus we may take a tiger as representing in his person absolute socialism and absolute anarchy—socialism in his internal relations, anarchy in his external relations. If we take tigerkind as the whole, and tigers as the units of which it is made up, we see that there is an anarchic relation between the whole and the parts. If we take a tiger as the whole and the cells (which in the remote past were

individuals having separate feelings and interests) as the units of which it is made up, we see that there is a socialistic relation between the whole and the parts.

The whole history of civilization is the history of a struggle to establish a relation between society and its units—between the whole and its parts—which is neither absolute socialism nor absolute anarchy; but a state in which, by action and reaction of each upon each, such an adaptation shall take place, that the welfare of the whole and that of the units shall eventually become coincident and not antagonistic. Such is the problem of civilization—of the development of the hyper-organism: integration without impairing the individuality of the component units. The final result to which we shall ever approximate, but never attain, will be perfect civil liberty, or the greatest liberty which is compatible with the utmost well-being of society as a whole; and perfect law, or such subordination of the individual will to that of society as may be compatible with the utmost well-being of the individual.

The outcome of these reflections seems to be, that just as from parental sympathy springs State interference, which when developed casts off every shred of sympathy and antipathy, even to the extent of awarding to Shylock his pound of flesh; so from special interferences, through a long process of generalization and friction, springs law, which in its final development is as incommensurable in terms of justice as is an oak tree in terms of gravitation and molecular repulsion. Growing out of justice, as the living, thinking animal grows (or grew) out of inorganic matter, it cannot be resolved by man into its component elements. And the process is going on around us to-day.

While then we may say that the law is a fairly coherent body of rules prohibiting the exercise of certain kinds of force (superior faculties) in certain classes of cases, it is not possible to say off-hand, or to discover on paper, what those kinds of force are, or what are the classes of cases in which their exercise is prohibited. This can only be done by a careful and exhaustive examination of the laws themselves, by subjecting them to a searching analysis, by a scientific instead of a popular and superficial classification of their matter, and, in short, by a process of rigid induction.

Thus are we brought to a position the very opposite of that taken up by those who would test every law by the standard of justice. We have reached the standpoint of Bentham, who cared nothing for vapourings about justice, but who would test every law by its effects on the welfare of society. (It is true he substituted the welfare of the greatest number for the welfare of the group; but this is immaterial here.) We are in the same



boat with those who, rejecting the appeal to abstract virtue as a test of the goodness or fitness of their actions, substitute the ultimate welfare of the individual. A practical test is as far from view as when we started. Hence the persistence with which the need should be insisted on for the thorough study of law in the concrete, and *the discovery*—not the manufacture—of the true statual laws which are actually operative in societies; of their tendency, and of the dynamical laws of their change and development. It is by the discovery of these laws that we shall find ourselves in possession of true and useful practical guides through the labyrinth of legislation and politics. We shall arrive at rules which are neither so simple as that enjoining an equal deal at cards, nor so vague and inapplicable as that which requires us to follow the effects of an action, down through its million ramifications, to the utmost ends of time.

The art of politics is the application of the science of nomology to the concrete; just as engineering is the application to human wants of the science of mechanics, and as navigation is one of the arts based on the science of astronomy. Until we have mastered the science we shall make but little progress with the corresponding art. Till Adam Smith laid the foundations of modern economics the fiscal policy of the Government was a game of perpetual see-saw between rival crotcheters. All was rule of thumb. So is it to-day with the great question of liberty and law. Yesterday we were all free traders and advocates of "let be"; to-day we are on the high road to socialism; to-morrow the Fates only know where we shall be. The only cure for this policy of drift is a patient and intelligent study of nomology, whereby middle principles of practical application will be brought to light, and the absurd fallacies of social doctrinaires put to flight for ever.

---

ART. VIII.—THE GROWTH OF COLONIAL ENGLAND :  
BRITISH SOUTH AFRICA.

1. *Our South African Empire*. By WILLIAM GRESWELL, M.A., F.R.C.I. In two volumes. London : Chapman and Hall, Limited. 1885.
2. *History, Productions, and Resources of the Cape of Good Hope*. Official Handbook. Edited by JOHN NOBLE, Clerk of the House of Assembly, Cape Town. Published for the Colonial and Indian Exhibition Committee by Saul Solomon & Co., Government Contractors. 1886.
3. *Her Majesty's Colonies*. A Series of Original Papers issued under the authority of the Royal Commission of the Colonial and Indian Exhibition. London : William Clowes and Sons, Limited, 13 Charing Cross. 1886.
4. *The Statesman's Year-Book for 1886*. Edited by J. SCOTT KELTIE. Twenty-third annual publication. London : Macmillan and Co. 1886.
5. *Africa*. By the late KEITH JOHNSTON, F.R.G.S. Third Edition, revised and corrected by E. G. RAVENSTEIN, F.R.G.S.; with Ethnological Appendix, by A. H. KEANE, M.A.I. London : Edward Stanford, 55 Charing Cross, S.W. 1884.
6. *The Colonial Office List for 1886*. Compiled from Official Records, by the permission of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, by EDWARD FAIRFIELD, C.M.G., and JOHN ANDERSON, of the Colonial Office. London : Harrison and Sons, 59 Pall Mall. 1886.

**M**R. GRESWELL'S two agreeably written volumes may fairly claim to hold the field as the best history of "Our South African Empire" yet presented to English readers. His attempt to give a conspectus of many of the principal events in South African history has been amply justified by the success he has won, alike in showing the dependence of momentous effects upon apparently trifling causes, and in tracing the intricate workings of many an involved policy and the doubtful driftings of a too often confused line of action. Sound in his views, which are comprehensive and exact, he is happy in his expression of them, and has achieved a remarkable success in keeping himself and his idiosyncrasies (if he has any) completely out of sight. While attributing the advent of the British in South Africa to their fear lest the French—in the course of the

death struggle that was going on in Europe—should seize the Cape peninsula, and thereby command the ocean route to India, he candidly admits that they brought with them the true colonizing instinct, such as they had already displayed in North America; and that South Africa, upon their assuming the direction of affairs, began at once to move forward. Some years previous to the actual occupation of the Cape by the English authorities, Lord North had pointed out its importance as constituting “the physical guarantee of our Indian possessions,” but affairs in other parts of the world hindered his taking steps to secure Great Britain in the possession of so invaluable a security.

Nothing is more noticeable in reading a series of books treating of the same historical subject than the disagreement they exhibit in the matter of dates and details. In the present instance one would expect to find the date of the arrival in Table Bay of Van Riebeck and his comrades—the first formal European settlers in South Africa—placed beyond doubt; but in fact it is variously given—as April 5 by Mr. Greswell, April 6 by Mr. Noble, and April 7 by the late Sir Bartle Frere! Each of these three writers admits, however, that Van Riebeck landed in April 1652, and marked out the site of the fort he was instructed to build.

A more difficult instance of reconciling dates is found in the case of the discovery of Natal by Vasco da Gama. Sir Bartle Frere states that he “passed the Cape in November 1497, and subsequently reached India,” but does not mention the discovery of Natal. Mr. Noble says da Gama “doubled the Cape of Good Hope on the 20th of March 1497, and, after touching at Natal and Mozambique, successfully reached India in the following month of May.” “The Colonial Office List,” Silver’s “Handbook to South Africa,” and Mr. Johnston’s “Africa” all state that da Gama, after passing the Cape discovered Natal on Christmas Day 1497. But Mr. Noble ought to have an authority equal to that of the three compilations named, and it would be interesting to know how he justifies his dates. The writer of the paper on Cape Colony in “Her Majesty’s Colonies” should correct in the later editions of that valuable compilation, which are certain to be needed, the obvious slip of the pen which makes him say that Vasco da Gama touched at the Cape *two* (instead of ten) years later than Dias. But surely Mr. Greswell might have made himself certain as to whether the Albany settlers sent out in 1820 numbered 6000 (Preface xiv. and page 29) or 4000 (page 73). As a matter of fact, we believe the number was *five* thousand, the number given by Mr. Noble. Leaving all further criticism upon “matters of detail,” such as the above, we gladly recognize the accurate and

careful manner in which the works heading this paper have evidently been prepared; and welcoming especially the eloquent preface written by Professor Seeley to "Her Majesty's Colonies," we pass on to the subject immediately concerning us—namely, the growth of British South Africa.

The first event connected with temperate South Africa of which we have undoubted record is the doubling of the Cape of Good Hope in 1486 by Bartholomew Dias, the Portuguese navigator. Towards the close of the summer of that year the King of Portugal, John II., sent out two ships of fifty tons each, and a tender laden with surplus supplies of food, to proceed along the coast of Africa southwards, with the hope of discovering a passage to India. According to Portuguese custom, the navigators were provided with stone pillars, shaped in the form of a cross, to be erected at such capes, bays, and headlands as they discovered; and amongst other points selected for this purpose was the southern point of the Orange River mouth (now the north-western boundary of the Cape Colony), which was named Cape Voltas, from the many "tacks" (*voltas*) needed to be made by the vessels on account of the adverse winds they encountered.

Proceeding seawards, they passed beyond the southernmost extremity of the continent, and, after directing their course eastwards for some days in the hope of reaching land, they turned their vessels' heads northwards, and finally discovered the present Flesh Bay, near Gauritz River, which they named "Los Vaquiros," or the Bay of Cowherds, "on account of the number of cattle they saw on land tended by native herdsmen." Proceeding further along the coast, they arrived in Algoa Bay, and landed on a small island, where one of the stone crosses was set up, and the name "Santa Cruce" given to the place. Mr. Noble, clerk of the Cape House of Assembly, whose recently published "volume on the History, Productions, and Resources of the Cape of Good Hope has been undertaken and prepared at the request of the Committee appointed by the Government for the representation of the Colony at the Colonial and Indian Exhibition," now being held in London, tells us, in the very interesting chapter on the "Discovery and Early History of the Cape," that "there were two springs on the island, which lead some to call it 'Fountain Rock,' and by both names the island is still known. The chief interest in the place is that it was the first land beyond the Cape which was trodden by European feet." Owing to the exhausted condition of his crews, and their unwillingness to voyaging eastwards, Dias was unable to proceed more than twenty-five leagues further; but he had the satisfaction of discovering the estuary now known as the mouth of the Great Fish River.

"We observe that Mr. Noble has adopted the correction offered by Mr. Major,\* and accepted by the late Sir Bartle Frere in his paper read before the Royal Historical Society in May 1883, that it was on Dias's *return* voyage that he first sighted the mountain range of the Cape Peninsula, and that it was "in remembrance of the rough seas they had passed through in doubling it, that Dias and his companions named the cape "Cabo de los Tormentos," or Cape of Storms.

Returning home, Dias reached Portugal in December 1487, having been out sixteen months and seventeen days, and announced his discovery to King John. That monarch, perceiving that the long-looked-for passage by sea to India was almost certainly promised by the recent voyage, promptly changed the name of the cape to that of "Cabo de Boâ Esperança"—THE CAPE OF GOOD HOPE.

Ten years later, Vasco da Gama was sent out from Portugal in command of a fleet with the object of reaching India. This object was achieved, for, after doubling the Cape of Good Hope in March 1497, and touching at Natal and Mozambique, India was reached in the following month of May. Beyond erecting stone crosses on some of the principal promontories, the Portuguese do not appear to have made any systematic attempt at a permanent occupation of the southern continent of which they were the undoubted discoverers. English and Dutch navigators, however, soon followed their lead; and in 1579 the Rev. Thomas Stevens, a Roman Catholic priest, who was wrecked near Cape Agulhas, gives the first account in English of the Cape recorded by an eye-witness. It is not inviting. To him the country appeared in no enticing aspect, being "full of tigers and savages, who kill all strangers."

The first English expedition, despatched to the East Indies in 1591, touched at the Cape; Captain James Lancaster, the Arctic explorer, being in command, owing to the loss of Admiral Raymond, who went down in his flag-ship. The fleet having sailed from Plymouth on the 10th of April, the crews were very sickly when they anchored in Table Bay on the 1st August, and the opportunity of obtaining a few cattle from the natives was little short of the means of saving the expedition from failure. Ten years later (in 1601), Lancaster, then in command of the first fleet of the English East India Company, comprising five ships, again visited the Cape.

"His crews had so suffered from scurvy that only Lancaster's own ship could drop her anchors, and he had to go in his boat to assist his

---

\* Late Keeper of the Department of Maps and Charts in the British Museum, and Vice-President of the Royal Geographical Society.

consorts in anchoring. Seven weeks ashore restored the survivors to health. Davis, another famous Arctic voyager, who had visited the Cape in the Dutch service in 1593, revisited it in 1607.\*

Shortly after the establishment of the East India Company, a similar body was constituted by uniting the various trading companies recently formed at Amsterdam, Rotterdam, and other towns, under the title of the "Netherlands General East India Company." This powerful body was incorporated by charter from the States General, under the date 20th March 1602. There were appointed six chambers at the principal towns, to whom was entrusted the election of "the seventeen" directors. Very considerable privileges were granted to the Company, which so prospered that for upwards of a century the dividends averaged above twenty per cent. During the sixteenth century the Cape was used as a place of call by the Portuguese, English, and Dutch engaged in the trade with the East. It was not, however, until the year 1619 that any serious intention of occupying the district was declared. In that year the Chamber of Seventeen were in communication with the directors of the English East India Company as to the advisability of founding a fort at the Cape as a joint establishment. Nothing was decided upon; and what at first appeared to be a decisive step was taken by the irresponsible action of two English captains, who, on June 3, 1620, formally took possession of the Cape, and the adjoining country in the name of King James I. This bold course of Captain Andrew Shillinge and Captain Humphrey Fitzherbert—worthy predecessors of the Imperial school of the present day—was not recognized by the King nor by the East India Company, whose captains apparently preferred the island of St. Helena as their place of call on their voyages to and from the East Indies. A generation passed away, during which closer attention was given to the claims of the Cape, and positive and practical evidence of its value was afforded on the occasion of the wreck, in Table Bay, in 1648, of the Dutch Indiaman, the *Haarlem*. Five months elapsed before the shipwrecked crew were taken off by the outward-bound fleet from Holland. In that time a quantity of vegetable seeds, which had been saved amongst the ship's stores, had been planted near the site of the present Cape Town, and had grown luxuriantly. Moreover, the sick men rapidly recovered their health, and abundance of game was found in the neighbourhood. Finally, the natives were friendly, and freely supplied cattle; so that a very favourable

\* "Historical Sketch of South Africa." A Paper read before the Royal Historical Society, in May 1883, by the late Right Hon. Sir Bartle Frere, Bart., G.C.B., G.C.S.I.

opinion of the capacity of the district was formed by the crew of the *Haarlem*, and two of them, whose names are deserving of record on the ground of their being directly instrumental in the European occupation of the Cape, Leendert Janssen and Nicholas Proot, drew up "a remonstrance," in which they urged upon the Netherlands East India Company the immediate formation of a garden and the building of a fort at Table Bay. In accordance with the dilatory character of the Dutchman, two years were passed in discussing the project, which had received the approval of a surgeon, Jan Antony van Riebeck, himself a great voyager and having a practical knowledge of the Cape. And now the actual occupation of the Cape was resolved upon; an expedition of three vessels, the *Dromedaris*, the *Reiger*, and the *Goede Hoop*, being equipped and despatched under the command of Van Riebeck. On Sunday, 7th April 1652, after a voyage of 104 days from the Texel, having escaped all dangers of the sea, and the more likely chance of being seized by Prince Rupert (then cruising between St. Helena and Table Bay on the watch for homeward-bound Indiamen), the three ships safely anchored off Freshwater River, and in the evening Van Riebeck landed and selected the site of the fort, and so began the first European settlement in South Africa.

Very considerable hardship and discomfort were at first experienced by the new-comers. They, however, found the natives were of a friendly disposition, and willing to barter cattle with them. As the object of the settlement was to furnish supplies to the outward and homeward bound ships, and as the principal supplies in the shape of sheep and cattle were only to be obtained from the Hottentot tribes, special care was observed in treating them well, and any one found abusing or ill-treating them was punished by flogging in the presence of the natives.

In reply to a suggestion of Van Riebeck, that the original plan of settlement might be extended, and some free men allowed to become resident at the Cape as "boers," or farmers, authority was given by the Company in 1656 to nine soldiers and sailors, who then received their discharge and were granted the privileges of free men and burghers, "to enlarge the cultivation of the lands for the promotion of agriculture and the growth of all kinds of garden produce."

In addition to the discharged soldiers and sailors, some four or five families of the Company's servants were allowed to cultivate gardens for themselves free of rent for three years, and to sell the produce to ships calling in the bay; at the same time the women and children were removed from the list of those receiving "free rations," and a money payment was made to

the head of each family. On February 21, 1657, the first allotments of land were made to the "free burghers" in the locality now known as the delightful suburb of Rondebosch. When, however, the Kaapman Hottentots returned from their annual excursion inland, and found the white men ploughing the ground where they were wont to dig out roots for their winter food, and where their cattle had been accustomed to graze from time immemorial, they became alarmed, and showed their resentment by sweeping off the colonists' cattle, and murdering one of the Dutchmen acting as herdsman. Hence arose the first of the wars with the natives, which was carried on for some months, and finally ended in 1660 by the Hottentots suing for peace. The news of the war greatly disconcerted the authorities in Holland, whose hopes of a peaceful occupation of the Cape were thus rudely dispelled. They suggested that arrangements should be made for acquiring lands by purchase, and, according to Mr. Noble,

a purchase was made in 1672 from two of the Hottentot chiefs, who claimed to be hereditary sovereigns of all the country from the Cape peninsula to Saldanha Bay, "lands, rivers, creeks, forests, and pastures inclusive;" but with the condition that where the colonists did not occupy the arable lands or pastures, the natives might erect their kraals and graze their cattle freely. The purchase-money of this cession was paid for in brandy, tobacco, beads, and merchandize of the value of little more than one hundred florins, or not quite ten pounds sterling.\*

While, on the one hand, the Company so far treated the "free burghers" generously as to supply them well (on credit) with cattle, implements, and seed, and even imported slaves for their domestic use, as no servants could be hired from the Hottentots; on the other hand care was taken that the Company should be lords and masters of the settlement in every way. This object was effected by forbidding the inhabitants buying anything except from the Company's store and at the Company's price, and by binding the "free burghers" to deliver all their produce to the Company on terms to be fixed at the discretion of its officers. All trade with natives and foreigners was stringently prohibited, and there were restrictions on the variety of crops to be raised, and on the intercourse they carried on with the crews of ships visiting the port.

After nearly eleven years of service, Van Riebeck was able to show that the main object of his appointment had been accomplished by the conversion of the Cape Settlement from a barren

---

\* "Official Handbook," by Mr. John Noble, p. 10.



waste into a desirable place for the refreshment of the fleets of Dutch East Indiamen (there being actually stored in the granaries thirty-two tons of grain, the produce of one harvest, and the Hottentots regularly supplying cattle), and in compliance with his earnest prayer he was promoted to the government of Malacca, afterwards becoming Secretary to the Batavian Council. His son, born in the first year after the settlement at the Cape (1653) rose to the high position of Governor-General of the Dutch East Indies.

In 1680 the number of colonial burghers had largely increased, new men (Germans, Danes, Flemings, and Dutch) taking their discharge year by year, and trying their fortune as colonial proprietors. Including the Company's servants and the burghers and their families, the European population amounted to about six hundred souls. Governor Van der Stell, finding from his excursions into the neighbouring country that there was abundance of excellent land only waiting to be tilled to produce most plenteously, wrote to the Council of Seventeen that, "as our colonists chiefly consist of strong, gallant, and industrious bachelors, who for the solace of their cares and for the managing of domestic concerns, would most gladly be married, and as such bonds would establish the colony on an immovable basis, we request that thirty or forty respectable young women be sent out, all of whom will be well disposed of in this place." The Directors were favourably impressed with the request; and a few years later (in 1687) the Chambers of Amsterdam and Delft informed Van der Stell that, in addition to other freemen, some French and Piedmontese refugees were willing to emigrate to the Cape.

Among them [says the despatch] are persons who understand the culture of the vine, who will in time be able to benefit the Company and themselves. We consider that, as these people know how to manage with very little, they will without difficulty be able to accommodate themselves to their work at the Cape, also especially as they feel themselves safe under a mild Government, and freed from the persecution which they suffered. It will be your duty, as they are destitute of everything, on their arrival to furnish them with what they may require for their subsistence until they are settled and can earn their own livelihood.

Upon their arrival at the Cape, these Huguenot refugees, numbering about three hundred men, women, and children, were mostly located on the lands along the Berg River Valley, where they became within a few years a self-supporting community. The Government that had boasted of its mildness, was not sufficiently humane to allow the refugees to preserve their

language; and after discouraging, by order of the Company, the teaching of the French tongue by the Huguenots to their children, the use of French in addressing the Government upon official matters was prohibited in 1709; and in 1724 the reading of the lessons at the church service in the French language took place for the last time. Le Vaillant, the French naturalist, who visited the Cape in 1780, states that he found only one old man who understood French. And Mr. Noble tells us that before the close of last century the language had quite ceased to be spoken.

The state of the country under the rule of the Dutch Company during the eighteenth century is thus concisely sketched by Mr. Noble:—

There was a continuous but vain struggle on the part of the free burghers to obtain some relaxation of the capricious and oppressive enactments of the Government, which not only excluded them from participation in foreign trade, but hampered them in all their transactions. In 1719, representations were made to the directors that, unless some alteration of the system was conceded, the inhabitants would no longer be able to find subsistence, and would be compelled to ask the Company to take them back again into their service. The concession they prayed for was the liberty of free trade along the coast, and to Sofala, Mozambique, and Madagascar. By means of such trade, it was urged, the poor inhabitants, who were only versed in agriculture, would find a living in the various occupations connected with navigation; the corn, wine, and other produce raised in the colony might, with greater convenience and profit, be sold; and if the coast traffic were to succeed, a good lot of merchandize would be bought from the Company to traffic with, so that the latter would also be greatly benefited. To gain this object, they added that they would be prepared to pay a reasonable import and export duty.\*

Foreign trade, however, in any form except in their own hands, was not acceptable to the Company, and the burghers met with no favour. They were assured that the Company would receive all the produce they could deliver so long as there was sufficient consumption, and that the surplus of such articles as the Company did not need might be sold by the owners to foreign ships in Table Bay upon the payment of a small duty in the shape of a fee to the fiscal. This privilege the burghers availed themselves of upon the occasion of the English and French fleets victualling at the Cape; an increased consumption of their produce enabled the residents in and around Cape Town to enlarge their houses and extend their farming operations; but when, in consequence of European wars, foreign fleets no longer touched at Table Bay, the colonists again felt the want

---

\* "Official Handbook," p. 17.

of a market and were reduced to an impoverished state. Hence arose a disposition on the part of many of the "free burghers," or "boers" as those engaged in agriculture were called, to remove from the neighbourhood of the garrison at Cape Town. "They crossed the mountain ranges and passed into the inland plains, where they obtained a subsistence by imitating the native mode of life, killing game and depasturing cattle." Thus the early Cape "boers" adopted the nomad habit of "trekking," which simply meant enlarging the range of their occupation of new land and a further advance into the interior. The advance may be traced from the various extensions of the boundary of the colony. Thus in 1745 a magistracy and a church were established at Swellendam, the Gamtoos River being then declared the farthest limit of the settlement; and forty years later, in 1786, a magistracy was established at Graaff Reinet, "to prevent hostilities with the natives, and any foreign power settling at Algoa Bay;" and the Great Fish River was proclaimed (exactly 300 years after its discovery by Dias) as the boundary of the Company's possessions.

In their advance through the fertile plains of the interior, the settlers were constantly exposed on the north to the hostility of the "bushmen"—who were widely spread over the country from the Nieuwveldt and Camdeboo mountains to the Orange River—and on the east they came in contact with the more warlike and formidable Kafirs. For the purpose of mutual defence the "boers" of a district assembled in a band called a "commando," which comprised all the adult males, and was placed under the control of a "field commandant" in each district, and a "field-cornet" in each subdivision of a district. How desperately the "commandoes" dealt with the bushmen may be estimated from the statement of Mr. Noble, that "the official records of Graaf-Reinet show that between 1786 and 1794 upwards of two hundred persons were murdered (?) by the bushmen, and that the number of the latter killed by "commandoes" was not far short of two thousand five hundred!"

The long-continued prosperity of the Dutch East India Company declined with the close of the eighteenth century; there were complaints of misgovernment from all its settlements and colonies; and in Cape Colony the long-growing discontent developed into "revolution," and on the 6th of February 1795 the inhabitants of Swellendam and Graaf-Reinet assembled in arms and expelled their magistrates, declaring they would no longer obey the Dutch East India Company, but would be independent. Alas, for their sighing for independence! A power, stronger than the Dutch Company ever had been, was

even then on the point of annexing their possessions: for the occupation of Holland by the French revolutionists had driven the Prince of Orange as a refugee to England; and, with his concurrence, an English fleet with troops, under Admiral Elphinstone and Generals Clarke and Craig, forcibly took possession of the colony in the name of the King of Great Britain on September 16, 1795.

An effort was made in the following year by the Dutch for the recapture of the Cape, but the result raises a smile as we read that "the Dutch squadron which was fitted out for the purpose, numbering nine vessels of war, with 342 guns and 2000 troops, under command of Rear-Admiral Lucas, was captured by Admiral Elphinstone, *without any resistance*, in the harbour of Saldanha Bay, in August 1796."

By the peace of Amiens in 1803 the Cape was restored to the Dutch; but on the war being renewed, General Sir David Baird, after a brief but honourable struggle, captured the colony, which, in consideration of a payment of two or three millions sterling to the King of the Netherlands, was finally ceded in 1815 in perpetuity to the British Crown.

During the temporary occupation of the Cape by the English, from 1795 to 1803, great good was done to the colony itself. Its importance as a military possession and the "key to the East," involved the construction of defensive works, and the maintenance of a considerable armed force at Cape Town. No less than a million and a half of English money is estimated to have been spent in the colony, whose exports at that time were less than £15,000 a year, and whose European population was not above 25,000 in number.

It was, however, by the wise government of Admiral Elphinstone and of General Craig that the material welfare of the people was most advanced. Every measure was adopted best calculated to promote the general prosperity. The monopolies and restrictions upon the internal trade of the colony were declared at an end; and every person might sell his produce to whom and in what manner he pleased. All inhabitants were at liberty to exercise any trade or profession they chose. The coast navigation was entirely free to all, and there was no longer any restraint upon the possession of boats or vessels by which the colonists might convey their produce to a market.

As was only to be expected, matters in the country districts were not immediately settled. The transfer of power was not at once understood as meaning a rigid obedience to the authorities at Cape Town, and for some years disturbances prevailed, though as a rule there was very little bloodshed.

From the date of the surrender, in 1806, to General Sir David

Baird, a new era was entered upon by the colony. At that time the total population was 73,663 souls, of whom 26,720 were of European descent. The lands in occupation consisted of 96 places, located in the districts of Cape Town, Cape District, Stellenbosch, Swellendam, Graaff-Reinet, Uitenhage, and Tulbagh.

The first event of importance after the colony became a British possession was the expulsion of certain Kafir tribes from the eastern districts, where they had become very troublesome neighbours, and their being driven across the Great Fish River. This was accomplished in 1811, but great difficulty was experienced in preventing their return; and in 1817, upon the district being visited by Lord Charles Somerset, who had become governor in 1814, he advised the Home Government to send out some thousands of British settlers to occupy the country, and to form an impassable barrier to the Kafirs.

Although Lord Somerset clearly set forth the dangers the new settlers would experience from the neighbourhood of the hostile Kafirs, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, when asking for a vote of £50,000 for the encouragement of emigration to the Cape, made no reference to this disadvantage, and the glowing account of the country, as being unrivalled in the world for its climate, natural beauty, and fertility, so provoked the eagerness of individuals to proceed to South Africa, that no fewer than 90,000 made application to be sent over, while only some 5000 could be accepted and provided for. The emigrants were required to be of good character, and no one was accepted who was not able to deposit with the Government at the rate of £10 for every family going out under his leadership.

Free passages were provided by the Government, and a free grant of land at the rate of 100 acres for every family or adult person taken out was made to the leaders.\* The first transport ships, the *Nautilus*, *Ocean*, and *Chapman*, arrived in Algoa Bay in April 1820, and were shortly followed by twenty-

---

\* Extract from an official circular, issued from Downing Street, London, 1819, addressed to "Colonists to the Cape of Good Hope":—"The Government have determined to confine the application of the money recently voted by Address in the House of Commons to those persons who, possessing the means, will engage to carry out, at the least, ten able-bodied individuals above 18 years of age, with or without families . . . . Every person engaging to take out the above mentioned number of persons or families shall deposit at the rate of £10 (to be repaid as hereinafter mentioned) for every family so taken out, provided that the family does not consist of more than one man, one woman, and two children under 14 years of age. All children above the number of two will be required to be paid for, in addition to the deposit above-mentioned, £5 for every two children under 14 years, and £5 for every person between 14 and 18 years of age."—*Annual Register* for 1819, p. 314.

three other vessels, bringing out the remainder of the emigrants. The landing-place was then unnamed; it was "a mere wave-washed beach;" but the Acting-Governor, Sir Rufane Shaw Donkin, anticipating that British enterprise and energy would convert it into an important commercial port, named it after his wife, Lady Elizabeth Donkin, and "Port Elizabeth" thus started into being, and became famous as the landing-place of the first body of English settlers on the shores of South Africa.

Some few detached parties of the settlers \* were distributed in the western parts of the colony; the Scotch settlers, under the lead of Mr. Pringle, were located in the Somerset district; but the main body, numbering nearly 4000 souls, were allotted lands between the Fish River and Bushman's River—on the extreme eastern border of the colony, and in the neighbourhood of Graham's Town, then a mere military post on the frontier, named after Colonel Graham, who had commanded in the Kafir war of 1811, but which soon sprang up into a place of importance as the chief town of the new district of Albany.

Considerable and unlooked-for hardships at first attended the young settlement. Wheat was at once and extensively sown in all parts of the settlement, and the crops promised well in their early stage. Just as the grains formed in the ear, the blight known as "rust" attacked them, and the whole crop became worthless. The same misfortune happened in the two or three succeeding seasons; but a worse calamity followed in the long-continued and heavy floods which damaged seriously houses, gardens, and stock. Relief was generously afforded to the almost despairing settlers, both from England and India, and the commissariat of the frontier army, by continuing to supply rations, kept off absolute want. Still, there were some inquiries as to the advisability of leaving the country and emigrating to Brazil. Fortunately, however, the innate British pluck prevailed, and the settlers bravely faced and overcame each fresh disaster with renewed courage and undiminished energy.

The establishment, in 1821, of a fair at Fort Wilshire, on the banks of the Keiskamma river (some thirty miles beyond the boundary of the colony), encouraged barter with the natives who brought elephants' tusks, corn, gum, mats, baskets, skins of wild animals, &c., and exchanged them for such stock as the English traders had, and which mostly consisted of beads, buttons, blankets, pots, brass and tinware. Thus commenced a

---

\* Among the "heads of parties" were gentlemen of high acquirements and good family connections, retired military and naval officers, and other persons of the greatest respectability; while the parties themselves comprised all kinds of handicraftsmen and husbandmen."—*Official Handbook*, p 53.

commerce which the settlers rapidly pushed, both with the natives and amongst the Dutch colonists; and many large and successful mercantile establishments owe their present prosperity to the foundations based upon the trifling transactions which took place at the fort.

The close of 1821 brought back Lord Charles Somerset, who showed great dissatisfaction with all that Sir Rufane Donkin had done in his absence : \*

† A settlement, named Fredericksburg, on the river Beka, formed of the half-pay officers and discharged soldiers of the African corps, was ordered to be abandoned; the fair at Fort Wilshire was abolished, and traffic with the natives was forbidden; a line of posts along the Fish River, which had previously effectually protected the settlers, was withdrawn; the seat of magistracy was removed from Bathurst to Graham's Town, and the magistrate appointed by Sir Rufane Donkin superseded. These acts created a general distrust in the stability of the measures of the Government; and a number of the principal settlers made arrangements for holding a meeting at Graham's Town to express their opinion, in true British manner, on the state of public affairs. Lord Somerset being informed of their intention, immediately issued a high-handed proclamation, notifying that public meetings for the discussion of public matters and political subjects were contrary to the ancient laws and usages of the colony, and any one attempting any assemblage of such nature without his sanction, or that of the local magistrate in distant districts, was guilty of a high misdemeanour, severely punishable. ‡

The settlers, thus baffled, addressed a memorial to the Secretary of State in 1823, and prefaced their complaints by stating that they did not complain of the natural disadvantages of the country to which they had been sent, and that they had ever been actuated by one undivided feeling of respect and gratitude for the liberal assistance of the British Government, "a feeling which future reverses can never efface." Chief among the grievances set forth were the insecurity of the border and the depredations of the Kafirs, which, they asserted, were in a great measure due to the vacillating policy of the Colonial Government.

Within a few years the Albany settlers experienced the result of one of the periodical descents of the tribes of the interior, who, from a variety of causes, were constantly pouring down from central Africa, and driving before them the tribes dwelling near the coast. The frontier Kafirs were thrown into a state

---

\* It is stated by Mr. Noble (p. 55) that Sir R. Donkin had reprimanded Captain Somerset for some infraction of military discipline, and that Lord Somerset, siding with his son, refused to meet Sir R. Donkin on his arrival at Government House.

† "Official Handbook," pp. 55, 56.

of panic by the irruption in their midst of hordes of "Fetcani," who proved to be a tribe of Zulus known as Amangwane, themselves flying from the wrath of the renowned Chaka. The Kafirs of the border (known as Tembus and Gcalekas) being threatened by the new comers, Governor Bourke resolved to assist them, and called upon some of the young Albany settlers to join the burgher "commando," and aid in repelling the invaders. The marauders were defeated near the river Umtata \* in 1828, and many of them after their defeat were admitted within the borders of the colony to serve as free labourers.

About this time the Kafir chiefs, Gaika and his uncle T'Slambie, died, and the removal of their authority allowed younger chiefs to come to the front, with the result that they broke the peace by attacking another tribe, driving them within the borders of the colony, and there slaying them. For this outrage, Macomo, a son of Gaika, and his people were expelled from the territory they had been allowed to occupy during good behaviour, and as they persisted in returning, the military patrol, charged with the duty of removing them, destroyed their kraals and seized some of their cattle; a skirmish ensued, blood was shed, and the Kafir war of 1834 broke out. On the morning of December 23, 1834, ten thousand † Kafirs crossed the border, slew fifty farmers within a week, burned hundreds of homesteads, and returned into Kafirland laden with spoil. The fears expressed in the memorial of the Albany settlers in 1823 were sadly fulfilled, and the evil result may be laid at the door of those whose supineness had left the border without an efficient defence.

Colonel Smith (better known as Sir Harry) mustered all the available forces of the colony, himself rode from Cape Town to Graham's Town, a distance of six hundred miles, and was at the frontier within six days of the news reaching him. Several months' fighting followed before the Kafirs were subdued. Sir Benjamin Durban, as an indemnity for the past and a security for the future, proclaimed the British sovereignty to be extended over the territory of the tribes as far as the Kei River. The natives were to be left on their lands, and between them and the Albany district a number of the Fetcani refugees, named Fingoes, who had been kept as slaves by the Gcalekas, and had taken no part in the war, were placed in the district now known as Peddie. Lord Glenelg, probably the most incapable of a long line of incompetent colonial secretaries, reversed the pro-

---

\* Now forming the boundary between Tembuland and Pondoland.

† The "Colonial Office List," says 20,000; Mr. Greswell says "no fewer than 30,000 of the Gaika tribes."



clamation of Sir B. Durban, whose expostulations brought about the close of his services in the colony. "His retirement from office, however, called forth a universal expression of regret, as well as substantial tokens of affection and gratitude on the part of the colonists."

By this time a series of causes had so prejudicially affected the Dutch colonists of the western districts, who considered the Government had broken their pledge to redeem the colonial paper currency, and who were especially aggrieved, first by the promulgation of the law, in 1826, for ameliorating the condition of their slaves, and then by their actual emancipation in 1833, that they had begun to "trek," or move away into the interior, in order to escape from the rule of those whose nationality differed from their own, and whose care for their interests and safety seemed to them so indifferent. During 1835 and the following years the exodus continued, until it was estimated that nearly ten thousand men, women, and children had crossed the Orange River into the wilderness beyond. Upon the subject of the great "trek" Mr. Greswell very sensibly remarks :

Upon this act of voluntary expatriation too much sentiment need not be expended, when it is considered that the uprooting of house and home does not mean the same thing to men of a roving spirit, in love with a pastoral life, as it does to those who have lived for generations, perhaps centuries, in valleys and among hills endeared by countless associations, and sanctified by the records and reminiscences of their forefathers. The veldt of South Africa is broad and alluring, the air is free and pleasant, and even in the days of the Dutch East India Company the voertrekkers were always roaming onwards, overstepping boundaries and expatiating in a peculiar liberty of their own, changing their pasture and their homes every summer and winter.\*

At first the emigrant Boers met with little serious opposition from the tribes through whom they passed ; but continuing along the uplands of the interior eastwards, they reached the wooded ridges of the Drakensburg. Here they sighted the rolling plains of the country, now the colony of Natal, and they hastened onwards to possess themselves of so promising a land. Over this district, however, and in fact from the Limpopo River, to the borders of Kaffraria, there ruled the fierce Zulu chief Dingaan, the brother and successor of Chaka. With the object of persuading this potentate to cede to them the tract of country between the Tugela River on the north and the Umzimvubu River on the south, the Boer leader Retief and about seventy followers visited Dingaan. This chieftain was more than their match in his rude statecraft ; they, hoping to possess themselves

---

\* "Our South African Empire," by William Greswell, vol. i. p 143.

of some of his most fertile lands, were deceived by the apparent friendliness of his reception of them, and having obtained his signature (?) to the treaty they had drawn up, were persuaded to attend a national war-dance to be given for their amusement. Upon a signal the Zulus rushed upon their unarmed guests, and assailed them to the last man. The Boer "laager" was surprised; and the township Weenen stands on the spot where the most gross act of treachery ever recorded in Kafir history was ruthlessly consummated.

The advent of a fresh leader in Pretorius, who stimulated his community as Cromwell did his followers, served to encourage the Boers to revenge themselves on Dingaan; and in December 1838, being attacked by the Zulus while they were protected by their "laager" of interlocked waggons, they exacted a bloody punishment in the slaughter, it is said, of more than three thousand Zulus. Dingaan's kraal was captured, and many of the skeletons of the massacred Boers recovered, amongst which was that of Retief, with his hunting bag still strapped to it, and in the bag was found the document ceding the country between the Tugela and the Umzimvubu.

Panda, a brother of Dingaan, revolted against him, and accepted the alliance offered by the Boers, who crowned him as King of the Zulus on February 10, 1839, and were confirmed by him in their occupation of Natal.

Upon the news of the Boer settlement in Natal reaching the Cape, the Governor, Sir George Napier, deeming it inexpedient that a rival colony should be set up on the flank of the Cape, declared that the emigrants were regarded as British subjects who had left the colony against the wish of the Government, and, having set up an independent Volksraad (at Pietermaritzburg) must be looked upon as rebels. Being confirmed in their position by the promises of the captain and supercargo of a Dutch vessel (which happened to be anchored off Port Durban), who assured them of the help and sympathy of the King of the Netherlands, the emigrant Boers addressed a memorial to Sir George Napier, praying "the honoured Government of her Majesty the Queen to recognise this settlement as a free and independent State under the name of the Republic of Natal and adjoining countries." Being pressed by the merchants interested in Cape Colony, and by the representatives of the Aborigines Protection Society, the British Government—though themselves averse to the extension of the Cape territories—ordered the English forces to take possession of the coast of Natal. The Boers attacked the English troops, and being successful, proclaimed Natalia an independent republic under the protection of the King of Holland, who had just stated in a despatch, dated 4th November 1842, to the Foreign

Secretary, "that the disloyal communications of the emigrant farmers had been repelled with indignation, and that the King of Holland had taken every possible step to mark his disapproval of the unjustifiable use made of his name." For a short time the British commander was hemmed in by the Boers, and reduced to great straits. The plucky conduct of a Mr. King, who rode many hundred miles through the heart of Kafirland, and carried the news to Graham's Town,\* resulted in succour being speedily sent to the garrison, the consequent dispersal of the Boers and hauling down of their flag, and a formal submission being tendered by the Volksraad held in July 1842.

As a result of the above-narrated events, Natal was declared (May 12, 1843) to be a British colony, "for the sake of the peace, protection, and salutary control of all men settled at or surrounding this important position of South Africa." So little to their liking did some of the Boers find this "salutary control" that they "trekked" north again, and crossing the Vaal River, founded a community, under the leadership of a voertrekker named Potgieter, in the neighbourhood of the present town of Potchefstroom. The British Government hereupon proclaimed that all offences committed by British subjects up to 25° south could be punished in a court of law, and the Boers replied by "trekking" beyond the boundary named, to Lydenburg (just beyond the line) and Zoutspansburg, still farther north. Here they were for some years uninterfered with by the Government of Great Britain; but in 1852 all doubt was set at rest by the conclusion of the Sand River Convention between the English and Boer plenipotentiaries, by which the Vaal River was fixed as the northern boundary of the Cape Colony, and the independence of the Boers dwelling north of the Vaal fully recognized.

But to return to the affairs of the Cape itself. After the exodus of the emigrant Boers little happened of interest until 1846, when a Kafir, who was being sent to Graham's Town on the charge of stealing an axe, was rescued by some of his tribesmen, and a fresh Kafir war was originated. Again all the available forces of the colony were called upon to take the field; the Kafirs were routed out of their strongholds in the Amotola Mountains; and British sovereignty was proclaimed in 1847 by Sir Harry Smith to be extended as far as the River Kei. His proclamation was respected by the Home Government, who twelve years before had reversed that of Sir B. Durban when he annexed

---

\* Mr. Statham says that "an English resident of Durban had, when the siege began, swam across the mouth of the harbour, and, taking horse on the southern side, ridden alone through hundreds of miles of the wildest country, arriving at Graham's Town in nine days—a performance still spoken of by colonists as "Dick King's ride."—*Blacks, Boers, and British*, p. 108.

the very same district. Peace, however, was of very short duration, for at the close of 1850 the Kafirs attacked a military force in the Boomah Pass, and on the next day massacred a number of military settlers in the Chumie Valley, who were preparing to celebrate their Christmas festivities.

For three years the war dragged on, proving ruinous to all classes of the inhabitants, and hindering the development of the resources of the colony. Sir Harry Smith was recalled, and General Sir George Cathcart appointed, and by him, in 1853, hostilities were brought to a close. The Fingoes, who had shown themselves loyal during the war, had a settlement assigned them on the lands of the turbulent Gaika tribe, the latter being removed to the east of the Thomas River. A new district, called Queen's Town, was erected out of the lands of the Ama-Tembus, and was occupied by an armed burgher population.

Just previous to the outbreak of the last-mentioned war the colonists had been seriously alarmed by the announcement that Earl Grey had ordered a batch of three hundred convicts to be removed from Bermuda to Cape Town. The greatest excitement was occasioned amongst all classes, and it was unanimously determined to resist the attempt to make the Cape a penal settlement. The arrival of the *Neptune* in Simon's Bay with the convicts on board roused the people to fever heat. A solemn league was entered into by the community, suspending all business transactions with the Government. For six months the struggle was continued; then the Government gave way; the ship sailed for Van Diemen's Land, and an Order in Council was issued in February 1850, revoking the former one in which the Cape had been named as a penal settlement.

Considerable agitation had for some time been on foot for securing representative government to the colonists; and in May 1850 the Governor and Legislative Council were empowered by letters patent to enact ordinances for the establishment of two elective chambers. It was not, however, until after the close of the war that the first Parliament was chosen; and on 1st July 1854 representative government came fully into operation by the formal opening of Parliament by Lieutenant-Governor Darling.

The arrival of Sir George Grey as Governor gave the colony what it had so long and so sorely needed—an able administrator and a far-seeing statesman. With the prestige attaching to his name as the successful Governor of South Australia, and afterwards of New Zealand, Sir George Grey received a more attentive hearing from the Home Government than might otherwise have been accorded to him. He at once advocated extensive public works, the maintenance of educational and benevolent institutions,

and the subsidizing of certain native chiefs, whose followers were to be largely employed in the construction of roads—thus accustoming the Kafirs to hitherto unknown habits of labour, and providing the means of better communication between the widely scattered settlements throughout the colony. The Imperial Parliament voted £40,000 for the furtherance of Sir G. Grey's policy, and the Cape Parliament about £50,000 for the equipment and maintenance of a police force to defend the dwellers on the frontier.

In the year 1857 a most remarkable instance of the blind faith reposed by the Kafirs in their "sacred prophets" was witnessed in the conduct of the Gaika and Gcaleka tribes. A Kafir seer, Umhlagaza by name,\* professed to have held converse with the spirits of the dead Kafirs; and he preached to the Kafirs that if they would destroy all their cattle, burn all their corn, and refrain from cultivating the ground, they should be assisted by the departed chiefs and heroes in a great war which should sweep from the face of the earth the hated white men and the despised Fingoes. These predictions were believed by the Kafirs; and it is computed that nearly a quarter of a million cattle were slaughtered, and such vast quantities of grain destroyed, that over twenty thousand people perished, and ten times that number dispersed themselves beyond the bounds of Kaffraria in their despairing search for food. Large tracts of the country thus depopulated were at once occupied by white settlers from the Cape Colony, who held their lands on a system of military tenure. The Anglo-German Legion, upon being disbanded at the close of the Crimean war, were also settled on the vacant lands at the expense of the Cape Colony; and the Governor was also instrumental in the bringing out, and settling on the banks of the Buffalo River, of a body of agricultural labourers from North Germany, numbering, with their wives and children, about 2000 souls.

The internal resources of the colony were so wisely looked after and developed by Sir G. Grey—who obtained the sanction of Parliament to a scheme for the purpose of assisting European immigration to the Cape, turned the first sod of the Cape Town and Wellington line of railway on the 31st of March 1859, vigorously pushed the construction of roads and bridges, and strenuously urged on the formation of a harbour of refuge in Table Bay—that within ten years of his landing at the Cape a most gratifying advance was evident in the prosperity of the

---

\* We are quite at a loss to know why Mr. Greswell speaks of a "prophetess" (vol. i. p. 132).

colony. The exports, valued in 1854 at £764,000, had increased in value to £2,594,000. The produce of wool had risen during the same period from eight and a half million pounds weight to thirty-six and a quarter million pounds. The imports had risen in value from £1,508,000 to £2,471,000.

The limits of the colony continued to be enlarged; British Kaffraria being incorporated in the year 1865, upon the advice of Sir P. E. Wodehouse, but against the general wish of the colonists both within the settlement and throughout the colony. In 1866 the Fingoes and Tembus, who were increasing very rapidly on the frontier settlements, were allotted lands in the district now known as the Transkei, and formed a living barrier between the colonists and the Gcalekas.

Between the years 1867 and 1869 a marked decline in the finances of the colony led the Government to draw up a large scheme of taxation, which was rejected by the House of Assembly in favour of a plan for a considerable retrenchment in the expenditure. The Parliament was dissolved, and upon an appeal to the electorate a new Parliament was returned strongly in favour of an amendment in the Constitution which should allow of the administration of the Colony being placed in the hands of a Cabinet possessing the confidence of the Legislature. Sir Henry Barkly was thereupon sent out as successor to Sir P. Wodehouse, and in 1872 introduced a measure—which was carried in the House of Assembly by ten votes, and in the Legislative Council by a bare majority of one—which conferred upon the colony “responsible government.” Coincident with the change in the form of government came the influx of capital and population, attracted by the successful working of the diamond mines in West Griqualand. Both causes combined with favourable seasons, and the consequent prosperity of those engaged in agricultural and pastoral pursuits, to benefit the colony materially, and for some years there was a succession of surpluses of revenue over expenditure.

A Commission appointed to consider the question of frontier defence reported in 1876 that “the colony was living upon a mine that might at any moment be sprung beneath its feet.” The warning came none too soon; for scarcely had additional defensive preparations been undertaken than “the accident of a fight at a wedding-feast in the Transkei set the tribes on the border in commotion.” The Gcalekas swarmed into Fingoland, and the customary scenes of savage warfare were enacted. Under the direction of Sir Bartle Frere energetic steps were taken, with the result of speedily driving the invaders beyond the borders and over the Bashee River—the eastern boundary of Gcaleka land. But the Kafirs were not at once beaten, and

shortly reappeared, and, crossing the River Kei, induced Sandilli, the chief of the Gaikas, to join them with many of his tribe. After a few months' fighting, Sandilli and many of the lesser chiefs were killed, and the Kafirs were again dispersed. Kreli was outlawed, and the Gaika country was declared forfeited, the Gaikas themselves being moved across the Kei and into the land from which the Gcalekas had been driven.

The Cape Parliament having voted its thanks to all who had been engaged in suppressing the outbreak, and having sanctioned the increase of Cape Mounted Police, took the further step of empowering the Government to proclaim areas within which it would not be lawful for any person to carry arms or weapons without a licence. Under the Peace Preservation Act the disarmament of the Fingoes and Kafirs on the frontier and in the Transkei was effected, and it was announced that the same law would be enforced against the Basutos. This tribe—occupying a territory to the north-east of the Cape Colony, with an area of about 10,000 square miles, well-watered, enjoying a delicious climate, and by some reputed to be “the finest grain-producing country in South Africa”—had made great progress since it had come under the protection of the Crown in 1869, and in 1871 had been handed over to the care and administration of the Cape Government. The attempt at enforcing the disarmament in 1880, and the consequent resistance on the part of the majority of the tribe, are probably too well remembered to need recapitulation. Suffice it to say that in 1881, the Cape forces having shown themselves incapable so far of carrying the decree into effect, both parties welcomed the offer of Sir Hercules Robinson to arbitrate. His award was that the Basutos should surrender their guns and receive them back on the payment of a small licence fee; there was further to be a complete amnesty, and no confiscation of territory. After the lapse of a year, as there was no sign of the award being complied with, it was cancelled, as was also the decree for disarmament. In the meantime, the feeling was growing very strong throughout the colony, that it would be well quit of its responsibility in connection with the country; and Mr. Merriman, then Commissioner of Crown Lands and Public Works, was deputed to visit England, and to lay the whole matter before the Imperial Government. The Basutos themselves expressing their desire of coming under the direct government of the Queen, it was decided to disannex Basutoland from the Cape Colony on two conditions—first, that the colony paid towards the cost of government the amount received as customs dues on goods imported into Basutoland; and the other, that the Basutos should show a loyal adherence to the new administration. Sub-

sequently, in 1883, an Act disannexing Basutoland was passed, and provision was made for the Cape Government contributing a sum not exceeding £20,000 towards making good any deficiency arising in the administration of the territory by the Resident Commissioner, who is under the direction of her Majesty's High Commissioner in South Africa.

In 1884 the first step towards annexation in South Africa on the part of the Germans was taken by a German man-of-war proclaiming a protectorate over the west coast from the Orange River up to 16° S., and shortly afterwards a German gunboat formally took possession of the coast (Walwich Bay and certain islands about which negotiations were proceeding with the British Government being excepted), in the name of the German Emperor. This proceeding, showing that other Powers were alive to the importance of the possession of the coast of South Africa, quickened the action of the Cape Government, and Walwich Bay was proclaimed British territory, and at the same time the port of St. John, at the mouth of the Umzimvubu River, on the east coast, was formally annexed. The long-pending incorporation of the whole of the Transkei territories was completed (the districts of Griqualand East, Idutywa, and Fingoland had been annexed in 1877); and in 1885 the territories of Tembuland, Emigrant Tembuland, Gcalekaland, and Bomvanaland were proclaimed integral portions of the Cape Colony. Thus the whole of the southern coast of South Africa, from the Orange River on the west to the Bay of St. Lucia on the east, has become "part and parcel" of the British Empire; for Pondoland is virtually British territory, a British officer being resident with its chief, and the sole port of the district, at the mouth of the St. John's River, having been purchased and proclaimed.

The boundaries of the Cape Colony, however, comprise inland districts of which no mention has as yet been made in this paper—namely, Griqualand East, which lies between Pondoland on the south-east, Natal on the north-east, Basutoland on the west, and Tembuland on the south-west; and Griqualand West, separated from Griqualand East by Basutoland, the Orange Free State, and a portion of the Cape Colony itself.

At the time of the "great trek" the Griquas, or Baastards, a mixed race sprung from the intercourse of the Boers with their Hottentot servants, also migrated from Cape Colony, and formed a settlement under the two chiefs, Waterboer and Adam Kok, in the country north of the confluence of the Orange and Vaal rivers, known now as Griqualand West. A later migration of a section under Adam Kok, in 1852, to the district then known as No Man's Land, between Kaffraria and Natal, led to the settlement of East Griqualand. In consequence of the discovery



of diamonds in Waterboer's country in 1867, and the rush of Europeans from all parts of the world, the Government annexed the region in 1871 to the Cape Colony as Griqualand West, a proceeding which almost led to a war with the Orange Free State, and which ultimately ended in a sum amounting to £90,000 being awarded to the Free State as compensation.

The Orange Free State, which lies almost surrounded by British territory, was founded by the emigrant Boers who entered the district from Natal when that colony was proclaimed British territory. They very soon became embroiled with the Cape authorities, and the usual result followed—that the district was declared to be annexed to the parent colony. In 1851, however, by letters patent it was declared to be a distinct and separate colony. Then came the Kafir war of 1851–52, and the British resident at Bloemfontein became involved in a dispute with the Basutos. As happened later in 1880, the Basutos proved too difficult to be dealt with as were the Gaikas and Gcalekas; and it was determined by the Home Government to “cut the painter” that attached them to the Orange River sovereignty. Much dissatisfaction was expressed by those who had invested capital in the colony, and by those who had settled therein, on the strength of its being British territory; but the end was achieved by the execution of the Orange River Convention, dated February 1851, declaring the country a free State; and of this dissevered district Sir George Grey wrote to the Secretary of State in 1855: “The territory forms one of the finest pastoral countries I have ever seen. There is no district of Australia which I have visited which throughout so great an extent of territory affords so uniformly good a pastoral country.”

The statistics of the Cape Colony are not as complete as are those of the Canadian Dominion, or those of the Australasian Colonies; but in Mr. Noble's “Official Handbook” a computation has been made of the area and population of the colony, including Griqualand West, the Transkeian territories, and Griqualand East. The total area is given as 213,636 square miles, and the population as 1,252,000 persons, of whom 340,000 are European or white, and the remainder coloured or native races. Chief and most numerous among the native races are the Kafirs, who may be roughly divided into *coast Kafirs* and *Kafirs of the plateau*. Among the former are the Ama-Zulus, Amatonga, Matabele, &c., who have gradually advanced from the north-east; among the latter are the more peaceful and agricultural Basutos, Ba-rolongs, Ba-kwana, and other Bechuana tribes. Then come the half-breeds (Griquas); and finally, the dwindling Bushmen and Hottentots. The following table shows the recent growth of the colony:—

| Year. | Population. | Imports.  | Exports.  | Revenue.   | Expenditure | Public Debt. |
|-------|-------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-------------|--------------|
|       |             | £         | £         | £          | £           | £            |
| 1854  | 265,000     | 1,548,000 | 764,000   | 300,000    |             |              |
| 1864  | 580,000     | 2,571,000 | 2,594,000 | 587,000    | 633,000     | 1,000,000*   |
| 1874  | 720,000     | 5,558,000 | 4,438,000 | 1,538,000  | 1,857,000   | 2,399,000    |
| 1884  | 1,250,000   | 5,260,000 | 7,031,000 | 3,318,000† | 3,375,000†  | 20,804,000   |

It is interesting to observe in what manner the public debt has been expended, and from a table published under the authority of the Controller and Auditor-General of the colony we learn that up to June 30, 1885, the disbursements were as follows:— Railways, £13,716,000; East London harbour, Buffalo River mouth, £502,000; Kowie harbour, Port Alfred, £290,000; bridges, 416,000; buildings, £213; telegraphs, £165,000; irrigation works, £33,000; immigration, £85,000; native rebellion, £4,794,000; Griqualand West liabilities, £310,000; loans for local works and irrigation, £219,000.

The railways, of which 1,600 miles are open, and telegraphs, with 8,663 miles of wire, are already reproductive works; and with the exception of the item for the native war (Basuto rebellion), the whole expenditure may fairly be said to have been incurred for works that, either directly or indirectly, must prove of a reproductive or remunerative character.

The colony itself, having no rivers available for internal navigation, absolutely demands a liberal expenditure upon the construction and maintenance of roads and bridges; and it is to be hoped that the Legislature may see its way clear to a considerable further outlay in this direction; it being a certainty that increased means of communication will most readily develop the resources of the country.

Irrigation especially appears to need an increased expenditure. Until 1876 no Government irrigation works had been constructed; in that year a small reservoir was sanctioned at Brand Vley, and since its completion (at a cost of £835) it has been the means of saving the lives of thousands of animals,

\* (About.) The debt dates from 1859, when it was £101,250. In 1869 it was £1,178,150.

† These figures agree with those in the "Official Handbook" (p. 318). The "Statesman's Year Book" for 1886 (in agreement with the "Statistical Abstract for the Colonial and other Possessions of the United Kingdom," 1885), gives the figures as—Revenue, £7,532,983; expenditure, £5,374,982; the former including loans, the latter including expenditure, under Act of Parliament.

whose value must have many times exceeded the cost of the work. Other irrigation works have been shown to be equally beneficial, and beyond doubt justify a very considerable extension of the system.

Every kind of pastoral and agricultural occupation can be followed in the colony. Sheep, goats, cattle, and horses feed entirely on the natural plants and grasses. Wheat and other corn crops yield excellent returns; and most of the products of the temperate and semi-tropical zones may be successfully cultivated.

Although the greater portion of the country is settled, and belongs to private individuals, there still remains a considerable extent of Crown lands, which are from time to time surveyed and offered for sale to the highest bidder at an annual rental. Owing to the excellent character of the land in Kaffraria, where small holdings have been so successfully worked by immigrants, allotments are now being made to applicants; and so recently as June 8 last, a body of emigrants, numbering 91 men, women, and children, were publicly bidden Godspeed by Princess Louise (after whom the district they are to inhabit is to be named), Cardinal Manning, Lord Wolseley, and others, in the Conference Room of the Colonial and Indian Exhibition.

Wool of excellent quality can be grown, and has been grown, throughout the colony. But in many parts injudicious and indiscriminate breeding, and careless farming of stock, have resulted in a deterioration of the staple. In 1830 the Cape exported only 33,000 lbs. of wool; in 1850 the amount was nearly six million pounds, valued at £285,000; and in 1872 the *maximum* of 48,822,000 lbs., valued at £3,275,000, was exported. Since that year the quantity has fluctuated, amounting last year only to 34½ million pounds, valued at £1,426,000.

Although mohair only began to figure in the exports from the Cape in 1862, it has since steadily advanced in quantity and improved in quality, and last year (1885) the export was 5,251,301 lbs., valued at £204,018.

Ostrich farming dates from 1865, when 17,522 lbs. weight of feathers, valued at £65,736, was exported. The successful introduction of artificial hatching by means of the "Incubator," perfected by Mr. A. Douglas, of Heatherton, Albany, gave an impetus to the industry; and in the following year (1870) the export of feathers rose to 28,786 lbs., valued at £91,229. In 1882 the maximum export was reached, 253,954 lbs. weight being exported at a value of £1,093,000. Owing to drought and a virulent fever, a decrease has taken place during the last two or three years. It is estimated that there are at least 150,000

domesticated ostriches living in the colony, in connection with which eight millions of capital is employed.\*

The first vine-sticks were brought into the colony in 1653, from the borders of the Rhine. Six years later a vintage is recorded; and in 1681 the first brandy was made. For two hundred years viticulture has occupied the most prominent position amongst the various branches of agriculture at the Cape. The last returns of the vineyards of the colony, in 1880, showed there were about sixty million vines on twenty thousand acres of land. The number of vines is now believed to exceed seventy millions. Owing to climatic conditions most of the wine districts are within the Western Province. The productive power of the vineyards of the Cape greatly exceeds that of any other "wine-country" in the world. It is also contended that the quality of the juice of the Cape grapes is superior to that of the European grapes, but the making of the wine is admitted to be, on the whole, of a primitive character; to this is due the fact of its comparatively limited consumption in Europe. Still, the wine industry is a source of revenue to a very large part of the population of the western district.

The Diamond Fields are situated in Griqualand West, and are said to have surpassed in richness and extent all other diamondiferous districts in the world. The first diamond, found by a Mr. O'Reilly in the possession of a Bushman boy in Hopetown district, was tried at Cape Town in 1867, and valued at £500. Upon being approved by Messrs. Hunt & Roskell in London, to whom it was sent for inspection, it was purchased by Sir Philip Wodehouse, and by him exhibited in the Paris Exhibition of 1867. Two years later the famous "Star of South Africa," weighing  $83\frac{1}{2}$  carats in the rough, was purchased from a native by a Boer, who gave £400 (or live stock to that value) for the gem, and immediately succeeded in selling it at Cape Town for £10,000. In June 1870 it was valued in Cape Town at £25,000: and "the rush" to the fields soon led to the most extravagant expectations being realized. In those days the journey from Cape Town took six weeks, and cost £50; now Kimberley is the inland terminus of the railway system, and can be reached in about thirty hours from Cape Town. The total value of diamonds exported from the colony up to 1884 is put at £29,772,576; the exports in 1884 being valued at £2,800,000.

Among the minor exports from the Colony are copper ore, of

---

\* In 1883 the Cape Parliament, becoming alarmed at several shipments of ostriches being made to South Australia, the Argentine Republic, and California, imposed an export tax of £100 on every ostrich, and £5 on every egg exported.

which 20,000 tons, valued at £395,000, were exported in 1885 ; and skins and hides, valued at £731,489 in 1884.

The commercial intercourse of the colony is mainly with Great Britain—the imports of British produce comprising mainly apparel and haberdashery (£618,786 in 1884), cotton manufactures (£378,000), iron, wrought and unwrought (£306,000), and leather and saddlery (£288,87?).

| Period from 1880 to 1885. | United Kingdom. | British Possessions. | Foreign Countries. |
|---------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|--------------------|
|                           | £               | £                    | £                  |
| Imports from . . . . .    | 34,336,000      | 5,696,000            | 3,444,000          |
| Exports to . . . . .      | 43,292,000      | 821,000              | 1,738,000          |
| Total value of trade .    | 77,628,000      | 6,517,000            | 5,182,000          |

The whole white population of the colony being no more than that of any one of half a dozen of the chief London boroughs, it is not surprising to find there are no large cities or towns in South Africa. Cape Town, the metropolis of the Cape Colony, is by far the most populous ; and its position as the seat of government and as an important commercial *entrepôt* has secured for it a comparatively wealthy resident community. Its inhabitants number about 60,000, including the coloured races. Port Elizabeth, next to Cape Town, is the most important seaport in the colony, but its population only numbers about 18,000, of whom, however, the greater portion are Europeans. Graham's Town, about 106 miles by rail from Port Elizabeth, ranks as the metropolis of the eastern and frontier districts, and has a population of 7,000 Europeans and 3,000 coloured natives. King William's Town, from its position on the highway from East London to the interior, and from the eastern districts to the Transkei, is regarded as an important commercial centre. Graaf-Reinet, the oldest and largest of the towns in the midland districts, has a few thousand inhabitants ; but Kimberley, owing to its origin, is the one town that has really sprung up with a growth at all approaching that of Australasian and Canadian towns. In Kimberley half the population of 30,000 are white ; and many substantial buildings have already been erected. The streets and roads, which extend over a distance of twenty miles, are well laid out and kept in good order ; and the town is lighted by thirty-two electric Brush lights of 2,000 candle-power each.

The Constitution of the Colony vests the executive in the Governor (who is appointed by the Crown) and his Cabinet, who are chosen by him from among those possessing the con-

confidence of the majority of the elected representatives. The legislative power rests with a Legislative Council of twenty-two members elected for seven years, and a House of Assembly of seventy-four members, elected for five years, representing the country districts and towns of the colony. By a law passed in 1882, speeches may be made both in English and in Dutch in the Cape Parliament. Both Houses are elected by the same voters, who in 1885 were registered to the number of 86,206.

The defence of the colony is provided for by permanent and volunteer forces, consisting of the Cape Mounted Riflemen (including the Cape Field Artillery), numbering 700 officers and men; the Cape Infantry Regiment, numbering 520; and volunteer corps numbering 3,923. In addition, every able-bodied man in the colony between eighteen and fifty years of age is liable to be called upon for active service. The outlay of the Imperial Government (mainly for military and naval purposes) in connection with Cape Colony and Natal was, in 1883-4, £303,595; and was estimated for 1884-5 at £293,635; the total number of troops comprising the British garrisons in 1885-6 is given at 3,387.

A very brief reference to Natal will complete our sketch of the growth of British South Africa. Natal was erected into a separate colony in 1856, and since 1882 has been administered by a Governor, aided by an Executive and a Legislative Council. The latter consists of thirty members, seven of whom are nominated by the Crown, and the others elected by the counties and boroughs. With an area of 21,150 square miles, about three-fourths the size of Scotland, Natal has a population of about 130,000, of whom under 10,000 are Europeans. Since 1879, however, the white population has increased by 50 per cent., and the colony presents a very favourable field for the efforts of the State-directed Emigration Society. But the words of the late Sir Bartle Frere, spoken before the meeting of the Royal Colonial Institute on January 24, 1882, should be remembered :

That in Natal the colonists are, as a rule, men very superior in position and education to the average Englishman, for this very simple reason: there is hardly any labouring class in Natal of white men. Owing to the large numbers of natives and of Indian coolies, almost all manual labour is done by others than European colonists. There is no field there for the uneducated Englishman, who has nothing but his own hands to trust to; unless he has some quality which will enable him to ascend into the position of an employer of labour, he had much better go to some other colony.

The population of Durban is about 20,000; that of Pietermaritzburg about 15,000. The imports in 1884 amounted to

£1,675,000, and the exports to £957,000. About 80 per cent. of the imports are from Great Britain, and about 75 per cent. of the exports are to Great Britain. European capital and intelligence are greatly needed to develop the very extensive coal-fields in the northern part of the colony; and, to our mind, no greater boon to British South Africa could be conferred than a considerable emigration of intelligent and energetic men from Great Britain to Natal, who, while complying with the requirements indicated by the late Sir Bartle Frere, and advancing alike the welfare of the colony and of themselves, would be in the best position for furthering the growth of the English power in South Africa by effectually checking that of the only opposing force with which we have to reckon.

The climate of Natal is unsurpassed by that of any portion of British South Africa, and probably no country of its size can boast so wide a range of resources. Amongst her exports are sugar, coffee, cotton, tobacco and arrowroot, as well as wool, barley, oats, beans and pease, butter, bacon, fruit, potatoes, soap, tallow, spirits, hides and skins, and ostrich feathers and ivory from the interior. Until the destruction of the Zulu power, the colony was too isolated to attract immigration; now, however, it is to be hoped its population will gain considerable accessions from the mother country; and should that fortunately happen, we do not doubt that—taken in conjunction with the growing favour with which the Cape Colony is now regarded as a field of emigration and as a health resort—the resources of British South Africa will speedily be developed, with the result of placing her in line with the others of England's mighty colonies hitherto denied her.

There is, however, a vast district to the north of, and almost equalling in size, the Cape Colony, and hither, probably, emigrants will flock. Bechuanaland, at present administered by Mr. Justice Shippard aided by two Engineer officers, and "policed" by Colonel Carrington and his corps of 500 mounted men, is as yet best known "at home" in connection with the famous expedition of Sir Charles Warren. It extends from lat. 29 north of the Cape Colony to lat. 22, and from long. 20 east to the borders of the Transvaal Republic, comprising about 170,000 square miles, and is all under the protection of her Majesty; that portion to the south and east of the River Molopo having recently been declared a Crown colony under the name of British Bechuanaland. The country is an elevated plateau, averaging from 4,000 to 5,000 feet above the level of the sea, and though containing a variety of climates, of soils, and of inhabitants, there is scarcely any land that is not suitable for farming purposes, and everywhere it is well adapted for the

habitation of the Anglo-Saxon race. The railway at Kimberley reaches to within ninety miles of British Bechuanaland; and we have the authority of Mr. Edward Maund (who while serving with Sir C. Warren surveyed and sketched the country through which the trade route runs to its northern limit at Inyati) for stating that there are no physical or engineering difficulties to prevent a line being run quickly over the Bechuanaland plains, where there would be only a few culverts to build.

Objection has been taken to Bechuanaland as being composed largely of "a waterless desert." But the vast herds of cattle which fatten and do well on the grass prove that water must be stored not far beneath the surface. Mr. Maund speaks of innumerable fountains welling up through the ground, and mentions one "recently discovered thirty miles west of Vryburg, between Motito and Takoon, where at a depth of twenty feet below the surface there is a stream of running water, fifty-seven feet deep, which must run away as a subterranean river without doing any good to the surface soil, simply because it requires man, aided by science, to prevent it thus running to waste."\*

Sir Charles Warren states that Bechuanaland is, from a commercial point of view, more highly cultivated than many parts of Cape Colony, and has supported for years a very large number of cattle; whilst the fact that the Boers are so anxious to migrate into the country is a test of its value as a farming district. Moreover, Sir Charles actually received, while he was in the country, 3,000 applications for farms from English and Dutch farmers resident in the Cape Colony and Orange Free State; and he says:

The fact is, that certain Cape politicians are well aware of the great value of the territory, and appear to be endeavouring to depreciate it in order to induce the British Government to hand it over to the Cape Colony. The British Government has already spent millions on wars in South Africa, which have only resulted in the waste lands being occupied by Boers: why should not the million recently expended in the pacification of South Africa have as its result, the colonization of the territory by English-speaking farmers?

When we remember that the power of opening up the vast interior trade is the vision upon which Great Britain has for the past fifty years feasted her eyes when called upon to contribute vast sums from her exchequer; and when we also recognize that as yet we only occupy posts on the road to the interior; there can be no doubt that our hold upon the trade route must be maintained at all hazards and at any cost, while it appears

\* Speech made by Mr. Maund at a meeting of the Royal Colonial Institute on November 20, 1885.



equally imperative to convert Bechuanaland from being British in name only into a territory mainly occupied and developed by British settlers.

“Plenty of good land, and liberty to manage their own affairs their own way, seem to be the two great causes of the prosperity of all new colonies.”\* So wrote Adam Smith, and the soundness of his conclusion has been amply borne out by the progress made during the last generation by the colonists of British North America and Australasia. Within the brief space of a century an unbroken record of prosperity has advanced these two great central homes of the British race into a position in which they equal in population and surpass in wealth the lesser countries of Europe. It is natural, therefore, to inquire why the British settlers in South Africa should not have made their adopted home advance in material prosperity with strides equal to those taken by their more prosperous brethren. Many and varied reasons are forthcoming to explain this undoubted fact. That South African colonists have enjoyed an abundance of “good land” is evident from the sparse population which even now occupies the territory under the sway of the Queen in that quarter of the globe. That the land is equally good to that of the Australasian colonies no one disputes; and “liberty to manage their own affairs their own way” has been enjoyed by South Africans at least as long as it has been by Australasians. Perhaps the main reason why South Africa has lagged behind in the race is to be found in the fact that the “plenty of good land” has not been enjoyed by those in whose possession it would have been best utilized to the general welfare of the country. Whilst, on the one hand, Australia and New Zealand have a homogeneous and British population, and quickly absorb such foreign elements as may come to their shores, and Canada has had its original French element more than neutralized by the influx of British immigrants; South Africa, on the other hand, has received no great stream of immigration from Britain, and the soil remains now, as at the time when the Cape Colony came under the sovereignty of Great Britain, very largely in the occupation of the Dutch and of the descendants of those Frenchmen who, upon the revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1687, left their country, and were granted a refuge at the Cape by the Dutch East India Company. Upon this subject the Hon. J. X. Merriman says :

Broadly stated, in South Africa, while all trade, all handicraft, and all commercial enterprise of every kind is in the hands of English

---

\* “An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations,” by Adam Smith, book iv. chap. vii. part ii.

or Germans, by far the greatest portion of the land is in the hands of colonists of Dutch extraction, who show no sort of leaning to a town life. To this rule there are of course many exceptions. You will find English farmers and Dutch townsmen; but from one end of South Africa to the other this is the broad dividing line which regulates the occupations of the populations, and which has also a controlling effect on the political leanings and aspirations. There is no record—and for very obvious reasons no official record can be taken—of the relative numbers of colonists of Dutch and of those of English or any other European descent. Estimates only can be framed, and from the best of those with which I am acquainted I am inclined to think that for the whole of South Africa, including the independent republics, colonists of Dutch descent might be put down at 330,000, and those of British or other European descent at 162,000, or slightly more than two to one; while in Cape Colony, including Griqualand proper, the numbers would be 220,000 Dutch to 120,000 English or other Europeans, or in the proportion of rather less than two to one.\*

Mr. Merriman's authority is beyond dispute upon a subject such as formed the theme of the valuable paper from which we have quoted. That paper, together with the discussion that ensued upon its reading, accurately and adequately sets forth the financial development of South Africa of late years; and very slight additional statistics are needed to represent the present position of the colony.

The character of the Cape Dutchman is admirably and temperately drawn by Mr. Merriman, and his remarks are deserving the careful consideration of all who are anxious to master the complex features (in which the race element so largely figures) attaching to the question of the future of the colony. He says:

To their qualities rather than their numbers the Dutch owe their political preponderance. In the first place, they are the chief landholders, and I believe that it is an axiom that whoever holds the land holds the balance of political power, and they have all the virtues as well as the defects of a community of landholding yeomen. They recognize no superior, but they are willing to accept every one as an equal, provided he is white. They have a disinclination for sudden change, and a tenacity of purpose which give them in any political contest a tremendous advantage over British colonists, who, in an atmosphere of colonial freedom, are in political matters, something like the Athenians of old, always ready to hear and believe some new thing. If I might coin a name for our Dutch fellow-colonists, I would

---

\* "The Commercial Resources and the Financial Position of South Africa." A Paper read before the Royal Colonial Institute on November 11, 1881, by the Hon. J. X. Merriman.

say they are not "Democratic Tories," of whom I believe there are some specimens in this country, but "Conservative Republicans." I wish I had the ability to make you recognize how very like an old-fashioned English farmer this same much-abused Dutch Boer is, and how it is no more right to accept as the type of the race the agitators in and about Cape Town, who trade upon the prejudices by abusing England, or the marauding ruffians who are giving us so much trouble in Bechuanaland, than it would be to take the drunken blackguards who are pursuing the same career as fair types of English colonists. A sober, temperate, God-fearing man, the double isolation arising out of the nature of his pursuits and the absence of a common language strengthens the prejudices of the Boer, and makes him suspicious of English ideas, which he associates with the smart tricks from which he or his friends have on some occasions suffered. But I make bold to say that no Englishman has ever settled at the Cape as a farmer—that is, as one exposed to the same vicissitudes and temptations as his Dutch neighbours—who has not imbibed a respect and liking for that rugged, obstinate race, even if he does not become, in his way of looking at things colonial, more Boer than the Boers themselves.

But, estimable as men of this sort are, who in Cape Colony and the Orange Free State as a rule treat their native dependents with kindness and moderation, and differ so widely from "those wilder and more turbulent spirits who, located on the confines of civilization in the Transvaal and elsewhere, act as men of strong and masterful European nationalities always do act under such circumstances," nevertheless, it is not among their virtues so to advance with the impetuous rush of this nineteenth century's closing decades as to keep the land of their birth even abreast of other civilized communities. The "apathetic and unenterprising" character of the Boers remains unaltered, and the following incident, recorded by Mr. Noble as having befallen him on the banks of the Oliphant River, still affords too true an illustration of that lack of energy on the part of its landowning population which retards the development of the resources of the colony :—

Scarcely any rain had fallen for some time past, and the river had not overflowed its banks for more than a year. The stocks of grain and vegetables were getting very low. The farmer was complaining much about the long-protracted drought, and when he had finished I took the liberty of pointing out how he could, by leading out the stream for the purposes of irrigation, or by fixing a pump to be propelled by the wind on the river-bank, secure an abundant supply independent of the weather. He seemed to listen with some interest to the development of my plans, and I began to hope that he had decided upon doing something to relieve himself of the difficulty; but eventually, after turning round and scrutinizing the whole horizon in the direction of the river's source, as if in search of some favourable

symptom, he yawned heavily, and merely observed, "Ach wat! dat zal een dag regen" ("Oh! it will rain some day").\*

Mr. G. Baden Powell, who also speaks from considerable personal experience, and uses the term Boer as applicable to all those whose families occupied the land when the English took over the country, says :

The chief fault that I have to find with the Boer is that he does not succeed in making himself prosperous, and is, in addition, a drag on the prosperity of his neighbours. He is the firm enemy of all co-operation; he has that fantastic religious bias that has led him on occasion to declare it impious to make dams where God has seen fit to provide but little water; . . . these peculiarities of character make the Boer little able to make the best use for himself of his surroundings. There are of course exceptions; but as a rule the Boer is slow to act, averse from change, greedy of land, disdainfully ignorant. . . . Their one ambition is to buy up large areas of soil, but they refuse to cultivate except as a last resort. Only the other day a Boer farmer in the west suddenly gave up a large area of cultivation. His neighbours asked him why, and the reply came, "Because now I have paid off all my debts." †

That South Africa is not making due progress, having regard to her physical characteristics, is too commonly known to need much demonstration. It is, however, noteworthy that the one weekly London paper which devotes itself to colonial and Indian affairs—namely, *The Colonies and India*—in its issue dated May 28 has two striking paragraphs, the one indicative of the prevailing feeling of those Englishmen who recognize with regret the slow progress of the colony, and the other purporting to be an "echo" from the newspapers latest to hand from the Cape itself, plainly showing at least the spirit of the colonists to which retrogression rather than progress is due.

In the first paragraph referred to it is pointed out that the advantages of the Cape Colony are certainly not inferior to those of the Argentine Republic; and yet, while South Africa has been standing still in the matter of the introduction of immigrants, the South American State has been importing labour to the amount of 6000 or 7000 souls a month, and has so improved her wool products that she is now able to compete with some of the best brands from Australia. It is evident that it is not the climate of the Cape that is to blame. That is genial enough, and a proper husbanding of the rainfall would secure ample

---

\* "Africa," by the late Keith Johnston, F.R.G.S., p. 401. London: Edward Stanford, 55 Charing Cross, S.W. 1884.

† *The Contemporary Review*, October 1885: "English Money in South Africa," by G. Baden Powell, C.M.G.

moisture for its agricultural and pastoral holdings. A new departure on the part of the Cape colonists is advised in the direction of an infusion of new blood, and in the cultivation of those large areas which it is a positive reproach to the country to allow to lie waste and unproductive. Labour could readily be obtained from any of half a dozen congested centres in the "old country," and capital is so abundant "at home" that it would be advanced (the credit of the colony being so good) with the utmost willingness for any enterprise of a reproductive character. But in the "echo" we have alluded to we are informed that the Cape Government intend to abolish their hydraulic engineer's department, on the ground that the colony is not suited to irrigation works on a large scale! How is such a decision to be reconciled to the experience of India and of Egypt? It is an old joke, but a true one, that South Africa can never be truly blessed until she has been well "dammed." We can only hope to learn that the "echo" has been a false one, and that irrigation and immigration are to be tried in the way they would be were the wisdom and experience of their friends "at home" to be adopted.

But just as our great home difficulty has been for many generations how best to deal with the masses of the poor in this country, so South Africa has found herself for ever face to face with her great "native difficulty." From the north—the great negro reservoir in the interior of Africa—vast successive hordes of savages have constantly overflowed in the past, and poured down, driving out their predecessors from the lands in which they had temporarily settled. The tide has been ceaseless, and can be easily traced in the history of the South African tribes since they have been known to Europeans. At length the advance of civilization from the sea-coast—which has only been effected at the expense of a succession of costly and bloody wars—has in some degree put a check upon the descent from the interior, though it is admitted that the Kafir and the Fingo were never more numerous, and are actually driving back and dispossessing from their conquered lands the Europeans, "who find it more profitable to sublet their land to native tenants than to try and farm in black man's country."

We have Mr. Merriman's authority for this statement, and he adds :

It is a very curious problem whether in Kaffraria and in Natal the experiences of Central America may not be repeated, and Europeans have to give way to the peaceful reconquest of the inferior race. However this may be settled, there can be no doubt of the great value of the natives as customers and labourers. All they want is the *pax Britannica* and a firm government, and they surprisingly soon learn to

wear European clothing, and to buy and pay for European manufactures. The Diamond Fields taught a useful lesson in this respect, for the native labourers came hundreds of miles from the interior to labour in the mines, and returned, or rather used to return (for the Transvaal Customs regulations, which seemed to include confiscation of native property, has sadly interfered with this trade) loaded with European manufactures. There are millions of black men in Africa, who, if they can be got to wear clothes and buy our goods, are just as valuable customers as any one else. . . . One great value of the native population in South Africa is that it is the natural door to this immensely valuable trade, which lies ready to our hand, and in the development of which we shall find much more profit than in shooting down our customers. \*

And Mr. Merriman sufficiently proves his case by quoting the instance of Basutoland. In 1869, as a result of their war with the newly established Orange Free State, the Basutos were reduced to the utmost straits, and petitioned Sir P. Wodehouse to extend them the protection of the British Government.

They were then [says Mr. Merriman] utterly beggared, homeless, and starving. In ten years' time, under the *pax Britannica* and the wise care of the Imperial and Colonial Governments, the trade of Basutoland had grown, according to the most competent judges, to the annual value of half-a-million sterling, and the Basutos themselves were the most industrious people and the largest producers, whether white or black, in South Africa. I saw the tribe in 1869, when Sir Philip Wodehouse proclaimed the sovereignty. They were starving savages, and there was not a trader's shop in the territory. In 1879, ten years later, the country was filled with traders, several of whom had stocks of manufactured goods from £20,000 to £50,000 in value; white clothes, saddles, ploughs, and other articles of European manufacture found ready sale. The Basutos were only 150,000 in number, a mere handful compared with the millions in South Africa. †

And we unreservedly agree with Mr. Merriman, Sir Charles Warren, Mr. George Baden Powell, and others who, having a practical experience of the indigenous peoples of South Africa, justly appreciate the enormous trade value which the native races may yet become to the industrial population of the mother country; and we point to the instance of Basutoland as affording a lesson which deserves the study of those who yet wonder whether any good thing can come out of South Africa.

---

\* Hon. J. X. Merriman: "The Commercial Resources and the Financial Position of South Africa."

† *Ibid.*

## 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.]

## ART. IX.—MR. GLADSTONE'S IRISH POLICY.

THOSE members of the Liberal party who have taken part in the opposition to Mr. Gladstone's latest Irish policy have endured many things at the hands of their friends. Traitorous, pedantic, unpractical, anti-democratic—such are the epithets bestowed on us in generous abundance. I do not complain of the treatment we have received. It is natural enough that excited partisans should have none but hard words for those who do not happen to share their belief in the leaders and the policy of the moment. We must hold on, and hope for better times; and we must lose no opportunity of promoting the sober and rational discussion of the great question now before the country. By the kindness of the Editors of the WESTMINSTER REVIEW I am permitted to state some of the reasons which govern my own individual judgment in this matter.

If it be treason to doubt the wisdom of our illustrious leader, I must avow myself a traitor of some standing. I have followed Mr. Gladstone loyally, as a party man is bound to do, but always with a considerable measure of mistrust. He is undoubtedly a man of political genius; and he seems to me to be animated by a sincere desire to do what is just and benevolent. But his mind, capacious and powerful as it is, seems to retain no consistent hold either on principles or on facts. He has indeed a wonderful command of principles and facts, when he requires them for purposes of advocacy; but when they have served his purpose, they seem to pass from his mind altogether, leaving it open to receive the new principles and facts which he may require for some other occasion.

I venture to think that this estimate of Mr. Gladstone's statesmanship is strongly confirmed by his treatment of the Irish land question. He set to work in 1870 with a sincere desire to avoid revolutionary methods. He recognized the landlord as the sole owner of the soil; he repudiated the tenant's claim to joint ownership; but he introduced certain new terms into the contract

of tenancy. The contract, thus re-drawn and amended by the State, was to be the basis of better relations between the parties, and the sources of agrarian strife were to be "sealed and closed up for ever." This prediction having been falsified by events, Mr. Gladstone came forward in 1881 as a strenuous advocate of joint ownership. A substantial right of property in the soil was secured to the tenant; the landlord was reduced to the position of a rent-charger; and Mr. Gladstone succeeded in persuading himself and his supporters that the process could be carried out without injury to the landlord. Once more he assured us that the law which he proposed would put an end to strife and make the position of the landowning classes more secure; and once more his predictions were not borne out by the event. Now he tells us that the position of the landlord has become untenable; that the rent-chargers must be bought out; and that the strife between classes in Ireland is so bitter that we cannot permit an Irish Legislature to settle the conditions of sale.

The agrarian revolution thus unintentionally brought about is due to two causes. First, Mr. Gladstone has not been guided by legal and economic principle in his dealings with Irish land. He is neither a State Socialist nor an orthodox economist; he borrows a principle, now from one school, now from the other, and employs it with masterly skill in support of some temporary compromise. In the second place, Mr. Gladstone has not kept a firm hold on the facts of the case. If he had known the Irish tenant, he never could have persuaded himself that the Act of 1870 would be accepted as a final settlement. He would have seen, what some of his critics saw plainly enough, that the Act would be regarded as a partial recognition of the Irish idea—the idea that land belongs to the cultivating occupier. I do not wish to lay an ungenerous stress on a mistake which was made in good faith; I do wish to bring out the fact that a mistake was made. For Mr. Gladstone is now proposing to deal with the government of Ireland very much as he dealt with the landlords in 1870. He is sincerely anxious to avoid revolution; he is faithful to the unity of the Empire; he refuses the claim of complete legislative independence. He proposes merely to re-draft the Act of Union, in the hope that the amended contract may be the basis of better relations between the two countries, and that the sources of political strife may be "sealed and closed up for ever." Is it treason to suggest that this Bill, if it should ever pass, will be accepted as a partial recognition of the Irish idea—the idea that Ireland is a country within which the British Crown has no rights whatever?

To the admirers of Mr. Gladstone his changes of opinion are so many proofs of his superior wisdom. They apply to his



utterances that theory of development which has done good service to a certain school of theology. They labour to persuade us that the Irish Government Bill was only a further revelation of truths which had long been cherished and expounded by its author. We are even asked to believe that the party and the country expressed their approval of the general policy of the Bill at the General Election of 1885. Mr. Beesly assures us that when Mr. Gladstone became a Home Ruler he "went straight to the people." Lord Granville, speaking at Manchester on May 7 last, asked triumphantly whether the Bill went an inch beyond the Midlothian speeches of last November. Lord Granville must have been experimenting on his audience when he asked this absurd question; but as the experiment seems to have been quite successful, it may be well to set out a brief itinerary of the way by which our party has been led.

On September 26, 1871, speaking at Aberdeen, Mr. Gladstone took note of the formation of a Home Rule party in Ireland. He did not exactly know what was meant by Home Rule, but he thought the demand for a separate legislature unreasonable, unless it could be shown that Ireland had made just demands, which England and Scotland had united to refuse. He contended that Ireland had in fact been treated with special favour by Parliament. Scotland and Wales had as good a title to separate representation; and to break up the United Kingdom in this way would be "to disintegrate the capital institutions of the country, for the purpose of making ourselves ridiculous in the sight of all mankind."

On March 20, 1874, Mr. Butt moved a Home Rule amendment to the address in the House of Commons. Mr. Gladstone once more declared that Parliament had done justice to Ireland, and he pointed out the extreme difficulty of defining what was meant by "exclusively Irish affairs."

On November 7, 1877, Mr. Gladstone received the freedom of the city of Dublin. In the course of a speech delivered on that occasion, he adverted to the fact, that the Home Rule party had recently increased its strength by capturing seven seats from the Conservatives, and no less than forty-three seats from the Liberals. He regretted the formation of an exclusively Irish party, and he reminded his hearers that O'Connell had stood shoulder to shoulder with English Liberals in the struggle for Irish rights. On March 20, 1880, Mr. Gladstone referred to this Dublin speech as a conclusive proof that he and his party had been faithful to the principle, "One Queen, one Parliament, one Empire." He also taunted the Conservatives with having encouraged the Home Rule movement by appointing Mr. King-Harman to the Lord Lieutenancy of county Roscommon.

I pass over the speeches made by Mr. Gladstone during the period when Mr. Parnell was actively hostile to the British Government. It may not be quite fair to found an argument on the highly rhetorical phrases in which the objects and methods of the Parnellite party were then described. But it is important to note the line taken by Mr. Gladstone in the debates on the Franchise Act of 1884. He scouted the notion that the loyal minority in Ireland would be exposed to danger by an extension of the franchise. "There is," he said, "some security for the loyal minority in the composition of this House;" and he went on to argue that eighty Parnellite members could never obtain absolute control of Irish legislation. Is it possible to suppose that when the Prime Minister used this argument he thought that the return of eighty Parnellite members would render it necessary to give Ireland a separate legislature, and that the protection of the minority was an "exclusively Irish affair?"

During the long electoral campaign of 1885, Mr. Parnell was careful to let us know clearly what he and his friends meant to demand in the coming Parliament. He cast aside Mr. Butt's federal scheme, and declared for an Irish Parliament as independent as that of 1782; and while he admitted that under the British Constitution he could ask no more, he said he could place no barrier to the march of a nation. He did not actually advocate separation from Great Britain; but he plainly implied that it was for Ireland to decide whether separation should take place or not.

Mr. Gladstone made no explicit answer to this demand. He asked the country to give him a majority large enough to make him independent of the Parnellite vote. And what was the Irish policy of the Liberal majority to be? "To maintain the supremacy of the Crown, the unity of the Empire, and all the authority of Parliament necessary for the conservation of that unity; and, subject to this governing principle, to grant to portions of the country enlarged powers for the management of their own affairs." There is nothing very definite in these phrases; but, even if we suppose that Mr. Gladstone's mind was already tending towards Home Rule, he could not afford to be definite. The watchword of his Midlothian campaign was the unity of the Liberal party. If at that time he had said in so many words, "I am in favour of giving Ireland a separate legislature, and of removing the Irish members from the House of Commons," the Liberal party would have been rent in pieces, and no man can say what the result of the election would have been. The unity of the party was successfully maintained; and the new House of Commons was composed of 333 Liberals, 251 Conservatives, and 86 Parnellites. Of the 333 Liberals not more than twenty

had expressed a distinct opinion in favour of Home Rule for Ireland.

Almost as soon as the result of the election was known, it was announced that Mr. Gladstone had become a convert to the principle of Home Rule, and the announcement was met with nothing more than the customary official contradiction. It may be contended that circumstances justified, or even compelled, this change of opinion; but how shall we account for the sudden abandonment of so many pledges, given and repeated with the most serious emphasis? Mr. Gladstone had done his best to convince us that the Imperial Parliament was in every way competent to make good laws for Ireland. He had protested against "condescending to the prejudices of the Home Rulers." He had warned the Nationalists that they must themselves present an intelligible scheme before their claim could be considered; and if the claim should prove to be unreasonable, he held that "there was a higher law than the law of conciliation." All these opinions have passed out of Mr. Gladstone's mind. He appears to be honestly unconscious of having ever held them. He now thinks that Parliament cannot make laws which will command the obedience of the Irish people. If there be a higher law than the law of conciliation, it is not for us to apply it. We must give the Nationalists, not exactly what they want, but at least what we can regard as a fair answer to the substance of their demand. We must make this concession in a spirit of confidence and hope; and our previous failures need not cause us the least misgiving.

These new views must have been clearly defined in Mr. Gladstone's mind before Parliament met in January; but they were revealed to the public only by slow degrees. First, there was a Conservative Government to be turned out of office; and here no difficulty was encountered. Then came the formation of a Cabinet of anxious inquirers; and the ingenuous intimation that if anybody had anything to say about Ireland, his views should receive the respectful attention of Her Majesty's advisers. The result of this invitation may be seen in the Blue-book, from which we learned that the Town Councils of Ireland are all in favour of Home Rule, and that the Grand Juries are against it, together with other facts of equal novelty and importance. While this valuable information was being collected, the Liberal party was undergoing a process of education, in the Disraelian sense of the word. Ministers were "finding salvation," and passing at once from the inquirers' bench to the platform, like so many converts at a Salvation Army meeting. Gentlemen on their promotion were sliding gently down an inclined plane of phrases, until at last they went over the edge and discovered that they

had always been Home Rulers. As for the lighter heads of the party, they were delighted with every detail of Mr. Gladstone's plan, and determined to force it on their friends and neighbours, long before they knew what the plan was to be. Meantime, the Cabinet considered, disputed, got rid of two intractable colleagues, and swallowed a vast quantity of formulæ. Mr. Gladstone's original proposals were cut down to the water's edge, but they were floated at last, and the Irish Government Bill was introduced in a remarkable speech.

I need not dwell on the history of the two months which elapsed between the oratorical triumph of April 8 and the political defeat of June 7. Let one remark suffice. By common consent, Mr. Gladstone is a master of the arts of party government; even his enemies say that if he is no statesman he is at least a great tactician. Since December last he has devoted all his skill and energy to this question, and with what result? The first Household Suffrage Parliament has been dissolved before its work was well begun; and it is by no means unlikely that a succession of Parliaments will be dissolved in like manner. The Liberal party is so seriously divided that we cannot be sure that it will ever be restored to its former strength. Wild hopes and fears have been excited in Ireland and among the Irish in Great Britain. Mr. Gladstone himself has lost his freedom of action by committing himself to all the details of a crude and ill-considered scheme. If this be tactical genius, we have had enough of tactics for some time to come.

But, it is said, whatever confusion Mr. Gladstone has caused, he has at least done something to advance the great principle of Home Rule. His Bill may never be carried, but in the end the principle must prevail. But what in the name of common-sense is this principle of Home Rule? Reduced to plain terms, it amounts to this: That Ireland is to have some kind of legislature, exercising some powers, subject to some restrictions, raising (or not raising) some revenue, and related in some way to the Imperial Parliament. As soon as we attempt to give precision to any part of this description, some good Gladstonian is sure to protest against the introduction of what he calls questions of detail. There are people who think that the federalization of the United Kingdom is a question of detail, and some of these people are members of the House of Commons. That a popularly elected legislature is a good thing—this is a matter of principle. Whether a proposed new legislature is required or not; whether it is likely to make good laws or bad laws—these are questions of detail. That we must do something to get rid of the Irish difficulty—this is a matter of principle. Whether Mr. Gladstone's scheme would destroy the roots of the Irish difficulty or leave them

in the ground—that is a question of detail. It only remains to carry the argument one step farther. That social order should be maintained in Ireland—this is a matter of principle. Whether it is maintained by concession or coercion—that is a question of detail. The distinction may be found useful the next time a Liberal Government has to pass a Crimes Act.

Hitherto I have been dealing with Mr. Gladstone as the leader of a party. I have tried to show that he carefully taught his party to take a certain view of the question of Home Rule; that he changed his own view suddenly, and without assignable reason; and that a considerable number of Liberals changed along with him. These facts throw a somewhat unpleasant light on the state of political parties. For some time past we have been drifting towards a state of parties not unlike what we see in the United States. We have two great parties, not divided by any clear difference of principle, each of which is only too ready to take up any proposal if it seems likely to become popular. Each party is provided with a machine; and as soon as some new proposal is added to the programme, the machine is set to work in support of it. The first few turns of the machine produce a great effect on persons of undecided opinions. We must all remember, about the middle of April last, how many good Liberals there were who shook their heads over the Bill, but at the same time thought that something of this kind was inevitable; we must, at least, be ready to take it up, lest perchance the Conservatives should out-run us and get the credit of settling the question.

But the weaknesses of party government in general, or of our own party in particular, do not affect the merits of Mr. Gladstone's Bill. If it had been a good Bill, we should have been bound to support it, while reserving our liberty to criticize the manner in which and the persons by whom it was introduced. But so far from thinking it a good Bill, I make bold to say that it was about the worst kind of Bill that could have been presented to Parliament under existing circumstances. It was obscure where it ought to have been clear; it left open and unsettled several questions of cardinal importance. These defects might have been wholly or partly removed in Committee; but no committee could have removed the radical weakness of the measure. The truth is that Mr. Gladstone committed himself to the hopeless policy of attempting to combine two conflicting and contradictory principles—the principle that Ireland ought to be made a self-governing country, and the principle that Ireland ought to be retained as an integral part of the United Kingdom. The same remark applies to all the schemes of Home Rule which have yet been put forward. Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Chamberlain differ widely on points of minor importance, but they are spending their

strength on the same insoluble problem—How to give Ireland a separate legislature and a separate Government without repealing the Act of Union. To the demand for national independence they both make the same answer: "You wish to have power to make your own laws. You shall have that power, on condition that you continue to respect the principle of free trade, as we understand it; the principle of religious equality, as we understand it; the unity of the Empire, as we understand it." To use a legal phrase, I would submit that the condition is repugnant to the nature of the gift.

It is supposed that the defects of Mr. Gladstone's Bill may be disregarded, because the Irish members have accepted it, and undertaken to work it. On this point I do not wish to raise any merely personal objection. I am disposed to think that Mr. Parnell and his friends do mean to work Mr. Gladstone's scheme loyally, if they can. But no eighty-six gentlemen can bind the Irish people to persevere in an irksome and thankless undertaking. If the restrictions imposed on a native legislature are in themselves illogical and irritating, attempts will be made to get rid of them. Suppose, for example (not a very extreme supposition), that there should be a genuine Irish movement in favour of the protection of native industry. Mr. Parnell might take the constitutional course of opposing the movement; but if the leader of the Opposition in the Irish Parliament were to take the question up, and confront Mr. Parnell with his Wicklow speech, what then? A strong Irish party would demand an enlargement of the powers of the Legislature, and nothing would be easier than to force on England the choice between conceding the demand and withdrawing the statutory Constitution. "Well," says the British Home Ruler, "then we should withdraw the Constitution." I do not believe that we should, or that we could. If we set up a Parliament in Dublin new parties will come into existence, new forces will begin to operate; Ireland will pass beyond our control for good or for evil. It is not likely that the Irish people will desire to put off the character of British subjects. They know that we are their best customers; and that one fact is worth more than all the rhetoric about "inextinguishable hatred." But if we give them a Constitution mainly composed of restrictive clauses, it is more than probable that our boasted safeguards will go down one by one, until at last the British Government will allow itself to be bought out at a very moderate valuation; while Ireland will go its way, a self-governing and disagreeably independent colony.

All these suggested safeguards are simply so many proofs that our statesmen have not yet realized the true nature of the issue before them. We may permit Ireland to govern herself as a

country separate from England, or we may refuse her that permission. We must choose between the two principles—Separation and Union—and when we have made our choice we must act on it, logically and courageously. At present we are merely wasting our time in illogical, unpractical, half-hearted attempts to combine two utterly inconsistent policies.

I do not myself hold the principle of separation; but I admit that there is much to be said for it. We have never been on very good terms with the Irish, and we are separated from them by sixty miles of uncomfortable sea. We are slow, unsympathetic, and businesslike; they are quick, emotional, and slovenly. We like a conventional and expensive kind of Government; they like to be led by individuals, and they are too poor to pay for what we call efficiency. We do not dislike them, but we disapprove of their characteristic habits. They do not hate us, whatever Mr. Sexton may say in his tragic moods; but they resent our intolerable airs of superiority. Perhaps we should be better friends if we were to part, as Ontario parted from Quebec. But if we separate, we must completely disentangle our own affairs from those of Ireland; we must leave ourselves no excuse for interfering with their management of their own concerns; we must offer them no more of our well-meant advice; and we must expect from them no assistance or contribution whatever.

To give the new Irish Government a fair start, Great Britain must take over the Army, the Navy, and the National Debt. No poor country can be expected to begin life with forty millions of debt slung round its neck. Nor can Ireland well afford to let any portion of its public revenue pass into the British exchequer. The sacrifices demanded of us will be considerable; but, on the other hand, we shall make no more advances for Irish purposes, and we shall not have to undertake the expense or the risk of any scheme of compensation. If Ireland is going to govern herself, it is quite clear that we are in no way bound to provide for the landlords, or the judges, or the civil servants of the Crown. We hand the country over as a going concern, and the new managers must meet their liabilities as they arise. Why interfere between a responsible Government and any class of its subjects? Why should an Irishman be exempted from the authority of the Government under which he lives because he happens to own land or to draw an official salary? If the new legislature treats the landlords harshly, we shall be very sorry for them; but they will have no claim on the British taxpayer. If the judges' pensions are taken away by law, that will be a gross breach of the conditions on which they were appointed. But we shall not be responsible. If a like injustice were perpe-

trated by the Government of Cape Colony, nobody would think of advising the victims to appeal to the Imperial Parliament. To avoid misconception, let me say that I do not believe the Irish Parliament would commit the acts which I have described. But if it is to be a genuine legislative authority it ought to have power to commit them. Either the Irish nation is of age, or it is not. If it is, we must learn to show some confidence in its discretion, instead of keeping it tied to England's apron-string.

If we asked Mr. Gladstone to vote for the kind of Home Rule I have described, he would reject the proposal with indignation, just as he would have rejected the Land Purchase Bill if it had been brought forward in 1870. Mr. Gladstone's method is to take a ticket for York, by way of proving his firm determination never, never to go to Edinburgh. It is only when his train has carried him "inadvertently" as far as Berwick that he begins to feel he can no longer fence or skirmish with the question of crossing the border. His followers cultivate the same habit of mind. They will give self-government to Ireland, but they will not hear of separation. They cling to the Act of Union, and many of them wish to keep the Irish members at Westminster. In the interest of Ireland I protest against the irrational endeavour to grant freedom, and at the same time to retain ascendancy. No good thing can come out of a party which says to the Irish people, "We fully admit your right to make your own laws; only you must allow us to appropriate three-fifths of your revenue, and to restrain you from meddling with religion, customs, excise, currency, and trade."

If the people of this country decide in favour of Home Rule, we must accept their decision loyally and make the best of it. But before the irrevocable judgment goes forth, let us anxiously consider whether the step, which we are invited to take be indeed inevitable. Is it not possible to solve the problem of Irish government without encountering the risks which must attend any fundamental change in the Constitution of the United Kingdom? I venture to say that it is possible; and my judgment is confirmed by all that I can learn of Irish opinion. It is clear that the Irish people have not formed any distinct notion of the form of government they desire. They supported the federal scheme of Mr. Butt; they supported the separatist scheme of Mr. Parnell; they accept the compromise offered by Mr. Gladstone. They have never been taught to realize what is implied in Home Rule, when the principle is logically carried out. The substance of their demand may be reduced to two simple propositions. First, Ireland is an independent nation, and she ought not to be joined in political union with the



English and Scottish nations, unless with her own consent. Second, Ireland ought to be governed by popular methods. The men who make her laws must be men who trust the people and are trusted by them. Both these propositions I am prepared to subscribe *ex animo*, without mental reservation. But I hold that we may accept and give effect to both, within the limits of the Union, without adopting any form of Home Rule.

Ireland is a nation, and not a province of England. Being myself a Scotchman, proud of my nationality and desiring to preserve it, I sympathize with the national sentiment which pervades Irish politics and literature. But if Mr. Chamberlain or any other Englishman proposes to set up a Scotch Parliament in Edinburgh, I shall oppose him strenuously, and that for several reasons. First, because a local Parliament would require new and expensive official machinery. Second, because it would be the cause of over-legislation, and of all those evils which result from the maintenance of two systems of law within the same country. Third, because it would narrow the range of Scotch politics and give undue importance to local and sectarian differences. Fourth, because it would diminish the influence of Scotland in the Imperial Parliament, by keeping her political leaders at home instead of sending them to Westminster. Every one of these reasons applies to Ireland as directly and forcibly as to Scotland.

Scotch legislation gives Parliament no trouble, because Englishmen have the sense to see that they do not understand it, and to let the Scotch members alone. We must let the Irish members alone; we must banish once for all the idea that Irish legislation should be used as a means for increasing the popularity of British statesmen. Downing Street never understood and never will understand any Irish question. Of course, if the Irish members bring in and discuss their own Bills, they must be kept as short of public money as the Scotch members are. It may be said that the Irish members will make unjust laws. Very likely they will; but the worst they can do will be no worse than the injustice we have ourselves committed in our well-meant efforts to legislate for them. Again, it may be said that Parliament will not have time to pass all the measures which Irishmen desire. There is a curious belief, very prevalent at the present time, that we ought to be always legislating on a large scale and at a great pace. As a Radical of what may now be called the Old School—the school of Mill and Fawcett—I hold that this belief is entirely mistaken. Our Parliament turns out, in an ordinary session, as many new laws as the three kingdoms can understand and apply to advantage. Changes in legislative

forms are required, not to increase the quantity, but to improve the quality of our legislation.

The Home Rule movement is only a phase of that questionable latter-day Radicalism—borrowed from the authoritative democrats of continental countries—which assumes that every kind of evil, social and political, can be cured by compulsion of law. This false belief has already cost Ireland dear. We have laid the land system of the country in ruins; but Parliament has only succeeded in proving that the agrarian problem will not be solved by any number of Land Acts. We are told now that the difficulties attending the maintenance of social order may be removed by changing the form of the government. I admit that the concession of an Irish Legislature would to some extent remove the prejudice against the law which now exists. But the question remains, whether that prejudice may not be removed by other means—by means which will produce a greater ultimate benefit to the people. This, of course, is a question which Mr. Gladstone and his friends will not allow us to consider. They have determined to try Home Rule, and they assume in their irrational haste that there is no alternative remedy.

I have never been able to see that the form of government we have provided for Ireland is materially worse than the form we have provided for ourselves. The spirit of centralization reigns in Dublin Castle, just as it reigns in Whitehall. The Grand Jury is not an ideal authority; but neither is Quarter Sessions. Even the anomalies of the Irish municipal franchise do not place the inhabitants of an Irish town in a worse position than the inhabitants of London. So far as Parliament is concerned, Ireland is fairly and more than fairly represented in the House of Commons; and we Liberals have insisted on admitting Irishmen to an equality with ourselves in the matter of electoral rights. But—and here I touch what seems to me the root of the Irish difficulty—while the form of the government is popular, its methods are despotic; and this is just one of the cases in which methods are more important than forms.

Mr. Gladstone's method with Ireland has always been more or less despotic. Sometimes he has tried force, as when he threw Mr. Parnell into Kilmainham. Again, he has tried benevolent despotism, as when he tried to solve the land question by means of an agrarian poor law. Even at this moment, in the act of creating an independent legislature, he must needs dictate beforehand what the Legislature ought or ought not to do. It has never occurred to him to govern Ireland, as he governs England and Scotland, by putting himself in contact with the people and making a direct appeal to their political judgment. The people of Great Britain are governed partly by law, but

chiefly by personal and social influence. The people of Ireland refuse to be governed because the representatives of law make no attempt to acquire personal and social influence among them.

It is the want of personal contact with their subjects which makes our statesmen so hopelessly weak in dealing with Irish disaffection. If an agitator makes a foolish speech in England, we can usually afford to let him alone, because the representatives of authority will be heard in their turn. In Ireland the authorities are never heard. If an agitator makes a foolish speech he is not answered; he is put into Kilmainham, and he emerges from prison after a short term, ten times more powerful and more ill-conditioned than he was when he went in.

The agitation which has culminated in the return of eighty-six Parnellites to Parliament may be said to have begun in 1879. The bad harvest of that year gave Davitt the opportunity to raise the land question, and to found the Land League. A General Election was approaching, and the anti-English parties were preparing to strike a blow at the Government. Lord Beaconsfield saw the danger, but he gave us the impression that he was pointing it out, not for the sake of Ireland, but rather to influence the elections in Great Britain. Mr. Gladstone hardly seemed to see the danger; he certainly made no attempt to meet it directly. He spoke scores of times in England, dozens of times in Scotland; he never went to Ireland at all. Can we wonder that the Irish people refused to give their confidence to a leader who would not even take the trouble to ask for it? I have been told by British politicians that the Irish would not listen to a British statesman, but this, I believe, is a complete mistake. When Mr. Gladstone was in Ireland in 1877, the Nationalists were annoyed and rather alarmed by his popularity. A friend who lives in Wicklow told me that the people in his neighbourhood came out of their houses and knelt down at the roadside to bless the great Englishman who had stood their friend. Surely the warm feelings of those people might have been turned to political account with advantage to them and to us. Mr. Gladstone has made a tremendous bid for the votes of the Irish members. I believe that a smaller bid would have sufficed if he had only chosen to bid for the votes of the Irish electors.

I have often endeavoured to discuss, in meetings of British Liberals, the arrangements which would be necessary if we desired to give a substantial measure of Home Rule within the limits of the Constitution. The Irish members ought to form a Grand Committee on Irish Bills, and we might well empower them to hold special sessions in Dublin for the purpose of taking evidence and of reporting generally on the needs of

their country. We ought to abolish the Lord Lieutenancy, and place the Executive Government in the hands of a resident Chief Secretary, assisted by a Parliamentary Under Secretary. Industry should be encouraged and the evil of poverty combated, not by grants of money, but by the encouragement of private enterprise, and the diffusion of sound information and advice. Order should be maintained, not by giving arbitrary powers to the Government, but by promoting the steady enforcement of the ordinary law. The Irish have been taught to look on the criminal law as a foreign institution, established for the benefit of landlords and unpopular persons generally. We encourage this delusion by tampering continually with the administration of justice on political grounds. If the Government wishes to see the law well administered, its best policy is to interfere as little as possible. I should like to see a Chief Secretary brave enough to govern Ireland without packed juries and to fight the secret societies without the aid of the informer.

Once on a time, these ideas were held to savour of doctrinaire Radicalism. They were received with some favour by advanced politicians; they were repudiated by moderate men who adhered to Mr. Gladstone and Lord Spencer. But now many of my advanced friends are so excited about Mr. Gladstone's new policy, that they cannot even listen with decent courtesy to any argument against it; while some of my moderate friends are drumming and shouting and flourishing subscription cards in the front rank of the Political Salvation Army. I have to complain of Mr. Gladstone, not only because he has produced an ill-considered scheme for the government of Ireland, but also because he has made the rational discussion of the subject almost impossible. We are told that the issue now before the country is clear and simple. We are to choose between Mr. Gladstone and Lord Salisbury, between Home Rule and Coercion, between a paper Union and a genuine community of sentiment. The issue is, in point of fact, obscure and complicated; we cannot even approach it until we have cleared out of the way the false issues which are raised to embarrass our judgment. I take the arguments of the Gladstonian Home Rulers, addressed to those whom they are pleased to describe as the seceding Liberals, and I find that they are simply so many attempts to withdraw our attention from the facts and principles which ought to influence the minds of practical politicians.

This is not a personal question between Mr. Gladstone on the one hand, and Lord Salisbury, or Lord Hartington, or Mr. Chamberlain on the other. There is perhaps none of these distinguished individuals who can offer us a complete solution of the Irish problem. No one man is to be followed in an emergency like

the present, the first necessity of the case is that competing policies should be fairly weighed against one another, and that all opinions should be heard. At the famous meeting of the National Liberal Federation, it was suggested that Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Jesse Collings were to be condemned because they would not allow Mr. Gladstone to frame a new Irish policy without consulting them. I always imagined that if men were governed without being consulted, they were properly described as slaves. In modern parlance they are robust Liberals, loyal Radicals, genuine believers in popular government.

The choice before us does not lie between Home Rule and Coercion. For my own part I am willing to let the Irish people manage their own affairs to an extent not contemplated by Mr. Gladstone; and I regard our Coercion Acts as so many proofs that we have not yet learned how to govern the country. The question is whether the necessity for coercion may best be removed by altering the methods of government, or by making a fundamental and irrevocable change in its form. Mr. Gladstone's own arguments on the subject of coercion are to me almost unintelligible. First, he points out that the record of Irish crime is much less formidable than it used to be. From this fact he draws the curious inference that our legislation for Ireland is and always must be a total failure. Coercion, it seems, cannot be effectively applied unless by a national legislature. But the question is by whom, over whom, and for what ends the coercive authority of an Irish Legislature will be exercised. Mr. Gladstone's speech in introducing the Irish Government Bill admits of two interpretations. He may mean to assure us, that if there is disorder in Ireland, the local Parliament will be able to apply measures such as he himself has often devised and supported for the repression of crime. If that is so, what will the anti-coercion party gain by the change? On the other hand, he may mean that when Ireland has a local legislature the necessity for exceptional measures will disappear. No solid reason is given for this sanguine forecast. We know that the establishment of a legislature in Dublin will be the signal for an outburst of agrarian excitement and religious strife. If Mr. Parnell is to be the first responsible head of an Irish executive, his difficulties will be numerous and grave. We gain nothing by attempting to conceal these difficulties from ourselves or from our Irish friends.

Again, the question at issue is a question for the present generation, and must not be mixed up with the controversies and blunders of the past. Nobody can understand Irish politics without a considerable knowledge of history; but history must not be pressed into the service of party. Let

us confess that England has made many mistakes in dealing with Ireland. How does that affect the question whether Englishmen and Irishmen can or cannot now agree to live peaceably within the limits of the Union? Let us admit that the Union was obtained by force and fraud. How does that affect the question whether the Union is or is not on the whole the most satisfactory basis for the future political relations of the two countries? Let us admit (rather a large admission) that Ireland was more prosperous and orderly under Grattan's Parliament than she has been under the Union. How does that affect the question whether we ought to establish a legislature utterly different from Grattan's Parliament in every essential respect?

If the arguments drawn from our own history are apt to be misleading, those which are drawn from foreign sources are still less useful for the purposes of the present controversy. When Holland and Belgium were separated in 1830 they became two separate and independent States. The case of Austria and Hungary is so peculiar, that we cannot make it serve as a constitutional precedent. If Mr. Chamberlain will turn over the reports of the cases decided under the British North America Act 1867, I question very much whether he will continue to hold up the Canadian Confederation as a model for our imitation. The Provinces were separate colonies of equal rank, possessing legislative bodies with plenary power. They were united, at their own request, in one Dominion; but their legislatures still have plenary power, except in matters assigned to the Canadian Parliament. No analogy can be established between the facts of the Canadian question and the facts of the question now under discussion. These foreign and colonial parallels are interesting in themselves; we shall do well to study them quietly as we have opportunity. But when used in debate they are often of less than no value. Even Mr. Bryce cannot throw much force into the argument, that because various systems of dual government have worked fairly well in various parts of the world, therefore a wholly untried system of dual government is likely to work well in the United Kingdom.

Again, it must be steadily borne in mind that Home Rule, as understood in Ireland, has nothing to do with the reform of local government, as understood in Great Britain. If a separate legislature is conceded, the reform of Irish local government will be a matter for that legislature and not for Parliament. If a separate legislature is refused, no administrative council, parochial, provincial, or national, can be regarded as a substitute for it. Mr. Gladstone's Bill has sometimes been described as a measure of decentralization; it is, in fact, a measure for

centralizing all power over Irish affairs in a single body. It is the creation of a new centre, in the shape of a legislature which may or may not favour the policy of decentralization recommended by Mr. Gladstone.

But all the fallacies which the debates on the Irish Government Bill have produced would have little influence on the public mind if it were not for the great master fallacy, that the Bill is an assertion of what are vaguely described as popular rights. I absolutely deny that in maintaining the Union we infringe any right whatever. The Irish people have the same political franchise as we have. They may fairly claim to be governed by popular methods, within the limits of the Act of Union. If they wish to repeal or alter the Act of Union, they must refer the question to the electors of the three kingdoms; and if the decision goes against them they are bound in duty to accept it loyally. Mr. Gladstone seems to hint that they are justified in mutinous resistance to the Act of Union, because it was obtained "by force and fraud." If this argument is admitted, the foundations of social order are not safe. If Irishmen may repudiate the Union, British Radicals may repudiate the National Debt. We may plead that the debt was contracted to support a policy of force and fraud, at a time when the masses of the people were not adequately represented in Parliament. These are, in fact, the arguments used by the few extreme persons who advocate repudiation.

In support of his theory, that the cause of Home Rule is the cause of popular government, Mr. Gladstone puts forward a statement which none of his critics would desire to leave unnoticed. He asserts that the opposition to his scheme has come chiefly from the classes—that is from persons of superior education and social rank. I should be sorry to waste a serious answer on this preposterous assertion; but I should like to ask—not the Prime Minister, but rather Mr. Herbert Gladstone, who is about my own standing—whether he has ever heard of the manœuvre known as carrying the war into the enemy's country? How does the British Home Rule party stand in relation to the classes? Mr. Gladstone himself was educated at Eton and Christ Church; brought into Parliament by ducal influence; promoted from step to step of the official hierarchy, and rewarded with many thousand pounds of public money. His trusted lieutenant, Sir W. Harcourt, is a person of noble or even royal lineage, once a lawyer, and still a sinecure professor. His unofficial confidant, Mr. Labouchere, is an ex-diplomatist, a denizen of the London clubs, and the editor of a Society paper. His Irish allies are Mr. Parnell, a landlord; Mr. Justin McCarthy, a drawing-room historian and novelist; Mr. Healy, a rising barrister, connected

by marriage with the Lord Mayor of Dublin. If I only possessed the style of Mr. Joseph Leicester, I would call on the sons of toil to arise in their might and sweep from power these minions of luxury and privilege.

We "dissident Liberals" have derived an advantage from the manner in which our Gladstonian friends have presented their case. Believing as we do that the Union can be and ought to be maintained, we should have been in a somewhat perplexing position if the deliberate judgment of our own party had gone against us. We might have been driven to acknowledge that Home Rule, though neither necessary nor desirable, had become practically inevitable. As matters now stand, we are not contending against the judgment of our party. An attempt has been made to deprive us of our judgment, to suppress differences of opinion, to decide a great issue under the imperious control of a suddenly awakened sentiment. We are absolved from our allegiance to leaders who treat us in this headstrong fashion. It is right that we should defer to the unequalled influence of Mr. Gladstone; it is not right that we should give him authority to revise the party programme as often as he changes his own principles of action.

There is every reason to believe that we have a great deal of trouble before us. This election may settle nothing; parties may be balanced and divided in the next Parliament as they were in the last. Even if Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Parnell should command a decided majority in the new House of Commons, the obstinacy of the House of Lords may cost us another penal dissolution. If the country decides against the advocates of Home Rule, obstruction will be the resource of the Irish members and their English allies. The patience of Unionist politicians may give way; under the stress of conflicting opinions we may take refuge in some unsatisfactory compromise. But the omens are not all unfavourable. We have defeated a powerful combination; we have finally disposed of one dangerous project; we have done something to open the mind of the country to the issue which is now to be tried. Great Britain and Ireland have to choose between Union and Separation. Both principles are worth considering; either the one or the other may be made the basis of a settlement. But we shall not be safe until we can find men who are prepared to act consistently and courageously on the principle which they adopt.

THOMAS RALEIGH.



## ART. X.—THE SOCIALIST MOVEMENT.

SOME good-hearted people must have felt an uncomfortable thrill when they heard Professor Huxley declare that he would rather have been born a savage in one of the Fiji Islands than have been born in a London slum. The advantages of civilization, from the slum point of view, must appear somewhat doubtful; and as a considerable part of the population of every large city live in the slums, the slum view has an importance of its own as a factor in the future social evolution. For it must be remembered that the slum population is not wholly composed of criminals and ne'er-do-weels—the “good-for-nothings” of Herbert Spencer. The honest workman and struggling seamstress live there cheek by jowl with the thief and the harlot; and with the spread of education has arisen an inclination to question whether, after all, everything has been arranged quite as well as it might be in this best of all possible worlds. The question, “Whether on the whole civilization has been an advantage?” has been a theme of academical discussion since Rousseau won the prize for an essay on “Has the restoration of the Sciences contributed to purify or to corrupt Manners?” and laid down the audacious thesis that riches gave birth to luxury and idleness, and from luxury sprung the arts, from idleness the sciences. But it has now changed its form, and has entered the arena of practical life: men are asking now, Is it rational that the progress of society should be as lopsided as it is? Is it necessary that, while civilization brings to some art, beauty, refinement—all that makes life fair and gracious—it should bring to others drudgery, misery, degradation, such as no uncivilized people know; and these emphasized and rendered the bitterer by the contrast of what life is to many, the dream of what it might be to all? For Professor Huxley is right. The savage has the forest and the open sea, the joy of physical strength, food easily won, leisure sweet after the excitement of the chase; the civilized toiler has the monotonous drudgery of the stuffy workshop, the hell of the gin-palace for his pleasure-ground, the pandemonium of reeking court and stifling alley for his lullaby: civilization has robbed him of all natural beauty and physical joy, and has given him in exchange—the slum. It is little wonder that, under these circumstances, there are many who have but scant respect for our social fabric, and who are apt to think that any change cannot land them in a condition worse than that in which they already find themselves.

The tendency to think of complete social change as a possible occurrence has come down to the present generation as an inheritance of the past. Old men still dwell fondly on the hopes of the "social missionaries" who were preaching when the men now of middle-age were born. Some even remember the experiments of Robert Owen and of his personal disciples, the hopes raised by New Lanark and Arbiston, the chill disappointment of New Harmony. The dream that glorified their youth has remained a sacred memory, and they have told how all might have been different had society been prepared in Owen's time for the fundamental change. And the great and far-reaching co-operative movement, born of Owen's socialism, has kept "his memory green," and has prepared men to think of a possible future in which co-operation should wholly replace competition, and Owen's dream of universal brotherhood become a living reality. Such part of the energy of the Owenite Socialists as was not merged in co-operative activity was swamped in the sudden rush of prosperity that followed the repeal of the Corn Laws and the English triumph of Free Trade. Now that that rush is long over, and the old misery is on the workers once more, their minds turn back to the old schemes, and they listen readily to suggestions of a new social order.

The abnormally rapid multiplication characteristic of the very poor is at once constantly rendering the problem to be solved more difficult and more imperatively pressing. Unhealthy conditions force the young into premature nubility; marriage takes place between mere lads and lasses; parenthood comes while father and mother are themselves legally infants; and the dwarfed, peaky little mortals, with baby frames and wizened faces, that tumble over each other in the gutters of the slums, are the unwholesome and unlovely products of the forcing-house of extreme poverty.

The spread of education and of religious scepticism has added the last touch necessary to make the poor ripe for social change. Ignorance is a necessary condition for prolonged submission to remediable misery: The School Boards are teaching the children the beauty of order, cleanliness, and decency, and are waking up in them desire for knowledge, hopes, and aspirations—plants unsuited for cultivation in the slums. They are sowing the seeds of a noble discontent with unworthy conditions, while at the same time they are developing and training the intelligence, and are converting aimless, sullen grumbling into a rational determination to understand the Why of the present, and to discover the How of change. Lastly, religious scepticism has enormously increased the value put upon the life which is.

So long as men believed that the present life was the mere vestibule of an endless future, it was possible to bribe them into quiescence in misery by representing poverty as a blessing which should hereafter bring in its train the "kingdom of heaven." But now that many look on the idea of a life beyond the grave with doubt, and even with disbelief, this life has taken giant proportions in their eyes, and the human longing for happiness, which erstwhile fed on hopes of heaven, has fastened itself with passionate intensity on the things of earth.

Such is the soil, ploughed by misery, fertilized by education and scepticism, ready to receive and nourish the seed of social change.

While the soil has been thus preparing, the sowers who are to scatter the seed have been fashioning. Thoughtful persons have noted the regular cycle of alternate depression and inflation trodden by industrialism during the last century. At one time industry progresses "by leaps and bounds," employment is plentiful, wages high (as wages go), prices of coal and iron high, profits increase, and fortunes are rapidly built up. This inflation after a while passes away, and is succeeded by depression; "short time" is worked, wages are reduced, profits diminish, the "market is overstocked." This in its turn passes away, and temporary prosperity returns, to be after a while succeeded by another depression, and that by another inflation. But it is noticeable that the depressions become more acute and more prolonged as they return time after time, and that there is less elasticity of revival after each. The position of England in the world's markets becomes yearly one of diminished advantage; other nations raise their own coal and their own iron instead of buying from us, and as the competition of nations becomes keener, English trade can no longer monopolize the custom of the world. The radical weakness of our industrial system is thus becoming patent—no longer veiled, as it was during the first half of the century, by a monopoly which brought such enormous gains that the drain of wealth into a few hands was comparatively little felt. Now that there is so much less to divide, the unfairness of the method of division is becoming obvious.

Nor can we overlook, in tracing the fashioning of those who are to sow the seeds of change, the effect on English thought of the greatly increased communication with foreign countries, and especially with Germany. English religious thought has been largely influenced by the works of Strauss and Feuerbach; philosophic thought by those of Hegel, Kant, and Schopenhauer; scientific by the speculations of Goethe, the practical labours of Vogt, Büchner, and Haeckel. English insularity has been

broken down in every domain of theoretical and speculative thought ; it was inevitable that it should also be broken down in the domain of practical sociology, and that German proposals for social change should win the attention of English students of social problems. The works of Marx, Bebel, Liebknecht, and Engels have not reached any large number of English people ; neither have those of Strauss, Hegel, and Kant. None the less in each case have they exercised a profoundly modifying influence on religious, philosophical, and sociological thought respectively ; for, reaching a small band only, that band has in its turn influenced thought in the direction taken by itself, and has modified the views of very many who are unconscious of the change thus wrought in their own attitude towards progress. At the same time the German graft has been itself modified by the English stock, and English Socialism is beginning to take its own distinctive colour ; it is influenced by English traditions, race, habit, and methods of public procedure. It shows, at its best, the influence of the open-air of English political life, the tolerance of diversity of thought which is bred of free speech ; it is less arrogant, less intolerant, than it is with Germans, or with those English who are most directly under German influence. In Germany the intolerance of oppression has caused intolerance of revolt ; here the very power of the democracy has a tendency to sober its speech, and to make it take its own way in the quiet consciousness of its resistless strength. This peculiarity of English life must modify Socialism, and incline it to resort, if such resort be possible, to methods of legislation rather than to methods of dynamite.

Nor has the effect of foreign thought been confined to the influence exerted by thinkers over thinkers, through the medium of the press. A potent worker for the internationalization of thought has been silently busy for many years past. At first insular prejudices were broken down only for the wealthy and the nobles, when the "grand tour" was a necessary part of the education of the fine gentleman. Then the capitalist broke down national fences for his own gain, feeling himself nearer in blood to his foreign colleagues than to the workers in his own land ; for, after all, common interests lie at the root of all fellow-feeling. And the capitalist abolished nationalism for himself : he hired Germans and Frenchmen for his counting-house work, finding them cheaper and better educated than English clerks ; when his English wage-workers struck for better wages he brought over foreigners to take their place, so that he might live on cheap foreign labour while he starved the English into submission. The effect of foreign immigration and of foreign importation has not in the long run turned wholly to the

advantage of the capitalist; for his foreign clerks and his foreign workers have fraternized with the English they were brought over to displace. They have taken part in club discussions; they have spread their own views; they have popularized in England the ideas current among workers on the Continent; they have made numbers of Englishmen acquainted with the solutions suggested abroad for social problems. Thus, the internationalism of the luxurious idle and of the wealthy capitalist has paved the way for the internationalism of the future—the internationalism of the proletariat, the internationalism of Socialism.

From this preliminary sketch of the conditions which make for a Socialist movement in England at the present time we must turn to an examination of the doctrines held and taught by the modern school, which claims to teach what is known as Scientific Socialism. The allegation, or even the proof, that modern civilization is to a large extent a failure, is obviously not sufficient ground for a complete social revolution. Appeals to the emotions by means of word-pictures of the sufferings and degradation of the industrious poor, may rouse sympathy, may even excite to riot, but can never bring about fundamental changes in society. The intellect must be convinced ere we can look for any wise movement in the direction of organic improvement; and while the passion of the ignorant has its revolutionary value, it is on the wisdom and foresight of the instructed that we must rely for the work of social reconstitution.

The first thing to realize is that the Socialist movement is an economic one. Despite all whirling words, and revolution fire, and poetic glamour, and passionate appeal, this one dry fact is the central one—Socialism rejects the present industrial system and proposes an exceedingly different one. No mere abuse can shake the Socialist; no mere calling of names can move him. He holds a definite economic theory—a theory which should neither be rejected without examination nor accepted without study.

The preliminary stock objection which is often held to be sufficient to wave Socialism out of court is the statement that it is "against the laws of political economy." No statement could be more erroneous; though it may be pleaded in extenuation that the abuse levelled by ignorant Socialists at political economy has given excuse for supposing that it is in antagonism to Socialism. With political economy, as the science which deals with the nature, the production, and the distribution of wealth, Socialism can have no quarrel. Its quarrel is with the present industrial system, not with the science which points out the ascertained sequence of events under that system. Suppose

a régime of avowed slavery : political economy, dealing with the production of wealth in such a state, would lay down how slaves might be worked to the best advantage—how most might be got out of them with least expenditure. But it would be irrational to attack political economy as brutal under such conditions ; it would be the slave system which would be brutal, and blame of the science which merely dealt with the existent facts would be idle. The work of political economy is to discern and expound for any type of social system the best methods of producing and distributing wealth *under that system* ; and it can as easily study and develop those methods under a régime of universal co-operation such as Socialism, as under a régime of universal competition such as the present. Socialism is in antagonism to this competitive system, and seeks to overthrow it ; but only the ignorant and the thoughtless confound in their hatred the system itself, and the science that deals with its phenomena.

In truth, Socialism founds part of its disapproval of the present industrial system on the very facts pointed out by orthodox economists. It accepts Ricardo's "iron law of wages," and, recognizing that wages tend to fall to the minimum on which the labourer can exist, it declares against the system of the hiring of workers for a fixed wage, and the appropriation of their produce by the hirer. It accepts Ricardo's theory of rent, with such modifications as to the influence of custom, &c., as are adopted by all modern economists. It assents to, and indeed insists on, the facts that all wealth is the result of labour applied to natural agents, that capital is the result of labour and abstinence, that in all save the most primitive forms of industry capital and labour—that is, the unconsumed result of past labour and present labour—are both necessary factors in the production of wealth.

Nor does Socialism challenge the accuracy of the deductions from "the laws of political economy" in a competitive system drawn by the trading community. That a man who desires wealth should buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest ; that he should drive the hardest possible bargains ; that in selling he should be guided by the maxim, *caveat emptor* ; that in buying he should take advantage of the ignorance or the necessities of the seller ; that the weakest should go to the wall ; that feeling should not interfere with business ; that labour should be bought at the lowest possible price, and as much got out of it as may be ; that trade morality differs from the morality of private life ;—all these maxims the Socialist regards as the evil fruits of the perpetuation among men of the struggle for existence ; a struggle which, however

inevitable among brutes, is from his point of view unworthy of human civilization.

Recognising thus the unsatisfactory results which flow naturally and inevitably from the present system, Socialism proceeds to analyse the way in which wealth is produced and accumulated under it, to seek for the causes of the extreme wealth and extreme poverty which are its most salient characteristics.

Applying ourselves, then, to the study of the production of wealth, we find taking part therein three things—natural agents, capital, and labour. These, under the present system, are represented in England by three types—the landlord, the capitalist, the proletarian. The transitional organisms need not detain us: the landlord who tills his land with his own hands, the capitalist who works in his own mill—these are exceptions; and we are concerned with the normal types. Abroad, the landlord pure and simple is comparatively rare. Of these three, the landlord owns the natural agents; no wealth can be produced without his consent. John Stuart Mill (*“Principles of Political Economy,”* bk. ii. ch. xvi. sec. 1) remarks that “the only person, besides the labourer and the capitalist, whose consent is necessary to production, and who can claim a share of the produce as the price of that consent, is the person who, by the arrangements of society, possesses exclusive power over some natural agent.” Given a person who, by possession of the natural agents from which wealth can be produced, can prevent the production of wealth by withholding the raw material, and you have a person who can successfully claim part of the wealth to be produced as a condition of allowing production to take place. He gains, by virtue of his position, wealth which one less fortunately placed can only acquire by prolonged labour. Nay, more; since many capitalists will compete for the raw material when it is advantageously situated, he will be able to obtain an ever higher price from the most eager bidder; as towns increase and trade develops, competition will drive the price up still higher; and this ever-mounting “rent,” paid to the owner of the natural agents, will enrich the lucky possessor, however idle, ignorant, or useless he may be. Thus is produced a class which has a vested right to tax industry, and which taxes it in proportion to its success. Not an improvement can be effected, nor a railway constructed, nor a road made, without toll being first paid to the owner of the soil. The whole nation is at the mercy of a comparatively small class, so long as it consents to admit that this class has a right to own the ground on which the nation lives. Here is a point at which Socialism finds itself in direct antagonism to the present system of society. Socialism declares that natural agents ought not to

be private property, and that no idle class should be permitted to stand between land and labour, and demand payment of a tax before it will permit the production of wealth. Socialism holds that the soil on which a nation is born and lives ought to belong to the nation as a whole, and not to a class within the nation; that the soil should be cultivated by individuals, or by co-operative groups, holding directly under the State—the “State” here meaning central organizing body or district organizing body, according as the organization is communal or centralized. And here, among different Socialist schools, difference in detail manifests itself. All agree that the soil must in some fashion be controlled by the community, and the benefits derivable from it spread over the community. But some Socialists would have each commune practically independent, with the soil on which it lives vested in each; the agriculturists of the commune would form an organized body for cultivating the soil, and the agricultural products would be collected in the communal store, and thence distributed as each member of the commune had need of them. Nothing would here be recognized as “rent,” since the total produce would pass under communal control. Other Socialists favour a system of more centralized management. But all agree that individual property in land must disappear, and that in the future land must not be used as an investment which is to bring in a profit in the shape of rent to some speculator or idler, but must be used for purposes of production for the general good, yielding food and raw materials for clothing and other necessities of life, but profit in the shape of rent to no individual.

The extreme Radical school of politicians accepts the Socialist theory of land, and denounces private property in the soil as vigorously as does the Socialist. In fact, the Radical is a half-fledged Socialist—indignant as many would be at the description: he is in favour of the State being the only landowner, but he boggles at the idea of the State being the only capitalist. His attitude to the land is, however, an important factor in the Socialist movement, for it familiarizes the national mind with the idea of the State absorbing the functions hitherto belonging to a class. The establishment of Land Courts, the fixing of judicial rents, the legal restrictions put on the “rights” of landlords—all these make for Socialism. M. Agathon de Potter, a well-known continental writer, rejoices over the introduction of Mr. Charles Bradlaugh’s Bill for expropriating landlords who keep cultivable land uncultivated, and for vesting the forfeited lands in the State, as a direct step towards Socialism. The shrinking of English politicians from the name does not prevent their advance towards the thing, and the Liberty and Property Defence League



is justified in its view that politics are drifting steadily in a Socialist direction.

Pass we from the landlord who holds the natural agents to the capitalist who holds the means of production. What is capital, and how has it come into existence? Capital is any wealth which is employed for profit. On this there is no dispute. As Senior says: "Economists are agreed that *whatever* gives a profit is properly called capital." Now, as all wealth is the result of labour applied to natural agents, capital, being wealth, must have been so produced. But another factor has been at work; as Marshall says, it is "the result of labour *and* *abstinence*." Wherever there is capital there has been labour, and there has also been abstinence from consumption. But in studying the origin and the accumulation of capital, this remarkable historical fact stares us in the face—that capital is not found in the hands of the laborious and the abstemious, but is obtained by a process of confiscation of the results of labour and the imposition of privation on the laborious. On this John Stuart Mill has the following pregnant passage:

In a rude and violent state of society it continually happens that the person who has capital is not the very person who has saved it, but some one who, being stronger, or belonging to a more powerful community, has possessed himself of it by plunder. And even in a state of things in which property was protected, the increase of capital has usually been, for a long time, mainly derived from privations which, though essentially the same with saving, are not generally called by that name, because not voluntary. The actual producers have been slaves, compelled to produce as much as force could extort from them, and to consume as little as the self-interest or the usually very slender humanity of their taskmasters would permit. ("Principles of Political Economy," bk. i. c. v. § 5.)

Capital always has been, and it always must be, obtained by the partial confiscation of the results of labour; that is, it must be accumulated by labour which is not paid for, or by labour of which the payment is deferred. In slave communities the slave-owner becomes a great capitalist by appropriating the total results of his slaves' toil, and returning to them only such small portion of it as suffices to keep the wealth-producers in capable working order. That is, the wealth produced *minus* the amount consumed by the producers, goes to the owner, and that part of it which he does not consume is laid by to be employed as capital. And it is worth noting that no considerable accumulation of capital was made, and no rapid progress in civilization was possible, until slavery was introduced. In a low stage of evolution men will not deny themselves present for the sake of future

enjoyment, nor incur present toil for the sake of future ease. But when, as was neatly said to me, the barbarian discovered that he could utilize his conquered enemy to much greater advantage by making him work than by merely eating him, civilization had a chance. Slavery was, in truth, a necessary stage in social evolution; only by forced toil and forced privation was it possible to accumulate capital, and without capital no forms of complex industry are realizable. At the present time that which was done frankly and unblushingly in the slave *régime* is done under a veil of fine phrases, among which free contract, free labourer, and the like, play a striking part. But in reality the "free labourer" only obtains as wage such portion of the results of his labour as enables him to exist at the standard of living current for his class at the time, and the remainder of his produce goes to his employer. And too often this portion of his is not sufficient to keep him in capable working order, as is shown by the sombre fact that the average age of the hand-workers at death is far less than that of the idlers. For in truth the slave of the past had the advantage over the wage-worker of the present—that it was to his master's interest to keep the slave in high physical condition, and to prolong his working life; whereas it is to the modern employer's interest to get as much work out of the "free labourer" as is possible in a short time, and then to fling him aside as he begins to flag, and hire in his place a younger and more vigorous competitor, to be in his turn wrung dry and thrown away.

Before considering what Socialism would do with the capitalist, we must turn to the proletariat, his necessary correlative. A proletarian is a person who is possessed of labour-force, and of nothing else. He is the incarnation of the "labour" necessary for the production of wealth, the third factor in our trio. This type, in our modern society, is numerous, and is rapidly increasing. He is the very antithesis of the really free labourer, who works on his own raw material with his own instruments of production, and produces for his own subsistence. In the country the proletarian is born on somebody else's land, and as he grows up he finds himself owner of nothing except his own body. The raw material around him is owned by the landlord; the instruments of production are owned by the capitalist farmers. As he cannot live on his own labour force, which can only become productive in conjunction with raw material and means of production (capital), he must either sell it or starve. Nominally he may be free; in reality he is no more free than is the slave. The slave is free to refuse to work, and to take in exchange the lash, the prison, the grave; and such freedom only has the present proletarian. If he refuses to work, he must take the lash of hunger, the prison of

the workhouse, and, on continued refusal, the actual gaol. Nor can he put his own price on this solitary property of his, his body—he must sell it at the market rate; and in some agricultural counties of England at the present time the market rate is from 7s. to 9s. a week. It is most significant of the bearing of the property-less condition of the proletarian that many farmers object to the very slight improvement made in the labourer's position by his being permitted to rent at a high price a small allotment which he cultivates *for himself*. The ground of the farmer's objection is that even such small portion of freedom makes the labourer "too independent," and thereby drives up wages. To get the full advantage out of him, the proletarian must be wholly dependent for subsistence on the wages he earns. The town proletarian is in a similar position—neither land nor instrument of production is his; but he also has his labour force, and this he must sell, or he must starve.

We have arrived at the citadel of the Socialist position. Here is this unpropertied class, this naked proletariat, face to face with landlord and capitalist, who hold in their grip the means of subsistence. It must reach those means of subsistence or starve. The terms laid down for its acceptance are clear and decisive: "We will place within your hands the means of existence if you will produce sufficient to support us as well as yourselves, and if you will consent that the whole of your produce, over that which is sufficient to support you in a hardy, frugal life, shall be the property of us and of our children. If you are very thrifty, very self-denying, and very lucky, you may be able to save enough out of your small share of your produce to feed yourself in your old age, and so avoid falling back on us. Your children will tread the same mill-round, and we hope you will remain contented with the position in which Providence has placed you, and not envy those born to a higher lot." Needless to say, the terms are accepted by a proletariat ignorant of its own strength, and the way to profit is open to landlord and capitalist. The landlord, as we have seen, obtains his share of the gain by taxing the capitalist through raising his rent. The capitalist finds his profit in the difference between the wage he pays and the value of the produce of his hired workers. The wage is fixed by the competition for employment in the labour market, and limited in its downward tendency by the standard of living. The minimum wage is that on which the worker can exist, however hardly. For less than this he will not work. Every shilling above this is fought over, and wage rises and falls by competition. At every stage of their relationship there is contest between employer and employed. If the wage is paid for a fixed day's work—as in nearly every trade—the employer tries to lengthen the day, the

employed to shorten it; the longer the day, the greater the production of "surplus value"—*i.e.* of the difference between the wage paid and the value produced. The employer tries to increase surplus value by pressing the workers to exertion; they lessen exertion in order not to hasten the time of their discharge. The employer tries still to increase surplus value by supplanting male labour with female and child labour at lower wages. The men resist such introduction, knowing that the ultimate result is to increase the amount taken by capital and to lessen that obtained by labour.

• Now, the Socialist alleges that these antithetical interests can never be reconciled while capital and labour are the possessions of two distinct classes. He points to the results brought about by the capitalist class while it was left unshackled by the State. The triumph of capitalism, and of *laissez-faire* between employers and employed, was from 1764 to 1833. During that time not only adults but young children were worked from fifteen to sixteen hours a day, and the production of surplus value was enormous. The huge fortunes of the Lancashire "cotton-princes" were built up by these overtaxed, quickly worn-out workers. The invention of machinery centupled man's productive power, and its benefits were monopolized by a comparatively small class; while those who made the wealth festered in closely crowded courts, those who appropriated the wealth luxuriated in country seats; one side of industrialism is seen in the Lancashire mansions, pleasure-grounds, and hothouses; the other in the reeking slums within the sound of the factory bells. Under a saner system of production, the introduction of machinery would have lightened toil, shortened the hours of necessary labour, and spread abundance where there was want. Under capitalistic industrialism it has built up huge fortunes for a few, and has reduced thousands to conditions of insanitary living and dreary degradation, worse than anything the world has hitherto known. It has poisoned our rivers, polluted our atmosphere, marred the beauty of our country's face, bestialized large numbers of our people. Improvements in machinery, which should be hailed with joy, are regarded with dread by large classes of workers, because they will throw numbers out of work, and reduce men, who were skilled labourers with the old machinery, into the ranks of the unskilled. True, the result of the introduction of machinery has been to cheapen—in consequence of competition among capitalists—many commodities, especially articles of clothing. But this effect is little felt among the labouring classes. They can buy perhaps three coats where they used to buy one, but the easily worn-out shoddy, thought good enough for clothes sold in poor quarters, is but a poor

exchange for the solid hand-made stuffs worn by their ancestors.

What, then, is the remedy proposed by Socialism? It is to deal with capital as it deals with land; to abolish the capitalist as well as the landlord, and to bring the means of production, as well as the natural agents on which they are used, under the control of the community.

Capital is, as we have seen, the result of unpaid labour; in a complex system like our own it is the result of co-operative—that is, of socialized—labour. It has been found by experience that division of labour increases productive ability, and in all forms of industry numbers now co-operate to turn out the finished product. In each commodity is embodied the labour of many workers, and the socialization of labour has reached a very advanced stage. But while industrialism has been socialized in its aspect of labour, it has remained individualistic in its aspect of capital; and the results of the combined efforts of many are appropriated to the advantage of one, and when the one has exhausted his power of consumption he retains the remaining results, and employs them for the further enslavement and exploitation of labour. Thus labour constantly adds new links to the chain which fetters it, and is ever increasing the capital which, let out at interest, becomes ever a heavier tax upon itself. Socialism contends that these unconsumed results of socialized labour ought not to pass into the hands of individuals to be used by them for their own profit; but should pass either into the industrial funds of the several trades that produce them, or into a central industrial exchequer. In either case, these funds created by past labour would be used for the facilitation of present and future labour. They would be available for the introduction of improved machinery, for the opening up of new industries, for the improvement of means of communication, and for similar undertakings. Capital thus employed would bear no interest, for no idle class would have a lien upon it; and thus, in a very real sense, capital would become only the deferred payment of labour, and the whole results of toil would be constantly flowing back upon the toilers. Under such conditions, fixed capital or plant would be owned for purposes of use by the workers who used it. Its replacement would be a constant charge on the commodities it helped to produce. A machine represents so much human labour; that embodied labour takes part in producing the finished commodity as much as does the palpable labour of the human worker who superintends the machine; that worker does not produce the whole value added in the factory to the material brought into it, and has no claim to that whole value. The wear and tear of the machine is an

offset, and must be charged on the products, so that when the machine is worn out there may be no difficulty in its replacement. Under such conditions also the distinction between employers and employed would disappear. All would be members of industrial communities, and the necessary foremen, superintendents, organizers, and officers of every kind, would be elected as the officers of trades unions are elected at the present time.

Poverty will never cease so long as any class or any individuals have an interest in the exploitation of others. While individuals hold capital, and other individuals cannot exist unless that capital is used for their employment, the first class will prey upon the second. The capitalists will not employ unless they can "make a profit" out of those they hire to work for them; that is, unless they pay them less than the value of the work produced. But if one man is to have value for which he has not worked, another must have less than the value of his work; and while one class grows wealthy on unpaid labour, another must remain poor, giving labour without return. Socialism would give to each return for labour done, but it recognizes no claim in the idle to grow fat on the produce of the industrious.

Interest on capital has—as is obvious indeed from the foregoing—no place in Socialism. Strongly as Socialism protests against the whole system of which landlords and capitalists form an integral part, it reserves its uttermost reprobation for the theory which justifies a class of the latter in living solely on money drawn as interest on investments. If a man possesses three or four thousand pounds he can invest them, and live all his life long on the interest without ever doing a stroke of honest work, and can then bequeath to some one else the right to live in idleness; and so on in perpetuity. Money in the capitalist system is like the miraculous oil in the widow's cruse—it can always be spent and never exhausted. A man in sixty years will have received in interest at five per cent. three times his original fortune, and although he may have spent the interest, and thus have spent every penny of his fortune three times over, he will yet possess his fortune as large as it was when he began. He has consumed in commodities three times the sum originally owned, and yet is not one penny the worse. Other people have laboured for him, fed him, clothed him, housed him, and he has done nothing in exchange. The Socialist argument against interest lies in a nutshell: a man earns £5; he gives labour for which he receives in exchange a power of possession over £5 worth of commodities; he desires only to consume £1 worth now, and to defer the consumption of the remaining £4. He

buys his £1 worth of commodities, and considers himself repaid for the fifth portion of his work by possessing and consuming these. But he expects to put out his saved £4 at interest, and would consider himself hardly used if, fourteen years hence, when he desired to exercise his power of consumption, deferred for his own convenience, that power had not increased although he had done nothing to increase it. Yet it can only be increased by other people's labour being left unpaid for, while he is paid twice over for his; and this arrangement the Socialist stamps as unjust. So long as capital remains in private hands, interest will be demanded for its use, and will be perforce paid; and so long also will exist an idle class, which will consume without producing, and will remain a burden on the industrious, who must labour to support these as well as themselves, and must produce sufficient for all.

Now, Socialism aims at rendering impossible the existence of an idle class. No healthy adult but will have to work in exchange for the things he requires. For the young, freedom from labour; they have to prepare for life's work. For the aged, freedom from labour: they have worked, and at eventide should come rest. For the sick also, freedom from labour; and open hospitals for all, without distinction of class, where tendance and all that skill can do shall be at the service of each. But for the strong and the mature, no bread of idleness, no sponging upon other people. With division of labour will come also division of leisure; the disappearance of the languid lady, full of *ennui* from sheer idleness, will entail the disappearance of the overworked slavey, exhausted from unending toil; and there will be two healthy women performing necessary work, and enjoying full leisure for study, for art, for recreation, where now are the over-lazy and the over-driven.

In thus condemning the existence of an idle class, Socialism does not assail all the individuals who now compose it. These are not to blame for the social conditions into which they have been born; and it is one of the most hopeful signs of the present Socialist movement, that many who are working in it belong to the very classes which will be abolished by the triumph of Socialist principles. The man who has inherited a fortune, and has embraced Socialism, would do no good by throwing it away and plunging into the present competitive struggle; all he can do is to live simply, and to utilize his position of advantage as a pedestal on which to place his advocacy of Socialism, and to employ his money in Socialist propaganda.

It is feared by some that the success of the Socialist movement would bring about the crushing of individualism, and an undue restriction of liberty. But the Socialist contends that the

present terrible struggle for existence is the worst enemy of individualism, and that for the vast majority individuality is a mere phrase. Exhausting toil and ever-growing anxiety, these crush out individuality, and turn the eager promising lad into the harassed drudge of middle age. How many capable brains are wasted, how many original geniuses lost to the nations they might illuminate, by the strife for mere livelihood? The artist fritters away his genius in "pot-boilers"; the dramatist writes down to the piece that will "pay," and harnesses his delicate fancy into coarse burlesque full of wretched witticisms; in the stress of the struggle to live, patient study and straining after a great ideal become impossible. Individualism will only really develop fully when Socialism has lifted off all shoulders the heavy burden of care, and has given to all leisure to think and to endeavour.

Nor is the fear of undue restriction of liberty better founded than that of the crushing out of individualism. One kind of liberty, indeed, will be restricted—the liberty to oppress and to enslave other people. But with this exception liberty will be increased. Only the very wealthy are now free. The great majority of people must work, and their choice of work is very limited. The poor must take what work they can get, and their complaint is not that they are compelled to work, but that they often cannot get work to do. In satisfying the complex wants of the civilized human being there is room for all the most diverse capacities of work; and if it be said that there are unpleasant kinds of work that must be done, which none would willingly undertake, it may be answered that those kinds of work have to be done now, and that the compulsion of the community would not be a greater restriction of personal liberty than the present compulsion of hunger; and further, that it would be easy to make a short period of unpleasant toil balance a long period of pleasant; and that it would be far better to have such tasks divided among a number, so that they would press very lightly upon each, than have them, as now, pushed on to a comparatively few, whose whole lives are brutalized by the pressure. The very strictest organization of labour by the community that can be imagined, would be to the great majority far less oppressive than the present system, for at the worst, it would but control an extremely small portion of each working day, and would leave the whole of the rest of the existence free, to be used at the pleasure of the individual, untrammelled by anxiety and harassing care for the mere necessities of life. The pride in skill, the stimulus of honourable ambition, the pleasure of success, all these would be present, as they are to-day; but instead of being the privilege of the few, they would brighten the life of all.



A profound moral impulse really underlies the whole of the Socialist movement. It is a revolt against the callous indifference of the majority in the "comfortable classes" to the woful condition of large numbers of the workers. It is an outburst of unselfish brotherhood, which cannot bear to sit at ease while others suffer, which claims to share the common human lot, and to bear part of the burden now pressing with crushing weight on the shoulders of the poor. It detests the theory that there must always be hewers of wood and drawers of water for a luxurious class, and proclaims that human degradation lies in idle living, not in earnest work. It would have all work, that all may have leisure, and would so distribute the necessary work of the world that none may be crushed by it, but that all may be disciplined. And this very outburst of human brotherhood is in itself a proof that society is evolving Socialism-wards, and that the evolution of humanity is reaching a stage in which sympathy is triumphing over selfishness, and the desire for equality of happiness is becoming a potent factor in human conduct. The Socialist ideal is one which could not meet with wide acceptance if humanity were not marching towards its realization.

On one matter the Socialist movement, both abroad and at home, has set itself in opposition to science and to right reason—*e.g.*, on the law of population. It is easy to see how this opposition has arisen, and it may be hoped that when Socialists in general disentangle the scientific statement of facts from Malthus' unwise applications of them, Socialism and prudential restraint will be seen to be indissolubly united. Malthus accurately pointed out that population has a tendency to increase beyond the means of subsistence; that as it presses on the available means, suffering is caused; and that it is kept within them by what he termed "positive checks"—*i.e.*, a high death-rate, especially among the children of the poor, premature death from disease, underfeeding, &c. The accuracy of his statement has been proved up to the hilt by Charles Darwin, who describes with abundant illustrations the struggle for existence—a struggle which is the direct result of the fact stated in the law of population, of the tendency of all animated things to increase beyond their food supply; this has led, and still leads, to the survival of those who are fittest for the conditions of the struggle. Unhappily, Malthus added to his scientific exposition some most unfortunate practical advice; he advised the poor not to marry until, practically, they had reached middle life. The poor felt, with natural indignation, that in addition to all their other deprivations they were summoned by Malthus to give up the chief of the few pleasures left to them, to surrender

marriage, to live in joyless celibacy through the passion-season of life, to crush out all the impulses of love until by long repression these would be practically destroyed. And when they found that the advice came to them from a clergyman, who had certainly not practised the repression that he preached—*vile* his eleven children—it is little wonder that “Malthusianism” became a word hated by the poor and denounced by those who sympathized with them. It is true that the advice of Malthus as to the putting off of marriage has been and is very widely followed by the middle classes; but it is perfectly well known that the putting off of marriage does not with them mean the observance of celibacy, and the shocking prostitution which is the curse of every Christian city is the result of the following of the advice of Malthus so far as marriage is concerned. It is obvious that Malthus ignored the strength of the sexual instinct, possibly because he had not himself tried to bridle it, and that the only possible result of the wide acceptance of his teaching would be the increase of prostitution, an evil even more terrible than that of poverty. But the objection rightly raised to the practical teaching of Malthus ought not to take the form of assailing the perfectly impregnable law of population, nor is it valid against the teachings of Neo-Malthusians, who advise early marriage and limitation of the family within the means of existence.

The acceptance of this doctrine is absolutely essential to the success of Socialism. Under a system in which children are forced to labour, they may begin to “keep themselves” at a very early age; but under a Socialist system, where education will occupy childhood and youth, and where old age is to be free from toil, it will soon be found that the adult working members will not permit an unlimited increase of the mouths which they have to fill. Facilitate production as we may, it will always take more hours to produce the necessaries of life for families of ten or twelve than for families of three or four. The practical enforcement of the question will probably come from the women; highly educated women, full of interest in public work and taking their share in public duty, will not consent to spend year after year of their prime in nothing but expecting babies, bearing babies, and suckling babies. They will rebel against the constant infliction of physical discomfort and pain, and will insist on the limitation of the family as a condition of marriage. The sooner this is recognized by Socialists the better, for at present they waste much strength by attacking a doctrine which they must sooner or later accept.

A glance backward over the history of our own country, since the Reform Bill of 1832 opened the gate of political power to those outside the sacred circle of the aristocracy, will

tell how an unconscious movement towards Socialism has been steadily growing in strength. Our Factory Acts, our Mines Regulation Acts, our Education Acts, our Employers' Liability Acts, our Land Acts—all show the set of the current. The idea of the State as an outside power is fading, and the idea of the State as an organized community is coming into prominence. In the womb of time the new organism is growing: shall the new birth come in peace or in revolution, heralded by patient endeavour or by roar of cannon? This one thing I know, that come it will, whether men work for it or hinder; for all the mighty, silent forces of evolution make for Socialism, for the establishment of the Brotherhood of Man.

ANNIE BESANT.



## CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

## THEOLOGY.

**A**LTHOUGH it appears rather late the translator and publisher have done well to produce in a popular form the second edition of Von Hartmann's "Selbstzersetzung des Christenthums und die Religion der Zukunft."<sup>1</sup>

In "The Religion of the Future," the most interesting thinker of contemporary Germany presents us with a concise statement of his religious position. It is slight in form, and with a polemical flavour which becomes at times, especially when Liberal Protestants or Socialists are in question, extremely intolerant. It is therefore unlike the author's later and more comprehensive and systematic works, "Das religiöse Bewusstsein der Menschheit" and "Die Religion des Geistes," but the earlier work is on this account more lively reading. It has been compared in Germany with Strauss's "New Faith and Old." Like Strauss, Von Hartmann realizes that the traditional concrete religions can no longer be retained. The best part of Strauss's book was, however, its statement of the modern scientific position and its relation to Christianity; when at the end he tried to describe what he called the "Machine of the Universe" as an object of worship the result was almost pathetically ludicrous. Von Hartmann is opposed on the one hand to the "Christian or stupid" party, which he identifies with Catholic Ultramontanism, and on the other to "the shallow irreligious Secularism of pseudo-Christian Liberal Protestantism," to which he considers that Strauss belonged fundamentally. (Von Hartmann was scarcely just, it may be noted by the way, in speaking of Strauss's "renunciation of idealism" in latter days. Strauss did not consider the monism which he advocated in opposition to all dualism, as opposed to idealism.) Concerning the essentially irreligious character of Protestantism, with its gospel of comfort and its adroitness in making the best of both worlds, Von Hartmann speaks very strongly. In regard to the relation of religion to science he has a more just conception than the author of "Natural Religion," whose brilliant epigrams do not always reveal a very intelligent grasp of the religious problem; and his discussion of this question is one of the most valuable parts of the book, although at one point he rather strangely falls into the weakness of Biblical exegetes, and asserts that science "maintains the doctrine of immanence," a function by his own showing entirely outside the province of science. The ideas of religion,

<sup>1</sup> "The Religion of the Future." By Eduard von Hartmann. Translated by Edward Dare. London: Stewart & Co. 1886.

he more truly says, are fragments of science cast among the people and receiving a large emotional development. "Science's task is to work with zeal and loyalty, in order to offer to the future a store of ideas as rich and valuable as possible, from which the eventual new religion can one day be formed." This new religion he does not venture definitely to forecast—it cannot be made by science—but he suggests that it will be a synthesis of the Eastern and Western religious developments, the Hindoo with the Jewish-Christian, "a pessimistic Pantheism which teaches the immanence of the individual soul in the one universal spirit, and the substantial identity of the universal essence with its individual manifestation." He advocates the virtues of this pantheistic panacea with much enthusiasm. In his latest religious work, "Die Religion des Geistes," Von Hartmann recognizes that the ideal of a universal churchless religion will always remain an ideal, but an ideal towards which there will always be a gradual approximation. The translation is executed in a faithful and intelligent manner. "Innovation" seems, however, a scarcely adequate rendering of Von Hartmann's *neubildung*, and Mr. Dare has allowed the printer to perpetuate constantly a curiously common error in regard to "Rénan." A short introduction would have added to the interest of the book to English readers.

Dr. Keningale Cook has written a book,<sup>2</sup> which is fairly interesting but scarcely satisfactory. He has attempted to show that in the history of Jesus we see the crystallization of an immense mass of Oriental tradition, but he has gone so far afield as Osiris and Buddha and the pre-Socratic philosophers of Greece, who can in no very exact sense be called the Fathers of Jesus. This undue discursiveness extends to the various chapters of the book. Dr. Cook is most at home among the parables and wise sayings from various sources with which he has plentifully enriched his pages. His general attitude is indicated in the Preface; he desires "to refound a truly nationalized Church upon the broader and more lasting basis of the religious impulse which is to be found in the heart of all conditions of men." At the same time, however, as he perceives without any attempt at reconciling the two positions, the highest ideal is a wise anarchism: "Perhaps, in the twentieth century, we may be free to begin again at the beginning and to copy humbly those rarely conscientious and surely excellent folk, every man of whom 'did that which was right in his own eyes.'" Dr. Cook is broadly sympathetic rather than scientific in his methods. He has not laid any scientific basis for his work by a critical examination of the documents with which he deals; he appears to regard Moses as the founder of Israel, and speaks with considerable confidence concerning Zoroaster; he does not tell us what amount of historical value he attaches to The Gospels. He is much fascinated by philology, and sometimes revels amid a wealth of

<sup>2</sup> "The Fathers of Jesus: A study of the Lineage of the Christian Doctrine and Traditions." By Keningale Cook, M.A., LL.D. 2 vols. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1886.

suggestions, which in the end succeed in bewildering the reader almost as much as they certainly bewilder himself. For instance, he finds in the Nile a fertile source of philological speculation. From the Egyptian root *ur, uri* (water), and the Sanscrit *vāri*, he would derive Ur of the Chaldees as an archaic Egyptian colony, and (in opposition to Max Müller who prefers *var*, to cover) the Sanscrit Heaven *Varuna*, as well as the Greek Heaven *Ouranos*, and the Latin *urina* and *urna* and their derivations. Across the mighty highway of the firmament the disembodied spirit was ferried just as his body was borne across the Nile to be buried in the mountains on its sunset side. At this point Dr. Cook finds not only a possible connection with baptism, but also a site for the Garden of Eden. "Is it possible that the region in which, through the yearly bounty of the Nile, agriculture was free from the curse which besets it elsewhere, was the land that occasioned the legend of the Garden of Eden? Upon this hypothesis, the Adam and Eve who were turned out of Paradise represent emigrants from a country too small to maintain its overgrown family. The memory of a paradise which they had lost was preserved in Aryana like the dream of a golden age—Egyptian exiles pining for home, and handing down to the far-off generations of their descendants an idealized reminiscence of their state of life by the Nile, where man might eat of the fruit of the ground without toil." This speculation is of some interest, as we may connect it with the distinct but harmonizing tendencies among students of language and of civilization and of biology to find the origins of man in Africa generally, and especially in the Nile valley, with its exceptional conditions. The essay on the "School of Pythagoras" is a rather too enthusiastic exposition of the legend-tinged education of perfection, founded on the conception of a large and harmonious development of the individual attributed to Pythagoras, "the noblest chimera in the world." "The Brotherhood of the Essenes" is also among the more interesting chapters. Dr. Cook is inclined to connect that sect with the priests of the Ephesian Artemis of the same name and so back into Egypt. He concludes: "There seems nothing to make it improbable that Jesus was brought up among Essene priests; there is nothing to make it probable that he remained an Essene, or addicted to any sect whatever." If some of the essays, having a fair right to the title, were published together in a compact and abridged form they would probably form an attractive and popular book. In their present state these two large volumes are much too miscellaneous and discursive.

From America comes one of those numerous and wearisome attempts to reconcile faith and science.<sup>3</sup> Mr. Porter has nothing of Professor Drummond's clever audacity; he writes in a laboured and earnest fashion, with little assistance from controversy, quotation, or allusion. He recognizes the unity of matter and force, and is enthu-

<sup>3</sup> "Mechanics and Faith: A study of the Spiritual Truth in Nature." By Charles Talbot Porter. New York & London: Putnam's. 1886.

siastic concerning the dynamic power of science, especially mechanics, to knock over the materialist, on the ground that in this particular science (and apparently in no other) "man, in his conscious ignorance, and with a sense of entire dependence, makes his appeal immediately to the Infinite Source of truth." Mr. Porter is so familiar with the construction of railway bridges and similar structures that the reader is tempted to conjecture that he is an engineer with a natural tendency to piety. This impression is distinctly strengthened when we find him speaking of the power which he recognizes behind the world as the "Infinite Engineer." (If this surmise is correct, Mr. Porter's conception is an interesting example of the anthropomorphizing tendency.) Associated with a profound distrust of the intellect as an organ of truth, Mr. Porter has an extreme faith in science, which he calls a physical revelation. "Mechanical science is the angel whose spear has vanquished the demon of superstition." It is quite impossible to understand the statement, "God so loved the world," except in the light of mechanics; so only, Mr. Porter tells us, may we hope to reach the "engine-room" of the world. Force (which he identifies with the emotional nature in a fashion slightly similar to Schopenhauer's identification of it with the will) is the first great spiritual reality, and constitutes, with truth, beauty, and love, "the quaternion of spiritual realities." Mr. Porter has a Wordsworthian feeling for nature, and with thoroughgoing American optimism he will have no such "senseless raving of morbid poets as, 'Nature, red in tooth and claw.' The earth exerts the inconceivable benefit of its uniform attraction, and the blind try to fix our attention on something falling from a precipice." Mr. Porter does well in trying to overthrow the degraded notions of science which have so long marked vulgar theology, but he is sadly overlaid in the attempt to discover Biblical morality in nature. The book is ingenious and leaves an impression of the writer's honesty and thoughtfulness.

"Nature and the Bible"<sup>4</sup> seems at first to offer to the English-speaking Biblical apologist an armoury of weapons. The Professor of Catholic Theology at the University of Bonn, turns out, however, to be a stupid but honest writer, who has read a vast number of scientific books, the plentiful excerpts from which form by far the most interesting part of his work. He seems to consider Cardinal Wiseman an "English savant" and treats all miracles, even the sudden stoppage of the earth at Joshua's command, *au pied de la lettre*. It is not, he holds, the object of the Bible to give instruction in natural history, but, according to the elastic but safe scholastic formula, "*de rebus fidei et morum* we can only consent to be guided by the rules of hermeneutics." Dr. Reusch admits that death existed among the lower animals before the Fall, man being preserved "by a supernatural act

---

<sup>4</sup> "Nature and the Bible: Lectures on the Mosaic History of Creation in its relation to Natural Science." By Dr. Fr. II. Reusch. Translated from the fourth edition by Kathleen Lyttleton. Two vols. Edinburgh: J. & J. Clark. 1886.

of God," and he finds a comfortable *modus vivendi* with Darwinism in the reflection that, after all, we do not know how many species God created in the beginning—ten or a hundred—for evolution to work on. The book is said to be "revised and corrected by the author." The translator appears to have done her work well, but would have been better employed on some work of genuine scholarship.

Yet another attempt to set forth the controversy between science and revealed religion—the chief factors in modern civilization—and to suggest their ultimate agreement and common triumph, is described as "A Dialogue for the Times."<sup>5</sup> It is a rambling conversation between two equally impotent controversialists, a thoughtful materialist, and a Christian supernaturalist. (There are said to be four "persons" but, strangely enough, only two appear.) It is written in a medium consisting of long irregular lines (with occasional accented words), having a superficial resemblance to "Leaves of Grass" or "Towards Democracy," but tamely pedestrian throughout. What it is all about is difficult to say; as Physicus at the end very truly observes to Psychicus:—

"Our converse now methinks, has run less on a 'glory of the sun,'  
Than halo of the moon, and thou'rt in jeopardy of being lunatic!"

Mr. Wicksteed has done well to translate the first part (all that has yet appeared) of the second and completely rewritten edition of Kuenen's "Historisch-Kritisch Onderzoek."<sup>6</sup> The translator has performed, very carefully and with the author's assistance, his translation of this important and elaborate investigation of the composition of the first six books of the Bible. It is in no sense a monograph, but the first chapter of an introduction to the Old Testament, and it is not so well adapted for a popular exposition as Wellhausen's brilliant "Prolegomena to the History of Israel," with which, however, Kuenen is in substantial harmony. The introduction to the volume is an interesting feature; it has been compiled with Professor Kuenen's assistance from various articles contributed by him to the "Theologisch Tijdschrift," and is an account of the criticism of the Hexateuch during the last twenty-five years with special reference to the growth of Kuenen's own views. He does ample justice to the work of Colenso (especially Part I. of his "Pentateuch," with its "imperturbable sang-froid and relentless thoroughness"), of Graf, of Wellhausen, and others (but he passes by Vatke to whom Wellhausen attaches so much importance) who have contributed to solve the great problem of the composition of the Hexateuch on the hypothesis that it consists of three great narrative and legislative strata, the prophetic or oldest, the Deuteronomic, and the priestly or post-exilian. "In setting forth

<sup>5</sup> "Christian Theocracy and the Dynamics of Modern Government: A Dialogue for the Times." Edinburgh: MacLachlan & Stewart. 1886.

<sup>6</sup> "An Historical-Critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch." By A. Kuenen, Professor of Theology at Leiden. Translated from the Dutch, with the assistance of the Author, by Philip H. Wicksteed, M.A. London: Macmillan & Co. 1886.



in this treatise, for the first time, its complete and systematic critical justification, I am no longer advocating a heresy, but am expounding the received view of European critical scholarship."

Professor Wendt modestly hopes that his book<sup>7</sup> will take a place in the development of opinion regarding The Gospels which has been growing since the end of the last century. He accepts Mark's gospel as the most ancient, and formed from a series of apostolic traditions arranged, in a more or less successful manner, chronologically. The second gospel is thus "a secondary source of the first rank," which (and not the original tradition on which it was founded) served as one of the sources for the first and third gospels. Dr. Wendt argues with considerable force against the hypothesis of Weiss, that Mark worked on the logia used by the first and third evangelists. An interesting portion of the book is an ingenious attempt to reconstruct the primitive apostolic logia upon which the gospels of Matthew and Luke may have been founded. In opposition to the general tendency of opinion, Professor Wendt is inclined to find a primitive and genuine apostolic document, emanating from John, embedded in the fourth gospel corresponding to the logia used by Luke, except that it only contained John's special reminiscences of the last days of the activity of Jesus. This is the theory of C. H. Weisse and Schenkel, and differs from that of Ewald and Hase, who considered that the evangelist was a disciple of John's who set down his master's oral traditions. It is strange that this hypothesis has not found more adherents, since it reconciles the unquestionably late character of the fourth gospel as a whole with those elements in it which once caused it to be considered an authority of the first rank. Professor Wendt goes beyond Weisse and Schenkel in the elaborate manner in which he deals with the gospel, and in the exact nature of his results. He insists on the Hebraisms in what he considers the Johannine portions, and believes that the fourth evangelist, who is responsible for the gospel as it now stands, was probably an Ephesian disciple of John's. Having laid the foundation in this part, Prof. Wendt will, in the second part of his work, proceed to give a systematic exposition of the teaching of Jesus.

Archdeacon Farrar has largely outgrown the turgid rhetoric which marked so strongly his earlier books, while retaining his strong feeling for the common-place picturesque, which, with his moderate Liberalism, has created for him so large an audience. His Bampton Lectures on the "History of Interpretation"<sup>8</sup> are among the best and most interesting work he has done, largely, perhaps, on account of the freshness of the subject. The history of the exegesis of the Bible is one of peculiar psychological interest, needing much more attention than could be bestowed on it in this volume. Within the eight

<sup>7</sup> "Die Lehre Jesu." Von Dr. H. H. Wendt, ord. Professor der Theologie in Heidelberg. Erster Theil. Die Evangelischen Quellenberichte über die Lehre Jesu. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck. 1886.

<sup>8</sup> "History of Interpretation. Bampton Lectures for 1885." By F. W. Farrar, D.D., F.R.S. London: Macmillan & Co. 1886

regulation lectures of the series, after a preliminary lecture on the success and failure of exegesis, Archdeacon Farrar divides his subject into Rabbinic Exegesis, Alexandrian Exegesis, Patristic Exegesis, Scholastic Exegesis, Reformers, Post-Reformation Epoch, and Modern Exegesis. Among the most satisfactory sections are those dealing with Theodore of Mopsuestia, Chrysostom, Jerome, Nicholas of Lyra, and Calvin. A very large, but perhaps not too large, amount of space is given to Philo, but other distinguished writers—Cornelius à Lapide, for instance, and Calmet—are passed by without notice. The account of Scholastic Exegesis is remarkably well done. The last lecture on Modern Exegesis is certainly the worst—the most unsatisfactory and the most careless. Archdeacon Farrar is compelled to look upon the whole movement of Biblical criticism since Strauss as a reaction, something analogous to the Counter-Reformation; and although there is truth in this view of the case, it is a sadly one-sided way of dealing with the great modern developments of Biblical criticism, and only culminates in a glorification of the respectable mediocrities of the English Broad Church school. In speaking of Strauss's "Leben Jesu" (which he rather inconsistently calls a "deadly attack upon the centre of Christian faith"), he falls back into the old style of florid declamation: "But one more of the many waves which have dashed themselves in vain upon the rock, and been scattered into mist upon the wind and scum upon the shore;" and he asserts his own view, according to which the Bible is not "the sole source of revelation, but rather the record of its progressive development." But it is not quite clear what this progressive revelation means; it seems clearly allied to that doctrine of "accommodation" concerning which, in more than one place, Archdeacon Farrar uses very severe language. He has taken as the motto of his book a sentence of Jerome's, but the impression left on the reader's mind is better summed up in the keen saying of a later day:—

Hoc liber est in quo quarit sua dogmata quisque,  
Invenit et pariter dogmata quisque sua.

It is remarkable how deeply Herbert Spencer's philosophy has penetrated recent orthodox theology; perhaps because, as a recent orthodox writer has remarked, one who accepts Spencer's "Mysterious Something which lies behind the forces of the universe" might be presumed to accept in time the more explicit language of the Bible. In any case, the fact is unquestionable, and a striking example is furnished by Dr. Cunningham, who, in his able Croall Lectures on "The Growth of the Church,"<sup>9</sup> boldly claims for the Church a niche in the system of evolution, and endeavours to trace the ecclesiastical organism, as "a microscopic, almost structureless, mass," in its progress from the indefinite, the incoherent, and the homogeneous, to the

<sup>9</sup> "The Growth of the Church in its Organization and Institutions. Croall Lectures for 1886." By John Cunningham, D.D. London: Macmillan & Co. 1886.

definite, the coherent, and the heterogenous, under the influence of its environment. He even speaks of "fœtal Christian meetings;" and reverses old-fashioned Church history, according to which the primitive Apostolic Churches were perfect, looking upon them as "rudimentary, unorganized, incomplete," or, as he says again, "they were like the *amaba*—they had as much consistency as kept them together and considerable power of movement, but they had no specialization of function or structure—the lowest form of organized life." He even finds an argument on evolution: "If bishops be the descendants of apostles, the law of evolution does not hold—there is deterioration and not development." The lectures are not so fanciful as these fragments of Spencerian philosophy might lead the reader to expect. They show considerable power of lucid exposition, and the style is always swift, bright, and vivacious, so that even the dull controversy concerning the claim of bishops to apostolical succession becomes interesting and even lively. Dr. Cunningham is not afraid to pun, even on the *ιδιοτικους ψαλμοὺς* of the early Christians. "The probability is that many of them were idiotic." He has a healthy dislike of what, by a rather abstruse metaphor, he calls "smoke-dried dogmatism," and his chief interest in controversies "arose from their being instances of evolution." He traces the ecclesiastic organism through its five stages of Individualism, Congregationalism, Presbyterianism, Episcopalianism, and Papalism. We thus reach the conclusion—which looks as if it ought to be awkward—that Papalism is the most perfect development of the Church; but Dr. Cunningham does not shrink from this conclusion, although he here seems to supplement his theory of evolution by a theory of dissolution. He is, however, very tolerant; every Church has done, and is doing, good in its own place and time. "And so may God prosper all!" One of the most interesting lectures is the last, on the History of Sunday Observance. Dr. Cunningham does not fail to point out that the Jewish Sabbath was for the most part a day given up to joyousness, to feasting and dancing, and that in Scotland itself Sabbatarianism is a fungous growth of yesterday, since even after the Reformation the people delighted in "Robin Hood" and other plays on Sunday.

Dr. Milligan is a Presbyterian of a more orthodox type.<sup>10</sup> The Revelation stands far above any other book of the New Testament, both as regards its structure and its diction. But it has long been felt that "the road to the New Jerusalem lies beside the madhouse," and the beauty and noble eloquence of this book have, in most people's eyes, been buried beneath a strange mountain of absurd and contradictory intepretation. While, however, it stands so high as a work of art, it is deficient in "spiritual" power, and it has been systematically neglected as well by Chrysostom, with his subtle homiletical perceptions, and many of the Fathers, as by Luther, Calvin, and later

---

<sup>10</sup> "The Revelation of St. John." By W. Milligan, D.D. London: Macmillan & Co. 1886.

Protestants. Dr. Milligan abjures the old Protestant superstition according to which the Babylonian harlot is the Church of Rome; she is merely, he thinks, the degenerate Church in general. He is shocked at the notions of previous writers, who have asserted that the Apocalypse is concerned with the red stockings of Roman Cardinals, the horse-tails worn by Turkish Pashas, and Sir Robert Peel's motion in 1841 of want of confidence in the Whig Ministry. He asserts, however, that The Revelation deals with the whole history of the Christian Church down to that mysterious event, commonly called the "Second Coming," but within this period with "great principles and not special incidents"—a safe and admirable distinction. He entirely rejects the Neronian theory, accepts the Apostolic authorship, and places the date as late as the close of the reign of Domitian, A.D. 95 or 96. On all these points he is, as he is aware, at variance with the main body of recent scholarship. He writes modestly, and his criticism is often acute.

Mr. Evans has published a series of Appendices<sup>11</sup> to his attempted demonstration—we beg pardon, "irrefragable scientific proof"—of St. Paul's authorship of the Third Gospel of The Acts. This is accomplished by bringing together with much labour parallel words and phrases, which are thus, he remarks, "(to borrow a quaint expression from the vocabulary of the late gifted, misguided, lamented Professor Clifford)—they are thus specimens of 'mind-stuff.'" Incidentally, Mr. Evans introduces an analogy between Paul and Ezra, founded on twenty-one parallels, such as "Ezra was a devout and prayerful Jew; St. Paul was a devout and prayerful Jew. Ezra was a unique personage in point of position; St. Paul was a unique personage in point of position;" and so on. Mr. Evans's style is of that slashing decisive kind, characteristic of ancient controversy, which used to be called "trenchant," but which is somewhat musty at a time when critics of the Bible, learning that there is development in the science of criticism as in other sciences, are also learning humility. One gathers that there is not a single fact that makes against Mr. Evans's hypothesis; he even finds an argument for Paul's authorship on the *dissimilarity* of the style of The Acts from that of the Apostle's recognized writings, because, of course, St. Paul would not write history in the same way as he wrote epistles. It is true that many very respectable authorities have accounted for the unquestionable points of contact by the theory that the writer of The Acts was a disciple of St. Paul's, but, as Mr. Evans energetically concludes: "So much the worse for those very respectable authorities."

Dean Church's "Advent Sermons"<sup>12</sup> are, as we expect from him, sound in style and refined in sentiment; they are not otherwise noteworthy. Dr. Cazenove's four short lectures<sup>13</sup> contain a temperate and concise

<sup>11</sup> "St. Paul, the Author of the Acts of the Apostles and of the Third Gospel." By H. H. Evans, B.A. Second Part. London: Wymann & Sons. 1886.

<sup>12</sup> "Advent Sermons, 1885." By R. W. Church. London: Macmillan. 1886.

<sup>13</sup> "Historic Aspects of the *a priori* Argument, concerning the Being and At-

statement of the old scholastic *d priori* argument for the existence of a God, with its modifications at the hands of Descartes, Clarke, and W. H. Gillespie. He does not seriously face Kant's treatment of the question. From the Cambridge University Press come the Divyāvādāna collection of early Buddhist legends,<sup>14</sup> carefully edited, for the first time, from the Nepalese Sanskrit MSS., in Cambridge and London; a prize essay on Prayer<sup>15</sup> according to the New Testament belongs to the school of Liberal theology. In Dean Howson's papers on the diaconate of women<sup>16</sup> (prefaced by a short biography), he expresses the opinion that he is dealing with the religious side of "a kind of revolution"—the woman's question—which, "on the whole, I believe to be a most healthy and most Christian revolution." The Unitarian theology of "The Prophet of Nazareth and His Message,"<sup>17</sup> is broad, simple, and homely, in genuine accordance with its motto—"In things essential, unity; in things non-essential, liberty; in all things, charity." Mr. Rendall's "Theology of the Hebrew Christians"<sup>18</sup> is an attempt by an orthodox writer "to realize the position and feelings of Hebrew Christians in Apostolic times as the natural result of their two-fold religious education." "The Story of Jeremiah"<sup>19</sup> is very tamely written, but it is in general outline fairly up to the level of modern scholarship. Mrs. Penny's brief introduction<sup>20</sup> to the "teacher from whom Sir Isaac Newton learned secrets of physical nature, and Hegel a whole transformation of German philosophy," may be helpful to the novice, though even at the outset he must familiarize himself with such conceptions as that of the "Corporeity of the Holy Ternary, the delight and playfellow of the Most High." In connection with this "Great Mysterium Magnum," or "Maternal Principle in Deity," it was taught that "the Word had become man, but that when it made itself woman, then the world would be saved"—a belief, we learn, "which some of our contemporaries warmly advocate at the present time."

---

tributes of God. Honyman-Gillespie Lectures for 1884." By J. G. Cazenove, D.D. London: Macmillan & Co. 1886.

<sup>14</sup> "The Divyāvādāna." Edited by E. B. Cowell, M.A., and R. A. Neil, M.A., Cambridge. 1886.

<sup>15</sup> "Die Lehre vom Gebet nach dem Neuen Testament." Von der Haager Gesellschaft zur Vertheidigung der Christlichen Religion Gekronte Preisschrift. Von Paul Christ. Leiden: Brill. 1886.

<sup>16</sup> "The Diaconate of Women in the Anglican Church." By the Very Rev. J. S. Howson, D.D. London: Nisbet. 1886.

<sup>17</sup> "The Prophet of Nazareth and His Message." By the Rev. Alfred Hood. London: Swan Sonnenschein. 1886.

<sup>18</sup> "Theology of the Hebrew Christians." By F. Rendall, A.M. London: Macmillan. 1886.

<sup>19</sup> "The Story of Jeremiah and his Times." By Harriet M. Johnson. London: Sunday School Association. 1886.

<sup>20</sup> "An Introduction to the Study of Boehme's Writings." By A. J. Penny. Reprinted from "Light and Life." Glasgow: Dunn & Wright. 1886.

## PHILOSOPHY.

THE second volume of Professor Green's Works<sup>1</sup> consists of selections from his unpublished philosophical papers. "It was his practice," the editor says, "both as college tutor and as professor, to write out and keep full notes from most of his lectures. These were re-written and amplified from time to time, and in some cases developed into tolerably finished compositions. In making selections from them it has been thought advisable not to include anything written before 1874, the date of the 'Introductions to Hume' (see vol. i.). The earlier drafts, though by no means devoid of interest, are for the most part superseded by those which are here printed; and where this is not the case, the more careful composition of the latter seems to show that they contained the writer's maturest views." With a few unimportant exceptions, the manuscripts have been printed without change of form or expression. In cases where the order or connection of passages was not obvious, the editor has had to exercise his discretion. He is also responsible for the division into sections, the table of contents, and the notes and insertions in brackets. The contents of the volume are "Lectures on the Philosophy of Kant" (I., The Critique of Pure Reason; II., The Metaphysic of Ethics); "Lectures on Logic" (I., The Logic of the Formal Logicians; II., The Logic of J. S. Mill); "On the Different Senses of Freedom, as applied to Will and to the Moral Progress of Man" (pp. 308-333); "Lectures on the Principles of Political Obligation" (pp. 335-553). Those who, from Green's previously published works, already know something of his metaphysics will turn with most curiosity to the latter part of the present volume. It will be found that the last series of lectures, although unfinished, is an extremely important contribution to political philosophy. These "Lectures," like the "Introductions" to Hume, are very much more than the titles indicate, having assumed the form of an elaborately reasoned treatise rather than of ordinary lectures. They begin with a discussion of "the grounds of political obligation." After this come sections devoted to criticism of Spinoza, Hobbes, Locke, and Rousseau. Then the theory of "sovereignty," and of the rights of the State over the individual, and of the individual against the State are discussed. Green's general doctrine is "that the claim or right of the individual to have certain powers secured to him by society, and the counter-claim of society to exercise certain powers over the individual, alike rest on the fact that these powers are necessary to the fulfilment of man's vocation as a moral being, to an effectual self-devotion to the work of developing the perfect character in himself and others." This, as he points out, is more in agreement

<sup>1</sup> "Works of Thomas Hill Green," late Fellow of Balliol College, and Whyte's Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Oxford. Edited by R. L. Nettleship, Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford. Vol. II., Philosophical Works. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1886.

with the utilitarian doctrine than with the doctrine of absolute "natural rights." The difference is that in place of the greatest sum of pleasures of all individuals as the end is put the moral self-realization of the individual in society. This does not mean that the State should directly promote moral self-realization, but only that it should aim at making it possible for all. A condition of its possibility is that men should be left free voluntarily to seek a good which they have in common with all men (that is, to lead the highest kind of moral life) or not; but no one can claim a "right" except on the ground that the concession of this right is necessary in order to enable him, if he chooses, to fulfil the ethical law of his being. There can be no rights "antecedent to society," but there are rights "antecedent to the State," which the State has for its first function to maintain. "Private rights"—alone treated in detail in the present series of lectures—are of this kind. Afterwards the author would have gone on "to examine in the same way the rights which arise out of the establishment of a State; the rights connected with the several functions of government; how these functions come to be necessary, and how they may best be fulfilled with a view to those moral ends to which the functions of the State are ultimately relative." In order to establish such a general conception as that which has been described, it was necessary to show that rights do not proceed originally from "the sovereign." A distinction is drawn between the sovereign power (whether an individual person or a representative assembly or the whole community meeting together) and "the general will." The sovereign in its coercive functions may be an expression of "the general will" of the society to seek a common good, as it is in every organized "State" properly so called; or it may be purely external in its action on the society, and have nothing to do with its common good, as, for example, in some Eastern empires, where it has been merely a tax-collecting and recruiting agency. In this last case the common good, so far as it is attained at all, is attained by a system of hereditary customs, and by such governmental organization as is present in separate villages. But here, as in the former case, the common good can only be attained by means of some mutual recognition of rights; at least of the "private rights" that have reference to life and liberty, property, and the family. Thus, "will (*i.e.*, the will to attain a common good), not power, is the basis of the State." This is not to be taken as implying one theory rather than another of the origin of States. What is asserted is the philosophical proposition that the State exists for the sake of an ethical good, not the historical proposition that the desire for this good has been the motive power in the actual formation of States. But it is implied that even the most personal motives of those who have taken part in the building up of States have been conditioned by their membership of society, and by their having, as far as they were able to produce any permanent effect, to work for the good of society, although not necessarily in a perfectly disinterested manner. In what sense the ethical end of which political institutions are the condition is to be understood when it is regarded as an object of direct pursuit by the

individual, may be learnt from the lectures on "The Different Senses of Freedom."

An illustration of the intellectual "solidarity" of Europe is furnished by the appearance of the first volume of a work on "The Philosophy of Law,"<sup>2</sup> by Professor L. Miraglia, of Naples, written from a point of view almost identical with that of Professor Green. The scope of the volume is the same as that of Green's lectures on Political Philosophy; being, first, to establish the idea of "rights" on a philosophical foundation, and then to discuss in greater detail "private rights." The foundation selected is, as with Green, the idea of society and of the State as conditions of the attainment of an ethical good. This idea is held by both writers to be essentially the Greek idea of the State as it was formulated by Aristotle and in modern times restored by Hegel. Before Hegel it had found expression in the writings of Vico; and to Vico, as much as to Hegel, Professor Miraglia attaches the exposition of his own doctrines. In particular, he accepts Vico's account of "the philosophy of law" as consisting in a certain combination of philosophy (that is, scientific or rational principles) with philology (in a generalized sense, including all that is now understood by anthropology, as well as history proper, not merely the grammatical study of languages). "Morals" and "Law" are to be regarded as parts of one general science of "Ethics." Of these, law is the realm of "external freedom," morals of "internal freedom." Along with exposition the book contains much criticism of writers of widely different schools.

Mr. W. L. Courtney's book<sup>3</sup> makes us inclined to say to Hegelianism that it is beginning to bore us with its Universal Self-consciousness. This is not the fault of Hegelianism, however. Mr. Courtney seems more concerned to be an orthodox Hegelian than to have anything original to say; but we are not sure that he has succeeded in his intention to be philosophically orthodox. If he will look up Green on the relation of the ideas of obligation and end, he will probably find that the doctrine expounded in "Constructive Ethics" is not strictly Hegelian. The title, "Constructive Ethics," it must be remarked, is a little misleading. It is explained in the preface, however, to mean only that a volume which is really constructive will follow this, which is entirely critical. The moralists criticized are English moralists from Hobbes to Mr. Spencer and Mr. Leslie Stephen; Kant, and his successors (Jacobi, Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel); and the pessimists. We find it really impossible to say what there is distinctive about the book. The style is readable enough in a way, but will not bear close

<sup>2</sup> "Filosofia del Diritto." Di Luigi Miraglia, Professore ordinario di Diritto nella R. Università di Napoli. Volume Primo. Parte generale—Diritto privato. Napoli: Tipografia e Stereotipia della Regia Università. 1885.

<sup>3</sup> "Constructive Ethics. A Review of Modern Moral Philosophy in its three stages of Interpretation, Criticism, and Reconstruction." By W. L. Courtney, M.A., LL.D., Fellow of New College, Oxford, Author of "The Metaphysics of John Stuart Mill," and "Studies in Philosophy." London: Chapman & Hall. 1886.



analysis. It is only fair to quote a passage as a specimen. The author is proving—

If proof were needed, that ethics, at all events, will not be satisfied with a purely critical treatment. For ethics has the power to lead us out of the phenomenal into the real, and its problems end by transporting us straight into the arcana of metaphysics. Its problems are essentially problems of consciousness, to begin with: they deal with internal, subjective factors like will, conscience, motive, and responsibility. Then come the questions as to the personality, and its relation to the world at large, the torturing problem of the relation of the finite to the infinite, of the individual to the absolute. And finally the discovery that unless ethics is based on some form of ontology—whether matter or spirit, absolute self-consciousness or absolute unconsciousness, will or idea—the whole of our ethical science is floating in the air, a bubble with all the colours of the rainbow but still a bubble, a vast luxuriance of branches and leaves and flowers which have no trunk to support them or root to nourish" (p. 13).

In reviewing Mr. Seth's book on "Scottish Philosophy" last January, we asked the question why there should not be an English Hegelian "Left." The aspiration that was then breathed has not been in vain. The eternal idea of English Hegelian Left has descended into the world of appearances under the form of a "Handbook of the History of Philosophy,"<sup>4</sup> by Mr. E. Belfort Bax. Mr. Bax's "Handbook" is intended to introduce the English student, hitherto nourished on Empiricism, to the more speculative German conception of Philosophy. For this purpose it seems to be in some respects well adapted. The author is interested in philosophy itself, in metaphysics, more than in the group of subjects known as "the philosophical sciences," which have been more cultivated in England. He has included the chief names of philosophy from the beginning of speculation to the present time; and his treatment is pretty impartial. In speaking of the state of contemporary English philosophy, he expresses the opinion that "the Neo-Hegelians, even if they have not said the last word on the speculative problem, are by far the most important school existing at present." "There is one point," however, on which he "would like to hear an explanation from one of the authoritative leaders of the more pronouncedly Right wing of the school—that is, as to the theological terminology affected." His own opinion about theology is clear enough; and he expresses it quite candidly. The following passage explains why we have classed him as of the Hegelian Left:

If the Real be simply a system of logical determinations alone, if its totality is exhausted in the Logical; if in its leading momenta, the formal is their determining side, then the philosophical-theistic and free-will theory of the Hegelians of the Right is established: if, on the other hand, consciousness is not creative; if the Logical necessarily involves an alogical element, and it is this alogical element which determines which is the *dύναμις* in the production of the experienced world, then we have discovered the root-meaning of the

<sup>4</sup> "A Handbook of the History of Philosophy. For the use of Students." By Ernest Belfort Bax, Editor of "Kant's Prolegomena," &c, Author of "Jean Paul Marat; a Historico-biographical Sketch," &c. London: George Bell & Sons. 1886.

protest of the Left wing of the Hegelian school against the theistic and idealistic guise in which the doctrine was presented by the conservative side . . . . The hypostasis of the formal moment which has so long dominated the speculative world then disappears. The ultimate principle of "Theory of Knowledge," or philosophy, the science which alone deals with first principles properly so called, is no longer "Consciousness," or thought as such, but the allogical subject which determines itself as *conscious*, which is the *materia prima* of consciousness. A little reflection, we think, will enable the student to see that this initial change of attitude shifts (so to speak) our point of view throughout every department of thought. The material rather than the formal henceforth becomes the determining moment in the synthesis of all and every *reality*. Thus (the author adds in a note) nature is self-determining and not determined *ab extra* by its mere formal moment which constitutes what we term "natural law" (pp. 350-1).

There is one question that we should like to ask in concluding. Why does Mr. Bax adopt the pedantic system of transliterating Greek names? Or, if he must be pedantic, why is he not consistently so? If it is "Proklos," why should it not be "Plotinos?" Is it because transliteration does not seem to be genuine unless there is a "k" somewhere?

We now pass from the Hegelians to the Evolutionists. Mr. Lloyd Morgan explains the purpose of his book, "The Springs of Conduct,"<sup>5</sup> as follows:—

My object in writing this volume has been to provide such of the general public as have the appetite and digestion for this kind of mental food-stuff with some account of the teachings of the modern philosophy of evolution in the matter of science and conduct. The book makes no pretension to be a scientific treatise; but at the same time, I would fain hope that it breathes the scientific spirit. It propounds no final system of philosophy, and yet I trust that neither philosophy nor system are wholly absent. It lays no claim to originality, but still I hope it may show some signs of individual assimilation. It is throughout tolerably plainspoken, and yet it has been my sincere desire to avoid giving offence to any.

The impression made by the book as a whole is very well described by the author's phrase, "mental food-stuff." Some readers may be disposed to complain that there is so little sack to that intolerable deal of bread; but then it is not every writer who gives us bread; and if Mr. Morgan is not often original (as he does not profess to be), he is, at any rate, fully justified in claiming that his book shows "signs of individual assimilation."

There is no want of stimulating quality in Vernon Lee's "Book of Dialogues,"<sup>6</sup> and there is always a solid basis of thought. The interest of the dialogues is not so much in the views inculcated by Baldwin, the chief speaker in all of them (although these, too, are interesting), as in the literary presentation of types of intellectual

<sup>5</sup> "The Springs of Conduct: An Essay in Evolution." By C. Lloyd Morgan. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1885.

<sup>6</sup> "Baldwin: being Dialogues on Views and Aspirations." By Vernon Lee, Author of "Studies of the Eighteenth Century in Italy," "Euphorion," "Miss Brown," &c. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1886

character, and in the thoughts about life that are carried to their logical conclusions by the different characters. Here is Baldwin's description of himself: "A creature troubled with the desire to create, yet able only to criticize; consumed (which is worse) with the desire to affirm, yet condemned to deny; a life spent in being repelled by the exaggerations of one's friends, and attracted by the seeming moderation of one's enemies, in taking exception in the midst of assent: scepticism in a nature that desires to believe and rely, intellectual isolation for a man who loves to be borne along by the current—an unsatisfactory state of affairs, yet to me the only one conceivable." Vernon Lee admits that she often sympathizes with her other characters more than with Baldwin, and, although agreeing with him, sometimes dislikes him. We are nearly of the same mind. We find the Voltairean Rheinhardt and the artistic pessimist Marcel, for example, more alive and interesting than the didactic Baldwin with his evolutionist ethics. "I can't make out our friend Baldwin," says one of the characters in the dialogue "On Novels;" "he is too strangely compounded of a scientific thinker, a moralist, and an æsthete; and each of the three component parts is always starting up when you expect one of the others." Of these component parts it seems to us that the moralist predominates. Baldwin looks at everything from the ethical point of view; and since the non-ethical points of view are sometimes alone appropriate, Baldwin is sometimes wrong. The other characters of the dialogues are more interesting, because in their different ways they represent "the free play of mind," while Baldwin always speaks under a sense of moral responsibility. But instead of taking the part of devil's advocate against Baldwin (as we should rather like) we will quote a passage from the first dialogue:

"Be that as it may," continued Vere, "my meaning is simply this. The world which surrounds us is not everything; the faculties with which we perceive it enter for just as large a share into our life; and this action is as much a reality as is a stone or a bench outside us. The world exists around us in a certain definite way, and with certain definite necessities, which we may find out by trying, as we find out that the stick plunged in water is not crooked, as it looks to our eye, and that the sun which seems to go round our earth does nothing of the sort; in the really existing universe, the objective universe, there is death and inevitable decay, and there is, as it seems to you and me and Rheinhardt, a cruel and conscienceless will, or no will at all, and, as an end to all our efforts, there is annihilation. But besides the outwardly existing there is the inwardly existing, our faculties, which act in a given way, reconstructing this outward world; and in this universe thus reconstructed by our mind and our conscience there is no real death, no evil will or indifferent omnipotence; above all, there is no annihilation. It is false, you will say; but is it false if, according to the laws of our sight, the stick plunged in the water is crooked? Would it not rather be false were we, because experience has taught us that the stick is straight, to cease to see it as crooked?"

"I see," put in Rheinhardt, who loved metaphysics as he loved a French comedy; "and the fact that all have faculties which make us see sticks which are straight as crooked when plunged in the water, is an obvious proof that somewhere or other there must exist a world in which all straight sticks really

do become crooked when held under water. The theory is not new, but it has the charm of eternal freshness."

Dr. Koegel's small volume (138 pp.) on "Lotze's *Æsthetics*"<sup>7</sup> is chiefly expository; but the author's work has not been without difficulty, since he has had to give systematic form to views that Lotze had nowhere completely systematized himself. The significance of Lotze seems to the author to be this, that he was the precursor of modern psychological *æsthetics*, and yet at the same time gave an adumbration of the genuinely philosophical treatment of art for which its psychological treatment is only the preparation.

Mr. Shadworth Hodgson's latest Address as President of the Aristotelian Society<sup>8</sup> is both a clear presentation of the leading principles of the author's philosophy in their relations to science and ordinary experience, and full of interest and suggestion in detail. To do more than give this general indication would take us too far into the matters discussed.

The Rev. M. Harvey, while admitting that "the pessimist can readily find a certain justification of his views in the many dark and discouraging facts of human existence," still believes "there are ample grounds for holding human progress to be a grand reality." To show that this is so is the object of these "Lectures,"<sup>9</sup> the substance of which was "originally delivered as an Athenæum lecture before a popular audience." There are four Appendices, the titles of which are "Opinions of Eminent Theologians who accept Evolution"; "Progress and Survival of the Fittest"; "Aspects of Pessimism"; and "The Poet Laureate's New Poem" ("Vastness").

We have received also a book called "Problems in Philosophy,"<sup>10</sup> which, the author says, "may seem to be constructed on the idea of gathering up the fragments that nothing may be lost"; a reprint from the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, April, 1885, of an article on Professor Drummond's "Natural Law in the Spiritual World"<sup>11</sup>; Part III. of Miss Hennell's "Comparative Ethics,"<sup>12</sup> a Lecture on "Energy," by Mr. W. F.

<sup>7</sup> "Lotze's *Æsthetik*." Von Fritz Koegel, Dr. Phil. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 1886.

<sup>8</sup> "Philosophy and Experience." An Address delivered before the Aristotelian Society, October 26, 1885 [Being the Annual Presidential Address for the Seventh Session of the Society.] By Shadworth H. Hodgson, Honorary I.L.D. Edin., Honorary Fellow of C.C.C. Oxford, President. London: Williams & Norgate. 1885.

<sup>9</sup> "Whence are we, and Whither Tending?" Three Lectures on the Reality and Worth of Human Progress. By the Rev. M. Harvey, Author of "Newfoundland—the Oldest British Colony," &c. London: Trubner & Co. 1886.

<sup>10</sup> "Problems in Philosophy." By John Bascom, Author of "Science of Mind," "Growth and Grades of Intelligence," &c. New York and London: J. P. Putnam's Sons. 1885.

<sup>11</sup> "Are the Natural and Spiritual Worlds one in Law?" By George F. Magoun, D.D., Iowa College.

<sup>12</sup> "Comparative Ethics, III. Moral Principle in Regard to Parenthood." [Present Religion, Vol. III.] By Sara S. Hennell, Author of "Thoughts in Aid of Faith," &c. London: Trubner & Co. 1886.

Bassett, M.R.C.S. Eng. (Bathurst, New South Wales)<sup>13</sup>; and a pamphlet by Mr. A. P. Sinnett, directed against a Report on Theosophy, by Mr. Richard Hodgson, recently published by the Psychical Research Society.<sup>14</sup>

---

### POLITICS, SOCIOLOGY, VOYAGES, AND TRAVELS.

A NEW book by the author of the "Creed of Science"<sup>1</sup> is sure to meet with favourable consideration—all the more, perhaps, because in it Professor Graham attacks directly what he had only, as it were, skirmished with in one of the chapters of his former work, namely, the great permanent problem of the age, commonly called the Social Problem. This problem, old as Plato and older, is once more pressing for solution.

The consciousness of the masses is becoming awakened to their social condition, and a rooted feeling is growing up amongst them that wealth, which is mainly the creation of those who toil and spin, is unjustly distributed. This social discontent, this newly awakened consciousness, is not due solely to poverty, which has always been with us, nor yet to agitators, who are themselves but "the distributors (often with much adulteration) of the thoughts" of other minds. It is due in part to the diffusion of education, but in the last resort it is the work of the philosophers and thinkers of all ages, and especially of the modern prophets from Rousseau to Carlyle, "whose mission it was to raise this redoubtable question"; and in the fact that the modern school of prophets are leaving metaphysical questions and turning their attention to the condition of man on earth, Mr. Graham finds the best hope of a true and wise solution of the problem.

The social question shades into the larger question of the general distribution of wealth, at the root of which lies the question, What is a just wage? Accordingly, after a slight sketch of the history of the problem in modern times, so as to show how the chief issues have been raised, Mr. Graham reviews the actual distribution of wealth in its economic aspect and discusses in a very lucid manner the influence of Trades Unions on the wages of labour.

In passing under review the various sharers in the annual produce of the country, Mr. Graham deals leniently with the fundholder "as a necessary and legitimate consequence of private property," and

---

<sup>13</sup> "Energy; or Thoughts on Inductive Reasoning in its Bearing on Natural Religion." Bathurst: Glyndwr Whalan. 1886.

<sup>14</sup> "The Occult World Phenomena, and the Society for Psychical Research." By A. P. Sinnett, Author of "The Occult World," "Esoteric Buddhism," &c. With a Protest by Madame Blavatsky. London: George Redway. 1886.

<sup>1</sup> "The Social Problem: in its Economical, Moral, and Political Aspects." By William Graham, M.A. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1886.

deprecates the fashion of socialist agitators in "bracketing together landlords and fundholders as alike living on the labour and sweat of others."

We do not understand Mr. Graham as deliberately justifying the application of this description to either class of property holder, but he implies a distinction which in our opinion his arguments do not sustain. In fact, Mr. Graham has in view only those landowners whose ancestors acquired their estates "by force, fraud, or royal gift, &c.": but if we are always to inquire how private property was originally obtained, the fundholder's capital would not always appear untainted. Surely prescription applies in the one case as much as in the other.

- Mr. Graham next describes the great industrial revolution of the last hundred years, the extinction of the small producer, the rise and supremacy of the capitalist, "when a conquest more important than the Norman was completed, a system more universal than the Feudal was introduced"; a revolution at first economical and industrial, but in the sequel political and social, which "perhaps for the last time has enabled a few to rise on the shoulders of the many and reduced the mass of mankind to subjection." Next, the origin of the individualistic instinct and of the institution of private property is treated, and finally the remedies, general and special, of the social disease are considered. At this point Mr. Graham eloquently enlarges upon the terrible antinomy between the fact that Iago's advice, "put money in thy purse," is "the lowest and most vulgarizing life-theory ever put before the children of men," and the equally certain fact that extreme poverty is a genuine hell. Out of this contradiction there is only one way. We shall have to change our conception of life and concurrently therewith the laws of property. We must make a sort of moral revaluation of the general objects of men's pursuits, and, with a view to the mitigation of the present gross inequality of wealth, we must alter the laws respecting the acquisition and ownership of things. The principle of private property must be preserved, but the rights of the possessor must be curtailed and his obligations increased. In a word, we must take certain steps towards Socialism or Communism. We must adopt the policy of "ransom," or, to use the fitter word, reparation, as against the present representatives of classes which have committed wrong in the past. We must multiply taxes on inheritances, increase the land tax, and appropriate unearned increments of rent. There are only two courses open to society, real reform or revolution, for the third course, *laissez faire*, has been found impossible. A democratic community no longer moves from *status* to contract, but rather in the reverse direction. Of the more special remedies, those favoured by Mr. Graham are: The spread of education, the furtherance of co-operative production by means of capital lent by the State, as Lassalle proposed, the extension of profit-sharing as a stepping-stone to true co-operation, and the wide diffusion of land by the creation (again with State aid) of peasant proprietors and holders of allotments. Next, certain heroic remedies are examined and found wanting. These are the land nationalization schemes of Mr. George

and Professor Wallace, and the more sweeping collectivism of the Social Democratic Federation. This latter could only be brought about after a revolution, and even if this were successful, Messrs. Hyndman, Morris, and Belfort Bax, "the triune deity" of the revolutionists, would have a task beyond mortal power in the reorganization of the industrial and social order. They would have to unmake and remake human nature. Finally, there is the anarchism of Bakunin, with the amorphous commune for ideal. The madness of this scheme is not so much in the end in view—"A peaceful idyllic vision seen across the stormy sky of destruction"—as in the supposition that this end could be reached by force. It will thus be seen that Professor Graham has no one solution for the social problem, and that he condemns as iniquitous or impracticable all the heroic remedies that have been proposed. He has perhaps more faith in the efficacy for good of State aid than is warranted by past experience; but he is quite ready to admit, or rather he most eloquently insists, that the most important reform of all has to be wrought in the mind and heart of man. Though the grammatical purist may often detect a fault in Mr. Graham's literary style, yet it has a freshness and vigour of its own which is in harmony with the strength and originality of the thought it clothes. We congratulate Professor Graham on having produced a work which is never dull, and which contains food for deepest reflection.

Few writers have done more to enlighten English readers as to the internal condition of Russia and the hopes and aims of the revolutionary party than "Stepniak." In the new volume which he has just published under the title of "The Russian Storm Cloud,"<sup>2</sup> consisting mainly of articles that have already appeared in magazines, he deals not only with the internal condition of Russia, but also with her relations to Europe. As we might have expected, he attributes her aggressiveness to her autocratic form of government. The Russian people are naturally—*i.e.*, under normal conditions—an extremely peaceful people, averse to war, gentle and industrial. But "Stepniak," somewhat inconsistently, admits that there is another and more potent reason—the necessity of obtaining new foreign markets for the growing industrial activity of the country; and it is not apparent in what way autocracy is responsible for this need, or how any other form of government could satisfy it by less objectionable methods. It may be that, as "Stepniak" asserts, "Russia is a bureaucratic oligarchy, slavishly serving a commercial oligarchy," and that the interests of other classes of the community are sacrificed to the merchant class. But this has been, or is, equally true of most other European countries in the present century, and the abolition of autocracy is not likely to change it. "Stepniak" labours to prove that the revolutionists are much more moderate and reasonable than they are generally supposed to be. They do not even want to destroy monarchy, provided the

---

<sup>2</sup> "The Russian Storm Cloud; or, Russia in her Relations to Neighbouring Countries." By Stepniak. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1886.

Tzars consent to accept the position of a constitutional monarch, giving the people genuine representative institutions, with adequate powers of self-government. The Nihilist terrorism is the outcome of police tyranny, and the denial of every legitimate means of ventilating grievances. The *conditio sine quâ non* of the terrorism is the existence of "illegal men" as they are called in Russia—men who are outlawed because they have fallen under the suspicion of the police, perhaps for no better reason than that some of their relatives have already been suspected. "Stepniak's" account of these "illegal men" and the life they lead is extremely interesting, and throws a flood of light on the strange phenomenon of Nihilism.

• He has a great deal to say about the coming revolution, analyzing the revolutionary elements, and the influences it has to contend against. It will not be a rising of the peasantry, he thinks, but of the towns; and the military element must be won over to the cause before it can hope to succeed. At present the strength of the revolution lies in the landed gentry, who, ruined by the emancipation of the serfs, are crowding into literary and professional careers where there is no room for them, and forming an intellectual proletariat—the most fertile source of revolutionary ideas. Imbued with the Western conception of liberty, idle because there is no work for them, pinched in consequence for means of living, and harassed beyond endurance by police interference, it would indeed be strange if they did not brood over means of ameliorating their condition, and be willing to risk all for the chance of winning the rights of free men for their fellow-subjects. But "Stepniak" does not lead us to expect any great success for his party in the immediate future. The mass is not yet leavened. When at last the revolution has done its work, the Russian Empire, he thinks, will resolve itself into a number of autonomous States. Even Poland will not seek more than "Home Rule." These essays must have a rather cooling effect on ardent revolutionists, and may serve also to allay many wild apprehensions amongst those who dread disorder.

Readers of Mr. Henry George's "Progress and Poverty"<sup>3</sup> are aware that the writer is not wanting in self-confidence. His new book on "Protection for Free Trade" shows no falling off in this respect. He undertakes to "harmonize the truths which free-traders perceive with the facts that to protectionists make their own theory plausible"; and he believes that he has "opened ground upon which those separated by seemingly irreconcilable differences of opinion may unite for that full application of the free-trade principle which would secure both the largest production, and the fairest distribution of wealth." After this promising exordium, it is rather disappointing to find that the resolution of this discord is the old "simple yet sovereign remedy" of his former work, the confiscation of the whole income arising from land by a tax on land values. Though the abolition of protection would greatly increase the production of wealth, it would be no per-

---

<sup>3</sup> "Protection, or Free Trade." By Henry George. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1886.



manent benefit to the working classes. "So long," he says, "as the land on which all must live is made the property of some, increase of productive power can only increase the tribute which those who own the land can demand for its use." Until Mr. George establishes the justice of his remedy it is hardly worth while to consider afresh its alleged efficacy.

We are not amongst those who think that patriotism is dead, or contemporary politics particularly degenerate. "Weak, piping times of peace" are not favourable to the display of heroic patriotism; but we see no reason for supposing that the sentiment is less strong and healthy, less capable of bearing noble fruit, than it has ever been. The practical working of our system of government leaves much to be desired, when judged by any ideal standard of political philosophy, and much at which every practical reformer of earnest purpose must chafe. But we take leave to doubt whether, considering the necessary limitations imposed by the fundamental conditions of representative government, there is any reason to complain of the general result as we see it in English politics of the present day, or any ground for maintaining that we are not steadily advancing towards a purer and more intelligent administration of national affairs, in spite of frequent blunders, in spite of petty rivalries and discreditable jealousies. Mr. Sydney Williams,<sup>4</sup> we presume, does not agree with us, though we cannot make this out very clearly. He is discontented with party government, yet he "does not urge its abolition." He is "concerned only to show that the institution is very far from perfect, and capable of great improvement." But who believes in its perfection, or in the perfection of any form of government the world has ever seen or expects to see? As for "improving" it, what rational suggestion has Mr. Williams? Absolutely none beyond a pious wish "to see a little more courage and independence"—a wish shared by all who desire human beings to be nobler and better than they are. There is indeed another suggestion—namely, that one more party should be formed—a neutral party, to hold the balance between existing parties. Would this add to the stability of government? Would it add to the "courage and independence" of the party in power to know that they must shape their policy, not according to their own views, but to suit the views of a minority who hold the scales between themselves and their rivals. In relation to these complaints and suggestions, the events of the last few months are significant. We admit the justice of many of Mr. Williams's complaints, but they are complaints against the frailties of human nature, not against the existing machinery of government. For this reason we think there is little practical benefit to be derived from the study of "Party and Patriotism." Its political morality is unexceptionable, so far as our hurried perusal has allowed us to take note of it; but it carries us only a very little way towards a deeper understanding of the problems of political morality. His

---

<sup>4</sup> "Party and Patriotism; or, the Degeneracy of Politics." By Sydney E. Williams. London: Swan Sonnenschein, Le Bas & Lowrey. 1886.

maxims are obvious and trite. No one is likely to deny them, or to see any deeper significance in them by Mr. Williams's aid. His book, is, in fact, a political sermon filled with platitudes, not unwholesome if we regard them as rough approximations, but conveying certainly no new gospel to weary seekers after truth, or eager watchers for a more excellent way of guiding the evolution of political institutions. It is clear that he has founded a good deal of his opinions on the writings of Carlyle, whom he freely quotes. But even this strong meat fails to give nerve and muscle to the feeble, faltering touch of Mr. Sydney Williams. We ought to have said that there is no party bias discoverable in the work. So far the author is rigidly consistent.

- "Triumphant Democracy"<sup>5</sup> is a wholesale and indiscriminating glorification of the United States of America, and all that therein is. Most people, in England at least, have a very fair idea of the relative size, wealth, population, &c., of America as compared with other countries, and will learn very little from Mr. Carnegie's superlatives. Mr. Carnegie gushes with "love" and "gratitude" towards the country of his adoption, which, he says, has removed from him "the stigma of inferiority which his native land saw proper to impress upon him at birth." Most people will be puzzled to know what "stigma" his native land (some part of the United Kingdom) could have impressed upon him at birth. Vaccination may occur to some. That, however, appears not to be the meaning of the mysterious sentence we have quoted. We are inclined to think that the clue must be sought in the Dedication, where he describes himself as "denied equality by my native land." This does not, indeed, help us much; but as we read on, he informs us that America has made him "the peer of any human being who draws the breath of life, be he pope, kaiser, priest, or king;" from which we conclude that his grievance against his native land is that she failed to accomplish this remarkable feat. The object of the book appears to be chiefly to teach the English people how immensely inferior in every respect England is to America, and to impress upon them that this inferiority is due to their monarchical form of government. For the accomplishment of the first part of this double task, Mr. Carnegie relies on statistics, which apparently he considers a sufficient test of national superiority; for the second he trusts to his own rhetoric. "I have tried," says he, "to coat the wholesome medicine of facts in the sweetest and purest sugar of fancy at my command. Pray you, open your mouths and swallow it in small doses, and like the sugar even if you detest the pill." We can assure Mr. Carnegie that having taken several doses both large and small, we find the "sugar of fancy" quite delicious, and the "pills" not at all detestable. We say without fear of contradiction that no well regulated British household ought to be without a supply of them.

We should have thought it impossible to make a book on "Railroad

---

<sup>5</sup> "Triumphant Democracy; or Fifty Years' March of the Republic." By Andrew Carnegie. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1886.

Transportation" <sup>6</sup> interesting to any but experts. Mr. Arthur T. Hadley has nevertheless achieved the feat. The secret of his success lies, no doubt, in the fact that his work bears in every line the impress of a strong, clear-seeing mind, practically acquainted with railway management and railway politics in their smallest details as well as their broadest principles, and well read in the history and literature of the subject in all parts of the world. We may remark in passing, that Germany has a very considerable railway literature.

Mr. Hadley deals mainly with the United States branch of the subject, but incidentally he includes Europe and India. He contrasts European, and more particularly English, systems with those of his own country, bringing out very clearly the differences of circumstance and the consequent differences in result in the various countries. His chapters on "The English Railroad System," and "English Railroad Legislation" ought to be read by every one who has anything to do with either. The railway legislation of France and Germany is also briefly but ably sketched. Strange to say, Italy has had the most varied experience of different systems, and has most exhaustively investigated their merits. Consequently from the political and social point of view, Italian railway policy is the most instructive of all. Mr. Hadley discusses with impartiality most, if not all, the questions on which the public appear to be unfairly dealt with by the companies. He is justly severe on abuses, while showing that many practices, such as combination and discriminating rates, are not in themselves unjust or injurious, though often unjustly and injuriously applied. Nothing can be more convincing than his demonstration of the fairness and even economic necessity of such arrangements under certain not uncommon circumstances. It is a pleasure to read this book, because, amongst its other merits, it contains nothing but solid, relevant, well-digested knowledge, useful not only to directors and legislators, but to political economists hardly less.

The Italian translation of Mr. Henry Latchford's "Wit and Wisdom of the English Parliament," <sup>7</sup> which we do not remember to have seen in the original, is a collection of the most striking scenes that have been enacted in the House of Commons, together with some of the greatest speeches delivered within its walls. But to the English reader by far the most valuable part of the book is the preface by the translator. In it he gives his opinion of contemporary events, and since it is always well to see ourselves as others see us, the mirror Signor Meale holds up may be found instructive. For instance, when dealing with "obstruction," he says, "in any other country a remedy for this evil would soon have been found, but England, who does not readily accept changes on account of her respect for tradition, required

<sup>6</sup> "Railroad Transportation: Its History and Laws." By Arthur T. Hadley, Commissioner of Labour Statistics of the State of Connecticut, Instructor in Political Science in Yale College. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1885.

<sup>7</sup> "Senno e Brio del Parlamento Inglese." By Henry Latchford. Traduzione per Gaetano Meale. Milano: Fratelli Dumolard. 1885.

some time before deciding to modify her ancient rules." The chapter devoted to Ireland is good throughout, and might be read with advantage by many Englishmen. In it Signor Meale deplores the fact that Mr. Parnell should have become the arbitrator of English politics, setting up and overthrowing Ministers according to his will and pleasure.

The Bar Committee has at last done a work of some public utility. By its orders a sub-committee of eminent conveyancers has recently drawn up and published a report on the subject of Land Transfer,<sup>8</sup> "in view of the fact that both of the chief political parties have announced their intention to promote measures for facilitating the transfer of land." The report consists of three parts. The first gives a historical sketch of recent legislative reforms affecting the common practice of conveyancing. The committee seem well satisfied with the results of these reforms, and suggest that further legislation on the same lines may be desirable. The second part is a very thorough examination of the systems of registration now existing in Great Britain. Every one of these, with perhaps the exception of that at York, has, for one reason or another, turned out a complete failure. Part III. states and examines the principal characteristics of the remedial schemes at present most in favour, and lays down the conditions essential, in its author's opinion, to any beneficial system. The report is remarkably fair and unbiassed. We do not know any other publication that shows so exactly what has been done in recent years, how matters stand at present, and what considerations it is essential to keep in view in any attempt to remedy existing defects.

"The Right of Landed Property in Egypt"<sup>9</sup> might more correctly be entitled "The Obligations of Owners and Occupiers of Land." It deals chiefly with the different kinds of tenure by which different lands are held, and the corresponding taxes to which they are liable. The subject is highly complicated, and not easy to master without considerable study; but this little work is a serious attempt to give an intelligible account of the land systems of Egypt, concerning which little is known and still less has been written.

We have received the second volume of Mr. Macleod's "Theory and Practice of Banking,"<sup>10</sup> Fourth edition. The work is so well known we need hardly do more than chronicle the appearance of the new edition.

Why the author of the "Wealth of Households"<sup>11</sup> should have chosen that title for a treatise on the general principles of political economy, we cannot tell. We expected to find practical hints for housekeepers. Instead of that, we have a treatise which aims at ex-

---

<sup>8</sup> "Land Transfer." Published by order of the Bar Committee. London: Butterworth. 1886.

<sup>9</sup> "The Right of Landed Property in Egypt." By Yacoub Artin Bey. Translated from the French by E. A. Van Dyck. London: Wynan & Sons. 1885.

<sup>10</sup> "The Theory and Practice of Banking." By Henry Dunning Macleod, M.A. 4th edition. Vol. II. London: Longmans, Green, Reader & Dyer. 1886.

<sup>11</sup> "The Wealth of Households." By Danson. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1886.

plaining the fundamental ideas and technical terms of economic science. It is extremely loose and inaccurate. At the very outset the writer confuses his readers, who are supposed to be beginners, by making "wealth" synonymous with "well-being"—a fatal confusion. Again, he confounds wages with salary, rent with hire, and gravely enumerates "alms and theft" among "sources of income." As for his explanation of "profit," we defy any one to understand it; and when we look for the formal definition, deliberately so labelled in the marginal analysis of the chapter, all we find is that risk is the mother of profit, and skill in estimating risk is its father! On the whole, the perusal of this book is about the readiest way we know of hopelessly confusing a pupil's ideas on economic subjects.

Had Ruskin and Carlyle never thundered against the degeneracy of modern times, "Echetlus"<sup>12</sup>—if indeed in such a case it could ever have seen the light at all—might perhaps have scandalized a few of those good people who hold that all is for the best in the best of all possible worlds, or have given voice to the vague repinings of the few who feel that nineteenth-century civilization is not entirely perfect. As it is, there is little in "Echetlus" that has not been better said already by Mr. Ruskin and many others. We grant that there is much that is true, and much that is eloquently expressed in "Echetlus." But there is always so much contemptuous ignoring of plain fact, and such laboured obscurity of style, such straining after unconventionality of expression, that the book as a whole we must condemn as pernicious in matter and ridiculous in manner. The author, like his great master, rails incessantly against the whole constitution of society; against machinery, manufactures, life in town (especially in suburbs), against most known methods of gaining a living, and most ways of living; against our professions, our science, our art, our literature, our work, and our play—everything, in fact, that savours of the simple country life of some imaginary period when all men were stalwart, manly, open-air workers, and all women were as simple, beautiful, and modest as the wild rose. Nor has he attempted to come to particulars. He deals only in the vaguest of general abuse. To attempt to grapple with his paradoxes would be an endless task.

Mr. Froude's "Oceana"<sup>13</sup> may serve as a bridge to lead us from Politics and Sociology to Voyages and Travels.

The vision of Sir James Harrington is, after two centuries and a half, but half accomplished. That what is realizable of the remaining half may yet be realized has been the dream of Mr. Froude. As a student of England's history he imagined to himself the Oceana that might yet be, and wisely determined to see and study for himself the Oceana that now is—to visit the colonies, "talk to their leading men, see their countries and what they were doing there, learn their feelings, and correct his

<sup>12</sup> "Echetlus: Considerations upon Culture in England." By Geo. Whetenall. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1886.

<sup>13</sup> "Oceana; or, England and her Colonies." By James Anthony Froude. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1886.

impressions of what could or could not be done" for federation. Twelve years ago Mr. Froude started on his tour, but got no further than the Cape. Ten years later he successfully carried out his long-cherished intention; and the volume before us is one result of his pilgrimage. Naturally there is little in his facts that can be new to English readers. But he brings to bear upon these facts a mind steeped in the philosophy of history, long accustomed to watch the working of existing political institutions and to study the laws of their evolution. His philosophy may be wrong, and his studies may sometimes lead him astray. But right or wrong, they raise "*Oceana*" to a platform high above the ordinary books of travel. Besides these rarer and more solid qualities, "*Oceana*" is a very judicious mixture of episode and picturesque description; it has plenty of movement and life; it gives a graphic account of all the author saw and heard (and of course his reputation secured him unusual opportunities for free and equal conversation with the best men of all classes everywhere); and it has all the charms of Mr. Froude's style. It goes without saying, therefore, that "*Oceana*" is pleasant and instructive. But it was not to please that "*Oceana*" was written. Mr. Froude's views on federation are well known, and they are shared by the leading colonial statesmen. The colonies are, as he tells us, in no mood for a union which would bring them again under the influence of Downing Street. But "British they are, and British they wish to remain; and impossible as it is to weld together two pieces of steel while below the welding temperature, let the desire for a union of equality rise in England and rise in the colonies to sufficient heat, the impossibility will become a possibility, and of political possibilities the easiest."

Like the Marquis of Lorne and all others who understand the temper of the colonies, he warns us to let all advances come from them, and to avoid pressing upon them anything for which they do not heartily wish. For the present there is only one important change which they desire. That is, to have a united navy, under one admiralty and one flag, each colony supporting out of its own resources the squadron allotted to it and bearing its name. Amongst minor changes, requiring no legislation, no formal pact, and yet potent for good, we can adopt a more considerate and heartier tone in official transactions; we can be more careful to give them the best men we have for governors; we can send them immigrants of the right sort; we can give them honours and rewards for public services such as our own public men value; we can admit them to the services, to the Privy Council, the Bar. For drawing closer the political connection we must wait until the occasion presents itself, and until they themselves demand it; above all, we must not let them suppose that the coldness of the Colonial Office correctly represents the temper of the English people.

No better moment than the present could have been chosen for the publication of "*Oceana*." With such an object-lesson before us as the Colonial Exhibition at South Kensington, the dullest of

us home-keeping folk can hardly fail to comprehend the dazzling magnificence of the future already assured to our colonies; and we look with ever-growing interest to such works as "Oceana" for light and leading in the solution of the grand problem—How to keep together in one harmonious family the great brotherhood of English communities. The problem is one which requires instant attention. The opportunity for its solution may come sooner than we think. The change of front towards Ireland, which Mr. Gladstone has inaugurated, must lead, sooner or later, to far-reaching changes in our representative institutions, the end of which we do not pretend to forecast. But it requires little sagacity to see that we are travelling with startling rapidity in the direction of federal institutions at home; and, if the present mood prevails, opportunities will present themselves for advancing in the same direction in our relations to the colonies.

But it is time to give some indication of the colonies and colonists visited by Mr. Froude. After a pleasant passage he lands his readers first at the Cape, where he finds much to lament: woful mistakes, and even sins in the past which we have not yet expiated, nor even learned to avoid in the future. The Cape problem is running the Irish problem very close, and bids fair to be soon equally tangled.

"From the Cape to Australia—from political discord, the conflict of races, the glittering uniforms, and the tramp of battalions—from intrigue and faction, and the perpetual interference of the Imperial Government, to a country where politics are but differences of opinion, where the hand of the Imperial Government is never felt . . . the change is great indeed." Mr. Froude's admiration for the Australians and their magnificent territory is warm and deep. It is all the more sincere because it is evidently extorted from him in spite of the deep distrust of democracy which he shares with his favourite Aristotle. The contemplation of the "greatness" of this wonderful country prompts the saddest as well as the most beautiful passage in the whole book:—

Democracies are the blossoming of the aloe, the sudden squandering of the vital force which has accumulated in the long years when it was contented to be healthy and did not aspire after a vain display. The aloe is glorious for a single season. It progresses as it never progressed before. It admires its own excellence, looks back with pity on its earlier and humbler condition, which it attributes only to the unjust restraints in which it was held. It conceives that it has discovered the true secret of being beautiful for ever, and in the midst of the discovery it dies.

The material prosperity of Australia is indeed marvellous. But for New Zealand—"the future home, as I believe it to be, of the greatest nation in the Pacific"—he prophesies still higher things. We wish we had space to give in full his general description of that wonderful land—its resources, the grandeur and variety of its natural features, its power of touching the imagination. We must content ourselves with his prophecy: "If it lies written in the book of destiny that the English nation has still within it great men who will take a place

among the demigods, I can well believe that it will be in the unexhausted soil and spiritual capabilities of New Zealand that the great English poets, artists, philosophers, statesmen, soldiers of the future will be born and nurtured."

Pleasant would it be to linger with Mr. Froude in the giant Kauri forests and the fern-clad glades, to sail on the Blue Lake, and bathe in the hot lakes, to visit the rude Maori settlements, and the cultured home of Sir George Grey in his island solitude. But we have spent too much time with him already, and must hurry away elsewhere.

We cannot give our readers a better insight into the merits and significance of this unique work—unique whether we consider its real or its nominal authorship—than by quoting from the candid preface of the chief compiler and editor, Mr. Dalton,<sup>14</sup> the Princes' "Governor." "Both Princes kept very regular diaries all the time they were away from home; these, written up every evening before turning in, both at sea and ashore . . . form naturally the groundwork of the whole. . . . I have also drawn largely upon the contents of letters. . . . With the private journals and letters that record the passing sensation of the day or hour, I have embodied a good deal from certain note-books in which the Princes entered at their leisure the substance of much which they read concerning the countries visited, or learnt in conversation. . . . Where such entries refer to figures and statistics, I have endeavoured to correct them up to date. . . . My own additions are marked off in square brackets." The absence of brackets is, however, rather a fallacious test of royal authorship, for the proof-sheets, after being compiled by Mr. Dalton, were read, corrected, and supplemented by various gentlemen possessed of special knowledge of the countries referred to, thus rendering the account trustworthy as to facts; but these gentlemen are not responsible for conclusions or opinions. The brackets, in fact, serve only to mark those portions (and they are considerable) in which the Princes have not even a nominal share. The charts, maps, and sketches have been made or corrected by experts. It will thus be seen that the young Princes are little more than Mr. Dalton's amanuenses—channels through which the opinions and knowledge of others are conveyed under Mr. Dalton's supervision into a reservoir where they are carefully filtered by Mr. Dalton and a staff of experts before being sent out for public use. By this process the work loses, of course, all individuality, though it gains indefinitely in utility. In fact, when we remember the unique advantages enjoyed by the Princes and their instructors for seeing and hearing the best wherever they went, and that they went to the West Indies, South America, the Cape, Australia, Japan, China, the Straits Settlements, Ceylon, Egypt, Palestine, and the Mediterranean, the materials at hand must have been of considerable value, and the care bestowed on them ought to have resulted in a first-rate handbook for

---

<sup>14</sup> "The Cruise of Her Majesty's Ship *Bacchante*," 1879-1882. Compiled from the Private Journals, Letters, and Note-books of Prince Albert Victor and Prince George of Wales, with additions by John N. Dalton. 2 vols. London: Macmillan & Co. 1886.



globe-trotters. It ought to be, and probably is, the best of all such existing handbooks. For people who like to do their globe-trotting in an armchair by their own fireside, no guide could be more pleasant, trustworthy, and respectable. More thoughtful books, going over a good deal of the same ground (*e.g.*, "Oceana"), have been, and we hope will be, written again and again. But "The Cruise of the *Bacchante*" will be read by thousands who would never look at any such work but for the exalted station and interesting youthfulness of its authors, and having read it, these good people can hardly fail to add a little of their meagre knowledge and imperfect understanding of lands beyond the seas, especially our own great colonies. That is something gained, and for that we thank the promoters of this work, the Prince and Princess of Wales. Of course, whatever positive merit the book has Mr. Dalton is entitled to the credit of it. Industry, accuracy, and good judgment are perhaps the only virtues he would claim on the strength of this compilation. As to the manner in which the work is turned out, we recognize hardly anything boyish in the style, and not much in the matter. Here and there we are gratified by coming on a remark or a description with a little of the boyish tone still left in it—"grinning through," as housepainters say of a dark paint under a light one. We wish there was a little more of it. On the other hand, the book is seldom trivial (as records of travel too often are), and it is brimful of condensed information. Everything, of course, was "explained" to the boys, and a good deal of the explanations are reproduced in the book. If the boy authors only marked, learned, and inwardly digested the contents of their own book, they would know a good many things that very few boys of their ages know.

Mr. Romilly's "Notes" on the Islands and Islanders of the Western Pacific<sup>15</sup> are so well worth reading, that we regret they were not given to the public sooner. His visit to New Guinea was made as long ago as 1881, since which time much has occurred there, and his information has lost some of its freshness. Still, the book as a whole is fresh enough, both in style\*and in matter, to make it welcome to every reader who feels any curiosity to know what manner of men inhabit these islands, how they live, what their surroundings are. In the Western Pacific, if anywhere now, the true unsophisticated savage is to be found; and we must confess that after giving him credit for all the good qualities Mr. Romilly testifies to, he is as unlovely an object as we can think of. His cannibalism is, from this point of view, a trifle, comparatively. It shocks our sentiments in a very peculiar way, no doubt; but it does not obtrude itself; it is generally practised in secret and denied in public. It is in their persons and their manners that the unspeakable repulsiveness of the island savage displays itself. We need not give instances. Mr. Romilly is

---

<sup>15</sup> "The Western Pacific and New Guinea: Notes on the Natives, Christian and Cannibal, with some Account of the Old Labour Trade." By Hugh Hastings Romilly, Deputy Commissioner for the Western Pacific, and Acting Special Commissioner for New Guinea. London: John Murray. 1886.

very discreet, but his pages supply instances in plenty; and readers who know something of "native" habits may read between the lines much which the author omits.

Mr. Romilly had the good fortune (why should we be ashamed to call it so in these days of special war correspondents?) to see from beginning to end the invasion of one native tribe by another. The alarm, the landing of the invader, the rush to arms of the invaded, the setting in battle array of both, the Homeric boastings and challenges to single combat, the shock of battle when at last they have worked themselves up to the full height of their demoniac war passion, the short bloody struggle, the rout of the invader, and the cannibal feast which closes the incident, are all well and faithfully described, probably for the first time by one who witnessed the whole drama. It is an impressive and suggestive narrative, the scene of which is laid in New Ireland. A very remarkable institution called the "Duk-Duk" flourishes in New Britain, and Mr. Romilly was allowed to witness it in operation several times. His account of it is very curious and interesting. These two islands, now known as Neu Mecklenburg and Neu Pomern, are amongst the largest of the recent German acquisitions; but if their climate is as bad as Mr. Romilly believes, they can be of little value of themselves, and the difficulty of dealing with the natives is greatly aggravated by the absence of regular chiefs through whom the natives could be governed. He mentions, but does not attempt to account for, the extraordinary frequency of irregularities in the hands and feet of the New Britons. Two thumbs on one hand are commonly to be seen. "I noticed sometimes six toes on a foot, and sometimes only four; and the toes are not unfrequently joined together by a tough membrane." As for moral qualities and fine sentiment, something may be gathered from the fact that there is no word for expressing thanks in any language of New Guinea, nor indeed do the natives ever feel the want. There are native trading fleets it seems in New Guinea, and it usually happens that when the real trading business is finished, the traders make a raid on "the pigs and girls," and carry them off if they can. "If the girls are sensible, they run into the bush on the eve of the strangers' departure, but there are many who like the fun of being fought for, and stay on purpose to be kidnapped. It gives some of them immense satisfaction to accept their lovers' payment for their marriage, and then to fly with the strangers."

Mr. Romilly has a good deal to tell about the horrors of the labour trade, and the force and fraud that was practised by "recruiters." Happily, he also assures us, that the worst features of the trade are now things of the past. The traders of recent years are a far better set of men, and well looked after by the imperial authorities. But naturally, the cruelty and deception of which the natives of a former generation were the victims have left their marks on the present generation, and the horrible initiation they underwent into the vices of civilization has left marks of degradation which will not be effaced by the best efforts of the missionaries for many a long day.

"Warm Corners in Egypt,"<sup>16</sup> is one of the best written of the many accounts that minor actors in the modern Egyptian drama have given of their personal experiences. The author does not tell us his name, or what his business in Egypt was. We infer that he was, at times at least, in the service of the Khedive, of whom he speaks with the highest respect and admiration. He was present, in what capacities we know not, at the destruction of Alexandria, and at the massacre of Baker's army near Trinkitat. He was also employed in sanitary work on the Nile, and in some of the worst cholera districts, and he made an adventurous expedition, with only one companion, into the Fayûm, an interesting and very little known district, of which he has written a charming account. It will be seen, therefore, that he was in some uncommonly hot corners. He has evidently lived some time in Egypt, and knows the language, character, and customs of its people, as well as of its rulers. His sketches and incidental references to them are, therefore, something more valuable than "first impressions" of passing visitors.

The author has a happy narrative style, a strong sense of humour, and a warm, manly tone. With these qualifications as a writer, and such experiences as he had to employ them on, his chapters cannot fail to be entertaining. As he relates nothing but what came under his own direct observation they are instructive also.

The author of "Life and Society in Eastern Europe"<sup>17</sup> is by profession "a roving linguist," or in less ambiguous terms, a teacher of the English language, "traversing a vast empire in search of bread in return for linguistic instruction," and we regret to say, meeting with "little encouragement and much less success." But if he failed in this, he enjoyed and has made good use of rare opportunities of studying the characteristics of the heterogeneous inhabitants of Transylvania. His search for employment brought him into direct contact with all ranks and races, and amongst the Magyars at least the native hospitality of all classes enabled him to see into their inner life in a manner that to us Western people may seem incredible. Nothing, for instance, could be more foreign to our English social life than that of the Magyar "magnate" under whose patriarchal roof the poor "linguist," for all his threadbare coat and borrowed boots, was welcomed as if he were a "distinguished traveller," instead of a stranger seeking wages. The English, it seems, are as much liked by the Magyars as the "Prussians" are hated, and Mr. Tucker reports numberless instances of respect and kindness shown to him on the strength solely of his nationality. The greater part of the book consists of dialogues between the author and his various interlocutors—priests, peasants, tradesmen, servants, professors, nobles, &c. These are very skilfully worked up, always characteristic, and often most humorous, as are the incidents of his adventures. We may safely congratulate

<sup>16</sup> "Warm Corners in Egypt." By "One who was in them." London: Remington & Co. 1886.

<sup>17</sup> "Life and Society in Eastern Europe." By William James Tucker. London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle, & Rivington. 1886.

Mr. Tucker on having produced a most lively and entertaining book, and thank him for his graphic sketches of some of the most interesting and least known of the races of Eastern Europe.

"*Emigrant Life in Kansas*,"<sup>18</sup> is an unpretending record of a boy's experiences in the far West. In 1870, the author, then ten years old, started from England with his father, (an upholsterer), his brother, and three other young men for Junction City, Kansas, to try their luck at farming and cattle raising. As only one of the party had the smallest acquaintance with country life, it may be imagined that they were not very successful, and of course they suffered unexpected hardships. Still they managed to get along somehow, and no doubt the author, being young, would have made his way had he not run away from his father and eventually returned to England. The book contains some sensible advice to intending emigrants, and will probably serve to correct exaggerated notions as to the facility with which success may be achieved by emigrants of the wrong sort.

Mr. Katscher's "*Studies and Pictures from John Bull's Home*"<sup>19</sup> merit great praise. His wonderfully minute and accurate sketches may serve to enlighten not only foreign but also English readers, who need not be ashamed to learn something from these spirited and truthful pages.

We do wrong to call these essays sketches; they are rather finished pictures of social life in England.

Mr. Katscher's earlier books on London show his wonderful painstaking faculty, and his gift of observation.

In the work before us we have a most exact and thorough description of the Salvation Army, and the work it is doing. Other portions of the book are taken up with the German population in London, modern journalism, engineering triumphs of England, and some slighter sketches on a great variety of social topics, all alike handled with delicacy and quickness of touch. The book deserves a wide circulation; the author's style is attractive, and the matter interesting.

Under the title "*Cosmopolitan Essays*,"<sup>20</sup> Sir Richard Temple has collected a number of his magazine articles, speeches, and papers read before societies. If we are to speak our mind without fear or favour we must say that we have found no sufficient reason in the contents of this volume for its high-sounding title, or indeed for its publication at all. So various and so unconnected are the subjects touched on that we can sympathize with Sir Richard's difficulty in finding any descriptive name that would comprehend them all; but we venture to suggest that a descriptive title is hardly a necessity, and that, at all

---

<sup>18</sup> "*Emigrant Life in Kansas*." By Percy G. Ebbutt. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1886.

<sup>19</sup> "*Nebelland and Themsestrand. Studien und Schilderungen aus der Heimat John Bull's*." Von Leopold Katscher. Verfasser von "*Bilder aus dem englischen Leben*," "*Aus England*," u.s.w. Stuttgart: G. J. Goschehnhe. London: Tribner & Co.

<sup>20</sup> "*Cosmopolitan Essays*." By Sir Richard Temple. London: Chapman & Hall, Limited. 1886.

events, it ought to be intelligible. Whatever the author intended to imply, there is not a single essay to which the title is applicable, nor in the whole of them, considered as one, is it possible to find any really cosmopolitan character. The author does indeed attempt to discover running through these scattered and independent units "one *nexus*, one guiding idea, one moral—namely, that of British duty and responsibility in affairs which concern almost every part of the world." The *nexus* may be there, but it is difficult to perceive with the unassisted eye. Moreover, such a *nexus* is distinctly British, and quite excludes the cosmopolitan idea. Sir Richard Temple has the reputation of an energetic and showy Indian administrator, but he is not, we judge, a man of extensive information, of deep philosophy, prescient statesmanship, or of literary genius. His essays are of very mediocre merit whatever point we view them from, rarely rising above the level of a leading article in a London "daily." And this is the more to be regretted, because, with his Indian experiences, Sir Richard ought to be able to give us something that we should really value.

It has often been remarked that Anglo-Indians seldom write anything worth reading about the country and the people amongst whom their life is spent; and the explanation usually suggested is that they are too much absorbed in the daily work of actual administration. But when a distinguished Anglo-Indian retires in the fulness of his vigour, enters Parliament, and takes to scribbling, is it too much to expect of him that he will confine himself to the special subjects on which he possesses special knowledge, and leave "economic statistics of the British empire" and such-like common studies to the wrangling of real experts and the vapouring of platform speakers?

Mr. J. G. Scott, whose "France and Tonkin" we noticed last year, has lost no time in giving us a general description of the newest addition to the British Empire.<sup>21</sup> He is as well qualified to do so as, perhaps, any other man, having both the ready pen and quick observation of the newspaper correspondent, and the experience of many years of residence and travel in Further India. He gives us a great deal of the kind of information most sought for respecting our acquisition—something of the history, customs, character of the people, and something of the country, its resources, and prospects. From his knowledge of these factors he draws the conclusion that Burma is the most valuable addition to our empire made these many years, just as British Burma is the richest and most valuable of our Indian provinces. But at the same time he warns speculative traders that the increase in the market for British wares is not likely to be considerable for some years. Of the Burmese people he speaks highly, notwithstanding their "inconceivable" laziness and their ridiculous self-conceit. They are brave, religious, sober, charitable, genial, humorous (the Irishmen of the East), considerate of the feelings of others; their women enjoy more perfect equality of rights and practical social

---

<sup>21</sup> "Burma: as it was, as it is, and as it will be." By J. George Scott ("Shway Yoe"). London: George Redway. 1886.

superiority than in any Western country. But their aversion to work leads Mr. Scott to prophesy that they will be driven out of the towns by the Chinese. Buddhism is a living reality with the Burmese, and enters into every detail of every-day life. Well ruled, they may become a pillar of support to our Indian Empire.

Signor Pelleschi<sup>22</sup> is not a literary genius, though he may be all he claims to be, "an attentive observer and a faithful narrator" of what he saw, or believed he saw. His book is very dull, and its dullness is aggravated by maudlin reflections on things in general. Skipping these, the reader in search of facts concerning a territory and a people little known will find a fair sprinkling of information, especially about the Indians and their customs.

We are glad to see a new edition of Mr. Sala's bright, sunny "Essays written in Hot Countries."<sup>23</sup> His chatty, confidential manner and good-humoured way of looking at things, enable him to use his quick observation most effectively, and make him deservedly one of the most popular of light descriptive writers.

All information concerning our new territory, Burma,<sup>24</sup> is welcome. In the interval between the deposition of King Thebaw and the definitive annexation of his dominions by the Indian Government, while the question of annexation was still under consideration, Mr. Grattan Geary visited the country for the purpose of "examining carefully some of the conditions of the problem, and seeing for himself what were the political, social, and military aspects of the question awaiting solution." This was indeed the only way that any European could at that time form an independent opinion on the question, for "no one even pretended to know what were the wishes or capabilities of the Burmese of the upper country." Mr. Geary has now published an account of his journey and the results of his examination of the Burmese problem, together with a good deal of the information he picked up during his stay. His conclusion appears to be that for the Burmans themselves the change is likely to be highly beneficial, but he is dubious about its advantages for the people of India and England.

The principal effect on the reader of Mr. Knighton's "Struggles for Life"<sup>25</sup> is the impression it leaves that the history of the human race is a record of hideous cruelty and unspeakable suffering, unilluminated by a single ray of anything noble or humane. He ransacks the history of the world from the earliest times to the present, and drags into light all the deeds of cruelty and lust, the devastations of war and

<sup>22</sup> "Eight Months on the Gran Chaco of the Argentine Republic." By Giovanni Pelleschi. London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle & Rivington. 1886.

<sup>23</sup> "Under the Sun: Essays mainly written in Hot Countries." By George Augustus Sala. New edition, with several additional essays. London: Vizetelly & Co. 1886.

<sup>24</sup> "Burma after the Conquest: viewed in its Political, Social, and Commercial Aspects, from Mandalay." By Grattan Geary. London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle & Rivington. 1886.

<sup>25</sup> "Struggles for Life." By William Knighton, LL.D. London: Williams & Norgate. 1886.

pestilence, of religion (so-called) and greed, the horrors of slavery and of the extermination of races. The recital is sickening. And for what object? With what result? Surely Mr. Knighton deceives himself when he answers: "To learn first the causes of deterioration and destruction, that we may obviate or remove them; and to discover the remedies, if possible, for imperfection and misery." What single cause of "deterioration and destruction" has he thrown the faintest light on? What single remedy for "imperfection and misery" does he point out? There may be some advantage in compelling people to look at the misery that is in their midst, in the hope that means of alleviating it may be devised. But is a bird's-eye view of the misery that mankind has inflicted and endured throughout all ages and in every land likely to quicken effective sympathy with the less striking forms of existing wretchedness which cry aloud for instant relief? Assuredly it can have no such effect. The only effect it can have, in our opinion, is to deepen the impression that man is altogether vile, and life a colossal blunder of Nature.

We have received the following:—"Year-book of Scientific and Learned Societies of Great Britain and Ireland; comprising Lists of the Papers read during 1885 before Societies engaged in fourteen departments of research, with the names of their Authors. Third annual issue" (London: Charles Griffin & Co., 1886); "Hazell's Annual Cyclopædia, 1886; containing nearly 2,000 concise and explanatory articles on every topic of current Political, Social, and General Interest referred to by the press and in daily conversation." Edited by E. D. Price, F.G.S. (London: Hazell, Watson & Viney, 1886); "Land." By James Platt, F.S.S. (London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co., 1886); "Why I would Disestablish: a Representative Book by Representative Men." Edited by Andrew Reid (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1886); "French Art and English Morals." By John Trevor (London: Swan Sonnenschein, Le Bas & Lowrey); "Duty and Privilege." By Charles Anthony (London: National Press Agency, 1886); "Political Evolution; or, From Poverty to Competence." By C. A. Washburn (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1885); "The Church and the Franchise." By Andrew Simon Lamb (London: James Nisbet & Co., 21 Berners Street, 1886); "The Masses: How shall we Reach Them? Some Hindrances in the Way set forth from the Standpoint of the People." By an old Lay-Helper (London: Charles Griffin & Co., 1886); "Report of the Minister of Education (Ontario) for the year 1885, with the Statistics of 1884" (Toronto: Warwick & Sons, 1886); "School Architecture and Hygiene, with Plans and Illustrations for the use of School Trustees in Ontario" (Toronto: Education Department).

We have also to acknowledge the following admirable Italian official publications:—"L'Assicurazione degli Operai Nella Scienza e Nella Legislazione Germanica." Ugo Mazzola (Roma: Tipographia Eredi Botta, 1886); "Atti della Commissione d'Inchiesta per la Revisione della Tariffa Doganale. I. Parte Agraria. Fascicola I." Fedele Lampertico (Roma: Tip. Eredi Botta, 1885); "L'Economia dell' Agricol-

tura in Italia, e la sua Trasformazione." C. Bertagnolli (Roma: Tip. Elzeviriana, 1886); "Risultati Sommarii dell' Inchiesta Intorno alle Condizioni Igienico-Sanitarie dei Comuni" (Roma: Tip. Elzeviriana, 1885); "Atti della Commissione per il Riordinamento della Statistica Giudiziarie Civile e Penale. Serie 3<sup>a</sup>, vol. xv." (Roma: Tip. Fratelli Bencini, 1885). Also several statistical reports relating to the industrial condition of the provinces of Arezzo and Vicenza, causes of death, and elementary instruction.

We regret we have no space to notice the following:—"Ueber die Römische Gerichtsverfassung." Von Ernst Hartmann. Ergänzt und herausgegeben von August Ubbellohde" (Göttingen: Bandenhoch und Ruprichts, 1886); "Skizze des Englischen Geldmarktes." Von Emil Struck (Leipzig: Duncker and Humblot, 1886).

---

### IIISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

WE have much pleasure in resuming our criticism upon the fifth volume of M. Duruy's work,<sup>1</sup> which brings down the history of the Roman State to the close at once of the reign of Marcus Aurelius and of the golden era of the great world empire. The chief feature of the first part consists of an account of the life and works of the great Emperor Hadrian, whose administration marks the final abandonment of the "forward policy" of his predecessors; it is the culminating point of the empire, soon to be followed by a decline so gradual as hardly to be perceptible at first, but unquestionably a decline. From this policy necessarily resulted a profound peace, only broken by the fierce outbreak of the Jews under the leadership of Bar Kokaba. Hadrian was content to forego military glory, and to be known as the wise ruler whose energies were unsparingly devoted to the detection and repair of the weak points in the administration of the laws and the civil and military government of the State. To his initiative also may be referred many of the magnificent specimens of architecture and engineering which were, by the ruder successors of the Romans, referred to the agency of magic. The reigns of the two Antonines followed practically the same lines as their immediate predecessor. The Roman peace was, however, broken in the reign of Marcus Aurelius by the invasion of the Marcomanni, *à propos* of which M. Duruy indulges himself with an amusing outburst of national feeling which we cannot refrain from quoting:—

This prolific race (the Germans) had increased in time of peace, and their greed had augmented with their strength. At the sight of the riches which

---

<sup>1</sup> "History of Rome and the Roman People." By Victor Duruy. Edited by the Rev. J. P. Mahaffy. Vol. V. Parts I. and II. London: Kegan Paul & Trench. 1885.



the productive activity of the Romans had amassed on the other side of the frontier their hearts were filled with hate and envy. "Those charming villas on the Danube and Rhine which they saw from their own wild bank seemed an insult to their straw huts. In their national poem, the "Nibelungen," the object of their hero's ardent pursuit, the conquest for whose sake the people are butchered and kings perish, is not the woman . . . as in the case of the Greeks under the walls of Troy, nor a tomb, as in the case of the French before Jerusalem, but treasure! In the midst of their sterile lands and savage forests that sensual race, greedy and poor, even then breathed the verses of Mignon about the lands where the golden apples grew, and which during eighteen centuries have excited their cupidity. In the time of the Cæsars they, by their continual attacks, disturbed that civilized, rich, and peaceable empire, which, under the Antonines, gave humanity a hundred years of peace. At the end they succeeded in throwing down the Colossus, and they precipitated the world into the sorrows and tears of the Middle Ages.

The second part of the fifth volume describes with much minuteness the domestic life of the Romans, pointing out with great clearness the points in which it differs from modern civilization, with especial reference to the great respect for family life evinced by the ancient Italians, to the prevalence of the custom of adoption, and to the institution of slavery. Municipal life is also well and minutely brought before us; the large measure of local liberty existing in the municipalities proving, somewhat perhaps to our surprise, that the Romans had solved (at least in the age of the Antonines) the problem of harmonizing monarchical government with local liberty. There can be little doubt indeed that numerous cities in Italy, South Germany, and France derive their local privileges and those of their trade-guilds from immunities conferred during the existence of the Roman empire. We cannot, in conclusion, avoid once more adverting to the excellence of the illustrations and maps which accompany the letterpress. M. Duruy has our best wishes for his success.

The editor of the *Second Punic War*<sup>3</sup> having in his preface rather unnecessarily attacked Mommsen, we carefully read the present work against the corresponding chapters of Mommsen's "History of Rome," and have somewhat reluctantly arrived at the conclusion that, in spite of the eminent authorities quoted by Mr. Arnold, the German historian has, in less than half the space, given us a description of the wonderful career of the Barcidæ, which, in careful composition, in just and terse delineation of character, in detail abundant yet duly subordinate to the general outline, is certainly superior to that of our countryman the very points in which Mr. Arnold claims the superiority. We have no wish, however, to detract from the merits of a work which, in the absence of Mommsen, would be of a very high order, and are content to leave the decision to our readers, although we doubt very much whether Dr. Arnold himself would have approved of the publication of the book in its unfinished state. We notice with approbation the notes upon the mining operations of the Phœnicians and Romans

---

<sup>3</sup> "The Second Punic War." By the late Thomas Arnold, D.D. Edited by W. T. Arnold, M.A. London: Macmillan & Co. 1886.

in the south of Spain ; also the excellence of the maps in illustration of the various military operations of the war.

At first sight Hittite antiquities would not appear to be a popular subject, but for all that in little more than twelve months Dr. Wright's book<sup>3</sup> has reached a second edition. Not the least important portion is the chapter contributed by Professor Sayce upon the progress made in deciphering the Hittite writings with the help of the bilingual inscription (in Cypriote and Hittite) of Tarkondêmos, which holds with respect to these researches the same position as the Rosetta stone formerly did among Egyptologists. The Hittite system of writing resembled that of the Egyptians and Assyrians, or, in fact, of any people who employed hieroglyphics and was partly ideographic and partly phonetic. The phonetic characters represented in turn a monosyllable or a dissyllable and sometimes both, while the ideographs were generally attached to the phonetic characters, though sometimes standing alone. The writing is always boustrophedon, the first line starting from right to left ; a word does not end a line, and lines are read from the direction towards which the characters look. The forms of the characters vary not only in different localities but on monuments from the same locality and of the same age ; and in some instances they tend towards hieratic forms. Tentative readings of some of the inscriptions are given, which, although at present (owing to the fewness and the mutilated condition of the monuments) are rather meagre, are yet made upon a sound method, and, with the help of fresh material, will probably lead to very important results. In conclusion, we have to thank Dr. Wright for the admirable workmanship of his book, and Mr. Rylands for his elaborate drawings of the inscriptions.

Some years ago, the late Mr. Coote wrote on the connection between Roman *Collegia* or Guilds and English municipal institutions, and now Mr. Baldwin Brown,<sup>4</sup> the Art Professor at the University of Edinburgh, tells us that he looks to them as the patterns from which Christians evolved their congregations and their churches. These *collegia* met in halls called *scholæ*, which were oblong halls, some fifty feet long, with apsidal terminations, and no doubt the "School of Tyrannus," which St. Paul used at Ephesus, was of such a character. Such halls might also be found in the houses of private persons, to be used for meetings or for social gatherings, and we know that the first church at Tours was formed by Bishop Litorius out of the hall in a senator's house. The Jewish synagogue also served as a model for Christian places of worship, and these, as far at least as the ruined specimens in Galilee show, are of a Roman basilican type. There is some doubt, however, how far these represent the normal form. The basilica, as Mr. Brown shows, was not necessarily apsidal, but possessed

<sup>3</sup> "The Empire of the Hittites." By William Wright, D.D. London : J. Nisbet & Co. 1886.

<sup>4</sup> "From Schola to Cathedral." By G. Baldwin Brown, M.A. Edinburgh : D. Douglas. 1886.

the special architectural feature of a division into nave and aisles and a clerestory, and almost always had a gallery over the colonnade of the nave, where the Christian churches had a plain wall usually covered with pictures. The reason of this alteration in design has not been hitherto apparent, and Mr. Brown's solution of it—that the Christians added the basilican colonnade to the plain oblong interior of the schola, instead of taking away the gallery from a basilica, is very plausible. His theory therefore, roughly speaking, is as follows: That the Christians first met in private halls and *scholæ*, and built such edifices for themselves, holding services also sometimes at the *cellæ* of martyrs in the catacombs. That in the end of the third and the fourth century, as the Church increased, larger buildings were needed and side aisles added; the apse being a reminiscence or survival of the *cellæ* or *exedra* of the cemeteries; and from these elements resulted the complete church of the fourth century, its oblong plan derived from the *schola*, its apse from the *cella*, its colonnades and system of lighting from the *basilica*.

Nothing requires more care than the criticism of minute historical points, lest one falls into the pit oneself has digged. A pamphlet has recently appeared written to correct errors into which the late Professor Brewer, Mr. Gairdner, and Mr. Friedmann have fallen respecting the Boleyn family,<sup>5</sup> and especially to support Mr. Friedmann's view that Anne Boleyn was older than her sister Mary, the grandmother of Lord Hunsdon. And yet the author writes, concerning Henry VIII.'s liaison with both sisters: "And is it not possible that in his selfish greed he (*i.e.*, Sir Thos. Boleyn) may, when his elder daughter (Anne, according to him) had lost her attraction for the king, have sought to maintain his power by the means of the charms of the other" (*i.e.*, Mary.) Does the writer think that Mary Carew was a rival of Jane Seymour's, or what evidence is there of Henry's passion for Anne having waned until marriage had produced its usual effect?

The English public generally are little aware of the enormous literature which has grown up in France upon the subject of the great French Revolution of 1789,<sup>6</sup> and should therefore be greatly indebted to Mr. Stephens for his trouble in placing before them the substance of the new information which he has gathered, upon what may in truth be called the most important period in modern history, unfortunately very imperfectly known in this country; indeed, with the exception of Carlyle's poem in prose (which can only by a stretch of courtesy be denominated a history), and a few scattered essays upon particular events and individuals of the time, there is absolutely no work in English upon the subject at present before the world; and yet a narration of the struggles of a great and civilized nation in its passage through trials so many and so great, ought to repay examination. It may be impossible for a Frenchman, whose immediate

<sup>5</sup> "The Early Life of Anne Boleyn." By J. H. Round, M.A. Elliot Stock. 1886.

<sup>6</sup> "A History of the French Revolution." By H. Morse Stephens. London: Rivingtons. 1886.

ancestors witnessed or took part in the stirring events of the era, to enter into a description of the epoch with the necessary impartiality; but it may, notwithstanding, be practicable for an Englishman to avoid partisan bias and yet preserve the dramatic interest of the story of a period abounding with great political lessons; a period during which nearly every socialist or democratic theory proposed up to the present time for the benefit of the people was successively put to the practical test of experience; and a period, the discussion of which is peculiarly appropriate at a time when democracy is developing great influence in English politics. Mr. Stephens' method in describing seriatim, with equal care and minute attention to detail, every circumstance, great or small, that had its part in producing the great modern cataclysm, renders it difficult to pick out any special paragraph or chapter for commendation, but the attention of the reader may with propriety be called to the description of the cumbrous, semi-political law corporations, the Parlements; the irregular assembly of the States of Dauphine under the leadership of Mounier, precluding the election of the States General and the preparation of the *cahiers*, or statement of grievances, &c., by each electoral district. The recital of the better known events, such as the fall of the Bastille, the various movements in Paris and the provinces, the flight to Varennes, are especially noticeable for accuracy in detail and moderate tone; and the numerous short biographies of the prominent actors in the great drama, with which the narrative is interspersed, show considerable perception of character and skill in seizing salient points, as well as considerable humour. As a sample, we would draw attention to that of Lafayette. The style is solid and sensible, without any attempt at fine writing. Altogether the book bids fair to be a classic work in the language, and we trust that the author's intention of completing the book early next year will be realized.

We must protest against the habit, far too common, of digging up the twaddle safely buried ten years ago or more in the back numbers of the monthly magazines, and of fathering such resurrection upon friends, at whose earnest request, &c. No doubt the articles of which Mr. Jerminham's book<sup>7</sup> is composed were duly appreciated in their time; but it is hardly fair towards the present generation to inflict upon them the reminiscences of a bore of the first magnitude; as for instance: How he saw Rossini for five minutes; how he had the good fortune to be present when the great Dickens was heard to say "No"; how he owned an undoubted autograph of Thackeray; how (thrice happy man!) he was twice bullied by Mr. Gladstone, &c. &c. We have waded through all this as in duty bound, but we strongly advise our readers *not* to follow our example.

The present volume<sup>8</sup> completes the series of Rhind Lectures,

<sup>7</sup> "Reminiscences of an Attaché." By H. E. H. Jerminham. Edinburgh and London: Blackwood & Sons. 1886.

<sup>8</sup> "Scotland in Pagan Times: the Bronze and Stone Ages." By Joseph Anderson, LL.D. Edinburgh: David Douglas. 1886.

torical philosophy, that in spite of immense drawbacks the history of mankind is one of progress, and that obedience to law is the condition of progress, he then assumes that man is born under a law of virtue applicable to nations equally with individuals, and that in loyalty, truth, and uprightness lies the root of all greatness. To use his own words, the progressive and conservative principle of civilization is the idea of God, and of the duties binding upon us because He is what He is. Great men are the fount of great thoughts, and the trial of nations lies in the loyalty with which they follow revelations made at sundry times and in divers manners by these prophets of the Most High. He then states, rather than examines, the contrary doctrine, that great men are teachers so far only as they follow the Divine illumination; so far, in fact, as they correspond with truth and no farther. He then proceeds to illustrate his thesis by a chapter upon the Pontificate of Pope Gregory VII. (in his opinion), the cardinal point of the Middle Ages; another upon mediæval Catholic hymns as the natural outcome and expression of the religion of the generation in which they were composed; others upon the art of the Renaissance, with especial reference to the career of Michael Angelo; upon the eighteenth century and the principles of 1789, concluding with a chapter upon the age of Balzac. Mr. Lilly has written a very interesting and, as far as we can judge, a very orthodox book; but in spite of the parade of logic in the introductory dialogue, we think it would have been a better one had he adopted the test of reason rather than that of faith, especially when he invites a comparison with a thinker so acute as Mr. Herbert Spencer.

Mr. W. J. Amberst, of the Society of Jesus, has published a work<sup>12</sup> which quite exhausts the subject he has taken on hand. The introduction is taken up with explanations relating to questions at issue between Roman Catholics and those of other religious denominations, one of which is the sense in which the words "Catholique avant tout" should be taken. The author of this work contends that the expression was used by Montalembert "to rouse the spirits of Catholics, who had just shaken off the chains of persecution, and were thinking how they could, by all legal means, use their liberties as Englishmen in defence of their religion as Catholics," and that Mr. Gladstone having adopted the *suggestio falsi*, a suggestion of the falsehood that, in civil matters, a Catholic would not give the laws of his country the first place, is responsible for it, and has never rejected it. Taking an Act passed in 1771, entitled "An Act for the Reclaiming of Unprofitable Bogs," by which Papists were enabled to take fifty acres of unprofitable bog, with half an acre of arable land adjoining, for sixty-one years, as the first relaxation of the tyranny exercised over Catholics, the author gives minute points of detail as to the progress of the various Bills in Parliament which brought about the present state of affairs. He

<sup>12</sup> "The History of Catholic Emancipation and the Progress of the Catholic Church in the British Isles (chiefly in England) from 1771 to 1820." By W. J. Amberst, S.J. In two volumes. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., 1, Paternoster Square. 1886.

charges the Catholics of England to work together, and especially to join with the Catholics of Ireland in order to obtain those remaining concessions which at any rate the former must hope for. What this working together means is not very clear, but there is no doubt that for Catholics complete individual independence of action is the safest way to success. That the many protests of loyalty to the Crown which are made by the author on behalf of the Catholics are sincere, no one can doubt. In reading the chapter which bears the ugly heading "English and Scotch Bigotry," we must say that we cannot agree with it, and the following passage is uncalled for:—"A Catholic priest cannot walk the streets of a town in Scotland without seeing in the countenances, and sometimes hearing from the mouths, of at least one-half of the Scotch people whom he may meet, signs and expressions which convey the idea that they are saying in their hearts what the Pharisees of old cried out against our Lord, 'Crucify Him, crucify Him!' And the religion of these people well fits them to hate what is good and true." It cannot be said that this work has been written with an impartial spirit, nor does it tend to give hope for improvement as regards the position of Catholics and Protestants.

The Bishop of Missouri has presented to the American Historical Association a paper on "The Louisiana Purchase in its Influence upon the American System,"<sup>13</sup> which is well worth the fifty cents it costs and the short time it takes to read forty-two pages of perfect print. As the paper is so short the following extract will suffice:—"The acquisition of Louisiana, as contributing to the enormous increase of the material wealth derived from the gold and silver products of these Western States, has had a very wide and decided influence upon the social life of this country. . . . The total increase in the wealth of the country in gold and silver from the regions included in the Western acquisitions of the United States amounts to fifteen hundred millions of dollars." It appears that the American Historical Association held its first annual meeting at Saratoga on the 9th of September, 1885, and its object is "the promotion of historical studies in this country . . . which shall foster not merely American history, but history in America. . . . It will open its ranks to historical specialists and active workers everywhere, whether in this country or in Europe, in State or local historical societies, or in any isolated individual field." We feel sure that many such interesting papers will be contributed to this most liberal association.

A touching account of the life of a singularly ill-used woman.<sup>14</sup> Most of us have read in the newspapers the details of the various legal proceedings in which she was engaged, and some of us have perhaps

<sup>13</sup> Papers of the American Historical Association, Vol. I. No. 1. "The Louisiana Purchase in its Influence upon the American System:" a Paper presented to the American Historical Association, September 9, 1885. By the Right Rev. C. F. Robertson, D.D., Bishop of Missouri. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1885.

<sup>14</sup> "Autobiographical Sketches." By Annie Besant. London: Freethought Publishing Co. 1885.

been inclined to place too severe a construction upon the purely literary connection that subsisted between her and Mr. Bradlaugh, or to listen too readily to the roar of calumny that assailed them, on the publication of the notorious "Fruits of Philosophy." Now, however, that the conflict is over, and it is possible to consider the facts without passion or prejudice, it will readily be admitted by any impartial person that although the judgment of the Master of the Rolls may have been as a dry matter of law technically correct, yet in truth that judgment under the forms of justice inflicted a cruel wrong upon a tender mother and a spotless wife in depriving her of her children, not on account of any moral fault (for her opponents had sought in vain for a speck upon her purity), but wholly and solely in regard to her speculative opinions. Let us hope that her sufferings have not been in vain, and that she will be the last in our own or any future generation to incur such a penalty for a matter of opinion. Her book is very pleasantly and moderately written, and we can confidently recommend it to our readers.

It cannot be said that the value of the "Memorials"<sup>15</sup> of the devoted young medical missionary, Harold Schofield, lies in any literary merit which they possess, but in the fact that, piece of patchwork though the book is, it nevertheless succeeds in giving the impression of a remarkable man, conspicuous for his ability, animated by the loftiest motives, and capable of a very high degree of self-sacrifice for a noble cause. Undoubtedly the men are very few who, after an equally distinguished student career, would be satisfied to bury themselves in a remote province in a foreign country where, according to the estimate of the majority of mankind, the honour to be gained was little, and the worldly profit less, but such was the more than cheerful, the glad choice which he made when past the first flush of youth, and after gaining such distinction during his course of study at the Manchester, London, and Oxford Universities, as made eminent success at home almost a certainty. The following passage from the preface of the book seems characteristic of its subject. Dr. Schofield's brother writes:—

After the book was compiled I came across two papers of interest. The one was written for his wife, who had the greatest difficulty to induce him to give it to her, and contains a list of his scholarships, amounting to nearly £1,500. The other MS. was a small bit of torn note-paper inserted in a portfolio containing over forty certificates of honour from the Victoria University, certificates of the London University, showing he was first in the honours list in zoology, and third in honours in geology, palæontology and classics, and also containing all his numerous diplomas. On the paper was written, "God resisteth the proud, but giveth grace to the humble."

This passage is really too modest in its recital of the honours which he won. A more complete account of the matter is contained in the

---

<sup>15</sup> "Memorials of R. Harold A. Schofield, M.A., M.B. (Oxon.), late of the China Inland Mission, First Medical Missionary to Shan-Si, China." Chiefly compiled from his Letters and Diaries by his brother, A. T. Schofield, M.D. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1886.

obituary notice taken from the *Lancet*, and printed on p. 241 of the volume. Dr. Schofield was besides something more than a mere student, he found pleasure in the activities of life also; even his holiday excursions were marked by enterprise as well as some degree of boldness, and many companions testify to his bright and happy spirit. His life career having been chosen and entered upon with such unselfish motives and with such high hope of accomplishing its aim, it is melancholy to reflect that it was prematurely ended three short years afterwards, when its useful and beneficent character was becoming daily more apparent.

The life of a first-rate man who was a conspicuous figure in the stirring times of Charles I. and Cromwell could hardly fail to be interesting, and Mr. Morris Fuller's scholarly work<sup>16</sup> is worthy of his eminent ancestor. We are glad to see that the book is already in its second edition, as it is not only a standard but a popular work; one that appeals to the student of ecclesiastical biography and to the general reader, who will be delighted with the character of the genial old preacher and writer and attracted by his quaint wit and wisdom. The Church of England has had many men of great humour among her clergy, as indeed other Churches have also had, and Fuller belonged to the class of which Sydney Smith and Archbishop Whately are modern instances, rather than to the sarcastic school of which Swift is the most illustrious type. His humour is full of sense and good nature, and the tone of his mind was high and reverent. Charles Lamb has said that the writings of Fuller are usually spoken of as "quaint" with sufficient reason; for, "such was his natural bias to conceits, that I doubt not upon most occasions it would have been going out of his way to have expressed himself out of them—above all, his way of telling a story, for its eager liveliness, is perhaps unequalled." Lamb adds that his works are now little read, except by antiquaries; and indeed they are not very generally accessible, though the author of the *Life* now before us has edited a volume of his "Pulpit Sparks," collected from various old libraries. Mr. Morris Fuller, however, gives a very lucid and interesting description of his hero's best works in the course of his narrative, along with admirably selected extracts, which may well tempt the reader to go to the fountain-head. Macaulay has pointed out that the cause of humanity gained greatly in the times of the Puritans, and that certain cruel sports, such as bear-baiting, were put down; but he says that the reason of this was, not that the sport gave pain to the bear, but that it gave pleasure to the beholders, and was therefore sinful. Now Fuller, in advance of his age, took a different view. In his "Holy State," he says that an animal's "dumbness is oratory to a conscientious man; and he that will not be merciful to his beast is a beast himself." His opinions on education were equally enlightened and sound. He pleads

<sup>16</sup> "The Life, Times, and Writings of Thomas Fuller, D.D., the Church Historian." By the Rev. Morris Fuller, M.A., Rector of Ryburgh. In two volumes. Second Edition. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co.



strongly for cultured persons only undertaking the high duties of teaching the young :

There is scarce any profession in the Commonwealth more necessary which is so slightly performed. The reasons whereof I conceive to be these : first, young scholars make this calling their refuge ; yea, perchance before they have taken any degree in the University, commence schoolmasters in the country, as if nothing else were required to set up this profession but only a rod and a ferula.

One is reminded of Mr. Tulliver's liberal education, which consisted of "the alphabet at one end and the birch at the other." In "The General Artist," Fuller gives a thoughtful scheme for study, including English, Latin, Greek, Hebrew, logic, rhetoric, mathematics, history, &c. ; and, after giving his advice on these, he points to their being only means to an end. He counsels the student to "keep a place for the diamond to be set in : I mean for that predominant profession of law, physic, divinity, or State policy, which he intends for his principal calling hereafter." The student's reading, he holds, should have made his "fancy so nimble that as soon as he heard any subject, he was able to speak to it." He commends history, like Carlyle, to all, whether scholars or general readers, on the ground that the man who does not know the past cannot judge the probabilities of the future. Such a being, he says, has "a crick in his neck," and cannot look behind him. "Without history a man's soul is purblind, seeing only the things which almost touch his eyes" Fuller's greatest work, the "Worthies of England," was not published till 1662, a year after his death. He thus sets out the design of the work :

England may be compared to an house not very great, and the several shires may properly be resembled to the rooms thereof. Now, as learned Master Camden and painful [Fuller uses this word for painstaking, or careful] Master Speed, with others, have described the rooms themselves, so it is our intention, God willing, to describe the furniture of those rooms ; such eminent commodities, which every county doth produce, with the persons of quality bred therein, and some other observables coincident with the same subject. Know then that I propound five ends to myself in this book. First, to gain some glory to God. Secondly, to preserve the memories of the dead. Thirdly, to present examples to the living. Fourthly, to entertain the reader with delight. And lastly (which I am not ashamed publicly to profess) to procure some honest profit to myself.

Of this book we cannot do better than quote the opinion of Professor Rogers, that "perused as an amusement, there are few in the English language which a man, with the slightest tincture of love for our early literature, can take up with a keener relish." Of the moderate and manly part that Fuller took in the troubles of his times we have not space to speak at present, and must refer our readers to Mr. Morris Fuller's admirable work. At first he pleased neither Cavaliers nor Puritans ; but Samuel Taylor Coleridge has paid him this tribute of respect : "Fuller was incomparably the most sensible, the least prejudiced, great man of an age that boasted a galaxy of great men." Mr. Morris Fuller has

so thoroughly entered into the spirit of his subject, that his political opinions of the leading events connected with his ancestor's life seem tinged with the feelings of the time. Whilst we cannot quite agree with all his views, they give a living zest to his writing, the style of which is throughout admirable. The book is one of enormous research. Of the hundreds of characters placed before the reader in the course of the *Life*, the author gives most interesting notices, and of one (Bishop Davenant) he has published an admirable life. Indeed, the worst fault we can find is with the *Index*, which gives a totally inadequate guide to this important work as a book of reference.

The high reputation of the late Dr. Birch<sup>17</sup> deserves in our opinion something better at the hands of his son than a few biographical notices cut from the leading journals and hurriedly strung together. A well-digested detailed history of the life and labours of one of the greatest of modern antiquaries would be a most valuable contribution to literature, and we hope to hear that such a work is in course of preparation.

Mr. Ralph Disraeli has rather disarmed criticism of his eminent brother's letters<sup>18</sup> by his short and sensible preface, in which he admits that their tone might be thought egotistical, but that they were written without thought of publication, and to a sister who fully believed in the writer's powers. Mr. Disraeli has also omitted everything that could give pain to any one, and all purely private matter. We do not therefore know what the letters have lost in piquancy; but, as they remain, they are interesting and racy reading, as might be expected. They exhibit, moreover, some of Lord Beaconsfield's best characteristics—a genuine love for his sister and family, and a happy and good-natured disposition. They are not "great letters" in any sense; nor can they for a moment be compared to the charming letters another eminent man of Hebrew stock addressed to a sister. There is no such high tone or interest about them as attaches to Mendelssohn's letters to his sister Fanny. The reader will, however, be at once impressed with the fact that these letters are written by a clever man to one not only held in affection but in reverence. And that Sarah Disraeli amply deserved these feelings is evident from her father's allusions to her, in the prefaces to his "*Curiosities*," "*Amenities*," and "*Miscellanies of Literature*." He says, speaking of his threatened blindness: "Amid partial darkness, I am not left without a distant hope nor a present consolation; and to her who has so often lent to me the light of her eyes, the intelligence of her voice, and the careful work of her head, the author must ever owe the 'debt immense' of paternal gratitude." When one remembers that Lord Beaconsfield's letters were many of them written to brighten and

---

<sup>17</sup> "*Biographical Notices of Dr. Samuel Birch*." By W. De G. Birch. London: Trübner. 1886.

<sup>18</sup> "*Lord Beaconsfield's Correspondence with his Sister, 1832-1852*." London: John Murray.

amuse his then old parents, and the sister who was doing so much for them, they appear in a very pleasant light. It need not be said that there is plenty of sarcastic wit. The following will serve as samples : "Charley Gore said that Lord John often asked how I was getting on at Wycombe. He fished as to whether I should support them. I answered, 'They had one claim upon my support; they needed it,' and no more." "Murray says that authors who write for posterity must publish on their own account." After his first election : "I begin to enjoy my new career. I find that it makes a sensible difference in the opinion of one's friends; I can scarcely keep my countenance." "Lord Francis Egerton spoke with all the effect which a man of considerable talent, backed by the highest rank and £60,000 per annum would naturally command." "Pakington was confident, fluent and commonplace and made a good chairman of Quarter Sessions speech. 'It is the best speech he will ever make,' said Sugden, 'and he has been practising it before the grand jury for the last twenty years.' However, I supported him very zealously, and he went to bed thinking he was an orator, and wrote to Mrs. Pakington, I have no doubt, to that effect." Here is Lord Beaconsfield's first introduction to the lady who became his wife : "I was introduced, by particular desire, to Mrs. Wyndham Lewis, a pretty little woman, a flirt and a rattle, indeed gifted with a volubility I should think unequalled, and of which I can convey no idea. She told me that she liked silent, melancholy men. I answered that I had no doubt of it." Mr. Disraeli had such evident enjoyment in his entrance to "Society" that his reader cannot fail to share it and be amused by his impressions. He writes in February 1833 :

I met the Nortons and Charles Mathews, who was very amusing. Yesterday I dined with the Nortons; it was her eldest brother's birthday, who, she says, is the only respectable one of the family, and that is because he has a liver complaint. The only lady besides Mrs. Norton was her sister, Mrs. Blackwood, also very handsome and very Sheridanian; she told me she was nothing. "You see Georgie's the beauty, and Carry's the wit, and I ought to be the good one, but then I'm not." I liked her exceedingly, besides she knows all my works by heart. Mrs. Norton sang and acted and did everything that was delightful. Old Mrs. Sheridan is my greatest admirer; in fact, the whole family have a very proper idea of my merits (!) and I like them all.

The letter in which Mr. Disraeli describes his celebrated first speech in the House of Commons is interesting. He had anticipated his statement to the House, that a time would come when he would be heard, some years before, in a letter dated February 7, 1833, where he writes : "Heard Macaulay's best speech, Sheil and Grant. Macaulay admirable; but, between ourselves, I could floor them all. This, *entre nous*. I was never more confident of anything than that I could carry everything before me in that House. The time will come." The letters we like least are those about the quarrel with O'Connell. On this subject Mr. Disraeli tells his sister : "The general effect is the thing, and that is, that all men agree I have shown pluck." When he wrote that, Mr. Disraeli was not in possession of the "giftie to

see ourselves as others see us." It was notorious that O'Connell had killed a man named D'Esterre in a duel, in 1815, and had been so shocked by what had happened, that he had vowed never to fight again. Some severe criticisms appeared in the papers at the time, and Mr. Disraeli melodramatically vowed eternal hatred to O'Connell, which, to judge by his after-mention of him in his letters, we are happy to believe he did not feel. The letters contain one or two pleasant allusions to Mr. Gladstone, especially in an account of a Royal Academy dinner, where Mr. Disraeli sat "between Gladstone and Sydney Herbert. . . . It went off very well, Gladstone being particularly agreeable." Unfortunately, these interesting chatty letters come to an end in 1852, just when their talented writer's career became most notable, his sister, after their father's death, having lived in or near London. In spite of their many excellences, the correspondence leaves an impression that their writer looked upon politics as a sort of superior game of skill, in which he had to pose for certain parts.

There is no profession in which success is so much due to enthusiasm as medicine, and the biography of eminent doctors,<sup>19</sup> is a *λαμπαδηφορία*, in which the sacred torch of the healing science is handed on from holder to holder, ever gaining brightness as it changes hands, in spite of the breath of obstruction and superstition which constantly threatens it, as when Harvey's professional prosperity was seriously injured by the publication of his "Treatise on the Heart and Circulation," and Simpson's application of chloroform in operations was opposed as irreligious and "a decoy of Satan." Mr. Bettany's book begins with Linacre and Caius, one the founder of the Royal College of Physicians, and the other the introducer of the practice of dissection; and it comes down quite to our own times, to Erasmus Wilson, Toynebee, and John Simon. In Caius's time the bodies of two criminals a year were sufficient for all the dissecting done in London, and when the demand became greater, the state of the law, which made it almost impossible to gain possession of subjects for dissection legally, had the usual effect of prohibitive laws which do not rest on the basis of the common conscience; that is, they simply raised the price, and did not stop the traffic. Sir Astley Cooper himself said that there was no one whom he could not dissect if he wished; and Hunter managed to secure the body of O'Brien, the Irish Giant, which is now in the museum in Lincoln's Inn, on its way to be sunk in the sea, which the deceased had expressly desired in order that his bones might be saved the fate which overtook them. The absolute prohibition of anti-vivisection would only produce a similar result. No surgeon could believe that the performance of an experiment like that on the antlers of a deer, which showed Hunter how to supersede the then generally fatal methods of operating in cases of aneurism, was morally wrong; and the desire to

---

<sup>19</sup> "Eminent Doctors: their Lives and their Work." By G. T. Bettany, M.A., B.Sc. Two vols. Hogg.

further knowledge and benefit humanity, would overcome the duty of obeying the law, not without some weakening of the moral sense, which is the infallible result of over-legislation. Neither volume bears a date on the title-page, an omission which we are sorry to see is not infrequent, and often renders the identification of editions difficult.

---

BELLES LETTRES.

OUT of several volumes of verse bearing different titles, which she has published in America, Mrs. Piatt has made a selection, and presents them to the English public as "Mrs. Piatt's Poems."<sup>1</sup> They are for the most part graceful compositions embodying some tender thought or delicate fancy. Their source of inspiration is to be found in the earlier poems of Mrs. Barrett Browning, and they recall both Adelaide Proctor and Christina Rossetti to our memory. In dealing with her subject, Mrs. Piatt lacks clearness and precision, and without sinning deeply she does not pay sufficient heed either to the necessities or to the refinements of metre. We should esteem her powers as a writer of verse far higher if she were to make a less liberal use of the colloquial parenthesis. Doubtless such expressions as "I think," "I fear," "you know," are convenient for metrical and other exigencies, but they are, after all, clumsy expedients for concealing poverty of thought, and want of command of verse. Many of Mrs. Piatt's verses are concerned with the sayings and doings of children. We are of those who hold that both the pathos and the humour of the nursery should be reserved for home consumption, but for those who think otherwise with regard to the "kingdom of heavenites," as Coleridge called babies, we can safely recommend Mrs. Piatt. Among the more striking poems in this volume are "A Voyage to the Fortunate Isles," "The Longest Death-Watch," and "Twelve Hours Apart." We select for quotation a double quatrain, entitled "Broken Promise."

After strange stars, inscrutable, on high,  
 After strange seas beneath his floating feet,  
 After the glare in many a brooding eye,  
 I wonder if the cry of "Land" was sweet?

Or did the Atlantic gold, the Atlantic palm,  
 The Atlantic bird and flower, seem poor, at best,  
 To the grey Admiral under sun and calm,  
 After the passionate doubt and faith of quest?

Students and admirers of Walt Whitman will read "Towards

---

<sup>1</sup> "Mrs. Piatt's Poems." *A Voyage to the Fortunate Isles, and other Poems.* By Sarah M. B. Piatt. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., 1 Paternoster Square. London. 1885.

Democracy,"<sup>2</sup> with patience as well as amusement, but to those who "call the master Beelzebub," we cannot commend the all too faithful disciple. The poem, if it be a poem, consists of a series of disconnected rhapsodies, interspersed with catalogues of places, and descriptions of men and women under various social aspects. The moral of the piece, if moral there be, is that the world and all that is therein is God, and the working-man is His prophet. We extract what we humbly conceive to be the pith of "Towards Democracy."

Grave and strong and untamed.

This is the clear-browed, unconstrained tender face, with full lips and bearded chin, this is the regardless defiant face I love and trust.

Which I came out to see, and having seen do not forget.

\* \* \* \* \*

There was a time when the sympathy and the ideals of men gathered round other figures;

When the crowned king, or the priest in procession, or the knight-errant, or the man of letters in his study were the imaginative forms to which men clung;

But now before the easy homely garb and appearance of this man as he swings past in the evening, all these others fade and grow dim. They come back after all and cling to him.

And this is one of the slowly unfolded meanings of democracy.

In reply to which we would urge the plea that although the cowl does not make the monk, neither does the absence of the cowl; and that formality and unreality are natural to the offspring of Adam, and are not inherent in forms of government.

Once our author condescends to break into rhyme, and gives us some really charming lines addressed to Squinancy-Wort.

#### WHAT HAVE I DONE?

Many an age ago,  
 Before man walked on earth,  
 I was. In the sun I shone;  
 I shook in the wind with mirth;  
 And danced on the high tops looking out seaward,  
 Where I had birth.  
 Thick footed monsters came,  
 And into the darkness went,  
 In ponderous tournament,—  
 Many an age ago.  
 But on the high tops I dwelt ever the same,  
 With sisters many a one,  
 Guiltless of sin and shame!  
 What have I done?

What have I done? *Man* came,  
 Evolutional upstart one!

---

\* 2 "Towards Democracy." Copyright, 1885. By Edward Carpenter. Manchester: John Heywood, Deansgate and Ridgefield; London: 11 Paternoster Buildings, 1885.

With the gift of giving a name,  
 To everything under the sun.  
 What have I done? Man came  
 (They say nothing sticks like dirt),  
 Looked at me with eyes of blame,  
 And called me squinancy-wort.

\* \* \* \*

Yet there is hope. I have seen  
 Many changes since I began;  
 The web-footed beasts have been  
 (Dear beasts!) and gone, being part of some wider plan.  
 Perhaps in his infinite mercy God will remove this Man!

"Babylon Bound,"<sup>3</sup> a Morality by Stanley Weall, is a most disappointing production. In numerous detached passages the author proves himself to be possessed of wit and style, and in the choruses he displays considerable lyrical powers. But what is the upshot of the whole? *Davus sum, non Ædipus*. Something is portrayed as in a glass darkly, but the author affords no interpretation to the bewildered spectator. Against such wilful and weariful obscurity, such elaboration of enigmas, we protest in the name of all the Muses. Of the other poems, "The Man in the Moon," which describes the gradual extinction of life on the earth from the absorption of heat, is the simplest, the clearest, and by far the most powerful. Mr. Weall, in straining after originality, is throwing away his undoubted powers as an able writer of verse.

Of "Waifs and Strays"<sup>4</sup> we will say but little. They are evidently the composition of an amiable lady, and they are quite harmless, but they do not appear to us to merit publication.

"Consolation and other Poems,"<sup>5</sup> by Abraham Perry Miller, are the expressions in simple but pleasing verse of those moral and religious sentiments which, in their recurrence to gentle and thoughtful minds, have all the charm of novelty, and impel them to poetical effort. Mr. Miller, if he is something less than a poet, can express himself in metre correctly and harmoniously, and without any slavish imitation of contemporary models. In his longest poem, "Consolation," there are some fine lines descriptive of a thunderstorm, which, if space allowed, would bear quotation. Perhaps the most original of his verses are the following lines to a Whistler:—

He never sings, but whistles as he goes,  
 Nor written song nor symphony he knows;  
 But in those strains, what music has its birth,  
 Into the common air of common earth!  
 What heavenly fountains, deep and far away,  
 Send up such bubbles to the light of day.

\* \* \* \*

<sup>3</sup> "Babylon Bound: a Morality, and other Poems." By Stanley Weall, B.A. London: Elliot Stock, 62 Paternoster Row, E.C. 1886.

<sup>4</sup> "Waifs and Strays, and other Lays." By Mrs. J. Taylor Cross. London: Swan Sonnenschein, Le Bas & Lowry, Paternoster Square. 1886.

<sup>5</sup> "Consolation, and other Poems." By Abraham Perry Miller. New York: Brentano Bros. 1886.

If the divine sweet sounds he makes were caught,  
 And into one befitting song were wrought;  
 The world would laugh and weep as ne'er before,  
 And sing the witching song for evermore.

But Mr. Perry, although an American, is by no means possessed of humour, or he would hardly address a young poet as "My Splendid Friend"! or describe St. Anthony Falls as the "Grandmother of Waters!" or essay the following metaphor—

Our hearts are eggs, and God must break the shell,  
 To get the treasure which He loves so well.

Gems like this remind us of Gifted Hopkins, and of our honoured guest, The Autocrat of the Breakfast Table, who created him a "joy for ever."

"Reynard the Fox,"<sup>6</sup> by A. D. Ainslie, is a pleasant and readable translation into a loose ballad metre of Goethe's well-known version of the "Reineke Fuchs," "that universal household possession and secular Bible," as Carlyle has named it, of European peoples. In his preface, Mr. Ainslie briefly recounts the several versions of the Legend from the Twelfth Century Reinardus Vulpes, to the Low German Version of "Reineke de Fos," published in 1498. We venture to predict that the present translation, with its easy tripping style and happy presentation in modern guise of old-world humour, will do much to make this "World's Book" better known among English speaking people.

Under the title of "Essays in the Study of Folk-Songs,"<sup>7</sup> the Countess Evelyn Martinengo-Cesaresco has brought together a number of scattered monographs on the primeval unlettered poetry of European nations. The Folk-Song, earlier even than the Folk-Tale, has its origin deep down in the heart of things. The joy of harvest or the vintage, the wonder and delight of the maiden to her lover, the inborn mysterious passion for depicting the "gods in the likeness of men," taught mankind to "lisp in numbers." It would seem that every nation under heaven has expressed the first and simplest thoughts of the human heart with a marvellous sameness, and that whatever else may come and go, at the peasant's fireside, and in the nursery of prince and peasant, the old songs, the old prayers, linger and abide. "The White Paternoster," the well-known prayer to Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John itself, very possibly a Christian adaptation of some primeval celebration of the hidden powers of night, survived the Reformation, survived Methodism, and will survive the penny press and the school-board. In a series of masterly essays, none the less ably, because clearly and pleasantly put together, the Countess Martinengo-

<sup>6</sup> "Reynard the Fox," after the German Version of Goethe. By A. Douglas Ainslie. London: Macmillan & Co. 1886.

<sup>7</sup> "Essays in the Study of Folk-Songs." By the Countess Evelyn Martinengo-Cesaresco. London: George Redway, York Street, Covent Garden. 1886.



Cesaresco brings both wide reading and personal knowledge to bear on such subjects as Nature in Folk-Songs ; Sicilian Folk-Songs, Greek Songs of Calabria, and Folk Lullabies. A book at once so attractive and so instructive is a rare treat, and we heartily commend it to the notice of our readers. The numerous translations of Folk-Songs which are scattered broadcast through this delightful volume, are rendered with unusual skill and grace. We give as a specimen the following translation of the evensong of Polish children :—

The stars shine forth from the blue sky ;  
How great and wondrous is God's might ;  
Shine, stars, through all eternity,  
His witness in the night.

O Lord, Thy tired children keep ;  
Keep us who know and feel Thy might,  
Turn Thine eye on us as we sleep,  
And give us all good night.

Shine, stars, God's sentinels on high,  
Proclaimers of His power and might ;  
May all things evil from us fly :  
O stars, good-night, good-night !

“In Quest and Vision”<sup>8</sup> Mr. W. S. Dawson discourses pleasantly and sensibly, though not without a touch of affectation, on Wordsworth, Shelley, George Eliot, and modern poets generally. On the whole, we are at one with Mr. Dawson. We agree with him in thinking that Shelley's conduct to Harriet Westbrook was an offence past all forgiveness ; that Wordsworth's message was one of consolation and peace ; and that George Eliot's intellectual renunciation of Christianity was made and sustained by an effort. We hold, too, with almost all that he has to say on the disastrous effect of religious doubt and pessimistic views on modern poetry. The questioning, despairing attitude is not favourable for the robuster and saner efforts of genius. Active revolt against all forms of faith, or the hope-illumined struggle of faith with doubt, or sunny unquestioning faith, are all favourable conditions for the development of poetic genius ; but the spirit that doubts past hope, and yet bewails its discredited deities, will spend its strength in empty and unavailing threnodies. On the other hand, we take exception to the charge of “pestilent obscenity” being brought against Sterne in common with Congreve and Swift. Such a union of names argues a want of ethical as well as literary discrimination. Again, it is an entire mistake to say of Wordsworth, that when he turned his face northward he knew that he was going to live as a peasant among peasants. Simply and hardly no doubt he lived in the little cottage at Townend, but not as a peasant. Lastly, we cannot let pass without protest such a phrase as “the light tintinnabulation of Mr. Thomas Moore.” When modern culture ever

<sup>8</sup> “Quest and Vision.” By W. J. Dawson. London : Elliot Stock, 62 Paternoster Row. 1886.

produces a lyric worthy to be named in the same breath as "Oft in the Stilly Night," then, and not till then, may culture take up its parable against Anacreon Moore.

In his introduction to "Essays on Poetry and Poets,"<sup>9</sup> Mr. Roden Noel discusses the philosophic value of poetic intuition, and he maintains that the moods and aspects of external nature betoken the presence "of something far more deeply infused," which it is the privilege of the poet to perceive and know by virtue of his inspiration. "Poetry," he says, "does not tell pretty lies for the sake of amusement, but penetrates to the heart of things." The primrose by the river-brim had secrets of her own, communicable to Wordsworth and his kind. The "wayward indolence" of the "short-lived foam," which Keats was the first to celebrate, is of the nature of human caprice, and bears witness to the real, though invisible presence of the *anima mundi*. But surely it is possible to observe and apprehend the outside world by the light and in the light of human personality, and yet to be conscious all the time that "we receive but what we give, and in our lives alone doth nature live. The existence of an informing and indwelling world-spirit depends on far deeper considerations than the chance resemblances between the motions of nature and of men. Of the long and carefully written essays which follow, on Byron, Shelley, Wordsworth, we cannot speak at length. In spite of some affectation of style, inseparable it would seem from literature of this kind, Mr. Noel displays a close knowledge of the authors whose writings he discusses, and a discriminating appreciation. He never writes only to depreciate, and he never praises for the purpose of detracting from the fame of a rival author. On the whole, the essay on Lord Tennyson appeared to us to reach the highest standard of criticism. By way of discovering an error: it was surely Wordsworth, in the "Leech Gatherer," who speaks of Chatterton as "the marvellous boy." When Coleridge wrote his monody on the death of Chatterton, he was "a marvellous boy" himself, and would not so have described a brother bard.

Translations of the Apostles' Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the Litany,<sup>10</sup> &c., into Greek iambs, the Te Deum into hexameters, and of various well-known hymns into iambic dimeters, will commend themselves only to the curious in such matters. Many of these renderings—that of the Lord's Prayer, for instance—appears to be simple, idiomatic, and exact; but except as a *tour de force*, we fail to see the object of such composition. Doubtless to Mr. Chatfield the work has been a labour of love.

The Delegates of the Clarendon Press issue an edition of Scott's "Lay of the Last Minstrel,"<sup>11</sup> with notes and preface by W. Minto. An

<sup>9</sup> "Essays on Poetry and Poets." By the Hon. Roden Noel. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., 1 Paternoster Square, London.

<sup>10</sup> "Litany and Hymns in Greek Verse." Translated by Allen W. Chatfield, M.A. London: Henry Froude, Amen Corner.

<sup>11</sup> "Scott's Lay of the Last Minstrel." Edited, with Preface and Notes, by W. Minto, M.A. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1886.

interesting account is given in the preface of the "inception of the poem," together with critical remarks on the metre (the suggestion of which, as Scott admitted, was due to Coleridge's, then unpublished, "Christabel"), the supernatural machinery, and the diction of the poem. The notes abound in historical details and graphic descriptions of the scenery of Teviot and of Tweed. A map of the district, which the editor calls Scott-land—*i.e.* the land of the Scott clan—is affixed.

Messrs. Simpkin and Marshall issue a reprint, with facsimile title-page of "Mr. William Shakespeare's Comedie of the 'Tempest,'" <sup>12</sup> from the original copy printed by Isaac Jaggard and Ed. Blount, 1623.

An edition of the first twelve books of the "Iliad" of Homer, <sup>13</sup> with introduction and critical notes by Walter Leaf, will be welcomed by scholars. In the introduction, after dealing with the text and the scholia, Mr. Leaf goes on to discuss the vexed question of the origin of the poem. He maintains that, while the *Μῆνις Ἀχιλλέως*, the work of "Homer" himself, is the original poem, yet that certain accretions, such as the story of the exploits of Diomedes, may be by the same hand; and he concludes that while the "whole of the first book, half the second, the greater part of the next five, and the eleventh, may be the work of one poet, yet that the eighth and ninth books must be assigned to a second author, and the tenth to yet another." The notes are in English, and are suitable to advanced scholars who are not German students.

We have also to acknowledge an edition of the "Œdipus Coloneus of Sophocles," <sup>14</sup> with notes, commentary, and translation in English prose. In addition to a critical introduction, to which is attached a map of Colonus and the neighbourhood, there is an excursus on manuscripts and editions, a metrical analysis, an appendix with Greek and English indices. The English translation is printed on the opposite page to the Greek text. It would be difficult to say too much of the marvellous completeness of this noble edition.

We can do no more than acknowledge the second volume of "Cicero's Letters," <sup>15</sup> with a commentary and introductory essay by Robert Yelverton Tyrrell. In the preface the editor calls attention to the fact that his is the first edition of the letters of Cicero, or of any part of them, which has been able to make use of the Codex Turonensis and Codices Harleiani for the recension of the text. Affixed to the historic essays, which are of the highest interest, there is a lengthy excursus on the Harleian Codex No. 2682.

<sup>12</sup> "Mr. William Shakespeare's Comedie of the Tempest." Published according to the true original copies. London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co.

<sup>13</sup> "The Iliad." Edited, with English Notes and Introduction, by Walter Leaf, M.A. Vol. I. Books I.-XII. London: Macmillan & Co. 1886.

<sup>14</sup> "Sophocles: the Plays and Fragments." With Critical Notes, Commentary, and Translation in English Prose by R. C. Jebb. Part II. "The Œdipus Coloneus." Cambridge: at the University Press. 1885.

<sup>15</sup> "The Correspondence of M. Tullius Cicero." With Commentary and Introductory Essays by Robert Yelverton Tyrrell. Vol. II. London: Longmans, Green & Co., Paternoster Row. 1886.

We have also received a second volume of Professor August Fick's redaction of the Iliad of Homer,<sup>16</sup> into its original Æolic form.

"Il Libro dell' Amore,"<sup>17</sup> by Marco Antonio Canini, is an anthology (of 700 pages) of Italian love poems, together with a vast number of love poems of all ages and all peoples, which are translated into Italian. An art of love, indeed, but destined rather for immortal lovers.

We received too late for notice in the April number of THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW, a folio copy of "Early Christian Symbolism."<sup>18</sup> This beautiful volume consists of illustrations of the well-known designs affixed to early Christian tombs in the Catacombs. The drawings, which are engraved on copper, were collected by the late W. H. Palmer, and are in part a reproduction and rearrangement of the plates of Bosio and Arizghi as reprinted by Bottari, and in part are original sketches from the walls of the Catacombs. The designs are arranged under heads: as "The Rod," "The Dispensation," "The Woman," "The Eucharist." This work, which was left by the late Mr. Palmer in a state approaching completeness, fell into the hands of Cardinal Newman, who committed the task of editing and arranging to Father Northcote and Canon Brownlow. Their task has been executed with care and judgment. We need hardly say that, both as regards selection of designs and the suggested interpretations, that the editors approach the subject from the point of view of Roman Catholic divines.

"The Colloquial Faculty for Languages,"<sup>19</sup> by Walter Hayle Walshe, M.D., consists of three parts. In the first he contends that, contrary to the generally received opinion, the power of learning to speak and write any foreign language fluently and correctly is a faculty so rare as to be exceptional. In the second part he seeks to assign to this exceptional faculty a physical cause, and in pursuance of his argument gives in outline a history of the varying fortunes of the doctrine of cerebral localization. The third part is an inquiry, conducted on the same principles, into "The Nature of Genius." The second and third divisions will afford agreeable and instructive reading for all who are gifted with "a liberal curiosity"; but only a physiologist can really weigh the arguments put forward, far less pronounce upon them. It is, then, to the first section that we shall confine our remarks, and without hazarding an opinion on the "local habitation" of "The Colloquial Faculty for Languages," we unre-

<sup>16</sup> "Die Homerische Ilias," nach ihren entstehung betrachtet und in der ursprünglichen sprachform wiederhergestellt von August Fick. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht's Verlag. 1886.

<sup>17</sup> "Il Libro dell' Amore." Da Marco Antonio Canini. Venezia: Libreria Colombo Coen e Figlio. 1885. London: Trubner & Co.

<sup>18</sup> "An Introduction to Early Christian Symbolism." By the late William Palmer, M.A. Edited, with Notes, by the Revs. J. Spencer Northcote, D.D., and W. R. Brownlow, M.A. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., 1 Paternoster Square. 1885.

<sup>19</sup> "The Colloquial Faculty for Languages. Cerebral Localization, and the Nature of Genius: Tentamen Physiologicum." By Walter Hayle Walshe, M.D. London: J. & A. Churchill, New Burlington Street.

servedly endorse Dr. Walshe's judgment as to the extreme rarity of the faculty itself. He distinguishes three kinds of linguistic faculty: the philological, the scholastic, and the colloquial. The possession of the first hardly, he thinks, "seems to signify anything specific, or strictly differentiated in the nature of its cerebral factors; mental aptitudes which will successfully grapple with intellectual problems as a class, will not be baffled utterly by those occurring within the range of philology." In the second variety, which we have termed the scholastic, he places "analytical grammarians and word-critics," and he classes them as belonging "in a humbler fashion to the previous group." "Far different," he proceeds to say, "is the case of the third variety of linguistic aptitude—that for readily assimilating and practically utilizing colloquial languages of the day. Herein lies a faculty peculiar, special, differentiated in a very striking degree—one which is the occasional, if rare, endowment of the otherwise non-intellectual, in some sort well-nigh brainless; one which cannot in its fulness be secured by any amount of toil—nay, which seems repelled in some varieties of organization by straining efforts to attain it." In the next chapter he passes in review the various recorded instances of consummate linguistic accomplishment, from Mithridates, King of Pontus—who is reported to have spoken twenty-two different dialects—down to our own time, when all previous performances "sink into insignificance before the culminating wonder of Cardinal Mezzofanti's perfect management of forty languages, with their dialects." But Dr. Walshe misdoubts such phenomenal achievements, and asks, "Before what courts of competent native examiners have these wonderful linguists appeared, and with how many such courts have they passed muster?" He thinks, as we do, that it is a very rare thing for a man to have a thorough practical knowledge of one other language besides his own, and if his knowledge approaches perfection it is little less than a wonder, only to be accounted for by extraordinary gifts developed by exceptional opportunities. This discouraging estimate is borne out in the work before us by a host of examples of the ludicrous errors into which some of the greatest writers, both French and English, have fallen, in their attempts to express themselves in a language not their own, or even to catch its true sense when written. Victor Hugo's complicated and colossal blunder is worth quoting. "Au moment," he writes, "où nous écrivons ces lignes, un coup d'équinoxe vient de démolir, sur la frontière d'Angleterre et d'Ecosse, la falaise Première des Quatre, *First of the Fourth*;" which means, being interpreted, "The Firth of Forth"—though how it came to be on the English border, or to be converted into a cliff, and finally to be demolished by an equinoctial gale, is more than we can explain.

In "Ecclesiastical English,"<sup>20</sup> which is a sequel to the "Revisers' English," by the same author, Mr. Washington Moon makes a damaging

---

<sup>20</sup> "Ecclesiastical English." By G. Washington Moon, Hon. F.R.S.L. Hatchards, 187 Piccadilly. 1886.

onslaught on the English of the learned authors of the Revised Version of the Old Testament. He undoubtedly proves his case against them, though we cannot help thinking some of his objections hypercritical. As regards the correct use of "naught" and "nought" we cannot agree with him. Mr. Moon says we have no such word in English as "naught," in the sense of "naughty;" but he surely forgets the words of Ophelia ("Hamlet," iii. 2): "You are naught, you are naught!" Nought, meaning "nothing," should, we are persuaded, be spelled with an "o"—not, as he would have it, with an "a." That this is in accordance with ancient usage is, to our mind, proved by the general employment throughout the North of England of the word "nowt" for "nothing," as illustrated in the proverb, "Nowt's niver i' danger." To return to Mr. Moon's indictment against the Revisers, we must confess that their work has never inspired us with much enthusiasm. We want no elaborate arguments to convince us that "the old is better."

"The Niti Literature of Burma,"<sup>21</sup> a collection of ancient proverbs and maxims from Burmese sources, translated into English by Mr. James Gray, is to an ordinary reader more curious than interesting. The proverbs and maxims are not, for the most part, very striking or pithy. To enter into their spirit one must be deeply versed in the habits, customs, and tone of thought of the races amongst whom they have originated.

"The Philosophy of Art"<sup>22</sup> consists of translations from the German of Hegel's "Introduction to the Scientific Study of Æsthetics," and of Dr. Michelet's "Philosophy of Art and the Science of Æsthetics," together with a laudatory and hortatory preface by W. Hastie, B.D. We are grateful for these translations, which will enable the English student to study the science of æsthetics at its fountain-head. We cannot, however, bring ourselves to believe in the theory set forth by Mr. Hastie in his preface, that art is destined to be the inspiring and guiding influence of the future, and that, like theology, its secrets are with the initiated few, to whom the multitude must come for instruction and support. That art has been and will be the delight, the consolation, and the enlightener of men we doubt not; but that it is destined in some mysterious fashion to embrace and overshadow all human life and effort, we believe to be a dream.

"The Education of the Artist"<sup>23</sup> is a translation (and a very good one) by Miss Clara Bell from the French of M. Ernest Chesneau. M. Chesneau, like most French writers on art, has this signal superiority over German art-teachers, that at least one can understand

<sup>21</sup> "Ancient Proverbs and Maxims from Burmese Sources; or, the Niti Literature of Burma." By James Gray. London: Trübner & Co., Ludgate Hill. 1886.

<sup>22</sup> "The Philosophy of Art." By Hegel and C. L. Michelet. Translated from the German by W. Hastie, B.D. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd. London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co. 1886.

<sup>23</sup> "The Education of the Artist" By Ernest Chesneau. Translated by Clara Bell. London, Paris, New York, and Melbourne: Cassell & Co., Limited. 1886.

him. His opinions are clearly formulated, so that we can either give or withhold our assent *en connaissance de cause*; and so long as he treats of matters within the range of his real knowledge and observation he commands something more than a mere assent to his propositions. We feel that he is speaking words of wisdom, and we listen with respect and admiration. But when he falls back upon what he regards as first principles the case is widely different. He babbles of "the soul," its mutability or immutability, its immortality, &c. In short, he lays down, as fundamental principles of art, a series of flimsy and unverifiable speculations on subjects of which he, like the rest of mankind, is necessarily profoundly ignorant, and which, moreover, have really no practical bearing on art. The important part of M. Chesneau's teaching is his insistence on originality in art to be attained by studying nature at first hand, and by avoiding slavish copying of the antique. We are entirely of one mind with him in mourning over the decay of national and local schools of painting, and in deploring the rapid spread of that dreary cosmopolitanism which in art, as in many other things, is passing over Europe like a blight, and effacing all variety of local colouring. It is some comfort to an Englishman that, according to M. Chesneau, our country forms the one exception to the universal decadence of art throughout Europe. "There is but one nation," he says, "of whom it can be said that it is improving on its past, and that is artistic England."

No doubt "A Bibliography of the Literature relating to Charles Dickens and his Writings"<sup>24</sup> is a valuable and all but necessary implement to bibliophiles, and every part of Mr. Kitton's volume will have more or less charm for devoted admirers of Dickens. But for us the only section of Dickensiana which possesses much interest is the "Critical." It is undoubtedly amusing, and to some extent instructive, to look through the contemporary criticisms of the earlier works of "Boz," and note how the new departure in fiction was received before the name of "Boz," and a little later of Dickens, became consecrated by success. One writer in an American periodical (*The Southern Literary Messenger*, May 1837) lashes himself into rage over the pseudonym of "Boz"—why, it is impossible to surmise or even to imagine; but he positively foams at the mouth, treating the harmless *nom de plume* as an offence against decency and good manners. Then there is a slashing critique from the *Saturday Review* (Dec. 17, 1859), containing some grains of justice and good sense floating in a sea of gall. But the two really good criticisms of Dickens's works—at once appreciative and just—are from *The National Review* (Oct. 1858) and from *THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW* (April 1866). The former, which is the more laudatory of the two, is from the pen of the late Walter Bagehot. Both are weighty, acute, sympathetic, and yet unsparing—just what literary criticism ought to be, but so seldom is.

<sup>24</sup> "Dickensiana: a Bibliography of the Literature relating to Charles Dickens and his Writings." Compiled by Fred. G. Kitton. London: George Redway, York Street, Covent Garden. 1886.

"Thoughts on Life,"<sup>25</sup> by S. S. Copeman, belongs to a class of books which we confess to regarding as an infliction. A great or striking or humorous thought on life or on death either, for that matter—in short, on any subject—is welcome when it comes incidentally in the midst of other matter. But a whole book made up of "thoughts" on one subject, by a variety of writers of all degrees of merit and demerit, is literary food of a kind which we find unappetizing and difficult to assimilate.

"The Book Lover,"<sup>26</sup> by James Baldwin, Ph.D., is a wise and pleasant little volume. In it the praises of books are celebrated in the words of some of the greatest authors, ancient and modern. It contains, too, the best counsel, drawn from the same sources, on the choice of books, which we have ever seen brought together; for, in place of arbitrarily formulated lists of titles, or schemes of reading too vast and ambitious to be practically useful, it offers sound principles by which each reader may choose for himself. Towards the end of the volume lists are appended of standard works in most departments of human knowledge.

The leading feature of the book market of the present year is the enormous increase of translations of the novels of great foreign authors. We have taken this fever in England, and "nothing is hid from the heat thereof." We have translations of Balzac, Zola, Daudet, and all the great realistic writers. No doubt there are translations and translations, and some are better than others; but the best are but poor substitutes for the originals. At this moment we have to notice English versions of the work of Ary Ecilaw. "Roland, or the Expiation of a Sin"—and "The Romance of a German Court,"<sup>27</sup> attributed, with how much of truth we know not, to themorganatic wife of the Duke of Hesse. In the latter, under the flimsiest veil, events are narrated which to an English reader are only a shameful scandal. The "Romance," taken only as a story, is interesting enough, although too profoundly sad for wholesome or pleasant reading. "Roland" is inferior in quality, and the translation, though conscientious, is too literal. It wants dignity of style, and too often sinks into the colloquial and commonplace.

"In the Light of the Twentieth Century," by "Innominatus,"<sup>28</sup> is something of the same type as "The Diothas," which we noticed some time ago; but it differs from that curious forecast, or *jeu d'esprit*, whichever it may be held to be, in two particulars. The author of "The Diothas" was in full accord with modern ideas, and revelled in

<sup>25</sup> "Thoughts on Life, from Modern Writers." Edited by S. S. Copeman. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co., Paternoster Square. 1886.

<sup>26</sup> "The Book Lover: a Guide to the Best Reading." By James Baldwin, Ph.D. London: G. P. Putman's Sons, King William Street, Strand; and John Stark, Busby Place. 1886.

<sup>27</sup> "Roland; or, the Expiation of a Sin." By Ary Ecilaw. "The Romance of a German Court." Translated from "Le Roi de Thessalie." Two vols. London: Remington & Co. 1886.

<sup>28</sup> "In the Light of the Twentieth Century." By "Innominatus." London: John Hodges, Soho Square. 1886.



his dream of their vast development, which he placed in an all but immeasurably distant future. "Innominatus," on the contrary, dislikes and distrusts a great part of the current thought and sentiment of the day, and seeks to discredit them by picturing their outcome at a period not more remote than the next century. The metaphysical jumble which he presents as the coming religion of the cultivated minority rather reminds one of Lord Dundreary's puzzle about his mother, his "old nurse," and his "Brother Sam," which ends, as will be remembered, by his asking, in hopeless bewilderment, "Then, who the devil am I?" The little volume contains much clever and acute reasoning. One sentence is especially memorable for its truth and for its terse wording. It is: "Obscurity is the atmosphere in which false philosophies live."

"Inquirendo Island,"<sup>29</sup> by Hudor Genone (evidently a *nom de plume*), is a quaint and clever book. In a short preface, in which occur such phrases as "the pestilential marshes of superstition," "the cold glaciers of reason," and "the fertile table-land of common sense," the author tells us that it is a satire, but will not, he hopes, "be found wanting in a spirit of full reverence for the essential truth of God's Universe." He is evidently not without misgivings on this point, and begs his readers not to judge his work without taking into account what he calls his "postface." This to us explains nothing. That the book is a satire is evident enough, and its satire is unmistakably directed against all the recognized schools of Christian thought. High Church, Low Church, Roman Catholicism, as well as various forms of Protestant Dissent, are all cleverly and delicately caricatured under the diverse queerly named sects of the Inquirendo Islanders. What is the residuum which the author exempts from satire is not so clear. The preface and "postface," taken in connection with the story itself, seem to us little more than an attempt at the favourite but impossible feat of "having your pudding and eating it." But from the *belles lettres* point of view, this is a matter of quite secondary importance. It is not as an allegory, nor as a satire, that we value the book, but as an ingenious and interesting story, something in the same *genre* as "Gulliver's Travels" and "Peter Wilkins," but with a dash of romance that makes one think of "Young Lochinvar." Read in this spirit, "Inquirendo Island" must be pronounced a complete success.

"Dagonet the Jester"<sup>30</sup> is a graceful little work. The scene is laid in an English village, and the story—a very slight one—opens during the struggle between Charles I. and his Parliament, and closes soon after the Restoration. These public events are, however, but distantly alluded to. All the principal actors are humble villagers, sheltered by their obscurity from the storms of civil war, but suffering the gloomy and disquieting influence of the new opinions. Dagonet, with his whimsical sayings and his light laughter-loving nature, may stand

<sup>29</sup> "Inquirendo Island." By Hudor Genone. New York and London: G. P. Putman's Sons. 1886.

<sup>30</sup> "Dagonet the Jester." London: Macmillan & Co. 1886.

as the representative of that frank, harmless gaiety, which Puritanism so sternly repressed that it has ceased to be a national characteristic. The uncongenial gloom is fatal to the poor jester. The story of his luckless life and pitiful death is touchingly told. The style and language of the narrative are vaguely archaic—not modern English, certainly, but not by any means the exact language of the period. This is the great flaw in an otherwise delicately executed work.

“Notes from another World,”<sup>31</sup> by Lord Granville Gordon, is a volume of stories of considerable merit. The writer is supposed during his lifetime to have entered into an engagement with a friend—a young lady—that whichever of them died first should send to the survivor news from the land of shades. Accordingly, he collects and transmits to his earthly correspondent the life history of such of the spirits around him as seem to him to have a story worth telling. The plan of the work is at once fantastic and lugubrious; but the tales are clever, spirited, and infinitely varied.

“Indian Summer,”<sup>32</sup> is one of Mr. Howells’ charming and subtle analytical studies. It is a story, but, like all his stories, its interest depends far more on the causation of incident by the mingling and clashing of various skilfully portrayed types of human character, than on anything striking or dramatic in the incidents themselves. In “Indian Summer” the analysis of character is almost entirely effected by means of conversations—of all methods the most difficult and the most artistic. By dint of hearing them talk, the whole group of persons represented becomes thoroughly known to us; and we think of them, not as characters in a book, but as real, living men and women, on whose qualities, peculiarities, and inconsistencies we speculate as though they were our intimate acquaintances. The scene of this unsensational yet most interesting and even poignant drama is laid in Florence, which, whether as regards its winter climate or its society, Mr. Howells does not paint in very glowing colours; but the *dramatis personæ* are one and all Americans.

We have received with great pleasure a new novel in three volumes by Mrs. Oliphant, whose name is a household word among us, and whose perennial spring is inexhaustible. “A Country Gentleman and his Family”<sup>33</sup> has all her old unmistakable characteristics. As usual, her thread is spun to the finest gossamer, and after reading through the three long volumes we wonder what spell has held us. The book is not one of her best, but that perhaps is due to her choice of untoward and unattractive characters; for we see no diminution of power, no loss of accuracy, in her delicate depicting of scenes and people.

<sup>31</sup> “Notes from another World.” By Lord Granville Gordon. London: Remington & Co., Henrietta Street, Covent Garden. 1886.

<sup>32</sup> “Indian Summer. A Novel.” By William D. Howells. One vol. Edinburgh: David Douglas. 1886.

<sup>33</sup> “A Country Gentleman and his Family.” By Mrs. Oliphant. 3 vols. London: Macmillan & Co. 1886.

The anonymous author of "Mrs. Peter Howard"<sup>34</sup> has judiciously named his book, for the whole interest of the story centres in this most charming and delicately drawn character. "Mated with a clown," and forced to lead a life repugnant to her, Millicent Howard dreams on as she has always dreamed—a pure and spotless creature, bent upon doing her duty, and scarcely complaining even to herself of her distasteful surroundings, till at length she meets her fate, and then her soul is stirred to its depths. But before all things she is *honnête femme*, and bravely battles with the temptation. Finally, however, goaded beyond endurance by the brutality of her husband, she is on the point of flying from her home when her husband is crippled for life by a carriage accident, and by his bedside she takes a last farewell of the man she loves. The subordinate characters are effectively and humorously drawn; and in closing this eminently readable book we gladly seize on the idea that the future yet holds possibilities of happiness for Millicent.

"Demos"<sup>35</sup> is an unusually good novel: a great variety of characters, of all classes and of both sexes, are admirably delineated. Richard Mutimer, the representative of socialistic democracy, is a careful and finished study. Each successive development of his disposition and tendencies, brought out by unexpected changes of fortune, is clearly the logical outcome of given circumstances on a given idiosyncrasy. Several others among the persons represented are no less skilfully and successfully portrayed. In female character the author of "Demos" is singularly successful: of this, the wife, the mother, and the sister of Mutimer—women of types utterly diverse from each other—afford a striking proof. The plot, too, is good, the incidents naturally produced, the *dénouement* likely, and at the same time powerful and dramatic. What the author's opinion may be on the "social question" is not perhaps of great importance from the purely literary point of view from which we regard works of fiction; but he is certainly not a socialist, nor even an ardent democrat.

Mr. Marion Crawford's "Tale of a Lonely Parish"<sup>36</sup> seems to promise through its title the sort of thing it really is—a very tame not to say dull story, in which the very small circle of individuals of whom the "Lonely Parish" consists, live and move exactly in the same groove day after day and year after year—saying and doing the same things evermore. Their little eccentricities of person and manner are incessantly referred to—so that one only thinks of them as the man with the "smooth hair," or the lady with the violet eyes, &c.; and so the reader yawns on through the two volumes. Yet there is matter towards the end of the book which is more than sufficiently *saisissant*. We suppose Mr. Crawford wishes to prove

<sup>34</sup> "Mrs. Peter Howard." Two vols. London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1886.

<sup>35</sup> "Demos: a Story of English Socialism." Three vols. London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1886.

<sup>36</sup> "A Tale of a Lonely Parish." By F. Marion Crawford. 2 vols. London: Macmillan & Co. 1886.

that even a lonely parish may be the arena of the most startling events. Why not?

Mr. Christie Murray's "Aunt Rachel,"<sup>37</sup> though by no means a thrilling romance like "Rainbow Gold," is yet a most charming idyllic picture, in which the figures are all more or less sympathetic. It is a curious fact that whenever the violin is a prominent feature in a story, it at once refines and elevates both players and listeners, and their whole lives are modified by its mystic influence. Such is the case in the present work, where the Staffordshire villagers who form the string-band at Barfield meet and practise in their garden on summer evenings, making melody of no slight merit and wanting no other enjoyment. Christie Murray has the power of drawing his readers along with him, and his inimitable rendering of the local dialect gives a comic cast to his writing which is irresistible.

Another musical novel—but this time in a minor key—"A Left-handed Marriage,"<sup>38</sup> by Mrs. Oscar Beringer, is a disastrous story from beginning to end. Its purpose is, we conclude, to show what fatal consequences may arise from morganatic marriages, and what serious complications are likely to accrue to the unacknowledged issue. In the present instance the son falls in love with his own father's morganatic wife! The book is dedicated to the Abbé Liszt, who is a sort of *hors d'œuvre* amidst the unpalatable food which Mrs. Oscar Beringer has set before us.

"Fortune's Wheel,"<sup>39</sup> now published in three volumes, originally appeared in *Blackwood's Magazine* as a serial, which may be held to be a warrant that it does not fall before a certain standard. In effect, it deserves very favourable mention. Without being great, it is an eminently pleasant book. The style is above mediocrity; there is a never-failing supply of lively and amusing incidents, and nearly all the characters are genial and sympathetic—some extremely well-drawn and lifelike. Mr. Innes Shand has perhaps a weakness for airing his knowledge of French—sometimes in literal translations of French idioms, as when he talks of a general "save who can," or of one of his personages launching himself "in full Bohemia;" but oftener in quotations of well-known, not to say hackneyed French phrases. But after all, this is a venial fault, so long as the French quotations are correct. Let us hope that "*Tu là voulu*" and "*Il n'y a que le premier pas 'que' coûte*" and "*Les chronicles du jour*" are printer's errors.

The hope that we expressed in our notice of Mr. Fergus's posthumous work, "A Cardinal Sin," that the supply might be perennial, seems in a fair way of being fulfilled. Evidently Hugh Conway's magic desk is inexhaustible. It has now given us "Living

<sup>37</sup> "Aunt Rachel: a Rustic Sentimental Comedy." By D. Christie Murray. Two vols. London: Macmillan & Co. 1886.

<sup>38</sup> "A Left-handed Marriage: a Story of Musical Life." By Mrs. Oscar Beringer. Two vols. London: Remington & Co., Henrietta Street, Covent Garden. 1886.

<sup>39</sup> "Fortune's Wheel: a Novel." Three vols. By Alex Innes Shand. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood & Sons. 1886.

or Dead,"<sup>40</sup> a three-volume novel, which, though not equal to "A Cardinal Sin," is both interesting and entertaining, and bears all Mr. Fergus's *marques de fabrique*, even to his little verbal solecisms, such as the use of "like" for "as," &c.

Coming after such books as "Unknown to History" and "The Armourer's Apprentices," "Chantry House"<sup>41</sup> falls flat. Enchanting as are Miss Yonge's mediæval romances, it must be confessed that her tales of modern every-day life are apt to be twaddling.

"Buried Diamonds,"<sup>42</sup> though not remarkable for literary skill, is nevertheless an unusually well-planned story, of unflagging interest throughout, and here and there manifesting considerable dramatic power. There are two heroines, both of whom are learned and both equally well drawn. Indeed, every character in the book is a well-sustained individuality; their peculiarities are not arbitrary, but typical, and have therefore the effect of making them so real and natural that they seem to be personal friends of the reader, and it is with a friendly solicitude that he follows them to the end of their troublous career.

"The Curate's Wife"<sup>43</sup> is an unimportant and inferior novel. It is not well written nor interesting, and it wants refinement. For our own taste, we would rather have an over-romantic, or even a sensational novel, than an utterly dull *terre à terre* story like "The Curate's Wife."

"Crime and Punishment"<sup>44</sup> is the English name of a so-called "Russian realistic novel," produced in English by Messrs. Vizetelly. The first title is accurately descriptive, but we do not see how it can be called "realistic." To us it seems rather to be phantasmagoric. Hardly one of the characters acts or speaks like a sane person. If it is a realistic presentation of Russian life and character, human nature in Russia must be strangely unlike human nature everywhere else. Not but what there are many natural touches scattered here and there throughout the story; but there is a general want of intelligible relation between action and motive, and an imperfect adaptation of means to ends, noticeable in a greater or less degree in every personage put on the scene; and this gives to the whole book a strange air of unreality, even to the verge of incoherency. It is not like real life either in Russia or anywhere else; it is like a wild, feverish dream. Nevertheless it is powerful, and not without a certain weird fascination.

<sup>40</sup> "Living or Dead: a Novel." By Hugh Conway. Three vols. London: Macmillan & Co. 1886.

<sup>41</sup> "Chantry House." By Charlotte M. Yonge. Two vols. London: Macmillan & Co. 1886.

<sup>42</sup> "Buried Diamonds." By Sarah Tytler. Three vols. Chatto & Windus, Piccadilly. 1885.

<sup>43</sup> "The Curate's Wife: A Story of Country Life." By J. E. Panton. Two vols. London: George Redway, York Street, Covent Garden. 1886.

<sup>44</sup> "Crime and Punishment: A Russian Realistic Novel." By Fedor Dostoeffsky. London: Vizetelly & Co. 1886.

In "Court Royal"<sup>45</sup> we have what is a rarity in contemporary English fiction—a novel really admirable from nearly every point of view. It contains deep thought, vivid and powerful characterization, cleverly conducted plot, and besides all this, is permeated and embellished by that indescribable charm and fascination which not only rivet the attention of the reader, but secure his goodwill, and thus blunt the edge of criticism. The genesis of the book is thus summed up by the author in his preface :

Two types, in two groups, are opposed to each other ; each group represents a set of ideas, social and moral ; the one coming on, conquering, overwhelming ; the other disappearing, and likely soon to be looked back upon as having become extinct in the moral world, like asceticism and mysticism. There are two heroines, each the focussing of the good qualities of the two groups ; and two heroes, each the concentration of the infirmities, of the same.

Without entering into detailed criticism of the work, which would involve telling the story (an easy plan of reviewing a book, but unfair, in our opinion, both to author and reader), we will confine our comments to the "argument," as it used to be called, which we have given in Mr. Baring-Gould's own words. To begin with, we doubt the approaching extinction of "asceticism and mysticism." Both are, we think, inherent principles of human nature. Men, no doubt, love pleasure ; but, strange to say, they also love torture, if self-inflicted and needless. While as to mysticism, we see no sign of its abatement—merely of its transformation. How can it die while the limits of human knowledge are so circumscribed and the realms of the unknown so infinitely vast ? So, too, we are by no means sure that the old ideas which Mr. Gould has labelled "feudal Christian morality" are so near dying out as he supposes. Ideas and schemes of life die hard, even when they are false ; but when they have more value than those which seek to supplant them, we may be pretty sure that there will be transformation or blending rather than destruction. The new conquering idea is, according to Mr. Gould, unchecked individualism. But is it not rather late in the day to treat "individualism" as the dominant current in the modern stream of thought ? Is not individualism itself seriously threatened by socialism under one form or another ? More than once in the course of the story we find the author complaining that "the time is out of joint." It is a singular characteristic of the present time that some, nay most, of the greatest thinkers in England and America, as well as on the continent of Europe, distrust and disapprove the drift and tendency of popular opinion. One word in conclusion as to Mr. Baring-Gould's characters. We have already commended them *en bloc*, but we cannot close without a separate tribute of admiration to "The Lady Grace" (who "focusses the good qualities" of the expiring group). She is to our mind one of the sweetest and truest personations of female character to be found

---

<sup>45</sup> "Court Royal : A Story of Cross Currents." By the Author of "Mehalah," "John Herring," &c. Three vols. London : Smith, Elder & Co., Waterloo Place. 1886.

in modern fiction: ideal, but yet natural. All the ducal family are wonderfully well rendered. The opposing heroine is interesting, but much less natural. Several of the less important personages are too clever to be quite in keeping; but this, though a fault, is a good fault. At any rate, it is as unavoidable by some writers as is its direct opposite by the vast majority.

We can give no higher praise to Mr. Hardy's new book, "The Mayor of Casterbridge,"<sup>46</sup> than to say it is a worthy successor of "Far from the Madding Crowd." There is the same consummate art in describing persons and places; the same aptness and picturesqueness of expression, the same under-current of sly humour, which have gone far towards forming Mr. Hardy's charming *accent personnel*. The character of Henchard is a grand study, which has not, so far as we recollect, its prototype in fiction. Whether it is an imaginary creation or a real personality, it is drawn with infinite skill.

"The Bliss of Revenge,"<sup>47</sup> by T. Evan Jacob, is a work of some power and merit, but it is coarse in texture. The good people are too good; the bad, unmitigated fiends. The author is evidently an agnostic, though he does not proclaim himself such; but his hero and heroine are agnostics, and advanced radicals of the modern school to boot. The villain of the story is a clergyman, and the author takes occasion to inveigh against bishops, to sneer at kings and nobles, to claim land as national property; in short, he flaunts the revolutionary programme that usually nowadays accompanies and disfigures religious unbelief. It is a pity we have not more unbelievers of the school of Strauss—rational in their attitude towards the known and the unknown. But these are matters of opinion, and do not militate against the excellence of the book as a work of art. From that point of view its defects are, as we said before, a certain coarseness of execution, and besides, a general atmosphere of unreality—what is called in French *un air emprunté*.

"My Destiny,"<sup>48</sup> by L. A. S. Carew, is a story of an incredibly weak, silly girl, supposed to be told by herself—a supposition which is not contradicted by anything in the style or manner of its telling.

Miss Rowsell's old-world romance, "The Silver Dial,"<sup>49</sup> is a sombre affair. It tells of the time when the curious clock at Strasbourg was made, and the story is interwoven with the fabrication of the clock; but, through an entire lack of local colouring, it fails to interest the reader. The three volumes follow a sort of crescendo movement as to their bulk. The first is barely of the ordinary size, the second is

<sup>46</sup> "The Mayor of Casterbridge: the Life and Death of a Man of Character." By Thomas Hardy. Three vols. London: Smith, Elder & Co., Waterloo Place. 1886.

<sup>47</sup> "The Bliss of Revenge." By T. Evan Jacob. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co., Paternoster Square. 1886.

<sup>48</sup> "My Destiny; or, Lady Musgrave." By Laura S. Carew. One vol. London: Pevington & Co., John Street, Adelphi. 1886.

<sup>49</sup> "The Silver Dial." By Mary C. Rowsell. Three vols. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1886.

stouter, and the third positively obese. This peculiarity has an odd effect; it seems as though the book had gradually grown fat and middle-aged before its birth.

"The Right Honourable,"<sup>50</sup> the joint production of Mr. Justin McCarthy and Mrs. Campbell Praed, is an extraordinary jumble of society, politics, and cosmopolitan conspiracy. The two gifted collaborators seem to possess between them an entire acquaintance with all human affairs. They are equally at home in the council chambers of Ministers of State and in the most secret meetings of Nihilists. In drawing-rooms and in "slums" they are equally in their element, and always with a mysterious air of being behind the scenes and knowing more than the *profanum vulgus*; yet, strange to say, all their descriptions—of society especially—bear the stamp of being written by "outsiders." Then, too, they mix up reality with unreality; thrust the shadows of their own creation into juxtaposition with the best known names in contemporary politics. Yet in spite of these very real and obvious flaws, "The Right Honourable" is very readable, and the story is interesting.

Another work of Mr. Justin McCarthy's which has reached us is a new edition of "Camiola."<sup>51</sup> We sincerely regret that our space—already overcrowded—precludes our entering into any discussion of the merits of the story. However, a new edition need not be introduced to the public as a new work.

Mr. McCarthy's little shilling volume, "Doom,"<sup>52</sup> contains a clever short story; painful and not very new in its machinery, but well treated. It relates the tragic fate of a young Englishman who is murdered (perhaps Mr. McCarthy would call it "executed") on board a Cunard steamer, by a Nihilist agent, as a *faux frère*. Much of the background is pleasant, and "Jack Harris," who "had taken the eighteenth century under his special protection, seeming to regard it as one unchanging period," is an amusing portrait (for it can hardly be called a caricature) of a well-known personality. "Captain Judge," too, the philosophic commander of the Cunarder, is a humorous sketch. He had not much time for reading, and having long ago made up his mind that Shakspeare was the best reading possible, he reads nothing else, and talks to himself in quotations. But all these pleasant touches are darkened by the hideous nightmare of Nihilism, which sprawls all over the picture and overshadows everything.

Evidently the author of "Link by Link"<sup>53</sup> considers her subject too solemn and too dramatic for ordinary treatment. It begins with a

<sup>50</sup> "The Right Honourable: a Romance of Society and Politics." By Justin McCarthy, M.P., and Mrs. Campbell Praed. Three vols. London: Chatto & Windus, Piccadilly. 1886.

<sup>51</sup> "Camiola: a Girl with a Fortune." By Justin McCarthy, M.P. New Edition. London: Chatto & Windus, Piccadilly. 1886.

<sup>52</sup> "Doom! An Atlantic Episode." By Justin Huntly McCarthy, M.P. London: Chatto & Windus. 1886.

<sup>53</sup> "Link by Link." By Cecil Courtney. One vol. London: Berington & Co. 1886.



prologue, and the story is carried on in scenes instead of chapters. The prologue opens with a fearful murder and burglary, the perpetrators of which are not discovered for ten years after. A case of mistaken identity then occurs—too improbable to be excusable even on the plea of the exigencies of the story. The plot is clumsily wrought, and the “links” by no means well-forged.

“The Wayfarers,”<sup>54</sup> by W. Ashworth Taylor, is what French writers term *une étude d'analyse*. It turns entirely on dissection of motives and the mutual action and reaction of varying types of personality. It is a thoughtful book, but its thought is that of the moralist, and still more moral vivisector, rather than that of the social reformer or of the politician. As may be guessed, its tone is not gay; indeed, there is not a bright or exhilarating chapter throughout the two volumes. But it contains a choice collection of careful studies of diverse types of humanity, few of them very salient, and none wildly eccentric, but each showing that individuality which comes only of being drawn from the life. The style in which it is written is far above the average. Altogether, it is a work which commands no small meed of admiration, but it is not very pleasant reading.

“The Fall of Asgard,”<sup>55</sup> by Mr. Julian Corbett, is a romance founded on ancient Norwegian history. As is shadowed forth by the title, it turns upon the fall of the old heathen gods by the forcible introduction of Christianity—a work commenced by Olaf Trygvasson, and completed by his godson, Olaf Haroldson, surnamed “The Thick.” Many of the characters are historic—*e.g.*, the two evangelizing kings, Grimkel the bishop, Sigvat and Bersi, the scalds or bards, Earl Swend and his sister, and Einer Thambaraskelmir, who may be said to figure as the villain of the piece. But Gudrun, and Thorkel her son, who are the principal personages in Mr. Corbett’s romance, are his own creations, and very admirable creations they are—in strict keeping with the times in which they are placed, and with the real characters among whom they move, yet informed with a breath of modern romanticism which gives them interest for readers of our own day. Gudrun may be said to typify that conservative instinct of womanhood which is especially manifested in all that pertains to religion. Thorkel is hard to move to any great or abiding zeal either for the old gods or the new; but he worships his mother, and sacrifices himself first to protect and afterwards to avenge her. We know not whether it will suit the taste of the general public, but to us “The Fall of Asgard” is not only a finely executed piece of work—which is, we think, beyond dispute—but delightful reading.

Miss Laura E. Richards fully redeems the promise of her title,

<sup>54</sup> “The Wayfarers.” By W. Ashworth Taylor. Two vols. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood & Sons. 1886.

<sup>55</sup> “The Fall of Asgard: a Tale of St. Olaf’s Days.” By Julian Corbett. Two vols. London: Macmillan & Co. 1886.

"The Joyous Story of Toto,"<sup>56</sup> It is "joyous," and the illustrations by E. H. Garrett are so frolicsome and rollicking that they heighten the effect of the *joyusetés* of the letterpress.

"Humour in Animals,"<sup>57</sup> by W. H. Beard, is a handsome volume, profusely illustrated. We like the spirit in which it is conceived; but we cannot help thinking the author puts too much distinctly human thought into the minds of his beasts. They think, no doubt, but "how" must ever remain a mystery.

"Dame Britannia and her Troublesome Family"<sup>58</sup> belongs to a class of literature to which we are not warmly attached—the political pamphlet in the form of a familiar story. Events, too, have gone so fast as to leave the author of "Dame Britannia" in the rear. Nevertheless, the little *brochure* is worth reading, for it contains some home-truths of which it is wholesome and profitable to be reminded.

"Hamlet's Note-book,"<sup>59</sup> by William D. O'Connor, is another of many wearisome and futile attempts to prove that Shakspeare's works were written, not by him, but by Bacon. Even if we had ample space at command, we should decline to occupy it with a discussion so "weary, stale, flat, and unprofitable."

Mr. Fleay's "Life and Work of Shakspeare"<sup>60</sup> is Shakesperian literature of a very different order. It is too important a work to be hurriedly reviewed at the tail-end of our section; so we reserve it for leisurely perusal, and careful notice in our next issue.

The Society papers boldly attribute the authorship of "Le Roi de Thessalie"<sup>61</sup> to the so-calledmorganatic wife of the Duke of Hesse; but without pinning our faith to the assertion, we will examine what internal evidence in its favour is to be found in the work itself. To begin with: "Le Roi de Thessalie" is evidently not written by a Frenchman. There is a certain unfamiliar ring in its turns of phrasing which, for the most part, helps to create that freshness and unconventionality which are marked characteristics of its style; but here and there we come upon clumsiness of construction amounting sometimes to obscurity, such as would assuredly be avoided by any Frenchman who possessed such literary ability as is displayed in the work under consideration. Next we may notice the intense sympathy and admiration which the author invariably manifests for his heroine. Now, a cynical Burmese proverb tells us that there is "no love like

<sup>56</sup> "The Joyous Story of Toto." By Lura E. Richards. With Illustrations by E. H. Garrett. London and Edinburgh: Blackie & Sons. 1886.

<sup>57</sup> "Humour in Animals: a Series of Studies in Pen and Pencil." By W. H. Beard. London and New York: Putnam's Sons.

<sup>58</sup> "Dame Britannia and her Troublesome Family—especially Pat." London: Sampson Low. 1886.

<sup>59</sup> "Hamlet's Note-book." By William D. O'Connor. Boston and New York: Houghton & Co. 1885.

<sup>60</sup> "A Chronicle History of the Life and Work of William Shakspeare, Player, Poet, and Playmaker." By Frederick Gard Fleay. London: John C. Nimmo, King William Street, Strand. 1886.

<sup>61</sup> "Le Roi de Thessalie." By Ary Ecilaw. Paris: Alphonse Lemerre. 1886.

self-love;" and readers of M. Zola's "Nana" will remember that, among all her passionate and devoted admirers, none was so adoring as Nana herself—a touch which always seemed to us to reveal M. Zola's profound knowledge of the type he there portrays. Again, Ary Ecilaw undoubtedly desires to paint his heroine, Nadjeska Ivanowna, as an ideal woman, and if he fails it is because his ideal is hopelessly false. We must imagine Nadjeska as beautiful and fascinating as her author chooses to represent her. He says so, and we must take his word for it. But when it comes to a question of moral perfection, we can compare her recorded acts with the array of lovely qualities that she is credited with. And what do we find? At the outset of her career, when first introduced into the world, she secretly engages herself to a young man who is her frequent partner at balls, knowing all the while that a family arrangement has been all but concluded by which she was destined to be the wife of the Prince de Mineleko. Then, when her father ruins himself at the gaming-table, she saves him from well-deserved dishonour by throwing over her lover, and bestowing her hand on Prince Mineleko, and she commits this breach of faith with a variety of aggravating circumstances. She never, either personally or by letter, explains to her sacrificed lover the supposed necessity of the sacrifice—never even announces to him her change of plans. And when De Mineleko loyally informs her of the natural jealousy of his disposition, and charges her, if she has ever loved another man, *not to accept his offer*, she marries him under false pretences, assuring him, by what the author calls "un mensonge pieux," that she had no previous attachment. A year later, when she again meets Waldemar de Heiligenthal, her former lover, she cares neither for him nor her husband; for, dazzled by the admiration of the Roi de Thessalie—a widower of forty-five, while Nadjeska is twenty—she has once more transferred her facile love. We will not follow her story to its sad *dénouement*. Touching and poignant that *dénouement* surely is, but, after all, just and well-deserved—the legitimate, almost necessary, outcome of all that led up to it. We will remark, in conclusion, that "morganatic marriage" is a farce, a contradiction in terms; for the essence of marriage is that it cannot be dissolved at the caprice of one of the contracting parties, nor even of both. What is the worth of a marriage which can be broken by the intervention of a former mother-in-law, however exalted her rank? Of the indecency of dragging into publicity the private affairs of royal personages we have spoken elsewhere (in noticing the English translation of "Le Roi de Thessalie"), and we only allude to it here as affording one more argument for the suggestion, that the book was written by the aggrieved Nadjeska herself.

## INDEX.

*All Books must be looked for under the Author's name.*

- ABBOTT, T. K., B.D., "Kant's Introduction to Logic, and his Essay on the Mistaken Subtlety of the Four Figures," translated by. With a few Notes by Coleridge, 539
- Abbot, F. E., Ph.D., "Scientific Theism," 541
- Adams, F. A., "My Man and-I; or, the Modern Nehemiah, 305
- Adams, W. H. Davenport, "The Merry Monarch; or, England under Charles II.," 272
- "Famous Caves and Catacombs," 577
- Aldrich, T. B., "Prudence Palfrey," 590
- Allen, A. V. G., "The Continuity of Christian Thought," 225
- Grant, edited by, "The Miscellaneous and Posthumous Works of Henry Thomas Buckle," new and abridged edition, 257
- J. H. and W. F., and J. B. Greenough, edited by, "Caesar's Gallic War, revised by H. P. Judson, 294
- Amiel, *see* Ward
- Annandale, C., M.A., LL.D., "A Concise Dictionary of the English Language, based on Ogilvie's Imperial Dictionary," 295
- "Annual Report of the Department of Mines, New South Wales, for the year 1884," 264
- Armitt, Annie, "In Shallow Waters," 502
- Arthur, W., "Religion without God, and God without Religion," 534
- BACCELLI, A., "Diva Natura," 310
- Badeau, A., "Conspiracy: a Cuban Romance," 595
- Bagehot, the late Walter, "The Postulates of English Political Economy," Students' edition, 246
- gwell, R., M.A., "Ireland under the Tudors; with a Succinct Account of the Early History," 273
- Barry O'Brien, *see* O'Brien
- Baskervill, W. M., "Andreas: a Legend of St. Andrew," 303
- Bastiat, the late Frederic, Political Economy," 551
- Beaujoint, Jules, collected and arranged by, "The Secret Memoirs of Madame la Marquise de Pompadour," 282
- Bell, H. T. M., "A Forgotten Genius: Charles Whitehead," 288
- Benson, Dr. W. H., "Frolicsome Girls: a Comedy," 292
- Bigg, Louisa, "A Ruined Sanctuary," 306
- Birkbeck, Dr. W. Lloyd, "Historical Sketch of the Distribution of Land in England, with Suggestions for some Improvement in the Law," 245
- BISMARCK, PRINCE, 489-515; his birth, family, and early life, 494; career in Parliament, 495, 6; Prussian representative at the Diet, 497; sketches of his colleagues, 499, 500; ambassador to St. Petersburg, 501; Minister-President, 502; Russian Poland, 503; Schleswig-Holstein struggle, 504; war with Austria, 505; North German Confederation, 506; war with France, 507; struggle with Rome, 508; domestic policy, 509; characteristics, 510; "sayings" quoted, 511-513.
- Bissell, E. C., D.D., "The Pentateuch: its Origin and Structure," 538
- Blackie, J. S., "What does History Teach," 567
- Blackwood's Educational Series: "Algebra for Beginners." Parts I., II., 262
- Blanford, H. F., F.R.S., "Report on the Meteorology of India in 1883," 263
- "Indian Meteorological Memoirs," 263
- Blunt, Rev. J. H., M.A., "The Reformation of the Church of England," vol. ii., 536
- Bluntschli, J. K., "The Theory of the State," 543
- "Boehme, Jakob," *see* Martensen
- "Böhme (Jakob), sein Leben u. seine theosophischen Werke in geordnetem Auszuge mit Einleitungen und Erläuterungen durch Johannes Claasen," 227

- Brackenbury, Major-Gen., C.B., "The River Column," 570
- Bradshaw, Mrs., "Merivale," 596
- BRET HARTE, THE WORKS OF, 71-83
- Broun's, Dr. H. G., "Klassen und Ordnungen des Thier-Reichs," 267
- Brown, J., B.A., "John Bunyan: his Life, Times, and Work," 285
- Browning, Oscar, M.A., edited by, "The Despatches of Earl Gowor, English Ambassador at Paris from June 1790 to August 1792," 568
- Buckle, *see* Allen
- Bullen, A. H., B.A., edited by, "The Works of Thomas Middleton," 587
- Burroughs, J., "Fresh Fields," 302
- Byrne, James, M.A., "General Principles of the Structure of Language," 296
- CAMPBELL, Lewis, M.A., "Sophocles;" Classical Writers' Series, edited by J. R. Green, 294
- Carpenter, W. Boyd, D.D., "Truth in Tale," 599
- Carrington, H., M.A., "Translations from the Poems of Victor Hugo," 293
- Case, Rev. F., M.A., "Short Practical Sermons," 232
- Cherbuliez, Victor, "The Trials of Jetta Malaubret," 600
- Chisholm, G. M.A., "A Pronouncing Vocabulary of Modern Geographical Names," 295
- "Christison, Bart., M.D., D.C.I., The Life of," edited by his sons, 578
- Church, A. J., M.A., "Isis and Thames: Hours on the River from Oxford to Henley," 590
- , "Two Thousand Years Ago," 590
- , R. W., Dean, "The Discipline of the Christian Character," 530
- Clapperton, Jane H., "Scientific Meliorism and the Evolution of Happiness," 250
- "Classics for Children," a Primer, 309
- Clough, R. L., "Election Lyrics," 292
- Cockburn, S., M.D., "The Laws of Nature," 535
- Codrington, R. H., D.D., "The Melanesian Languages," 298
- Coleman, J., "Memoirs of Samuel Phelps," 580
- Colonics, *see* Representative
- Combe, M., and Duncan Lisle, "Arnold Robur: a Novel," 594
- "Commonplace Sinners," 304
- Conway, Hugh (F. J. Fergus), "A Cardinal Sin," 596
- Cortrel, E. L., "The Inter-Oceanic Problem and its Scientific Solution, an address, 265
- Corvichen, R., "The Philosophy of all Possible Revelation, and other Writings," 535
- Cotterill, C. C., M.A., "Suggested Reforms in Public Schools," 253
- Cotton, H. J. S., "New India; or, India in Transition," 243
- "Cowen, Joseph, Speeches delivered by, at the General Election, 1885," 546
- Cox, Sir G., Bart., M.A., "Lives of Greek Statesmen," second series, 502
- , Homersham, "The First Century of Christianity," 532
- "Crak, G. M., "Twelve old Friends," 310
- Crane, T. F., A.M., "Italian Popular Tales," 590
- , W., "The Sirens Threc. A Poem," 585
- Croll, J., LL.D., F.R.S., "Discussions on Climate and Cosmology," 260
- Crommelin, May, "Poets in the Garden," 585
- Cross, Rev. J. H., "Bible Readings, Selected from the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua, 232
- DALL, Mrs. C. H., "What we really know about Shakespeare," 577
- Daly, J. B., "Radical Pioneers of the Eighteenth Century," 571
- Daudet, Alphonse, "Sappho," 600
- Davenport, *see* Adams
- De Laveleye, E., "Letters from Italy." Translated by Mrs Thorpe, 556
- De Morgan, the late A., "Newton. his Friend and his Niece," 573
- Direy, A. V., Prof., "Lectures Introductory to the Law of the Constitution," 239
- Dillon, the Hon. H. A., "Costume in England." By the late F. W. Fairholt, F.S.A. Third edition, 287
- "Dogma no Antidote for Doubt," 232
- Donnat, Léon, "La Politique Expérimentale," 241
- Dorner, Dr. A., "System der Christlichen Sittenlehre," 531
- Douglas, J., "Measure for Measure," 592
- Dudgeon, F. E., compiled and designed by, "The Illustrated Language of Flowers Birthday Book," 586
- Dukes, E. J., "Everyday Life in China," 558
- Duruy, Victor, "History of Rome." Edited by the Rev. J. P. Mahaffy. Vol. IV. Parts I, II., 561

- East India Merchant (An), "Circulating Capital," 249
- Economy, *see* Emigration
- Edmundson, G., M.A., "Milton and Vondel: a Curiosity of Literature," 289
- Emery, A., "Orpheus and other Poems," 291
- EMIGRATION, THE ECONOMY OF, 515-527; differing views on Emigration, 516; a tradition of the British race, 517; seventeenth century colonization, 518; colonization by the Earl of Selkirk and his followers in 1803, 520; settlement of Port Elizabeth, 521, 522; later efforts, 523, 524; Western Australia recommended, 526
- "Encyclopædic (The) Dictionary. Vol. v. Part I., 590
- "English (The) Illustrated Magazine," 1884 5, 308
- Engstrom, Rev. C. L., "Purity treated Purely," 232
- Evelac, H., "The Leaven of Malice," 593
- Everett, J. E., D.C.L., "Outlines of Natural Philosophy, for Schools and General Readers," 262
- FAIRBANKS, A. M., D.D., "The City of God," 224
- Fairholt, *see* Dillon
- Falconer, Helen, "The Story of a Strange Marriage," 304
- Farjeon, B. L., "In the Silver Sea," 595
- Farrar, F. W., D.D., "Sermons and Addresses delivered in America," 535
- FARTHEST NORTH (THE), 161-189; choice of Lieutenant Greely as commander, 463, his instructions, 464; sufferings during retreat from Fort Conger, 465; life at Cape Sabine, 466; disappointment, 467; terrible sufferings, 468, 470; increase to geographical knowledge, 471-475; the limit of human occupation, 467; game of the "Far North," 477, 478; scientific observations, 479-482; health of the party at Fort Conger, 483; travelling, 484; possibility of establishing a station at Fort Conger, 485; fossil remains, 487
- Fassnacht, G. E., "The Brothers Grimm," "Kinder und Hansmarchen," with Notes and Introduction, 294
- Fauriel, M., "The Last Days of the Consulate," edited by M. L. Latouze, 563
- FAWORTT, HENRY, 83-93; his character, 84; family, 85; college career, 86; sympathies, 87; action as an administrator, 88; at the Post Office, 89; political views, 90, 91
- Fergusson, Lieut.-Col. Alex., "The Laird of Lag: a Life Sketch," 576
- Pick, A., "Die Homerische Ilias nach ihrer entstehung betrachtet und in der ursprünglichen sprach form wiederhenge stellt," 291
- Field, A. D., "Palermo: a Christmas Story," 591
- Fisher, J. A., "A Select Bibliography of Ecclesiastical History," 232
- FISHERY (THE) QUESTION: ITS IMPERIAL IMPORTANCE, 393-416; first appears in the Treaty of Utrecht, 394; France and the North American fisheries, 395; rights of Great Britain and of the United States defined by Convention of 1818, 397; position of the various fisheries, 398, 9; Wheaton, Kent, Webster, all in accord with British views and interpretation, 400; negotiations between Great Britain, Canada, and United States, 401-405; great concessions to the United States by Treaty of Washington in 1871, 406; Halifax award, 407; expiry of Washington Treaty and fresh negotiations, 408; increasing value of the British North American fisheries, 409; American vessels fishing in British waters, 410; Canadian exports a prime necessity to the States, 411; national importance of Canadian fisheries, 412-413; imperial value of Canadian harbours and seamen, 414-416
- Fiske, John, "The Idea of God as affected by Modern Knowledge," 528
- Fitzgerald, Percy, M.A., "The Art of the Stage as set out in Lamb's Dramatic Essays," 301
- \_\_\_\_\_, W., D.D., "Lectures on Ecclesiastical History," 565
- Fornander, A., "An Account of the Polynesian Race," vol. ii., 279
- Fothergill, J. M., M.D., "The Will Power: its Range in Action," 300
- GALE, F., "Modern English Sports: their Use and their Abuse," 300
- "(Garrison, William Lloyd: the Story of his Life." Told by his children, 276
- GARRISON, WILLIAM LLOYD: THE STORY OF HIS LIFE, 366-393
- Giffen, Robert, "Essays in Finance," second series, 549
- Giles, the late Rev. J. A., "Apostolical Records of Early Christianity," 533
- Gill, W. W., B.A., "Jottings from the Pacific," 256
- Gillespie, Rev. C. K., M.A., "Revision Reasons." I. The Pentateuch, 231

- GLADSTONE (Mr.) AND GENESIS, 119-136  
 Gladstone (the Rt. Hon. W. E.), M.P.,  
 "Political Speeches in Scotland,  
 November, 1885," revised edition, 546  
 ГОРЬКАЯ ПРАВА, 313-355  
 Gordon-Cumming, C. F., "Wanderings  
 in China," 558  
 Goschen (the Rt. Hon. G. J.), M.P.,  
 "Addresses on Educational and Eco-  
 nomical Subjects," 554  
 GRATTAN AND THE IRISH PARLIAMENT,  
 179-207; enters the Irish Parliament,  
 179; moves an amendment to the  
 Address in 1779, 180; Grattan and  
 Flood in Kilkenny, 182; the Volun-  
 teer movement, 183; the "Declara-  
 tion of Irish Rights," 184-5; how  
 viewed and supported in Ireland, 186-  
 7; carried by both Houses, 188;  
 Grattan's efforts for emancipation  
 of the Catholics, 190-195; Orange  
 institution founded in 1795, 196;  
 Parliamentary corruption so rank that  
 Grattan retires in 1797, 198; rebellion  
 of '98, 200; followed by "coercion,"  
 and preparations for the Union, 201;  
 opposed by Grattan, 202-3; Grattan  
 returned for Malton in 1805, 205,  
 journeys to London to move the  
 Catholic question in Parliament in  
 1820, and dies a week after his arrival,  
 207  
 Green, the Hon. Mrs., "Bound by a  
 Spell," 310  
 "Green Pleasure and Grey Grief," 306  
 Greenough, *see* Allen  
 Grenville-Murray, E. C., "Imprisoned  
 in a Spanish Convent," 598  
 GREVILLE (THE) MEMOIRS. Part ii,  
 93-119; sketch of William IV., 95;  
 relations between the Queen and her  
 mother, 96; Brougham, 97-100; re-  
 miniscences of Mr. Thomas Grenville,  
 101-2; Lord John Russell, 103-7;  
 Sir B. Peel, 108-110; Lord Melbourne,  
 111-112; Duke of Wellington, 112-  
 115; Earl of Derby, 115; Macaulay,  
 116; Bishop Wilberforce, 117  
 Gunmere, F. B., Ph.D., "A Handbook  
 of Poetics for Students of English  
 Verse," 293  
 Guyot, Yves, "English and French  
 Morality, from a Frenchman's Point of  
 View," 258, 547  
 HADDON, Caroline, "The Larger Life:  
 Studies in Hinton's Ethics," with some  
 unpublished letters of James Hinton,  
 539  
 Hamilton, Gavin, "The Latin of the  
 Latins," 587  
 Hanson, C. H., "The Land of Greece,"  
 563  
 Harcourt Roe, Mrs. J., "The Bachelor  
 Vicar of Newforth," 597  
 Harley, Rev. T., "Moon Lore," 254  
 Harnack, Dr. A., "Lehrbuch der Dog-  
 mengeschichte," 530  
 Harrison, F., "The Choice of Books, and  
 other Literary Pieces," 588  
 ———, J. A., "A Handy Anglo-Saxon  
 Dictionary," 303  
 ———, J. E., "Introductory Studies  
 in Greek Art," 299  
 Heath, F. G., "Burnham Beeches," 267  
 Heaton, W., "The Three Reforms of  
 Parliament," 284  
 Henty, G. A., "Through the Fray," 593  
 Hershon, P. J., "A Rabbinical Commen-  
 tary on Genesis," 231  
 Hertzka, T., "Die Gesetze der Sozialen  
 Entwicklung," 548  
 Hichens, R. S., "The Coastguard's Secret,"  
 598  
 Hilmey, Prince Ibrahim, "The Literature  
 of Egypt and the Soudan," vol. i., 589  
 Hime, M. C., M.A., "Unbelief," 232  
 ———, "A Schoolmaster's  
 Retrospect of Eighteen and a half  
 years in an Irish School," 251  
 "His Child Friend," 592  
 Hodder, E., "Thrown on the World," 309  
 Howells, W. D., "The Rise of Silas Lap-  
 ham," 303  
 "Hullah, Life of John;" by his Wife,  
 574  
 ILLINGWORTH, T., "Distribution Reform,"  
 219  
 Ingoldsby, T., "The Knight and the  
 Lady," 587  
 Irvine, M. C., "The Symmetry and Soli-  
 darity of Truth," Part i., 232  
 JEANS, J. S., "England's Supremacy:  
 Its Sources, Economics, and Dangers,"  
 249  
 Jenkins, Edward, "Jobson's Eneinics,"  
 Second edition, 593  
 ———, John, "The Laws Concerning  
 Religious Worship, also Mortmain and  
 Charitable Uses," 250  
 Jews, *see* Mission  
 Johnston, H. H., "The Kilima-njaro  
 Expedition," 556  
 Jones, C. A., "Saints of the Prayer  
 Book," 231  
 Jordan, W. L., "The Winds," Third  
 edition, 266  
 Jewett, B., M.A., "The Politics of Aris-  
 totle," Translated into English, with  
 Introduction, &c., 540  
 "Juarez and Cesar Cantu," 278

- KING, E., "Europe in Storm and Calm," 285  
 ———, "The Golden Spike," 591
- LAMB, Charles, "Mrs. Leicester's School, and other Writings in Prose and Verse," With Introduction and Notes by A. Ainger, 301
- Lane-Poole, Stanley, Selected and edited by, with Commentary and Notes, "Letters and Journals of Jonathan Swift," 588
- Laroche, C., "A Propos d'une Nouvelle Grammaire Française," 311
- Lawrence, T. J., M.A., LL.D., "Essays on Some Disputed Questions in International Law," Second edition, 249
- Le Free, R., "The History of a Walking Stick," 509
- Lenormant, F., "The Book of Genesis," Translated from the French, with Introduction and Notes, 533
- Levander, F. W., "Solutions of the Questions on Magnetism and Electricity, set at the Intermediate Science Examinations of the University of London, 1880 1881," 262
- Lighthall, W. D., M.A., "An Analysis of the Altruistic Act," 512
- Lisle, *see* Comble
- Little, J. Stanley, "My Royal Father," 592
- LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT AND POLITICAL EDUCATION, 355-366
- Lovett, R., M.A., "Norwegian Pictures drawn with Pen and Pencil," 255
- Luff, A. P., B.Sc., "Introduction to the Study of Chemistry," 262
- MACAULAY, G. C., M.A., Edited, with Introduction and Notes by, "Livy, Books xxii. and xxiv.," 294  
 ———, J., "Stirring Stories of Peace and War, by Sea and Land," 310
- MacGrindle, J. W., M.A., "Ancient India as described by Ptolemy," 279
- Mackay, C., "The Founders of the American Republic," 275  
 ———, W., "Beside the Still Waters," 307
- Macleod, H. D., M.A., "The Elements of Economics," vol. ii., pt. i., 551  
 "Macmillan's Primary Series"—Xavier de Maistre "La jeune Sibérienne," et "Le Lépreux de la Cité d'Aoste," 294
- Maginn, W., "Miscellanies: Prose and Verse," Edited by R. W. Montagu, 292
- Maine, Sir Henry S., "Popular Government," 237
- Maitland, A. C., "Rhoda: a Novel," 306
- Marshall, W. M., M.A., "Cruces of Criticism," 588
- Martensen, the late Dr. Hans L., "Jakob Boehme," 226
- Martin, Sir T., K.C.B., "Faust: a Dramatic Poem by Goethe," Part II., Translated by, 586
- Mawer, Mrs. E. B., "Analogous Proverbs in Ten Languages," 586
- Meignan, Victor, "From Paris to Peking over Siberian Snows," Edited from the French by W. Coun, 256  
 "Memoirs (The) of the Empress Marie Louise," From the French of St. Amand, 564
- Meredith, George, "The Adventures of Harry Richmond," 597
- Mickiewicz, Adam, "Master Thaddeus," Translated by Maude Ashurst Biggs, 292
- Middlemass, Jean, "A Girl in a Thousand," 594
- Middleton, J. H., "Ancient Rome in 1885," 559
- Miller, E., M.A., "A Guide to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament," 231
- MISSIONS TO THE JEWS: 136-178
- Mitchell, Mrs. Murray, "In Southern India," 257
- Muffat, R. S., "Mr. Henry George, the 'Orthodox.' An Examination of Mr. George's Position as a Systematic Economist, and a Review of the Competitive and Socialistic Schools of Economy," 245
- Molesworth, Mrs., "Us: an Old-Fashioned Story," 309
- Morris, E. E., "Epochs of Modern History: the Early Hanoverians," 566
- Mulholland, Rosa, "Vagrant Verses," 584
- Murdoch, J., "A History of Constitutional Reform in Great Britain and Ireland," 283
- Murray, D. Christie, "Rainbow Gold: a Novel," 306  
 ——— James A. H., LL.D., Edited by, "A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles," Part II., 590
- Murusus Pasha, D.C.L., Translated into Greek Verse by, "Dante's 'Paradiso,'" 586
- NASEBY, "Oaks and Birches: a Novel," 595
- Noble, E., "Irish Pride: an Unsocial Tale of Social Life," 599



- Nokes, W. F., Translated into English Blank Verse by, "Cornelle's Tragedy 'Polyeuctus,'" 295
- Norris, W. K., "Adrian Vidal," 304
- O'BRIEN, R. Barry, "Fifty Years of Concessions to Ireland, 1831-1881," 271
- O'Hagan, *see* Teeling
- O'Hanlon, Alice, "The Unforeseen," 308
- Ord, Julian, "A Summer Day-dream, and other Stories," 305
- Owen, Ashford, "The Story of Catharine," 598
- PARTY GOVERNMENT, 429-461**
- Pater, W., "Marius the Epicurean," 594
- Patten, S. N., Ph.D., "The Premises of Political Economy," 247
- Pattison, the late Mark, "Sermons," 228
- Pears, E., LL.B., "The Fall of Constantinople; being the Story of the Fourth Crusade," 268
- Pfeiffer, Emily, "Flying Leaves from East and West," 254
- Phillips, H. A. D., "Our Administration of India," 546
- John, LL.D., "Manual of Geology, Theoretical and Practical," edited by R. Etheridge and H. G. Seeley. Part II., 258
- Platt, James, "God and Mammon," 232
- Plummer, C., M.A., edited, with Introduction, Notes, and Appendix, by, "The Governance of England," by Sir John Fortescue, Kt. A Revised Text, 544
- Pocock, N., edited by, "Troubles connected with the Prayer-book of 1549," 271
- Poe, E. A., "The Raven," with Literary and Historical Commentary by John B. Ingram, 293
- Pogatscher, *see* Sonnenschein
- Pontalis, A. L., "John de Witt, Grand Pensionary of Holland; or, Twenty Years of a Parliamentary Republic," translated by S. E. and A. Stephenson, 281
- Præd, Mrs. C., "Australian Life, Black and White," 256
- "Princeton (The New) Review," Jan. 1886, 511
- "Pulpit (The) Commentary," 1 Corinthians and Galatians, 231
- Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, 536
- Pycn, Evelyn, "The Poet in May,"
- RAABE, W., "The Hunger-Pastor," translated from the German by Arnold, 599
- Radenhausen, C., "Die Echte Bibel und die Falsche," 229
- Rawnsley, Rev. H. D., edited by, "Christ for To-day," 226
- REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT IN OUR COLONIES, 50-71**; "Island Constitutions" in West Indies, 53; Canada and early responsible government, 54; South Africa, 55; epochs of colonial history, 59, 60; struggle for self-government, 61 2; grievance of North Queensland, 63; bicameral government, 64, 65; proportion of representatives to population in Colonies, 66, 67; "representation the sovereign remedy for every evil," 70
- Réville, Jean, "La Religion à Rome sous les Sévères," 531
- Robertson, G. C., "Hobbes," 538
- J. L., M.A., "The White Angel of the Polly Ann," 593
- Robinson, A. Mary F., "The New Arcadia and other Poems," 583
- Rodd, Rennell, "Fada, with other Poems," 583
- Rogers, Prof. J. G. T., M.P., "Six Centuries of Work and Wages," new edition, 550
- ROMAN EMPIRE (THE INFLUENCE OF THE) ON THE CATHOLIC CHURCH, 32-50**
- Romundt, Dr. Heinrich, "Die Vollen- dung des Socrates," 236
- Rosenzweig, Dr. Adolf, "Das Jahrhundert nach dem Babylonischen Exile," 231
- Ross, Miss E. M., "Only a Girl," 304
- "Rothe's (Dr. Richard) Gesammelte Vorträge u. Abhandlungen," 535
- Rowbotham, J. F., "A History of Music," Vol. i., 578
- Rowe, J. F., M.A., and W. T. Webb, M.A., "Hints on the Study of English," 589
- Royce, J., Ph.D., "The Religious Aspect of Philosophy," 541
- SAINSBURY, George, Selected and Edited by, "Clarendon Press Series—Sainte-Beuve 'Causeries du Lundi,'" 295**
- "Specimens of English Prose Style, from Malloy to Macaulay," 299
- Salmon, G., D.D., "A Historical Introduction to the Study of the Books of the New Testament," 229
- Salter, W. M., "Die Religion der Moral," 232
- Scherer, W., "A History of German Literature," translated by Mrs. Conybeare, edited by Max Muller, vol. i., 589
- Schurç, E., "Le Drame Musicale," 311

- Schürer, D. E., "Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi," 229
- Schurer's "History of the Jewish People," Clark's Theological Library, 565
- Schwab, Dr. M., Translated for the first time by, "The Talmud of Jerusalem," vol. i., 231
- Schwartz, J. M. W., "Julian. a Tragedy," 291
- Scott, C. A. A., B.A., "Ulfilas, Apostle of the Goths," 231
- Scrutton, T. E., "The Influence of the Roman Law on the Law of England," 250
- Searing, A. E. P., "The Land of Rip Van Winkle," 255
- 
- ment," 303
- Sendall, W. J., "The Literary Remains of C. S. Calverley," with a Memoir 290
- Serbati, A. R., "Psychology," vol. ii., 536
- Seth, A., "Scottish Philosophy," 232
- Shakespeare, William, "The Merry Wives of Windsor," Edited, with Notes, by H. B. Wheatley, 587
- Shepherd, H. E., M.A., "The History of the English Language from the Teutonic Invasion of Britain to the Close of the Georgian Era," 296
- Sidgwick, Prof. H., "The Scope and Method of Economic Science," 553
- Sime, W., "Cradle and Spade," 598
- Sinclair, T., M.A., "Humanities," 557
- Shaden, D. B. W., "A Poetry of Exiles," vol. i., Second Edition, 585
- 
- Second Edition, 585
- Smellie, T. D., "Ocean and Air Currents," 265
- Smith, J., Selections from the Writings of, and others, "The Natural Truth of Christianity," Edited by W. Metcalle, 227
- Smith, R. H., "The Science of Business," 249
- 
- W. R., "Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia," 555
- SOCIALISM AND LEGISLATION. 1-32
- Sonnenschein, E. A., M.A., and Alois Pogatscher, edited by, "Select Poems of Goethe," 295
- Sorley, W. R., M.A., "On the Ethics of Naturalism," 235
- Spencer, T., "On the Origin and Reproduction of Animal and Vegetable Life on our Globe," 265
- Spettigue, J. H., "Jephthah's Daughter," 308
- St. Columb, G., "An Ascent of Parnassus by way of Mendacia," 587
- Stephenson, Rev. H. M., Edited with Notes, and Vocabulary by, "Æschyli Prometheus Vincetus," 291
- Stokes, G. G., M.A., "Burnett Lectures—On Light," 261
- Stone, C. J., "Christianity before Christ," 231
- Story, W. W., "Fiammetta: A Summer Idyl," 592
- Stroehlin, E., "Athanaso Coquerel Fils," 232
- Strong, H. A., M.A., and Kuno Meyer, Ph. D., "History of the German Language," 589
- Stuart, J. J., "Songs and Verses," 581
- "Studies (Short) from Nature," 266
- "Sunshine and Sea. A Yachting Visit to the Channel Islands and the Coast of Brittany," 257
- TAFEL, Rev. R. L., "The Issues of Modern Thought," 227
- Teeling, G., Edited by, "Selected Speeches and Arguments of the Rt. Hon. Thomas, Baron O'Hagan," 569
- Tennyson, Alfred Lord, "Tiresias and other Poems," 581
- "That Very Mah," 300
- "Thirty Thousand Thoughts," Sections XII. to XV., 231
- Tinker, Mary A., "Aurora. A Novel," 597
- "Tiny (The) Mite," 596
- Tiegear, E., "The Aryan Maori," 280
- Tulloch, J., D.D., "Movements of Religious Thought in Britain during the Nineteenth Century," 223
- Twining, Louise, "Symbols and Emblems of Early and Medieval Christian Art," New Edition, 536
- Tynms, T. V., "The Mystery of God," 231
- "VAGRANT VIATOR," 292
- Vambéry, A., "The Coming Struggle for India," 242
- Vasili, Count Paul, "Berlin Society," 257
- Veitch, J., LL.D., "Institutes of Logic," 237
- WALKER, F. A., "A Brief Text-book of Political Economy," 553
- Wallace, A. R., LL.D., "Bad Times: an Essay on the Present Depression in Trade," 243
- "Wanderer," "Glamour: a Novel," 307
- Ward, Mrs. H., "Amiel's Journal: The Journal Intime of Henri-Frederic

- Amiel, "translated, with an Introduction and Notes," 575
- Warren, F., "Only One Other," 307
- Warter, the late J. W., "An Old Shropshire Oak," edited by R. Garnett, LL.D., 577
- Way, A. S., M.A., "The Iliad of Homer done into English Verse." Vol. i. Books I-XII., 586
- Webb *see* Rowe
- Weiss, Dr. H., "Moscs u. sein Volk," 232
- Welsh, C., "A Bookseller of the last Century," 573
- Wells, D., LL.D., "Practical Economics," 248
- Werry, E. F., "Charcombe Wells," 308
- Westropp, H. M., "Primitive Symbolism, as illustrated in Phallic Worship," 281
- Westwood, T., "Gathered in the (loaming," 290
- White, E., Archbishop, "The Seven Gifts," 226
- Wilkinson, J. J. G., "Emanuel Sweedenborg," 572
- Williams, H., M.A., "English Letters and Letter-Writers of the Eighteenth Century," first series, 588
- "Willsbro, Poems by Jamin," 291
- Wilson, Col. Sir Charles, "From Korti to Khârtoum," fourth edition, 557
- , Rev. J. M., "Nature, Man, God," 230
- WOMAN (THE) QUESTION, 207-223
- Wood, T., "Our Insect Enemies," 267
- ZACHER, DR., "The Red International," translated by Rev. E. M. Geldart, 548
- Zeller, Dr. E., "Outlines of the History of Greek Philosophy," translated by S. A. Alleyne and E. Abbott, 537
- Zimmern, Helen, "Heroic Tales, retold from Firdusi the Persian," 590
- Zola, E., "Germinal: or, Master and Man," "Thérèse Raquin," "The Rush for the Spoil," 599

END OF VOL. LXIX.

THE  
WESTMINSTER  
REVIEW.

JANUARY AND APRIL,  
1886.

---

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

SHAKSPERE.

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

---

*NEW SERIES.*

VOL. LXIX.

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

**Ballantyne Prices**

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





