

THE
WESTMINSTER
REVIEW.

JULY AND OCTOBER,
1879.

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

SHAKESPEARE.

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

~~~~~

NEW SERIES.

VOL. LVI.

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

Ballantyne Press
BALLANTYNE AND HANSON, EDINBURGH
6 HANCOCK STREET, LONDON

Storeroom Jethriahns Public Library,

Acc. No. 7857

Date 2.8.75.

THE
WESTMINSTER
AND
FOREIGN QUARTERLY
REVIEW.

JULY 1, 1879.



ART. I.—FREE TRADE, RECIPROCITY, AND FOREIGN
COMPETITION.

1. *Free Trade and Protection.* By Professor FAWCETT, M.P. Macmillan & Co. 1878.
2. *Statistical Abstract for the Principal and other Foreign Countries.* London. Dec. 1878.
3. *Lectures on the Labour Question.* By THOMAS BRASSEY, M.P. Longmans, Green & Co. 1878.
4. *Reciprocity.* A Letter addressed to Mr. Thomas [Bayley] Potter, M.P., by Sir LOUIS MALLET, C.B. Cassell, Petter, & Galpin. 1879.

“It is strange, after thirty years of silence, to hear—issuing as it were from the tomb—the assertions and the fallacies against which the Anti-Corn Law League so long and so successfully contended, and which most people supposed were buried beyond hope of resurrection. It is stranger still to hear such ghostly heresies enunciated by men whose position and intelligence might be presumed to protect them against the influence of doctrines which, theoretically and practically, are incapable of coherent exposition.”

THUS wrote the editor of a London newspaper a few weeks ago. And, strange though it may seem, we are unquestionably fighting our Free Trade battles over again. A new generation has sprung up since the struggle which culminated in the repeal of the Corn Laws, and although it has been supposed that Englishmen imbibe Free Trade principles almost with their mothers' milk,

[Vol. CXII. No. CCXXI.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. LVI. No. I. A

the fact must not be overlooked that these are times when even what have been deemed the most sacred and indisputable principles and axioms are called upon "to show cause" why they should be generally accepted. It is not very surprising, therefore, that, under the pressure of almost unexampled depression of trade, the principles on which our commercial policy has been based should be carefully overhauled and severely criticised. Since the discussion commenced, sufficient has been written and said to afford material for arriving at a conclusion as to the merits of the arguments adduced and the proposals made. Certainly the difficulty felt by Sir Louis Mallet in writing his letter to Mr. T. B. Potter, M.P.,* still exists—the difficulty of finding any clear statement, or practical programme of what "Reciprocitarians" propose. Replying to Lord Bateman's speech on the question in the House of Lords, on the 29th of April last, Lord Beaconsfield had to confess that, after listening with much attention to the speech of the noble lord, "he really did not know what he required."† Nevertheless, we may fairly conclude that all that can be said in favour of Reciprocity has been said, and that any lack of clearness and coherence in the expositions and appeals must be put down to inherent defects in the theory itself. At a time when trade is so bad that any proposal that held out the slightest prospect of relief would be joyfully welcomed and fairly tried, it is only reasonable to credit the opponents of Free Trade with having put their panacea before the country in its most attractive form.

The most prominent theory with them is, that the present depression is chiefly owing to the fact that, as a nation, we have continued a policy of what they call "one-sided Free Trade." Whether Lord Bateman, Mr. MacIver, M.P., Mr. Thompson, Mr. Alfred R. Wallace, or Mr. Hatton, be taken as the spokesman, the argument is pretty much the same. We are told that as we have opened our markets free to the world, and other countries have not in return opened their markets free to us, everybody is at liberty to sell us anything they make, while we are prevented from selling to them by the import duties they levy on our goods. Consequently, it is said, foreigners are supplying themselves with what they want (and to some extent supplying us also), while we, who depend chiefly on our foreign trade, are going to the bad. The remedy suggested is that we should trade freely only with those who will trade freely with us, and that on goods coming from countries that put a duty on ours,

* Reciprocity. A Letter addressed to Mr. Thomas Bayley Potter, M.P., by Sir Louis Mallet, C.B. Published by the Cobden Club.

† *The Times*, April 30th, 1879.

we should put a duty equal to the one they impose. This they call "Reciprocity," or "Trade at even weights,"—which we presume means that, because other countries have foolishly weighted themselves in the struggle for the world's trade, we ought to do the same. Practically it is Protection over again. An old fallacy with a new name.

That this country is suffering from a very severe depression in trade is unfortunately only too evident. In manufacturing districts thousands of men are out of work, and those employers who have not closed the whole or part of their works are, in many instances, complaining that they are keeping them going at a loss in order to avoid the further loss that would be incurred by shutting them up. Our exports of British and Irish produce decreased from 256,000,000*l.* in 1872 to 192,000,000*l.* in 1878. The income tax assessment for the year April 5th, 1877, showed a decrease of 9·13 per cent. on trades and professions, 3·81 per cent. on mines, and 24·75 per cent. on iron-works. The returns of pauperism for the Lady-day quarter give the number of persons receiving relief, exclusive of lunatics and vagrants, at 688,603 in 1877, 702,825 in 1878, and 752,870 in 1879. When things are in this condition there are always any number of reasons given why they are so. Some of course are sound; others are palpably foolish; and others, chiefly promulgated by those who have interests to serve, or theories to bolster up, are misleading. It is at such times that Protectionists and timid Free Traders, who have never mastered the fundamental principles of political economy, are fully charged with astounding tales of the disastrous effect that foreign competition is having on our commerce. Employers of labour, anxious to keep down the wages of their workmen, or hoping to obtain some kind of protection for their own particular trade, also carefully collect and circulate information of the same character. When trade is prosperous, although the import duties levied by other countries and ourselves are unaltered, little is heard of these alarmists; but when the tide turns they come out in full force, and by incessant repetition induce many people to think that there must be some foundation of truth in their statements and reasoning.

When it is suggested that the stagnation in trade is due to our Free Trade policy, the first impulse should naturally be to ask,—How fares it with countries that do protect their own industries? If we are suffering alone, or more than others, or if Protectionist countries are suffering very slightly, and that in proportion to the extent to which they have adopted Free Trade principles, there would be *prima facie* ground for alarm. On inquiry, however, the depression is found to be universal. Every country in Europe is suffering from it, and in the United States

the condition of things has been most deplorable. French exports of home produce decreased from 154,904,000*l.* in 1875 to 137,452,000*l.* in 1877.* In Belgium more than half the coal-pits—383 out of 675—were closed last year. In Germany the same condition obtains. Of 190 industrial companies quoted on the Berlin Stock Exchange last year, one-half had paid no dividend, and of the coal, iron, and mining companies quoted, two-thirds were in the same condition.† In Sweden, according to the *National-ekonomisk Tidskrift*, the crisis is now very severe. The railways unwisely extended in 1870-3 have got into serious difficulties; the wood and iron trades have suffered much from depression; and merchants and manufacturers have failed to an alarming extent. In the United States many mills and factories, built and fitted up at great cost when trade was good, have been since sold at ruinous loss. It was stated in the papers two or three months ago that the creditors of the Fall River Mills—a very extensive concern—had agreed to take 6*s.* 8*d.* in the pound in settlement of their claims. So deplorable has the condition of the iron trade been during the depression, that the Iron and Steel Association of Pennsylvania in a letter to a Committee of Congress, dated March 23rd, 1876, said: “Manufacturers are either in the hands of the Sheriff or selling iron below cost.” Out of more than 800 railway companies in the Northern States we are told that more than three-fourths pay no interest on the original capital. In 1876-77 the property of eighty-four railway companies with a mileage of 7700 miles and a capital of 80,000,000*l.* was foreclosed by the mortgagees, and proceedings were commenced against forty-four more, with a mileage of 5400 miles and a capital of 60,000,000*l.* In the beginning of last year 1,250,000 artisans were out of work; and the failures there were more in 1878, both in number and amount of liabilities, than in any of the previous six years. In number they exceeded those of 1877 by 1571, and in amount by 8,000,000*l.* In the State of Massachusetts the number of vagrants relieved was in 1873, 45,653; in 1874, 98,263; in 1875, 137,308; and in 1876, 148,936. Another indication of the condition of things in the States is that their import of tea—an article which they do not produce—fell from 4,893,000*l.* in 1873 to 3,132,000*l.* in 1878,

* Mr. Thompson's remark (*Fraser's Magazine*, February, 1879, p. 197), that the peasantry are worse off in England than in France, has no bearing whatever upon the question of Free Trade in goods. It is a question of Free Trade in land; in that respect the French are Free Traders and we are not. The condition of our peasantry is mainly traceable to our unjust laws relating to primogeniture and entail, and the transfer of land.

† Mr. Mundella, M.P., Paper read before the Statistical Society, February 19th, 1878.

representing a decrease of about 7,000,000 lbs. weight. The condition of the Asiatic, and particularly the Indian, trade with England and the whole of Europe may be gathered from the report presented to the recent annual meeting of the Suez Canal Company at Paris. The amount of shipping that passed through the Canal last year showed a decrease of $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. compared with 1877. This was in spite of the extra traffic occasioned by the despatch of troops and stores to and from India in consequence of the unsettled state of affairs there and in Europe.

This general depression cannot be due to Free Trade, because the countries to which reference has been made are not Free Traders. The causes of bad trade must therefore be looked for elsewhere. It would be folly to hold Free Trade responsible for bad harvests in India, famines in China and India, and war in Turkey, Asia, and Africa. Free Trade is not to blame because people lend their money to bankrupt foreign Governments and lose it, or because limited liability companies turn out to be unsound, and bank directors are dishonest. Nor is it the fault of Free Trade that people in all parts of the world are poor and cannot afford to purchase our goods.

Nor does the commercial history of our country give any support to the suggestion that Protection would improve our condition. Protection, in one form or another, has at various times been tried and all kinds of devices have been adopted to benefit particular trades. The importation of cattle and fresh meat used to be prohibited; cattle were not even allowed to be brought from Ireland. The importation of butter for food was prohibited; it might be got from abroad to use as grease for machinery, &c., but the Custom-house officials put a tarred stick through every keg to make it useless as food. In order to protect the woollen trade and encourage the home supply of wool, the export of sheep was prohibited in the reign of Elizabeth. A man convicted of doing it was, for the first offence, liable to forfeit his property, to undergo twelve months' imprisonment, and have his left hand cut off, and nailed up in the market place: for the second offence he was to be put to death. In the reign of Charles II. (1678) an Act was passed ordering that every dead body should be buried in a woollen shroud. When it was found that cotton goods were likely to interfere with the woollen trade an Act was passed in 1721 imposing a fine of 5*l.* on any one wearing calico, and of 20*l.* on any one selling it. When it became impossible to prevent the use of these goods heavy import duties were put on raw cotton. Thus our ancestors attempted to suppress and drive away the very trade that we now so much dread losing. The French wars kept corn so dear during the close of the last century and the beginning of this, that it was necessary to limit its waste

as much as possible, and not only was its use for distillation occasionally prohibited, but it was made a fineable offence to sell bread until twenty-four hours after it had been baked—because new bread cut so much to waste—and in 1800 a baker in Manchester was fined 5*l.* for selling a loaf before it was twenty-four hours old. When the wars were over and peace was signed in 1815, corn became cheap, and the Corn Laws were passed in order to keep the price up. The effect upon the country was most disastrous. From 1815 to 1832—a time of absolute peace—our exports declined from 51,000,000*l.* to 36,000,000*l.* In 1832 duties affecting 700 articles were modified and the exports rose to 51,000,000*l.* in 1841. The distress in the country was still great, and in that year Government Commissioners had to be sent down to Burnley and Stockport with Government funds to keep the people from starving. In Stockport 3000 dwelling-houses were shut up, 5000 people were out of work, and more than half the master spinners failed before the end of 1842. Sir Robert Peel then commenced repealing and reducing the import duties, and from that year down to the present time the commercial progress of this country has been unequalled.

When modern Protectionists are reminded of these facts they at once exclaim, “Oh, but we don’t believe in Protection like that. We are Free Traders, but we are not in favour of ‘one-sided Free Trade.’ We are in favour of Reciprocity, and would have Free Trade with those countries that admit our goods free, but would put a duty on goods from countries that put duties on our goods.” That is a fair statement of the case as it is put before the country. And the question simply is—If other countries refuse free admission to our goods should we, *therefore*, refuse free admission to theirs? The answer to that question depends very much on the answer we give to another, and that is—Are we Free Traders, do we admit goods into this country free, for the benefit of other nations or for the benefit of ourselves? If for our own benefit, are we to give it up because others will not avail themselves of it? If other countries will not buy in the cheapest market are we, therefore, not to buy where we can get what we want cheapest and best? Other countries undoubtedly injure us by putting import duties on our goods, but they injure themselves also; and are we still further to injure ourselves because their action is already affecting us? are we to cut our noses off because we are offended with our faces? This is what Reciprocity really means.

Free Trade can never impoverish a country or cripple its commerce. On the contrary, it is essential to the full development of the resources of the world. Its policy is to facilitate us in selling such goods as we can produce cheaper than other nations,

and in buying that which they can produce cheaper than we can. Different countries and different peoples have special qualifications for producing and making special goods, and it is for the benefit not only of themselves, but of everybody else, that their energies should be concentrated on that which they can produce best. Free Trade means unrestricted access to wherever the article we require is most plentiful, and can be most readily obtained. The invention of machinery and the introduction of improved modes of communication between various parts of a country and of the world are known to facilitate trade and be beneficial to the people, because they enable more to be done, more to be produced, and more to be obtained with the same amount of labour. This is precisely what Free Trade does, and what Protection prevents. Bastiat, the French Free Trader, put the matter in a nut-shell when he asked, "Which is best for man and for society—abundance or scarcity?" The issue is also reported to have been very tersely put at a recent Free Trade demonstration in Paris. "What," it was asked, "was this so-called Protection? Protection from whom? Protection from what? Simply Protection *from* cheap clothes, cheap food, cheap iron; Protection from obtaining many comforts of life."* The first condition of successful business is to buy cheaply; to sell cheap we must buy cheap, and Free Trade is essential to buying in the cheapest market. Import duties must increase the cost of the article imported. Those who require it will have to pay more for it, and to recoup themselves they will require more for the goods they sell. Those, again, who buy from them will have to charge more for their goods; and thus the cost of living and manufacturing is increased all round to an extent proportionate to the duty imposed and the demand there is for the article on which it is levied. An increase in the cost of living involves an increase in the cost of manufacturing, and an advance in the price of an article always tends to check the demand for it. If we are now being closely pressed by foreigners in neutral markets, a slight advance might be sufficient to alienate from us a considerable portion of our foreign trade. Thus the people would suffer in two ways. In addition to having to pay more for what they required, they would have less to pay it with, as trade would be crippled and work scarce. The Canadians are likely to experience this as the result of their new Protective tariff. The first effect it is having is to lower wages. This can however only be a temporary relief to the employers. With the prices of goods raised all round, wages will have to be advanced again, though the extent to which

* *Edinburgh Review*, April 18, 1879, p. 363.

trade will be curtailed by the high prices will render it impossible for the advance to be in proportion to the increased cost of living. According to the *Toronto Globe* :—

“The manager of the Canada Southern Railway Company, in reducing the pay of its employés and working staff, stated that the reduction of expenses in this way has been rendered necessary by the increased cost of running since the introduction of the Protective policy. Coal costs the company 50 cents per ton more than it ought to cost, iron is taxed from $17\frac{1}{2}$ to 35 per cent., locomotives and cars pay 25 per cent., bridges 25 per cent., and hardware 30 per cent. On the other hand, the receipts have been diminished by the same cause. The increased cost of living tends to lessen the passenger traffic; and, according to the returns of the port of Montreal, the shipments of grain have fallen off, the quantity exported from January 1st to May 14th this year being 1,473,790 bushels, against 1,898,836 bushels during the corresponding period last year—a decrease of nearly 23 per cent. Meanwhile, as the working man’s wages are reduced, his expenses are increased. Flour, which three months ago cost him 3 dols. 60 cents per barrel wholesale, now costs 4 dols. 15 cents; sugar is 1 cent per lb. dearer; oatmeal has gone up 15 per cent., bacon is 10 per cent. dearer, and beef is also higher. Clothing has likewise advanced in price.”

The advocates of Reciprocity, however, acknowledge the advantages of true Free Trade, but they deny that our present condition is such, and they propose to improve it by making it more Protective. They will only allow the application of the term “Free Trade” to the commerce of those countries whose ports are open perfectly free to each other. But surely if one country opens its ports free it is much nearer to Free Trade than if neither did so. On the principle that “half a loaf is better than no bread”—it being acknowledged that Free Trade is a good thing—it is better to have “one-sided Free Trade” than “two-sided Protection.”

What the public want to know, but what the friends of Reciprocity seldom attempt to show, is, how it will improve our condition if we retaliate on Protectionist countries by putting duties on their goods. They show how it would injure the other country, and that might gratify one of the lowest propensities of our nature; but it would be very poor compensation for the injury that we should inflict on ourselves. A war of tariffs would be little less desirable, and almost as disastrous as a war of powder and steel. Nations, like men, object to be driven. We are reminded at this point that perhaps the most amusing feature of the discussion is Mr. Hatton’s quotation of the remark (evidently with serious approval) that, “Once a man of courage and power comes to the front in Parliament to advocate the Christian

maxim, 'Do unto others as you would have others do unto you,' Free Trade, as it stands, is doomed."* What Mr. Hatton's views of Christian maxims may be we know not, but ordinary students of Bible teaching imagine that precisely the opposite results would follow the practical adoption of the maxim quoted. If "Do unto others as you would have others do unto you" means "Do unto others as they do to you," it has hitherto been woefully misunderstood, and its high position in our code of morality has certainly been obtained under false pretences. If it is, however, to be understood to mean what it clearly says, then our present policy of adhering to Free Trade with countries that do not trade freely with us, although we wish them to do so, carries it out to the letter. Mr. Wallace objects to the use of the word "retaliation,"† but the following quotation from a letter by Mr. MacIver, M.P.,‡ shows that the policy is intended to be one, not only of retaliation, but of compulsion also:—"If we want real Free Trade—as assuredly we do—we must go beyond the present teaching of British political economy, and make it the interest of those who now exclude our manufacturers to adopt a different policy. Our foreign friends who decline to understand the advantages that Free Trade offers, would understand at once the disadvantages under which a British retaliatory tariff would place them."

The advocates of Reciprocity vary very much in their views as to what duties should be imposed. They complain loudly of the importation of certain classes of goods from countries that tax our exports; but beyond that, their utterances are, as a rule, contradictory and indefinite. The proposal which Mr. Wallace makes is, however, distinct and clear enough; but surely it is the most absurd that was ever conceived. It is: "To reply to Protectionist countries by putting the *very same import duty on the very same articles* that they do, changing our duty as they change theirs."§ But if we are to impose import duties at all, we should put them on classes of goods on which the country against which we intend them to operate does not levy them. If it is necessary for a country to levy a duty on our goods in order to protect its own makers, it is very certain that they cannot compete with us here, and it would therefore be useless for us to levy a duty to prevent their doing what they cannot do when there is no duty. On the other hand, if manufacturers elsewhere can sell their goods here, they do not require a Pro-

* *Tinsley's Magazine*, April, 1879, p. 383.

† Article in *Nineteenth Century*, April, 1879, p. 644.

‡ *The Times*, Nov. 16th, 1878.

§ *Nineteenth Century*, April, 1879, p. 645.

pective duty at home, and if they have one they would soon take it off if we put one on their goods here. But that would not enable us to sell to them; for if we cannot beat them in our market here, we certainly could not compete with them at home, even if they did admit our goods duty free. For instance, Continental countries levy duties on our cotton goods, but it would be useless for us to levy a duty on their cotton goods, because they send none here. Russia puts an import duty on our iron goods, but we cannot put one on hers, because we buy none from her. We could levy a duty on Russian corn, Norwegian timber, Spanish fruits, and American cotton and oil, but these countries need not impose a duty against us on these goods, because we cannot export any to them. If we are to admit duty free what they admit free from us, they would of course admit all these articles free, knowing that we should never send any to them, while they would be under no compulsion to take the duty off goods that we can send there but which they cannot send to us. Surely if there is any sense in Reciprocity at all, it must be in imposing a duty on the articles that other countries send to us, unless they will take the duty off those goods that we do or could sell to them. And to that the objection is that if duties here would be injurious to our trade it would be folly to impose them merely for the chance of taking them off again as a favour to other nations when they were prepared to "reciprocate" it. Further, maintaining duties on particular goods from one country which we remitted on the same goods from another country would lead to endless trouble and confusion. If we levied a duty on silk goods from France, we probably should not do so from Belgium or Spain, as these are not silk-exporting countries. There would be nothing to prevent French silks being sent to Spain or Belgium and then sent on to England. Or, if we arranged to receive French iron, on condition that they would admit ours, and we levied a duty on Belgian iron because they levied one on ours, Belgium could send her iron across the borders into France, and export it from there duty free to England. Belgium might, for such a purpose, arrange with France to allow her silk to pass through her territory duty free, if France accorded a corresponding privilege to Belgian iron. It would be found practically impossible to counteract such arrangements, and much bitterness and bickering would ensue from them.

Mr. Thompson* refers to the competition of French refiners in the sugar trade as a special grievance. He points out that

* *Fraser's Magazine*. February, 1879, p. 202.

we import more refined sugar than we export, but he does not show how putting a duty on the sugar sent here would improve our export trade. We should imagine that if the French sugar refiners' trade here was stopped, his competition for the business in neutral markets would be keener than ever. The grievance, of course, is that the French Government, by a roundabout method, give a bounty to their sugar refiners on the sugar they send abroad. This enables the French merchants to export sugar at a lower price than they otherwise could, and than they can sell it at home. The result has been to injure seriously our sugar refining trade. This is very annoying to sugar refiners; but are we to put a duty on French sugar in order that we may be compelled to pay a higher price for English sugar, so that the English sugar trade may prosper? Those who are so anxious to benefit their fellow-countrymen can do so now—there is nothing to prevent their buying English lump-sugar by paying the higher price for it. It is kept in stock in almost every town; but how many of our Reciprocity friends do buy it? The fact is, the French Government is yearly paying a portion of our sugar bill, and so long as they are willing to do it we shall be very foolish if we do not let them.

The French people derive no benefit from it. Competition will prevent the refiners from getting any more nett profit than they would without the bounty. And the extra demand that is created by the bounty will raise the price of sugar, and the French people will, therefore, have more to pay for it than they would if the demand was not thus unnaturally stimulated. Thus, they really lose in two ways—they pay through the Government so much of our sugar bill, and they also pay more for what they use themselves.

The same reply may be made to Mr. Thompson's reference to the Belgian glass trade. He says—

“This inferior glass the Belgian manufacturer ships off to England and sells at a price calculated so as to be well under what the English manufacturers can produce it, the Belgian one, should he sustain any loss in carrying out this arrangement, being recouped by the extra price that he can safely charge on the better glass in his own country, as he has no foreign competition.”*

We ought to be obliged to the kind but simple people who will thus submit to pay more for their best glass in order that we may have their common glass specially cheap. This idea that Protection enables makers to sell their goods at less than the ordinary price abroad is evidently held by many Protectionists. Mr. Wallace says—

* *Fraser's Magazine*, February, 1879, p. 201.

“Foreign manufacturers, protected by import duties against competition by us, enjoy practically a monopoly in their own countries, and can secure such a profit on the bulk of their goods sold at home that they can afford to undersell us with their surplus stocks.”*

Foreign manufacturers are not quite so foolish as is imagined; they will never deliberately make goods to sell at a loss, or without profit, abroad, no matter how well they are doing at home. If they can sell at a profit away from home, unquestionably they will do so, but in that case they will require no duty in their own country to protect their trade; the price of the goods will secure them the monopoly. Nor will an import duty enable them to secure an extraordinary profit at home—competition amongst themselves, or with others that would soon enter the field, would speedily rectify that. We cannot legislate for, or base any arguments on the conduct of, makers with surplus stocks. If they have to sell such stock at a loss once, they will be very careful about overstocking in the future. Surplus stocks must also, as a rule, be disposed of to ordinary customers; a maker cannot develop a foreign connection at a moment's notice.

Again, if we protect one trade we must protect all. One-sided Protection would lead to intolerable rivalry and wire-pulling on the part of different trades. If the sugar trade is protected against French competition, and the glass trade against Belgian competition, what can be said to the demand of the farmer to be protected against the competition of foreign corn and cattle? No one is suffering more from free imports, at the present time, than the British farmer. Yet our position as a manufacturing nation depends so much on our facilities for obtaining cheap food that no one would for a moment listen to a proposition to put a duty on it. The butcher would also want protecting against foreign meat, the ironmaster against Belgian iron, and the cotton manufacturer against American calico. We could not fairly or logically refuse the one if we granted the other. This alone is a fatal objection to all “Pleas for Reciprocity.”

A particularly strong feeling exists against the United States. They used to buy a great deal from us. Now they levy such heavy duties that we are practically shut out of their markets. And to make matters worse they are actually sending goods here to compete with us in our own towns. Surely, say the Reciprocity-ans, it would be both fair and politic to levy a duty on what they send here. But the United States send us very few *manufactured goods*. The following is the total value of the cotton, iron and steel goods we have imported from them recently:—

* *Nineteenth Century*, April, 1879, p. 645.

| | Cotton Manufactures. | | Manufactured Iron and Steel Goods. |
|----------------|----------------------|-----|---------------------------------------|
| 1875 | £95,000 | ... | £216,000 |
| 1876 | 451,876 | ... | 241,839 |
| 1877 | 163,000 | ... | 200,000 |

Whereas in 1877 we sent there, in spite of high Protective duties—

| | |
|--|------------|
| Cotton goods | £1,318,948 |
| Thread for sewing | 414,747 |
| Linen piece goods | 2,208,701 |
| Linen thread. | 124,324 |
| | £4,066,720 |
| Iron, iron goods, and hardware | £925,155 |

In 1876 the value of our imports from America was 75,900,000*l.*, but 68,200,000*l.* of it was food and raw material. Now, what is there to levy a duty on of any practical moment? Even under the present high tariff we send far more manufactured goods to the United States than they send here, and if we are to put duties on what they send to us, they could put higher duties on what we send to them, and we should suffer most. Take either cotton manufactures or iron goods as an example. The American would at once say, "I don't at all mind the English keeping me out of their market, if you will keep them out here. If they prevent me sending my 200,000*l.* worth of iron goods there, you prevent them from sending their 925,155*l.* worth here, and I shall be the gainer." And so he would.

The only way in which we could effectually touch America would be by putting a duty on her exports of food and raw materials—that is, either on corn or cotton. But to do it would be perfect madness. A duty on raw cotton would, of course, raise the price of all our cotton goods, and put us at such a disadvantage in every foreign market that we might lose a considerable portion of our trade. The countries that got the trade would have to buy cotton, so that the result of our policy would be to injure ourselves without permanently affecting America, as she would still supply the countries to which our lost trade would go.

The one-sidedness and utter unreliability of Mr. Hill's statements about American locks has been so thoroughly exposed by letters in the *Times* from lock makers and others that further reference to Mr. Thompson's allusion to that matter is unnecessary.

But we are told that "France is the country which ought to be taken as the strongest case in support of a policy of Reciprocity,"

and Mr. Thompson argues that because our imports from France were 45,000,000*l.* in 1877 against 17,000,000*l.* in 1860, and our imports from there exceeded our exports by 20,000,000*l.*, we are getting the worst of the bargain. Leaving this question of the balance of exports and imports for a time, we find from French newspapers and French commercial reports that French manufacturers are also complaining that they are suffering seriously in these transactions. How both sides can be getting the advantage of the other is difficult to understand. The partial extent to which France has adopted Free Trade has practically made its commerce in some trades. With the previous restrictive tariff it was hopeless for Frenchmen to attempt to compete with makers elsewhere; but when that tariff was revised and the markets of the world were thrown open to them, they awoke to the fact that competition on their part was possible. For instance, when their ironworkers were protected by high duties all the ironwork for their railways was supplied from England, but when the duties were reduced they were soon in a position to supply their own. Unquestionably French competition is a serious thing in more than one trade, but the advocates of Reciprocity entirely fail to show how their nostrum will help us, nor do they attempt any explanation of the fact that many of the protected trades in France are seriously depressed. The sugar trade has already been dealt with, and reference may now be made to the woollen, clothing, and silk trades, upon the condition of which considerable stress is laid.* The following figures indicate that, however much our makers may be troubled by the competition of French dealers in these goods, their export trade in them is not in a very satisfactory condition:—

| French Exports. | 1865. | | 1877. |
|--|-------------|-----|-------------|
| Woollen goods | £12,112,400 | ... | £15,040,000 |
| Apparel | 4,964,000 | ... | 3,460,000 |
| Millinery and small fancy wares | 8,076,000 | ... | 6,248,000 |
| Silk manufactures | 17,140,000 | ... | 10,368,000 |
| | £42,292,400 | | £35,116,000 |

Showing a decrease in these goods of 7,176,400*l.*, while their total export trade had increased 11,372,000*l.* The only item that shows an increase is woollen goods, but the fact that the French *import* of woollen goods has increased 80 per cent. and of silk goods 190 per cent., in the same time, shows that even Protective duties have not enabled French manufacturers to have matters all their own way in their own country.

* *Fraser's Magazine*, February, 1879, p. 202.

Mr. Thompson speaks of the "glaring unfairness" of the French import duty on serge cloth once preventing some persons from purchasing it here, while a manufacturer there seeing the cloth, commenced to make it, and is "*now sending it in large quantities to England.*" But if that maker can sell his cloth in this country it is evident that our makers would be powerless to compete with him in France even if there was no import duty.

In connection with the woollen trade we must remember that during the last few years the fashion has run very much upon the class of goods that the French excel in, and to which our manufacturers have not devoted sufficient attention. A Report, presented by three students selected from the Bradford Technical School last autumn to visit similar institutions on the Continent, was published in the early part of this year. The following extracts from it indicate what French success and English failure is traceable to :—

"Special attention would appear to be paid to the instruction of the scholars in dyeing and chemistry, in both French and German schools, and this may be remarked, not only of those seen, but also of all of which any information has been obtained. . . . It is an undoubted fact that foreign goods, especially those of French make, are better dyed than ours, that the colours are brighter and more durable, and that a softer finish can be obtained, and these points are ascribed by many practical men to the superior and more intelligent method adopted by the French of treating the raw material in its primary process. . . . In nearly all cases the French goods seen, showed, if plain material, better colours and nicer gradation of tints and shades; or, if fancies, superiority and richness in the design, and more pleasing effects in combinations of colour in warp and weft. . . . Taken as a whole, then, we are of opinion that the taste and skill of the French manufacturers are, on the whole, superior to ours, and more fully developed. Though to some extent these qualities may be more common to them as a nation than to us, there can be but little doubt that the course of technical education undergone by all, or nearly all, connected with the management of manufacturing establishments has greatly improved these natural properties, and the necessity for schools for teaching technical science and imparting higher education has been so fully recognised by foreign manufacturing countries, that these institutions are to be met with in almost every town. Lille, Roubaix, and Crefeld are all towns only half the size of Bradford, and now all possess these schools—the Polytechnic at Rheydt has been built to meet the wants of the two neighbouring towns of Rheydt, 17,000 inhabitants, and Glaubach, with 35,000."

Mr. C. E. Bousfield, one of the Jurors at the Paris Exhibition, in an address to the Students of the Textile Department of the Yorkshire College, after speaking of the manifest improvement in the taste and finish of British manufactures since 1851, and

of the departments in which they unquestionably excel the world, referred to "the richness and variety of the French Woollens," and the French Worsteds, which, he said, "for infinite variety of design, for perfection of make and finish, and cleanliness of dye, are superior to those of any other country." And Mr. Mitchell, the President of the Bradford Chamber of Commerce, and one of the Judges at the Paris Exhibition, recently said, "We cannot hope to resume our position of supremacy on the old lines. If we would be successful we must adapt ourselves to the changes of taste and fashion that are for ever occurring, and not seek to keep the world bound to the acceptance of the same kind of goods from year to year."

It will be seen that this is not a question of Reciprocity, lower wages or longer hours of labour, but of skill and a thorough acquaintance with the details of the manufacturing process. Levying an import duty here on French goods would not decrease their competition with ours abroad. Nor would it benefit our makers at home. The style and finish of certain of the French goods is preferred, and an import duty would not make people buy what they do not like. It would certainly raise the price of the goods to the English consumers, but in these days of dress and fashion the majority would still buy the article they preferred.

In the silk trade the conditions are similar. We buy between 8,000,000*l.* and 9,000,000*l.* worth of silk goods from France because they are preferred. Taking quality into account it is asserted that silks of our own make are of quite as good value as the French, but it is only when they are also up to the mark in style and design that the people buy them. That our makers are improving is evident from their exports, which from 788,894*l.* in 1841 rose to 2,351,839*l.* in 1859 and 3,134,062*l.* in 1874. In bad times like the present a trade in an article of clothing which is to a large extent a luxury is sure to feel the depression quickly and severely. The silk trade is also an illustration of how Protection entirely fails to benefit some industries, the products of which can be easily smuggled. The importation of silk goods used to be entirely forbidden. Surely the home trade should have prospered then. Yet petitions were presented to Parliament from the silk workers of Coventry and Spitalfields complaining that smuggled goods so undersold theirs that wages had gone down to starvation point. In 1826 a duty of 30 per cent. *ad valorem* was levied on foreign silk. Smuggling was then more prevalent than ever; so much so that it was estimated that one half of the silk sold here was smuggled. In 1845 the duty was reduced to 15 per cent., and smuggling then ceased to be worth the time and risk.

When it is stated that we are being flooded with foreign paper because our import of it has risen from 368,000*l.* in 1865 to 598,000*l.* worth in 1877, it is found convenient to omit to state that the value of our exports of paper was 463,000*l.* in 1865, 901,000*l.* in 1877, and 924,000*l.* in 1878.

The suggestion that a duty should be put on Belgian iron is approved by those who are misled by newspaper accounts of the extent to which it is used here. Few people are aware that in 1877 the whole of the iron and iron goods—pig iron, rails, girders, bars, hardware, and castings—sent here from Belgium was only 52,622 tons—not as much as many of our works turn out. In 1878 our total import of iron bars and iron and steel wrought and manufactured from all parts of the world was only 208,461 tons, and of this 64,000 tons was re-exported and 60,000 was Swedish iron, a quality that we should still import if there was a duty on it, as it is a special kind used in the Sheffield trade. In the same year we exported 2,299,223 tons. So that in a war of tariffs on iron we have everything to lose and nothing to gain.

The idea that if the 45,000,000*l.* worth of manufactured articles of all descriptions which we import was made here there would be plenty of work is pleasant and plausible, but utopian. Some of the goods would probably not be made here, even if they could not be got abroad. Others doubtless would. But as import duties would raise the price of all goods of the kind on which the duty was put, the demand for them would be curtailed, so that the makers would not get all the trade that formerly went abroad, and the extra price that would have to be paid by those who did buy them would probably have been spent on other articles and have given employment to men who, under the altered circumstances, would have to go without it. Further, the demand in some departments of the export trade would fall off. The goods with which we previously paid for the imported articles, or, in other words, the goods which the imported articles bought of us, would not be sold. Consequently, although there might be more employment in some directions, there would be less in others. It would merely be robbing Peter to pay Paul. It is not wise to pay more for English made goods than the same kind can be obtained for abroad. No more so than it is to pay a higher price for an article made in the town in which we live than it can be got for elsewhere. If it were, we all ought to buy boots, tin goods, and furniture, made by the local cobbler, tinner, and cabinet-maker, instead of supporting the shoemaker, ironmonger, and furniture dealer, who buys his goods from Northampton, Wolverhampton, and London. If it be prudent for a Londoner to buy boots that have been made at Northamp-

ton, why should he not purchase a pair of French made ones if he prefers them?

If people could only thoroughly understand that "Trade is exchange of commodities," and that gold is a commodity, the chief use of which is to facilitate the exchange of other commodities, one-half of the difficulties they have on this question would vanish. They would see that it would be suicidal for us to give up buying from other countries what they can produce cheaper and better than we can, or than it is worth our while to do. When foreigners sell us goods they have to be paid for them in commodities, either gold, raw materials, or manufactured articles, and producing or obtaining the articles which we thus exchange gives employment to the people. If to a nation A we have to pay a certain amount of gold for what we get from them, we obtain the gold by sending goods to another country B that requires them and has gold; or if A will take goods, but does not require any that we make, we send our goods to a country C that does produce what A wants, and then C supplies A instead of paying us, and the account is settled. We can only buy of other countries in proportion as they (not necessarily the same countries) buy of us, and other countries can only buy of us in proportion as we buy of them. If we cannot dispose of our goods abroad we cannot buy from abroad, because we cannot pay. Of course, we could for a time pay in cash, but we should soon use all our coin and bullion up, and then if we could not obtain a fresh supply in exchange for our goods, our purchasing power would be at an end. On the other hand, if we do not take the goods of other countries, they cannot take ours, because they have no other means of paying for them. *Those who sell must buy.* Those who buy freely are enabled to sell freely. The truth of this is established by the fact that remission of *import* duties has always been immediately followed by an increase in our *exports* of British produce.

| | Duties Remitted. | Exports rose from |
|-----------|---|--|
| | £ | £ |
| 1845-1852 | 8,600,000 | 58,000,000 to 78,000,000 |
| 1853 | Gladstone's first Budget —123 duties repealed, and 133 reduced. | } 78,000,000 to 98,000,000 the same year. |
| 1856-7 | 3,800,000 | |
| | | 95,000,000 in 1855 to 122,000,000 in 1857 and 130,000,000 in 1859. |
| 1860-5 | 9,470,000 | 135,000,000 to 165,000,000 |
| 1866-74 | 8,300,000 | 188,000,000 to 239,000,000. |

Since 1874 no duties have been repealed, but additional taxation has been levied, and our exports and imports have

both declined. In the twenty years, 1853 to 1873, we remitted duties to the amount of 19,000,000*l.*, and our exports of British produce increased from 95,000,000*l.* to 255,000,000*l.* Thus much have we been able to accomplish under a Free Trade policy and with the duties of other countries quite as much against us as they are now. Those Reciprocitarians who deprecate the *post hoc propter hoc* line of argument when it is used to prove that the great prosperity of the first twenty-five years after the adoption of our Free Trade policy was due to that policy, do not hesitate to resort to it when they desire to show that the present depression is the result of Free Trade. They would also have us believe that the leaders of the Free Trade agitation thirty years ago taught that if their policy were adopted there would be no more stagnation in trade, and they urge that because there is stagnation now Free Trade must be acknowledged to be a failure. The fact is, the people were never taught that the millennium would be inaugurated with the adoption of Free Trade. They were assured that our commerce would increase rapidly, and that their condition would be very materially improved, and the predictions have been abundantly verified.

Our free ports have, to a very large extent, made this country the market for the world. A great quantity of the produce of other countries, which is sold to foreigners again, passes through our hands. We take it of the producers in payment for our goods, and we send it to those of whom we make purchases who do not buy our own manufactures. In this way we export between 50,000,000*l.* and 60,000,000*l.* of foreign and colonial produce annually. One-half of the raw wool imported by France passes through this country—that is, it is imported by us and then exported to France. This all means a profit to our merchants, warehousemen, and shippers.

The theory of Protection is that we should export as much as possible, and import nothing that we can in any way produce at home. The Americans act on this idea: they levy 1500 duties on imports, but an export duty is forbidden by their Constitution. Even if it was not correct that “goods for goods” is the basis of trade, and that if a country will not buy it cannot sell, it would be found that the idea of exporting goods without importing others in return, would be injurious to the country adopting it, because its own exports would always have to be paid for in gold.* Gold would consequently accumulate rapidly, and as its value, like everything

* Under certain circumstances and for a time payment could be made in bonds of Government, Railway, and other Stocks. The United States are to a limited extent doing that now.

else, depends on the supply, it would decrease in value, and all goods would advance in price. Gold having always to be sent to that country, would become correspondingly scarce and valuable elsewhere. The country importing so much gold would soon require more to represent the same relative value as formerly, while in other countries less gold would represent what was a given value before, therefore her goods would soon be very dear to the first-named countries' customers—that is, out of their scarcity they would have to pay a larger quantity of gold for them. The high price of goods in the country in question would also make it worth the while of other countries to send their goods there in spite of the duty, unless they were absolutely prohibited; and if it was still desired to keep them out, higher duties would have to be imposed, and that would still further raise the price of home-made goods.

If the imposition of import duties with the object of putting pressure on other countries to induce them to abolish duties that affect us was a desirable thing, there is a practical difficulty in the way of our adopting it. Our import of manufactured goods from any one country is comparatively so insignificant that it affords no scope for bringing influence to bear. Mr. Thompson proposes to meet this difficulty by using our colonies as a "cat's paw." He says:—"It must be a *sine qua non* with our colonies that if they wish for our support in time of need, and wish to continue as integral portions of the great British Empire, they must follow our policy in this respect and open their ports free to ourselves and to all nations that give us and them Free Trade, but exclude by import duties those who refuse to do so."

Doubting very much that our largest and most powerful colonies—and it would be their trade and not that of the smaller ones that would be likely to weigh with other countries—would be prepared to endure much inconvenience for the sake of the somewhat sentimental honour of "continuing as integral portions of the great British Empire," or that they value very highly "our support in time of need"—seeing that their liability to attack is much increased by their connection with us—we imagine that the inauguration of a policy of this character would be the prelude to the disintegration of the "great British Empire." It is highly improbable that Australia, Canada, India, the Cape Colonies, and the West Indies would submit to a prohibition to buy in the cheapest market simply in order that we might be enabled to compel other nations to buy of us.

An inquiry into the results of Protection in the United States is very instructive. If the theories of Protectionists are sound, everything there should be in a most prosperous condition. Duties have been most carefully levied to develop and sustain

home manufactures. The resources of the country are practically inexhaustible, and the people are energetic and ingenious; yet, with a vastly more extended territory and a larger population than ours, they only do one-third as much foreign trade as we do. In 1877 their total exports and imports were 219,500,000*l.*; ours were 646,700,000*l.* During the recent depression they have suffered fearfully. Trade has been so bad with them that emigration from this country practically ceased—*i.e.*, nearly as many people came back as went. The total number of emigrants from here to the United States decreased from 238,747 in 1872 to 64,027 in 1877. While to Australia the number increased from 15,876 to 31,071, and emigration from the States to Australia also increased rapidly. The policy of restricting imports by levying duties most effectually cripples America's foreign trade in manufactured goods. In 1878 her total domestic exports were 114,500,000*l.*, of which 88,500,000*l.* was agricultural produce. So that her export of manufactures of all kinds to all the world was only 26,000,000*l.*, and that includes oilcake, timber, petroleum, manufactured tobacco, &c. People who talk of her competition with us in foreign markets cannot know that in 1878, her total export of manufactured cotton goods was 2,300,000*l.*, and her export of steel and iron—raw material and manufactured—2,500,000*l.* Our export in these two staple trades was nearly 90,000,000*l.* In ten years her export of manufactured goods increased only 3,000,000*l.* In 1868 manufactured goods were 17 per cent. of her total export; in 1877 they were only 12 per cent., one important reason being that the cost of building factories and fitting them up with machinery is half as much more there than it is here, and everything that is used in manufacturing is more expensive. Eight shillings a ton duty is levied on coal, consequently New England manufacturers cannot buy coal from Nova Scotia, although it would be cheaper; they have to get it from Pennsylvania at a great cost. The cost of producing pig iron at the furnace bank increased from 14 dollars per ton in 1853, and 16 dollars in 1863, to 30 dollars in 1870, and 34 dollars in 1873—the high tariff mania commenced in 1864-5. Protection has made steel rails so dear that it is said that it would have paid the American people to have bought and closed all the steel rail works in the country and to have pensioned the men. In April the price of steel rails in England was 4*l.* 5*s.* per ton; in the States it was 8*l.* 10*s.*, for an inferior article; the consequence being that an order for 12,000 tons for delivery there was given to a Sheffield firm; they are able to pay the freight and duty of about 130 per cent., and still their rails are considered to be cheaper than the American made ones, because they are more durable. In 1872 the Michigan

Central Railway Company laid steel rails in the place of their iron ones. Across the Detroit River the Canadian Southern Railway Company did the same. The rails cost the United States Company 20*l.* per ton, but they cost the Canadian Company only 14*l.* 10*s.* per ton. The cost of laying a single main line out of Chicago was 400,000*l.* more in rails alone than it would have been if they could have imported them duty free. Mr. Wells told us* that an ordinary passenger car cost from 200*l.* to 400*l.* more on account of the duties levied on the materials used in making it and fitting it up. In this way the cost of transport in America is much increased by Protection.

Mr. Wells has also shown that between 1860 and 1873 Protection so advanced the price of food, house-rent, &c., that although wages went up 60 per cent., an artisan in 1873 had to work one-fifth longer than in 1860 to purchase the same articles. Fresh meat doubled in price; butter and milk advanced one-fifth; coal 40 per cent.; and rents 144 per cent.

The effect of duties on the trades they were intended to benefit is illustrated by the following extract from the evidence given before a Government Committee by Mr. Oakes Ames, a leading Massachusetts manufacturer:—

Question.—What, according to your experience, was the effect of the increase of the tariff in 1864 on the industries with which you are specially acquainted?

Answer.—The first effect was to stimulate nearly every branch, to give an impulse and activity to business; but in a few months the increased cost of production and the advance in the price of labour and the products of labour were greater than the increase of the tariff, so that the business of production was no better, even if in so good a condition, as it was previous to the advance of the tariff referred to."

The United States' shipping trade has been almost ruined, and ship-building has been fearfully crippled by Protective and differential duties. In 1855, nineteen per cent. of the trade between England and America was done in English vessels; in 1877, seventy-two per cent. of it was. The duties they levy on materials, and the high wages that duties necessitate, have made it impossible for their ship-builders to compete with ours. And as they levy a duty of thirty-five per cent. on the value of a British-built vessel before it can be transferred to an American owner, they effectually prevent their ship-owners from buying ships abroad. The result has been that whereas in 1860 they did seventy-one per cent. of their trade in their own vessels, in 1868 they only did forty-four per cent., and in 1877 only twenty-eight per cent. of it. Thoughtful Americans are realising that

* Speech at a dinner of the Cobden Club, 1873.

this is the result of their Protective policy. The Hon. F. H. Morse, late United States Consul-General in London, in an article in the *International Review* for May, after speaking of the extent to which the American carrying trade is done in foreign vessels, says,—

“Except the English, these foreign ships are built of wood, and, as a rule, are inferior to ours both in construction and equipment, and certainly are no better handled or cared for. How, then, is the fact of their taking so large a portion of the trade to be accounted for except but by low freights, *which they are enabled to charge by means of the less cost of their ships*, generally the less expense of sailing them, and in a measure also the willingness of the owners to accept smaller profits?”

The following is also an interesting item :—

“The fact that, out of all the lines of splendid steamers now running between Liverpool and America, not one belonged to the United States, was regarded as a disgraceful condition of things, and caused the New State Line to be projected, the history of which is very curious, and to me interesting. In order to secure a subsidy from the national purse the steamers must be American built, and when the iron plates required for their construction came to be ordered it was found that they could not be supplied by American makers, except at a ruinous price. They were eventually procured on the Clyde, and, with all the rivet holes bored, cut to pattern, and ready for putting together, were shipped to New York for erection by American workmen, the duty being remitted thereon, so that the tariff, the object of which *is said* to be the protection of American shipping, has to be suspended to allow of the creation of a line of steamers. It is not the first time this has occurred. After the great fire at Chicago the same thing was found necessary. In order to lighten the weight of that fearful calamity it was decreed that all materials required for its rebuilding should enter duty free. This circumstance caused not a few to ask themselves why a course of legislation that was seen to be beneficial to those temporarily made destitute was not likely to prove equally satisfactory to those made permanently poor by reason of other circumstances.”*

Our own experience illustrates the advantage of the opposite policy. In 1815 the registered tonnage of vessels belonging to the United Kingdom was 2,447,831 tons. In 1849, after thirty-five years of Protection, and with the Navigation Laws and thirty Reciprocity treaties in force, the tonnage had only risen to 3,096,344 tons. The Navigation Laws were repealed in 1849, and in 1877 our registered tonnage was 6,115,638 tons, and this included a large number of steam vessels, that can make two or

* “The Failure of Protection in the United States,” a pamphlet by Joseph Wood, p. 8.

three voyages in the time that sailing vessels are going one. When the shipping trade was protected it increased 26½ per cent. in thirty-five years; when we did away with all privileges and restrictions it increased 97½ per cent. in twenty-nine years.

It is expected that the return of national wealth in the States at the census in 1880 will be less than in 1870. The losses of the Civil War and the wiping out of the wealth in slaves in the previous decade amounted to about 7,000,000,000 dollars; yet, notwithstanding this, the national wealth increased 14,000,000,000 dollars from 1860 to 1870. The total wealth of the country is now estimated to be 27,120,000,000 dollars—a decrease since 1870 of about 3,000,000,000 dollars. Of course this is only an estimate; but the assessed valuation of property in states and cities shows that the true valuation next year will be less than it was in 1870.

There are signs, however, that an improvement has set in in American commercial affairs, and as the depression there commenced sooner than it did here we may hope that the worst is over with us. America can recover from depression more quickly than we can, because the vast extent of her unoccupied territory affords a capital outlet for her surplus artisan population, and her agricultural produce is a constant source of wealth. Already large numbers of people have left the manufacturing districts to settle down to cultivate the land. It is stated that 20,000,000 acres were newly occupied in 1878. The effect of improved trade there is already being felt here. In the first quarter of the present year the United States imported 20 per cent. more English cotton piece goods than they did in the same time in 1878. And Messrs. McCulloch and Co.'s Weekly Financial Circular, dated New York, May 29th, said:—"The commercial movement continues to exhibit a departure from the large excess of exports over imports that has so long prevailed. The exports of merchandise in April fell \$6,000,000 below those of last year, while the imports of goods showed a gain for an equal amount."

Unquestionably a return of prosperity in the States will be accompanied by an increased import of foreign goods. The low prices which have prevailed there, owing to the necessity to dispose of goods at almost any sacrifice, have enabled the Americans to sell abroad, and have also rendered it difficult for outsiders to send goods to them at a profit. But with an increased demand at home and a consequent advance in prices, exportation will become more and more difficult to American merchants, and the sale of foreign goods there will become more possible to foreign makers. Thus, the unhealthy balance of trade, which has recently prevailed in the United States' foreign transactions, will speedily rectify itself.

We may now refer to "the balance of exports and imports," as it is very usual for the advocates of Reciprocity to argue that "as our imports exceed our exports every year, we are buying more than we sell and must pay the difference out of capital—that is, we are living on our savings." Lord Bateman, in a speech in the House of Lords, April 29th, 1879, said,—

"Now we import 150 millions more than our exports, and no previous accumulations can stand such a strain."

Mr. Thompson is evidently also imbued with the same fallacy, for he says,—

"In the year 1872 our exports to Germany, Holland, Belgium, France, and the United States amounted to 154,786,733*l.* and our imports to [from] those countries to 142,018,782*l.*, showing a balance in our favour, excess of imports over exports [exports over imports], of 12,767,951*l.*; but in the year 1877 our exports to those countries had decreased to 102,292,321*l.* and our imports from them had increased to 182,669,318*l.*, showing a balance against us, excess of exports over imports, of 80,376,997*l.* [our imports from those countries exceeded our exports to them by 80,376,997*l.*]"

The idea contained in this very confused sentence is plausible at first sight. True, we do import more than we export. Last year our total imports exceeded our exports by 146,000,000*l.*, but that is by no means a bad sign. It must not be forgotten that the Board of Trade, in giving the amount of our imports, gives the value of the goods when they reach this country, and it therefore includes the cost of carriage from the country that sends them, while the amount of the exports is the value of the goods before they leave here, and does not include carriage out.* As we pay the carriage of the goods we import, and that goes to the ship-owner, the amount we actually pay to foreign countries for the goods we get from them is considerably less than the amount given in the Board of Trade returns. On the other hand, the amount of exports given is less than the countries to which they are sent pay for them, as there is the carriage to be added. Another cause of our imports being large is that interest on our foreign investments practically comes in in the form of goods, in

* Professor Fawcett is in error when he states that "the value at which any article which is imported is estimated includes the cost of carriage, and the profits of the merchant who imports it; whereas in estimating the value of exports, both the cost of carriage and the profits of the exporting merchant are excluded."—"Free Trade and Protection," p. 129 (the italics are our own). Actually the case is the reverse. The value of the imports is returned to the Board of Trade by the importer at their cost to him; and the value of the exports is returned by the exporter at the price at which he has sold them and not at what they cost him. Consequently, the profit of the merchant here is not included in the amount of our imports, but it is included in that of our exports.

the same way as our foreign loans go out mostly in that way. When trade is bad we are in a position to invest but little abroad, and that is one explanation of the decrease in our exports now. In such times we also need all our interest, and it, therefore, has to come to this country; whereas, in good times, a great deal of it remains abroad and is re-invested. This explains how it is that our imports exceed our exports so much more in bad times than when trade is prosperous. Our income from investments abroad was estimated at 26,000,000*l.* in 1867 and 65,000,000*l.* in 1877, so that 600,000,000*l.* or 700,000,000*l.* must have been invested in the ten years, and foreign countries have that 65,000,000*l.* to pay us before they begin to buy our goods. Countries that are indebted to others must pay not only for what they import but also the interest on their debt, consequently they generally export more than they import.

Another explanation of the rapid growth of our imports is the increased extent to which we purchase foreign supplies of food. Our consumption per head of imported articles of food in 1858 was (in value) 18*s.* 3*d.*, in 1868 1*l.* 16*s.* 2*d.*, and in 1877 2*l.* 19*s.* 7*d.*

The thing is clear enough, and people would not make any mistake about it, if they got rid of the impression that goods are actually paid for in cash. Goods are practically paid for by goods, and those who receive the most goods, in proportion to the quantity they send out, make the best profit. In 1877, although we imported 394,000,000*l.* worth of merchandise, we only sent out 39,800,000*l.* worth of gold and silver; and while we exported 252,000,000*l.* worth of goods we only received 37,100,000*l.* of gold and silver. So that in that year we got 142,000,000*l.* worth of goods more than we sent out, and only sent out 2,700,000*l.* more bullion and specie than we received. Last year we imported much more merchandise than we exported, and yet we also imported 6,000,000*l.* more gold and silver than we exported.

The proofs that our balance of trade is on the right side are clear and simple:—

1. We have had so much money to invest abroad.
2. Although for many years our imports have exceeded our exports and we have invested so much abroad, we have not exported more bullion than we have imported.
3. The wealth of the country has continued to increase. The assessed income of the United Kingdom was in

| | | | | | |
|------|---|---|---|---|--------------|
| 1855 | . | . | . | . | £308,000,000 |
| 1865 | . | . | . | . | 396,000,000 |
| 1875 | . | . | . | . | 511,000,000 |

The realised wealth of the nation was estimated in

| | | |
|------|----|----------------|
| 1855 | at | £4,700,000,000 |
| 1865 | „ | 6,100,000,000 |
| 1875 | „ | 8,500,000,000* |

A penny in the pound income tax now produces nearly four times the amount it did in 1842. Comparing 1868 with 1878, notwithstanding the present depression, the income tax returns show an increase of forty-four per cent., and the income from trade has increased sixty per cent. The capital invested in railways has increased thirty-four per cent. Our imports increased thirty-four per cent. and our exports twenty-nine per cent. It is estimated that the wealth of the country increased 2,400,000,000*l.* in the ten years—that is, at the rate of 240,000,000*l.* a year.

In times of depression it is surprising how even well-informed and sensible people will, without taking the trouble to look up the facts, blame anything but the real cause, and suggest any remedy but the right one. The gaunt old spectre of foreign competition is continually brought out to frighten the timid, and we are perpetually being assured that in this or that particular trade England's days of prosperity are numbered. Fifteen or twenty years ago it was the machinery trade that was in danger. Schneider, of Creusot, got an order to supply the Great Eastern Railway with locomotives: they declined a repetition of the order at the same price, and we believe have never sent any more here. Then it was the ship-building trade that was forsaking us. Ship-building yards on the Thames were closed, and the Isle of Dogs was desolate. The fact was, iron ships were supplanting wooden ones, and ship-builders on the Clyde and the Tyne, near the coal and iron fields, were able to outstrip their London rivals, but the trade had not left the country. Then we had joinery from Norway, and we were told that foreign-made doors and windows would supplant the work of our ordinary house carpenters. From the import returns, however, it appears that few of those who gave sample orders cared to repeat them. Belgian coal was once advertised in London, but did any of it ever come? A ship-load of American bar iron was sent to Liverpool and sold, and every newspaper in the country published the fact, but they have not been able to announce the arrival of a second lot. We all remember being startled by the announcement that the Japanese were going to supply us with bricks. Now the cry is against Belgian iron, French woollens, and American calico and hardware. For a time these will answer the same purpose as

* *Edinburgh Review*, April, 1879, p. 428.

their predecessors in the scarecrow line, and then they will be heard of no more. Curiously enough this sort of thing is not confined to England, and we occasionally find two or three nations making themselves miserable with the thought that the other is destroying their trade in a particular article. While we are complaining of foreign competition foreigners are complaining of British competition. From quotations given by Mr. John Morley in the *Fortnightly Review** we learn that at Elbœuf, the centre of the French woollen trade, the manufacturers complain that their trade has seriously declined of late years owing to the competition of British goods. At Aubusson the famous manufacture of carpets is said to be extinguished by foreign competition. Machinists at Rouen declare that the trade in looms and engines is terribly cut up by the competition of England, Belgium, and Switzerland. The French correspondent of *Ellison's Annual Review* of the cotton trade (October, 1878) wrote,—

“If England, in the face of the development of the cotton industry in all parts of the world, is not able to find a new outlet for her manufactures, and does not reduce her immense production, our industry is destined to be ruined next season.”

English cotton velvets are also credited with seriously affecting one of the industries of Amiens; and the *Manchester Guardian*† (the leading commercial paper of the north of England), under the head of Commercial Notes, said,—

“The general depression is affecting the French velvet trade very seriously, and is said to become worse from day to day. One of the most important firms at Saint Etienne has given notice of a considerable reduction of its staff of *employés*. Short time has extended from Normandy to the Broglie district. The spinning mill at Broglie is running only three days per week, and the hours of labour have also been curtailed in the spinning mills of Saint Quentin des Iles and Saint Vincent la Rivière. A committee has been formed at Lille to arrange preliminaries for a general congress of the operatives' societies of the North of France to discuss the wages question and decide upon the steps to be taken in connection therewith. A circular has been issued by the committee to the operatives and societies of the district protesting against the reduction of wages in progress, and requesting co-operation in promoting the proposed congress.”

Mr. Hatton takes up the cudgels for Protection in a series of articles in *Tinsley's Magazine*.‡ Unfortunately, however, for the cause he espouses, Mr. Hatton is not a logician, nor is he careful with facts, except in so far as he is remarkably careful not to give the whole of them when the information would not

* October, 1878, p. 563.

† May, 13th, 1879.

‡ *Tinsley's Magazine*, March, April, May, and June, 1879.

be agreeable to his theory. He also has an ingenious method of putting his statements in the form of conversations, and thus apparently transferring the responsibility of their authenticity to the shoulders of some unknown person. A great many statistics are quoted,* showing that the exports of English goods to the United States have very much declined during the last five or ten years, but we are not told that in place of the decline being due to successful legitimate American competition, it is due almost entirely to the falling off in the demand in the States (owing to the depression there), and to the prohibitive import duties that are levied on our goods.

When he says that "Unless trade recovers in England, British capital will go to the other side in much greater force than hitherto, and British labour will naturally follow,"† he also does not find it convenient to remind us that in no country in the world have capitalists suffered so much from depression of trade as in the States, and that so far from English labour being likely to go there to any appreciable extent beyond the average of the last twenty years, the emigration returns show that the decrease in the number of emigrants to America has been even more remarkable than the decrease in our exports. Had he extended his inquiries in the right direction, and not confined himself to such biased Protectionist teaching as was sure to be afforded by *The Sheffield Daily Telegraph*, *The Birmingham Daily Gazette*, and Mr. Lister of Bradford, he would have found that in place of English manufacturers being likely to go to the States, American manufacturers are in some instances actually coming here. Protection has made everything so dear there that some of the chief American makers of sewing machines have built works in England and Scotland, and now make their goods for the European market at them.

Mr. Hatton further states that "a comparison of the trade returns of exports of foreign countries with those of England show that one of the chief reasons for the present distress is that Great Britain is exposed to a foreign competition which has been recently and rapidly developed,"‡ but he deems it superfluous to give any facts or statistics to support the statement. To show that our trade has decreased is by no means sufficient, because it has decreased everywhere. It is necessary that it should be proved that our customers are buying as usual, and that some one else is supplying them. Statistics are given in abundance to demonstrate points on which there is no dispute, but when required to establish a novel idea like

* *Tinsley's Magazine*, pp. 384, 385. † *Ibid.*, p. 384. ‡ *Ibid.*, p. 387.

the one in question, they are not forthcoming. To ordinary men the trade returns do *not* show that we are suffering from foreign competition. The returns for the four Continental countries—Holland, Belgium, France, and Italy—the amount of whose exports are given for 1877, show that for that year, as compared with 1872, there has been a falling off of more than 24,000,000*l.* The only instance in which Mr. Hatton attempts to sustain his attempt to alarm us is by quoting the amount of the exports from the United States, showing an advance from 89,268,000*l.* in 1872 to 122,000,000*l.* in 1877.* He does not, however, state that 23,000,000*l.* out of the 33,000,000*l.* increase consisted of food, oil, tobacco, and wood. In giving the advance in United States' exports to Canada as having risen from 28,000,000 dollars in 1868 to 51,000,000 dollars in 1878, no notice is taken of the fact that between 1874 and 1878 they decreased 12 per cent. The mere statement of a difficulty without showing how the proposed remedy will remove it is valueless. Assuming that the statement that the Americans are supplying Canada with certain goods that we formerly sent there is correct, the next step should have been to show either that it is due to the fact that Americans levy duties on their imports, or that it would be remedied if we levied duties on the goods they send here. This, however, Mr. Hatton does not attempt. In considering United States' exports to Canada during the recent severe depression, we must remember that American merchants have been pushing off their goods at almost any price to turn them into cash, and Canada being the most convenient district outside their own borders has been specially subject to that kind of trading. A correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian*, writing last year, said: "I find the whole country overrun by American travellers soliciting orders for their manufacturers at almost any price to secure a sale." The validity of this explanation is also sustained by the fact that the exports from United States to Canada increased in proportion as trade became more and more depressed there and elsewhere, and that they are decreasing as it improves in the States. The Americans themselves admit that in many departments we should undersell them in their own country in fair competition. In fact, this is the only excuse they offer for levying the duties they do. How can they, therefore, compete with us abroad in those departments? The Hon. D. I. Morrell, the President of the American Iron and Steel Association, in his inaugural address at a recent trade congress at Pittsburgh, said: "Do not open our ports to the products of foreign labour, for the certain

* *Tinsley's Magazine*, p. 387.

result will be to close many American mills and factories, and take away the bread of American workmen." So it has come to this—that artisans emigrating to the States can only get a living there by extorting from their neighbours, under the cover of a high tariff, prices for the produce of their labour that are far higher than the goods could have been supplied for by the country from which they came.

Mr. Hatton is unfortunate with his facts. He tells us in one place, that "we are importing 15,000,000*l.* a year of French silks;"* whereas our actual total import of silk goods of all kinds from France in 1877. was only 9,191,319*l.* In fact, elsewhere,† he reproduces a table of our import of manufactured goods, which shows that our total import of silks, velvets, &c., from all the world was only 12,969,496*l.*! Again, in reference to our purchases of produce from America, he writes: "To-day we are paying for that produce, not in hardware, not in machinery, not in cotton, not in silks, not in carpets, *but in gold.*"‡ A reference to the bullion and specie account in the Trade and Navigation Returns, however, shows that in 1878, while our export of gold and silver to the United States was 1,911,570*l.*, our import from there was 2,482,067*l.*, and during the last three years we have received nearly 7,000,000*l.* more bullion and specie from the States than we sent there. The fact is, that although for some time America has been exporting more merchandise than she imported, she has not received the balance in gold. Part of it has gone to pay shipping freights for, as has been already shown, the bulk of American goods are carried in English and other foreign vessels: part of it is required to pay interest on her Government, railway, and other stocks held abroad—chiefly in this country; and a considerable portion of the remainder has gone to redeem some of those bonds. In former years we supplied the States with goods and capital for various enterprises, and they are now repaying part, not because they are in a position to do so, but because they are almost compelled to do it, as their tariff prevents them receiving our goods in payment for theirs. When this method is exhausted they will probably find themselves in considerable difficulty.

Mr. Hatton is rather difficult to please on this import question. Sometimes he is concerned at the large amount of our own imports,§ and he extols the American policy because it results in their importing more than they export. At others, when he is straining every nerve to make things look at their worst, he announces with dismay that our imports are decreas-

* *Tinsley's Magazine*, June, p. 553.

† *Ibid.*, June, p. 533.

‡ *Ibid.*, May, p. 418.

§ *Ibid.*, March, p. 258.

ing.* He would also "point a moral and adorn a tale" by referring to the past commercial prosperity and subsequent decay of Holland. Referring to the competition with which the Dutch had to contend, he tells us that "the Dutch did not retaliate; neither will the English." And then, with tragic effect, he asks, "Where is Holland now?"† But the whole point of his argument is wanting because he does not attempt (and would certainly fail if he did attempt) to show that either retaliation or protection would have been of the slightest assistance to the Dutch in their struggle for supremacy.

Just now the cotton trade is much depressed, and we are often seriously told that the Americans are beating us not only in neutral markets but in this country at the very doors of our factories. What are the facts? Last year the value of our import of cotton yarn and cotton goods from all parts of the world was 2,000,000*l.*, while our export was 66,000,000*l.* If the United States could compete with us in the cotton trade our exports and theirs would show it. During the last two years we exported more cotton goods than we have ever done in any previous two years, while the value of the cotton goods exported by the States never until last year reached the amount of 1869. That the Americans have no chance with us in the open markets of the world in the cotton trade is evident from the fact that in spite of their heavy Protective duties, they import more manufactured cotton goods than they export. In 1878 the value of their import was 2,900,000*l.*, and of their export 2,300,000*l.* In 1877 we exported to the countries of North and South America (excluding the United States) 9,283,720*l.* worth of cotton goods. They (the United States) exported to the whole world 2,047,179*l.* worth. If the Americans cannot supply the countries at their very door, it is obvious that their prospect of doing so further from home is very small.

Mr. Thompson points out that our export of cotton piece goods to Holland, France, Portugal, Italy, Austria, Greece, and the United States has fallen off in quantity between 1875 and 1877.‡ The reason is, however, not that they are surpassing our makers, but that there, as here, trade has been very much depressed, and the people have not been able to purchase as before. That this is the correct explanation is evidenced by the fact that these countries are also importing less raw cotton for their own manufactures. In that year (1877) our total export of cotton piece goods was 200,000,000 yards in excess of any previous year. Mr. Brassey, M.P., also showed, in a lecture

* *Tinsley's Magazine*, June, p. 533. † *Ibid.*, March, p. 264.

‡ *Fraser's Magazine*, February, 1879, p. 208.

delivered in January, 1878, that at the time to which Mr. Thompson refers cotton manufacturers in Sweden, Norway, Prussia, Saxony, Baden, Wurtemberg, Alsace, Austria, Switzerland, Belgium, France, and Italy, were complaining of cheap Manchester goods offered, they said, at prices never heard of before. In Baden, trade was expected to revive "when politics were more settled, for then Manchester might find an outlet for her goods elsewhere." In Switzerland they spoke of the competition of English yarn and goods as "ruinous, not only in the home market, but in foreign countries to which Swiss goods are exported." And in January, 1878, the *Neue Züricher Zeitung* called attention to the fact "that the causes which are checking the prosperity of the British cotton trade equally affect the like industry in this country, the most important that Switzerland possesses."

In the iron trade the facts are similar. The following were the exports of pig, bar, and railway iron from the chief iron-making countries in 1877 to all parts of the world:—

| | |
|-------------------------|---------------|
| Belgium | 213,716 tons. |
| Germany | 142,604 „ |
| United States | 16,103 „ |
| Great Britain | 2,346,370 „ |

We, therefore, exported six times as much as the other three countries combined. Earl Granville tells us that while in the five years succeeding 1872 there was a reduction in the annual production of iron throughout the world of 800,000 tons, the proportion of that reduction in England was only one-fifth of the whole amount, although we are at the present time making 48½ per cent. of the whole of the iron produced in the world.* Much as our iron trade has suffered, it is evident, therefore, that we have not suffered as much as other countries in proportion to our output.

Some people are very much exercised about the Belgian iron trade, and certainly we do import a considerable number of rolled joists and girders. It is not, however, because English makers cannot make them quite as well and as low in price. They have not laid themselves out for doing it. The Belgians have made the girder trade a speciality; their mills are fitted up with rollers capable of making almost any size or section that can be desired, and as they use very common iron they can sell them at a low price. In England only two or three of our best makers roll any selection of sections and sizes, and as they use best iron only, their price is prohibitive, except where quality is essential

* Speech at Wolverhampton, June 6th, 1879.

and cost a secondary consideration. But the rolling mills in the Cleveland district, where iron is cheap, could, if they would put down the plant, compete with Belgian girders quite as successfully as they have done with Belgian railway rails.* The reason given for not doing this hitherto has been that the trade is comparatively a small one, and not worth the cost of putting down the machinery. But our makers may depend upon it that the trade is growing; architects are continually specifying them now. Girder plates can already be supplied cheaper in the north of England than anywhere else, and there is no reason why it should not be the same with rolled girders.

One reason why there has recently been more foreign competition here than usual is that when trade is bad abroad, and goods hang on makers' hands and they are in urgent need of cash, they send them here to sell—to turn into cash at whatever price they will fetch. They send them here because they know that we are the wealthiest people in the world, and that money can always be got for goods if the vendor will let them go cheap enough. This is not ordinary competition, but it is what our makers are subject to in bad times, and not a little of the stuff that has been sent here lately from the United States and elsewhere has been sent to turn into money at almost any sacrifice. The sale of screws under cost price, by auction and other methods, was carried to such an extent there last year that at a conference of manufacturers and others recently held, it was found necessary to reduce the output by running the screw mills half-time after June 1st, and the makers bound themselves not to undersell a price list agreed upon.

Why should the cotton goods imported here from the States have risen in value from 95,000*l.* in 1875 to 451,570*l.* in 1876, and then have fallen to 163,000*l.* in 1877, if the transactions were of an ordinary nature and paid the American manufacturer? And why should it have been in some instances impossible and in others very difficult to insure the execution of a repetition of an order?

The question naturally arises, "Then why is trade so bad?" And the answer is,—The production of goods exceeds the capacity of the people to buy them. There has been great waste, loss, and destruction of property, and the world is poorer in consequence. The abnormal prosperity of a few years ago was, in a great measure, the result of the Franco-Prussian war

* One of the largest recent Italian contracts for steel rails has just been won by a British firm, from a very large number of competitors, home and foreign. The rails are required for the Milan railways, and the contract is estimated at nearly 60,000*l.*

and over-speculation elsewhere, and we have for some time suffered from the reaction. The demand for goods seven years ago was great and special. Wars had destroyed property and it had to be replaced. We lent money to foreign Governments and countries foolishly. When we invest money abroad it usually goes out in goods, so that when we are lending large sums there is a great demand for our manufactures; but if the investments turn out bad, we keep our money at home for a time, and that department of our foreign trade collapses. An immense amount of capital, that is now unproductive, has been sunk both at home and abroad. It is not all absolutely lost, but for the time being the interest is; and those whose incomes depend on that interest are, of course, not in a position to spend as usual, and therefore our home trade is affected. There was a great rush of business in 1871-2 and 3. A great demand and high prices. Corresponding efforts were made to supply the goods; works were built, machinery put down, and mines sunk. The demand fell off; but the capacity for supplying it remained, and now the facilities for supply are much greater than the demand. Other countries have lost heavily, and are unable to buy as before. The decline in our foreign trade is due to decline in foreign demand, and not to our being beaten by foreign competitors.

The Franco Prussian war was an immense cost to France and Germany. The French indemnity to Prussia was 200,000,000*l.*; their own cost, including that of the German occupation, was stated by the Minister of Finance to have been 371,515,280*l.* The loss of trade in both countries during the war would be at least 100,000,000*l.*, so that the total loss would be close upon 700,000,000*l.* The Russo-Turkish war has involved great loss and destruction of property. The *St. Petersburg Gazette* of January 18th, 1879, stated that the war had then cost Russia alone 115,000,000*l.*

Since 1870 260,000,000*l.* has been sunk in American and Russian railways. We have lost in loans to foreign countries since 1870 about 160,000,000*l.* In fact, Mr. Brassey tells us that "fifty-four per cent. of the foreign loans issued in London are in default.*"

Terrible famines in India and China have impoverished those countries. Our own drinking customs are a perpetually increasing drain upon us. The expenditure of nearly 150,000,000*l.* a year on intoxicating liquors consumes the savings of the people and leaves them unable to cope with a time of depression as they might, and ought, after the prosperous times we have had.

The Suez Canal has affected our trade. The passage to India

* *Nineteenth Century*, May, 1879, p. 798.

and China being now so quick, smaller stocks are required in those countries and on the water than previously. It has also brought the Mediterranean cities nearer to the Asiatic countries, so that in place of buying the produce of those countries through our merchants, as formerly, they now trade direct.

We have had six bad harvests in ten years, and the loss on a bad harvest is estimated at from 20,000,000*l.* to 25,000,000*l.* This loss must fall either upon the people or the farmers—the farmers must receive a smaller return for their outlay and labour, or the people must pay a high price for their food. The large supplies of grain which foreign countries are able to send us have kept prices down, consequently the loss of a bad harvest falls mainly upon our agriculturists, and they have suffered severely.

The maintenance of large standing armies impoverishes the world by the taxation it necessitates, and the extent to which it withdraws able-bodied men from productive labour. The Governments of Europe keep something like 2,000,000 men under arms, and spend about 150,000,000*l.* a year on their armies and navies.

Lastly, wars and rumours of wars have during the last five years shaken the confidence and crippled the trade of the world. With the possibility (and at one time the probability) of a declaration of war by this country hanging over Europe, traders bought, as it were, from hand to mouth, and capitalists shrank from investments and advances.

An illustration of over-speculation, consequent on over-production and its results, is afforded in the United States. The Government there gave large tracts of land to railway companies to lay down railroads. A large number of companies were formed and there was a great demand for iron. In 1871 they imported 1,183,483 tons. They at once built ironworks of their own and prepared to supply the demand themselves. In 1870 their make of iron was 1,865,000 tons, in 1875 it had risen to 5,439,000 tons; but the demand had fallen off. In 1872, 1,530,000 tons of rails were used, of which they made 1,000,000 tons; in 1875 they could make 1,940,000 tons, but there was only demand for 810,000 tons. In 1871 they imported 565,701 tons of rails, and in 1875 only 18,258 tons.*

At the same time every country largely increased its production of pig iron. The production of the five principal iron-making countries in the world increased from 8,800,000 tons in 1867 to 15,500,000 tons in 1873. Makers in each of these countries having works built and plant put down, have since done their utmost to sell their iron anywhere at almost any price.

* "Work and Wages," an Address by Mr. Thomas Brassey, M.P., at Leicester, October, 1877.

In the cotton trade the number of spindles is stated by the *Statist* to have increased as follows :—

| | 1860. | ... | 1877. |
|--------------------------|------------|-----|------------|
| United Kingdom | 29,000,000 | ... | 39,500,000 |
| United States | 5,235,727 | ... | 10,000,000 |
| Europe | 13,250,000 | ... | 19,603,000 |
| India | 338,000 | ... | 1,231,000 |

Consequently the supply is much greater than the present purchasing power of the people, and the competition of makers with one another has cut prices down till there is little or no profit. The home demand for cotton goods has fallen off; the consumption in this country has decreased since 1870, while our export has increased 30 per cent.

Professor B. Price quotes the *Pall Mall Gazette** to the effect that between 1871 and 1875 the number of collieries at work here increased from 3100 to 4501, and in 1875-6-7 270 of them failed.

In all trades the story is similar—competition is excessively keen for the business there is, and prices are much reduced. It is remarkable that until recently the quantity of goods exported by us decreased very little, although the value was 62,000,000*l.* less in 1877 than in 1873. For instance, in 1875 we exported 24½ million yards *more* cotton goods than in 1872, and we got 8,500,000*l.* *less* for them. Mr. Giffen, the head of the Statistical Department at the Board of Trade, stated a few months ago that the total value of the British produce exported in 1877 would, if prices had been the same as in 1877, have been within a million of the value of the same exports in 1873.

Recently a great effort has been made to show that the depression is traceable mainly to the disturbed condition of the currencies of the commercial world. For some years there has been a falling off in the supply of gold. • At the same time there has been a greater demand for it, because Germany and, to some extent, France and the United States have been adopting gold in place of silver as the standard of their currency. On the other hand, the supply of silver from the new Nevada mines has considerably increased, and that, together with the quantity thrown upon the market by the change in currency, has lowered the value of silver very materially. The theory now is that by demonetizing silver, which was nearly one-half the currency of the world, the facilities of exchange have been seriously curtailed, gold has become scarce and dear, and great loss has been inflicted on silver-currency countries. It is alleged that in the East, where silver is the standard, prices have been considerably raised by the fall in

* *Contemporary Review*, May, 1879, p. 280.

its value, and that there is therefore a loss upon all exchanges with Europe. To a certain extent this is true; but what the East loses Europe gains—when silver currency countries are at a disadvantage, gold currency countries are at an advantage, so that the commercial world, taken as a whole, is no poorer. As Professor Bonamy Price very ably points out, a diminution in the supply of gold may lower prices, or an increase in the supply of silver may raise them, and produce serious results to individuals, but neither can cause extensive and permanent commercial depression. A change in the value of currency “creates thorough disturbance in the relations which debtors and creditors bear to each other. It benefits one class and equally injures another. The debtor who is pledged to pay a certain number of sovereigns, if there has been appreciation, is compelled to purchase these sovereigns with a larger quantity of his wealth: he loses. On the other hand, his creditor is now able to purchase more goods with the same coin: what the debtor loses he wins. . . . There is no diminution of the national wealth, no weakened power of buying in the aggregate. The means of one set of persons are reduced: those of another are proportionately enlarged.”*

The diminution in the supply of gold and the special demand for it by other nations have not, as might have been expected, raised prices, simply because there is still as much gold as trade has recently required. Notwithstanding the large quantities required to accomplish the changes in the currency to which we have referred, there is no lack of gold in the hands of our bankers, and the rate of discount has seldom been so low as it has been during the last five or six years. The scarcity of gold and the depreciation of silver cannot, therefore, be accepted as explanations of the present depression. Doubtless gold would be dear and some inconvenience would result from the demonetization of so much silver if trade was good, but as trade has not been good the effects of a decrease in the world's hard money currency have not been felt.

The acceptance of any theory respecting depression in trade is considerably facilitated in some quarters if it embraces, or is accompanied by, a hearty denunciation of the working classes and their leaders. The proverbial red rag has a soothing influence upon a bull compared with the effect that a remark in defence of, or in extenuation of, errors committed by trade unions has upon the Mr. Roebuck and Mr. Greg stamp of politicians. That it is through the stupidity and selfishness of our artisans that we are losing our trade (it is always assumed that we either are losing it or are going to lose it), and that their high wages

* *Contemporary Review*, May, 1879, pp. 274, 275.

and short hours of labour are responsible for the present depression, is clear to them, because they have always asserted that it would be so, and their reputation as seers is therefore at stake. That employers should uphold such a theory is to be expected, since they have a purpose to serve by so doing, but that politicians and social reformers who profess to be, and who should be, above the petty prejudices and jealousies of commercial life, should thus warp their judgment is deplorable. Their cry is, however, a somewhat threadbare one. As long ago as 1680 we read that Mr. John Bassett, M.P. for Barnstaple, stated that the high wages paid in this country made it impossible for our textures to maintain competition with the produce of Indian looms. "An English mechanic," he said, "instead of slaving like a native of Bengal for a piece of copper, exacted a shilling a day!" It is also curious that employers abroad have the same cry as employers here. Workmen there, as here, have had higher wages and are working shorter time, and they think that is why trade is bad with them. In Germany wages went up one-third in 1871-2; coal doubled in price, and all raw materials went up one-half. The fact is, people in other countries are realising that there is a limit to the amount of work a man can regularly do, and they are learning that it is very questionable whether, in the long run, as much can be got out of a man in seventy hours per week as in sixty hours.

The class of goods in which foreign competition affects us most shows that it is not altogether a question of wages. We are competed with the closest in the commonest class of goods—those on which the least labour is expended. Whereas, if the labour was the item in which the cost was so much greater here than abroad, our disadvantage would be greatest in those articles on which the most labour is expended. In the iron trade, it is Belgian rolled girders that we import; in the cotton trade it is common piece goods that run ours the closest; in clocks and watches it is the common American and Swiss goods that find their way into our market. In the glass trade Mr. Thompson tells us that it is the commonest kinds that the Belgian sends us. But in each of these trades in the highest class goods we distance all competitors. Our greatest fear would really be from the United States if they should adopt a Free Trade policy. If any people beat us in best work it will be the Americans, and America is the land of high wages. It is not low wages, but greater dexterity and superiority of workmanship that we have to fear. At the present time, according to the evidence of the most competent authorities, the English workmen, with all their faults and failings—and they are neither few nor small—are still the best and cheapest in the world: though not so far a

head as formerly. Others are improving, and we must expect it. No greater mistake can be made than to imagine that the low-wage and long-hour workman is necessarily the cheapest.

The following extracts from a Report issued by Mr. Alexander Redgrave, Chief Inspector of Factories, giving the results of a detailed personal examination of Continental factories, workmen and work, made in 1873, are interesting and instructive on this point:—

“The value of the English workman still remains pre-eminent, though the interval between him and his competitors is not so great as it was. . . . The Belgians are an industrious and painstaking race, but, with the French, they lack that intentness of purpose which is the characteristic of the Englishman. . . . There is no question for a moment of the vast superiority of the cotton, woollen, and flax factory operatives in England over the French and Belgian workmen of the same class. . . . The Yorkshire foreman of founders who has been mentioned, was certainly not backward in speaking well of his Belgian workmen, but, he said, they could not do the work like an Englishman; they could neither keep to their work, nor do the same amount in the same time. This was a fact acknowledged by all.”

We are heartily tired of reading passages like the following, containing sweeping statements and denunciations, which the writers do not support with a shadow of evidence. Mr. Greg, after speaking of the “stagnant, gloomy, and disastrous” condition of trade, says,—

“This condition has been enormously aggravated by the almost incredible blunders and perversity of the working classes themselves.

“Orders and contracts, which might have given adequate, and possibly even profitable, occupation to our artisans, had over and over again to be declined by capitalists here, and were taken up in Continental countries, simply because the men, while fully recognising the disastrous state of trade, obstinately refused to accept adequate reduction in rates of wages which were legitimate and possible only in prosperous times, and virtually insisted on a selfish and unjust exemption from sharing in the misfortunes of their employers.”*

Probably a more unjust reflection on the conduct of our working classes was never made, even by Mr. Greg. Throughout the whole tirade not the slightest evidence is adduced to sustain the statements. Yet, after the experience Mr. Greg has previously had of the incredulity with which his terrible warnings are received, we supposed he would now have deemed it desirable to demonstrate their accuracy, if at all possible.

We regret that Professor Bonamy Price should have followed,

* *Nineteenth Century*, May, 1879, pp. 834, 835.

to some extent, in the same track, by giving his deservedly highly-estimated opinion on the same side without supporting it with a single illustration. He says: "We have been told of many large contracts which have been sent to foreign countries for execution because English workmen have distinctly refused a moderate reduction of wages, which would have brought them work and wages, and repelled foreign competition."*

If the instances in which contracts have thus had to be refused are "many," and have occurred "over and over again," there should be no difficulty in giving the particulars of one or two of them, so that the men might be afforded an opportunity of stating their side of the case, without which an impartial judgment is impossible. Indeed, it is most unfair to make charges of this character, which by their indefiniteness evade the possibility of a definite refutation.

Mr. Hatton's tales about Sheffield workmen refusing to make axes of a particular pattern, and of Glasgow fur cap makers refusing to put the ear-laps further back, may be told to those who are anxious to believe them; but after the experience we have had of the purely imaginary nature of such stories, he must excuse us if we decline to accept his version of the case until further particulars are forthcoming. Workmen were most unfairly blamed for the high price of coal and iron a few years ago. It was shown in evidence, before a Select Committee of the House of Commons, that between October, 1871, and March, 1873, coals in West Yorkshire advanced 15s. 5d. per ton at the pit's mouth, while wages only advanced 1s. 1½d. per ton. Coal was advanced eight times, and wages only five times, and the rise in the price of coal always preceded the rise in wages. Professor Fawcett estimates the average advance in the price of coal at 13s. 6d. per ton. Of that the masters got 11s. and the men 2s. 6d. The extra price paid for coal in one year was 81,000,000*l.*, and the masters got 66,000,000*l.*, and the men 15,000,000*l.* of it. Is it not folly for Mr. Greg to speak of workmen as having "virtually insisted on a selfish and unjust exemption from sharing in the misfortunes of their employers," when wages in almost every trade have been very materially reduced, and in some cases where demands for further reduction have been referred to arbitrators mutually agreed upon, the decision has been that the proposed reduction was excessive, and in others—as the recent (May 27th) award in the South Yorkshire and North Derbyshire coal district—that the employers had not adduced reasons sufficient to justify any reduction at all?

* *Contemporary Review*, May, 1879, p. 282.

† *Tinsley's Magazine*, April, 1879, p. 389.

Iron workers' wages have been reduced one-half since 1873. The *Times*, in the early part of this year, said,—

“Wages are now on an average below the range of 1871—in some cases they are even twenty per cent. lower; and we shall therefore be justified in assuming that, taking one district with another, the miners are not now earning much more than one-half what they did in 1873.”

And Mr. Brassey says—

“The downward movement in the wages of miners, from the inflation of 1873, has been unprecedented both in extent and in the rapidity of the change.”*

Scotch iron miners are now working for 3s. 6d. a day, less than they have ever had since 1863. In 1873 their wages were 8s 6d. a day.

People write and talk as though there were no disputes between masters and workmen anywhere but in England. Whereas, the struggles and strikes are frequently far more severe and embittered abroad than here. In Belgium, France, the United States, and Sweden, the military have had to be called out during the last year or two to quell disturbances arising out of labour disputes.

Nor have the men been as extravagant and foolish as there is a desire to have us suppose. * The tales about beefsteaks for their dogs and champagne for themselves are like the stories retailed by Mr. Hatton: they require confirmation. The investments in Building Societies and Savings' Banks show that in a vast number of cases there has been thrift. The amount invested in Savings' Banks was, in 1870, 53,000,000*l.*; in 1873, 61,000,000*l.*; and in 1877, 72,000,000*l.* The amount of capital held in Co-operative Societies increased from 685,000*l.* in 1865 to 3,653,000*l.* in 1874; and the funds held under the Friendly Societies Act rose from 5,000,000*l.* in 1865 to 9,000,000*l.* in 1874. In Lancashire, more especially in Oldham, large sums have been invested by working men in Co-operative Cotton Mills, and the great increase in the number of electors in some districts (more than 7000 in one year in Durham alone) through the men building or purchasing their own houses proved that there had been both industry and economy. In 1872, 268 men working at Pease's collieries deposited 3900*l.* in one Building Society. In another Building Society the men at the same group of collieries deposited on an average 300*l.* a month.

Men are not all saints—many of them are drunken and foolish, and not a few of them lived fully up to their income in prosperous

* *Nineteenth Century*, May, 1879, p. 794.

times. But in what grade of society* was not this so? They were certainly not alone in their folly. In questions relating to wages and hours of labour they and their leaders have undoubtedly acted unwisely at times, but has the conduct of masters on these and other matters always manifested the possession of a monopoly of wisdom? It is unfair to attach special blame and to administer special rebuke to one class for faults and vices that are common to all. In fact, homilies and reproaches so manifestly unjust as those indulged in by Mr. Greg defeat themselves, because they tend to make workmen determine that they will never again pay the slightest attention to remonstrances from such a quarter.

What, then, is our position as a commercial people? It appears that we are still ahead of the world, but that other nations are advancing. We cannot expect to monopolise the trade of other countries, and it would be foolish for us to lose our tempers because foreigners make what they can for themselves. We have a good start, and with ordinary care we can keep it. Above everything we must not change our commercial policy; but rather try to induce other nations to adopt it, by showing them that we still believe it to be the true policy. It has marvellously benefited us, and if other countries will adopt it they will improve their own trade and ours too. The wealthier a country gets the more it will buy, and the wealthier the nations of the earth become the larger will be the trade that each country will do with the others. The advocates of Reciprocity all admit that universal Free Trade is the condition to be desired. But if England shows any signs of giving way on her policy—if she gives any sanction to the Reciprocity theory—the cause of Free Trade throughout the world will receive a blow from which it would take a generation to recover.

The absurdity of the eagerness with which quack remedies are suggested in times of panic was well illustrated by Mr. Shaw-Lefevre, M.P., who reminded us* that in 1870, when trade had been quiet for two or three years, an effort was made to obtain the appointment of a Committee of the House of Commons to inquire into our commercial treaties, with a view to suggesting a policy of Reciprocity, and an agitation was also commenced to obtain State aid for emigration. Neither effort was successful, but it turned out that we were on the verge of a season of marvellous prosperity, for within twelve months trade improved and increased to an extent that had never before been equalled.

* "A Decade of British Trade," An Address delivered at a meeting of the Statistical Society, Nov., 1878, by Mr. Shaw-Lefevre, M.P.

Two remedies in addition to Reciprocity have also been suggested in the present crisis. They are emigration and restriction of production. Emigration would be a temporary and costly relief, because it would soon make our position worse than before. Not only does the departure of numbers of full-grown men, whose training at considerable cost has qualified them to be a source of wealth to the country, seriously impoverish it by decreasing its productive power; but inasmuch as it is chiefly the sober, healthy, and intelligent who emigrate, a constantly increasing proportion of halt, blind, idiotic, and dissolute men are left at home. Well-meaning people who encourage and superintend emigration schemes may benefit those whom they send out, as they certainly do the country to which they send them, but it is very certain that the outcome of their philanthropy is more injurious than beneficial to this country.

The folly of restricting production is thoroughly exposed by Professor Price.* Such a process must inevitably enhance the price of the goods in the trade to which it is applied, because the standing charges of works (rent, taxes, interest on plant, &c.) remain the same whether the place is worked four or six days a week, and there will, of course, be a larger per-centage on the produce of four days' work than on that of six. Increased prices means decreased trade, and the reduced output would soon itself be as much "over-production" as the original one. Further, such a step would put a premium on foreign competition.

Trade is bad, because people cannot buy; and for such a condition of things there is no heroic remedy. Prices must be brought down as near as possible to the purchasing capacity of possible consumers, and every one must be frugal; affairs will then gradually right themselves. Low prices will restrict unnecessary increase of production; and if people retrench needless expenditure they will soon be in a position to purchase at the low prices. The demand thus created for goods will stimulate trade; this will react on consumers, and once more the capacity to purchase as usual will return and prices will advance.

Already there are rifts of blue in the sky. The reports from Lancashire, the West Riding of Yorkshire, and Staffordshire are more encouraging. *The Financier*, a few weeks ago, said: "To the happily increasing number of trades in which signs of improvement are becoming observable, may now be added the cotton manufacture, the position of which has hitherto been one of depression, so extreme as almost to border on despair." And Messrs. Levita and Hudson, in their Monthly Report on the Manchester Trade, dated June 5th, wrote: "A more hopeful

* *Contemporary Review*, May, 1879, p. 281 and following.

feeling is now dominant . . . steadiness and regularity of price characterise all departments of the market." May there be no disappointment!

The troubles, through the worst of which it is hoped we have passed, and the foreign competition with which we are threatened, should suggest and enforce some lessons and warnings. We must as a nation be sober and honest. Our drinking customs are our greatest "rock ahead," not only morally and socially, but commercially. They not only waste our health and our time, but they deteriorate our strength, our dexterity, and our judgment. The loss to the country through the physical and mental ruin and premature death of thousands of victims of the liquor traffic every year can never be estimated. What inventions and discoveries we might now be reaping the advantage of had it not been that multitudes of our brightest intellects have been blighted and blasted by intemperance, we shall never know. The lack of sobriety amongst our artisans, with whom steady hands and clear heads are essential to the execution of the best work, will tell against us with increasing power as foreign competition becomes keener, and the loss of time inseparable from drinking habits is becoming an item in the cost of our manufactures, even more serious than any probable increase in wages or reduction of hours of labour. If we mean to maintain our position before the world, we must turn our backs on the liquor trade.*

The manufacture of heavily-sized cotton goods, cast iron scissors, and goods of that character must be discountenanced; and we must encourage inventions. The Americans are an ingenious and an inventive people, but they have no monopoly of ability. "Necessity is the mother of invention." With wages high and a position to make, America has had her trade to get by struggling for it. We are only now having that necessity brought home to us, and we must facilitate education and thought if we would produce inventors and men of genius; and when we have them we must encourage and facilitate them by providing cheap and effective protection for the results of their labour. As an illustration of the saving that a single invention may enable the country to make, it has been stated that while it takes two tons of coal to make one ton of iron rails, and ten tons of coal to make a ton of steel rails, it only takes twenty-five cwt. of coal to make a ton of Bessemer steel rails. And Bessemer steel rails

* Those who are concerned (and very properly so) about our large import of food, will do well to remember that if it was not for the destruction of grain in making intoxicating drinks, we should require 20,000,000*l.* worth less from abroad.

wear very much longer than iron ones.* We are told that at Crewe station the ordinary iron rails used to last eight months, four months on each face, whereas Bessemer steel rails laid there have worn seven years on one face. It is stated that the Metropolitan Railway could not have been worked with iron rails, on account of the continual interruption of traffic that there would have been for repairs and renewals.

A reform of our land laws is now only a question of time, and then with a sound financial and commercial policy and peace and confidence at home and abroad, trade will flourish.

ART. II.—THE FEDERATION OF THE ENGLISH EMPIRE.

SOME ten years ago, if we remember rightly, Mr. John Bright made a series of vigorous speeches embodying advice and counsel to the working classes of Great Britain. He pointed out to them the mistake they were committing in crowding into cities and engaging in mechanical and manufacturing work to the neglect of agriculture. The burden of his advice was: "Go back to the land." He pointed out how much of the land of Great Britain and Ireland was still lying waste: held as deer forests and grouse moors, which, if cultivated, would maintain directly many thousands, and the produce of which would cheapen the necessaries of life to many thousands more who worked in cities. He even propounded a scheme for purchasing these waste lands from their present proprietors at compulsory rates, in order to give them back to the people.

No doubt Mr. Bright was right in the advice he gave, and much of the forcing of trade and over-production of manufactures which has resulted in the present commercial stagnation and disorganization of the labour market, would have been avoided had the mass of the people gone back to the land. He clearly foresaw the dangers that lay ahead, and he rightly pointed out the safe course to be followed. The error that he fell into was, we believe, in directing the people to the uncultivated lands of Great Britain, as though these were the only uncultivated lands that the empire possessed. Though these lands are waste lands in an agricultural sense, they are not so from an æsthetic or even an economic point of view. They are the recreation grounds of the wealthy

* "Wages in 1873," an Address read before the Social Science Association at Norwich, Oct. 1873, by Mr. Thomas Brassey, M.P.

classes of the empire, and are for this reason of high value. To take these lands in a compulsory manner from their owners and split them up into farms would create evils far greater than would be cured by that process. It would disorganize rather than consolidate society. The lands to which the people should go are not the parks and pleasure-grounds of old England, but the waste lands of the outlying parts of the empire. When there are thousands of acres of magnificent land lying unoccupied and unused, waiting, as it were, to be cultivated to yield ample sustenance for vast populations, why interfere with the rights of property of a very large class of the community by such a measure as compulsory purchase? These outlying parts are the true waste lands of the empire, and it is to these lands that the people should be directed. It seems absurd that, in an empire such as that of Britain, it should be deemed necessary to propound any such scheme as that of purchasing the deer parks and grouse moors of Great Britain for the purpose of cultivation, while vast tracts of better land in neighbouring parts of the empire are left waste and totally unoccupied. Suppose, for example, that in the county of Kent there could not be found land enough for all those resident there who were willing and anxious to engage in agriculture, while in Yorkshire there were vast tracts of cultivatable land *unowned* and unoccupied: would it not be the wiser policy to encourage the people of Kent to move to Yorkshire and take up land there, rather than to attempt to make room for them in Kent by the compulsory purchase of the parks and flower gardens of the wealthier residents? Yet the same in kind though differing in degree is the policy that would devise the compulsory purchase of the deer parks and grouse moors of Great Britain, while in Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and various other parts of the empire there are vast tracts of unoccupied land, capable of absorbing ten hundred times the surplus population of Great Britain. Surely it would be the better policy to direct the people to these lands.

But if the pressure of population in Great Britain were to be relieved by encouraging emigration to the colonies, how would this benefit England? Under the present colonial policy emigration to the colonies means the permanent loss to England of so many people. When an emigrant leaves her shores he ceases to be available for her defence, and he is no longer taxable for her support. His departure certainly tends to reduce the burden of poor rates, and by his productive labour in the new land whither he has gone he tends to cheapen the cost of the staple necessaries of life in England. But these effects would be produced quite as much whether he went to Canada or to the United States: whether he went to another part of the empire or to a foreign country. The fact that he leaves England is the

only fact in which England is interested : where he goes to is of but little consequence, as in any case he is lost to England. In this way he differs from the labourer who moves from Kent to Yorkshire, under the suppositious case stated, for this migration does not reduce the population of the nation, and directly increases the national wealth, in consequence of the labour becoming more productive. The emigrant who goes to the colonies tends by his labour to develop and enrich the colony, And under the present system of governing the empire the growth and development of a colony can only result in separation from the mother country. We have shown in a previous article* that under the present imperial policy every stage of development in the life of a colony is an approach towards separation from the mother country. There is no possibility of the colony being ultimately embraced by the political system of the mother country. Thus every emigrant who leaves the mother country and seeks a new home in a colony, enriches and develops that colony by his labour ; by his labour he helps to found what in the near future will be an independent rival nation. It is in this particular that the great difference lies between the labourer who moves to Yorkshire and he who moves to Canada ; and it is the intuitive perception of this state of things that has always rendered England so indifferent to the direction of the stream of emigration — nay, has frequently made England desirous of entirely stopping the stream. If the empire were truly one, would not the growth and development of any colony be of the most vital importance to England ? If Canada were as much a part of the empire as is Scotland, would it not be England's first care to direct the stream of emigration to Canada rather than allow it to go to the States ? In a truly unified empire the farmer in Kent and the farmer in Manitoba would be equally subjects of the empire : the one as the other would be liable for her defence, taxable for her support, and by his labour help to increase the national wealth. Such a position as this, however, could only be realized under a federation of the empire, which would accord similar political privileges to each, similar responsibilities, and similar representation in the Imperial Parliament. Under such a system emigration to the colonies would no longer be looked upon as a loss of population to the nation, the emigrant would still remain truly one of the nation, his labour while enriching the district whither he went would also enrich the empire at large ; his transference from one part where his labour was not required and where his support was a burden on the community, to another part of the empire, where his labour was of

* See THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW, No. 110, Art. I.

high value, and where he was self-supporting, would convert him from an "unproductive consumer" to a producer. Under a federal system it would be England's aim to encourage emigration from the mother country to the colonies, so as to enhance the producing power of each individual of the nation—in other words, to increase the national wealth.

A glance at the emigration statistics for the last half century will show how little directive control has been exercised over emigration. Thus, in the sixty-two years from 1815 to 1876 the total number of emigrants who have left the United Kingdom is 8,424,942. Their destinations were as follows:—

| | |
|---------------------------------|-----------|
| United States | 5,467,075 |
| British North America | 1,549,010 |
| Australasia | 1,165,628 |
| Other places | 248,229 |
| | <hr/> |
| | 8,424,942 |

Thus, while England sent 5,467,075 emigrants to develop and enrich a foreign Power, she secured only 2,957,867 for her own colonies, assuming that the other places are British possessions.

Taking the money value of these emigrants at 1000 dollars a piece, as is ordinarily assumed in the United States, we find that they represent a sum of 5,467,075,000 dollars or about 1,125,000,000*l.* sterling that England has presented to the United States. This, spread over a period of sixty-two years, represents an annual gift of nearly 19,000,000*l.* sterling. Is it surprising that, under such a system of assistance, the United States should have prospered and grown at a rate that has amazed the world? This immense stream of emigration might, with the exertion of very little directive force, have been used for the fertilizing of the British colonies. The colonies are capable of absorbing ten times this number and yet have room for more. The money value of these colonists would have been added to the national wealth of Britain, instead of having been handed over to a foreign Power. But, doubtless, the reason of the indifference to the destination of emigrants from England is to be found in the fact that, under the present colonial policy, the development of the colonies means ultimately separation from the mother country, and it is felt that it matters little whether emigrants go directly to a foreign Power or to a part of the empire which will ultimately and chiefly, by reason of the accession of these very emigrants, become a foreign Power. Perhaps it may even be argued that it is better to let these emigrants go to a foreign Power that is already established rather than to direct them to the colonies where they will in the near future found other independent nations.

If England were independent of other countries, if she could supply the daily wants of her inhabitants from her own territory, if she could absorb the manufactures of her inhabitants within her own territory, one could understand and appreciate the colonial policy that has hitherto been adopted by the Home Government. But when England is dependent on other countries for the bare necessities of life, when she is dependent on foreign countries for a market for her manufactured goods, one cannot but be amazed at the policy that would advise indifference to emigration; at the policy that has for its result the loss of the colonies; the loss, in other words, of those very lands which, if peopled with the emigrants from Great Britain, could supply all the necessities of life to, and afford a market to absorb all the manufactures of, England.

A few figures will show to what a large extent England is dependent on outside countries for the necessities of life. Thus, the home-grown wheat crop of 1878, which was reported to be a full average, amounted to 11,500,000 quarters. And in order to supply the home market 13,000,000 quarters would have to be imported from abroad. In other words, England could supply less than one-half of the wheat required to support her population. And it cannot be expected that there can in the future be much material increase in the quantity of wheat grown in the United Kingdom. Indeed, the tendency seems to be rather in the opposite direction, as from agricultural statistics it appears that, whereas in 1870 there were (in the United Kingdom) 3,773,663 acres under wheat, in 1876 there were only 3,125,342 acres thus occupied, being a decrease of 648,321 acres. In 1877 again the acreage was about 3,300,000, and in 1878 about 3,400,000.

A comparison of the values of food imports for the years 1870 and 1876 shows how startlingly large is the sum that England pays to other countries for the common necessities of life, and how rapidly this sum is increasing. The following Table gives the values of the various articles imported in the respective years:—

| | 1870. | | 1876. |
|---|-------------|-----|-------------|
| Foreign stock (live and dead) | £7,656,606 | ... | £19,030,455 |
| Corn, flour, and grain of all kinds | 34,054,657 | ... | 51,534,648 |
| Butter | 6,793,877 | ... | 9,702,624 |
| Cheese | 3,274,331 | ... | 4,251,428 |
| Eggs | 1,102,080 | ... | 2,610,231 |
| | <hr/> | | <hr/> |
| | £52,881,551 | ... | £87,129,386 |

In 1877 the total value of the above articles imported was 96,879,737*l.* the value under the heading "corn, flour, &c." having risen to 63,192,224*l.*

Taking the population of the United Kingdom at the following figures:—

| | |
|--------------------|------------|
| 1870 | 31,205,000 |
| 1876 | 33,093,000 |
| 1877 . , | 33,446,000 |

we find the value of the above food importations per head of the population to be as follows:—

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| In 1870 | 1 <i>l.</i> 13 <i>s.</i> 10½ <i>d.</i> |
| In 1876 | 2 <i>l.</i> 12 <i>s.</i> 7¾ <i>d.</i> |
| In 1877 | 2 <i>l.</i> 17 <i>s.</i> 11 <i>d.</i> |

The *increase* in the value of the food imports of 1876 over that of 1870 amounts to 34,247,835*l.* And this increase corresponds to an increase in the population of 1,888,000. In other words: in order to maintain this additional population, a sum of 18*l.* 2*s.* 9½*d.* per head had to be expended for the necessaries of life, comprised under the above five headings, brought from foreign countries. This seems a remarkably large sum to be expended per individual on the above-mentioned articles of food, and it would seem as though this large increase in the imports were more than sufficient for the increase in population, and that the increase in importation must be augmented by an accompanying decrease in home production. On examining the agricultural statistics for 1870 and 1876 more closely we find this to be the case. The following Table shows the acreage under the various crops for the years 1870 and 1876 respectively, and the acreage per head of population for each year:—

| Acres under | 1870. | | 1876. | |
|------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------|
| | Acres. | Acres per head of population. | Acres. | Acres per head of population. |
| Wheat . . | 3,773,663 | ... 0·120 ... | 3,125,342 | ... 0·094 |
| Barley . . | 2,623,752 | ... 0·084 ... | 2,762,263 | ... 0·083 |
| Oats . . . | 4,424,536 | ... 0·141 ... | 4,298,722 | ... 0·129 |
| Rye . . . | 74,527 | ... 0·002 ... | 64,951 | ... 0·019 |
| Beans . . . | 539,968 | ... 0·017 ... | 528,556 | ... 0·016 |
| Pease . . . | 318,607 | ... 0·010 ... | 295,012 | ... 0·008 |
| Total . . | 11,755,053 | ... 0·376 ... | 11,074,846 | ... 0·334 |

Thus, the total acreage under grain crops (including beans and pease) shows a decrease of 680,207 acres in 1876 as compared with 1870. For each particular crop, except one (barley), there is less acreage in 1876 than there was in 1870, and for each particular crop, without exception, there is less acreage per head of the population in 1876 than in 1870. The decrease in the total acreage amounts to 0·042 acre per head of the population.

In 1877 the acreage under the above crops amounted to 11,103,196, being an increase of 28,350 acres over 1876; but owing to the increase in the population the acreage per head of the population was only 0·332 acre, being a decrease of 0·002 acre per head as compared with 1876.

On going back a few years we find that the falling off in the acreage is still more remarkable than that above quoted, showing that the food products of England are steadily decreasing, not only relatively to the population, but absolutely. It is impossible to get thoroughly accurate figures on this subject, but the following for 1841 are taken from the "Encyclopædia Britannica," printed in 1842, and are no doubt approximately correct. The figures are for *England and Wales* only.

| | 1841. | | 1876. | |
|----------------|------------|-------------------------------|------------|-------------------------------|
| | Acres. | Acres per head of population. | Acres. | Acres per head of population. |
| Wheat . . . | 3,800,000 | ... 0·236 | 2,917,765 | ... 0·120 |
| Barley and rye | 900,000 | ... 0·056 | 2,310,004 | ... 0·095 |
| Oats and beans | 3,000,000 | ... 0·187 | 2,267,892 | ... 0·093 |
| Total . . . | 7,700,000 | ... 0·480 | 7,495,661 | ... 0·308 |
| Population . | 16,035,198 | | 24,244,010 | |

Thus, in the thirty-five years from 1841 to 1876 the total acreage under wheat, barley, rye, oats, and beans has *decreased* by 204,339 acres, while the population has increased from 16,035,198 to 24,244,010. The acreage per head of the population has decreased from 0·480 acre per head in 1841 to 0·308 acre in 1876; a decrease of 0·172 acre per head. It is very remarkable to note that the acreage under wheat per head of the population in 1876 is almost exactly half of what it was in 1841; being 0·120 acre in 1876 against 0·236 acre in 1841.

These statistics are, we think, sufficient to convince the most sceptical that England is dependent to a very large extent on foreign countries for the necessaries of life. England seems to have reached the limit of her food-producing capacity some years ago, since which time any increase to her population must be maintained entirely by foreign grown food. Judging from the foregoing statistics, it is probable that at the present time fully one-third of the population is thus maintained, and more than one-half is dependent on foreign-grown wheat for bread.

Under such a condition of things it would be extremely interesting and valuable to know what the surplus population of the United Kingdom numbers—that is, the number of those persons who could be spared from the population, without impairing the "national efficiency"—those whose labour is not

required in the United Kingdom, and which, if transferred to another part of the empire, would be more productive, and the wealth of the nation thus largely increased. For it must be apparent that it is a completely false system of economy, which, by charitable donations and otherwise, gives large sums of money for the purpose of importing food to maintain in idleness and semi-idleness large numbers of people, who, if transferred to other parts of the empire would be, not only self-supporting, but (under a Federal system) largely contributory to the national wealth. Unfortunately, however, there are no statistics that will give information on this subject. Though, doubtless, the number of such persons is very large, it can only be arrived at by conjecture. The statistics of pauperism will help towards forming an estimate of the number. The numbers of paupers (exclusive of vagrants) for the United Kingdom for the years 1870 and 1876, together with their cost of maintenance, are as follows :—

| | Number. | | Cost. |
|------------------------|-----------|-----|------------|
| 1870 | 1,279,499 | ... | £9,363,797 |
| 1876 | 932,283 | ... | 9,135,058 |
| | <hr/> | | <hr/> |
| Decrease . . . , . . . | 347,216 | ... | £228,739 |

The numbers show a marked diminution, though the cost of maintenance does not diminish proportionately, and the sum expended still amounts to the very respectable figure of 9,135,058*l.*, or 5*s.* 6*d.* per head of the gross population. This sum, however, is but a portion of the immense amount which is annually expended in England in private and public charities, in helping to maintain large numbers of the people in semi-idleness. How large this number may be it is impossible to say accurately, but where we have a million paupers supported absolutely by taxes levied on the people, we may, we think, safely conclude that there are at least twice as many more who are half supported by begging and charity, and who are valueless to the nation as workers, their labour being insufficient to support themselves, and only having the practical effect of taking away work from another equal number of people who would otherwise be fully employed.

These three million people cost the United Kingdom for their support on the above supposition an annual sum of 18,000,000*l.*, which, capitalized at four per cent., represent a capital sum of 450,000,000*l.* If these people were transferred from the United Kingdom where their labour is not required, to some other part of the empire where they would be self-supporting, and not only self-supporting, but also producers, clearly the above annual outlay would be saved, and the national wealth increased by a capital sum equal to 450,000,000*l.* But there would not only be this saving effected, there would also be the direct gain on account of

these people becoming producers. The money value of an immigrant to the nation whither he goes, when that nation has useful work for him to do, is, as we have already said, ordinarily assumed in the United States at 1000 dollars, or 200*l.* per head. The transfer of these people would therefore represent a direct increase to the national wealth of 600,000,000*l.*, which, combined with the saving effected, would represent a total increase of 1,050,000*l.*

All this, however, presupposes that the emigrant in leaving the United Kingdom and going to one of the colonies does not become lost to the British nation—does not become less a subject of England than if he had continued to live in England—presupposes, in fact, that there is established throughout the empire a Federal system, that would accord to each district, and to every subject, no matter in what part of the empire he resided, similar political rights, privileges, and responsibilities.

Let us now consider a few figures in regard to the size and development of the great colonial dependencies of Great Britain. Many of the figures are taken from a lecture delivered by the Right Hon. W. E. Forster on "Our Colonial Empire," in Edinburgh, in 1875. First as to extent—

| | |
|--|-------------------------|
| Australia and New Zealand, about | 3,100,000 square miles. |
| South Africa " | 225,000 " |
| North America " | 3,350,000 " |
| Total | 6,675,000 " |

While the extent of all Europe is only 3,787,469 square miles. The above estimate also takes no note of the tropical possessions and the numerous smaller dependencies.

The population for 1871 is given by Mr. Forster as follows:—

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Australia and New Zealand, about | 2,000,000 |
| South Africa " | 850,000 |
| North America " | 3,750,000 |
| Total | 6,600,000 |

It is, however, when we consider the growth of the population, as Mr. Forster points out, that we are impressed with the wonderful strength and vitality of the colonies. Thus, in 1850 the population recorded for the colonies under consideration was—

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Australia and New Zealand, about | 550,000 |
| South Africa " | 400,000 |
| North America " | 2,500,000 |
| Total | 3,450,000 |

showing an increase in twenty-one years at the rate of 91 per cent. Well may he ask, "What will be the future increase?"

On examining the agricultural statistics of the colonies combined with the statistics of population, we cannot fail to be impressed with the wonderful development that is taking place. Take those of Canada for the years 1841 and 1871. The statistics are not so full or complete as those that can be obtained for Great Britain; still, such as they are, they serve for purposes of comparison. In the following Table the "acres under culture" represent land that has been actually broken up and reclaimed from the wilderness:—

| | 1841. | | 1871. | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------|----------------------|---------------|----------------------|
| | Population. | Acres under culture. | Population. | Acres under culture. |
| Ontario . . . | 455,688 ... | 1,811,431 ... | 1,620,851 ... | 8,833,626 |
| Quebec . . . | 697,084 ... | 2,671,768 ... | 1,191,516 ... | 5,703,944 |
| Nova Scotia . . | 202,575 ... | *600,000 ... | 387,800 ... | 1,627,091 |
| New Brunswick | 156,162 ... | 435,861 ... | 286,594 ... | 1,171,157 |
| Manitoba . . . | 4,704 ... | 4,041 ... | 12,228 ... | *18,000 |
| P. E. Island . . | 47,042 ... | *178,041 ... | 94,021 ... | 445,103 |
| Brit. Columbia | — ... | — ... | 10,586 ... | *12,000 |
| | 1,563,255 ... | 5,701,142 ... | 3,602,596 ... | 17,810,921 |
| Acreege per head of population . . . | | 3·646 acres | | 4·944 acres. |

For the same years the corresponding statistics for England and Wales are as follows:—

| | 1841. | 1871. |
|---|----------------|------------|
| Average under culture (including permanent pasture) | 28,749,000 ... | 29,709,249 |
| Population | 16,035,198 ... | 24,244,010 |
| Acreege per head | 1·792 ... | 1·221 |

Thus, while in England in 1841 the acreage under culture amounted to 1½ acre per head of the population, in Canada it amounted to 3½ acres; and in England in 1871, while the acreage had *decreased* to 1¼ acre per head, in Canada it had increased to 5 acres per head. And during these thirty years, while the population of England had increased 51 per cent., in Canada it had increased 180 per cent. Perhaps no other facts could be adduced which show more clearly and concisely England's growing dependence on foreign countries for food supplies, and at the same time Canada's growing capability for furnishing these supplies.†

These statistics refer only to what has been done in Canada, and do not exhibit the enormous undeveloped resources which only require labour to be converted into wealth. The wheat

* Estimated.

† We have used Canadian statistics in making the above comparison, but similar statistics hold good for all the large dependencies of the empire.

lands of the great North-West alone, comprising Manitoba and the Saskatchewan country, are given by perfectly trustworthy authorities at over 250,000 square miles in extent—160,000,000 acres!—more than five times the whole cultivated area of England and Wales. And this, be it remembered, is but a small portion of the great heritage of the British people that is lying unowned and unoccupied. One such fact as this is alone sufficient for the argument, and it would only weary the reader to adduce more figures, besides, by their very largeness, producing a feeling of vagueness and distrust.

We think it will be admitted that the foregoing statistics show conclusively that fully one-third of the population of the United Kingdom is now dependent on foreign grown food; that the limit of the food-producing capacity of England has already been reached, and the food-bearing acreage is now stationary and perhaps decreasing; that any additional population must be supported entirely by foreign grown food; that there is a large surplus population, valueless as workers, so maintained at a heavy expense; that the drain of emigration represents an immense sum of money annually presented by England to a foreign Power. These statistics also show that the population of the colonies is increasing at a marvellous rate; that in Canada the increase per cent. is more than $2\frac{1}{2}$ times greater than the increase in England; that, notwithstanding this, the increase in the food-bearing acreage of Canada is still greater than the increase in the population; that Canada alone is capable of supplying more than all the food required in the United Kingdom, and that all that is required to do this is the population to develop the immense latent resources.

To put the matter concisely: In Great Britain there is a large surplus population with an immense demand for foreign grown food; in the colonies there is a large undeveloped food-producing area, with an immense demand for foreign labour. How can these conditions be combined so as to be mutually satisfying?

Under a Federal system, when all parts of the empire would be tributary to, and represented in, one Imperial centre, it would be the first and most important care of the Imperial governing body to see that the resources of every part of the empire were developed to their proper and natural extent, and that no part was left unoccupied and unproductive while another part was burdened with a heavy surplus population. This would immediately necessitate a close supervision over emigration from one part to another. In England, where the population is dense, it would be a primary object to reduce the population to the minimum required for the necessities of that part of the empire, by encouraging in every way possible the emigration of the

surplus number to those parts of the empire where population was sparse, and where much valuable work could be done in developing the latent resources of the country. The immediate effect of this would be of high value. In the first place, the burden of supporting a large number of people in idleness or semi-idleness would be at once removed. Secondly, the wealth of that part of the empire to which these people went would be largely increased, from the fact of their labour being employed in developing latent resources. Thirdly, this again would have a reflex action upon England, from the fact of these emigrants in their new position of ease and independence becoming large consumers of manufactured articles, thus giving a ready market for the manufactures of England and affording remunerative employment to many of their countrymen at home; while, at the same time, the produce of the agricultural labour of these emigrants would supply the needed food in England, the interchange of the commodities establishing a traffic that would find employment for many men and much capital. Fourthly, the general wealth of the empire would thus be largely increased. Fifthly, what may be called the taxable fund at the command of the empire, would be increased by the fact of these emigrants being converted from burdens upon the general population, to being themselves wealthy and burden-bearing citizens.

It must not be imagined that what is recommended is the wholesale shipping away of confirmed paupers; such a scheme as this would without doubt fail and end disastrously; but what is aimed at is the assistance in money and otherwise of able and competent citizens to move from one part of the empire to another, where their labour would be fully employed. Their departure would relieve the pressure of population in England; would leave room for the full and complete employment of many who are at present only partially employed, and would allow of the gradual absorption of the great army of paupers that is at present dragged at the tail of the vast social vehicle.

For the purpose of giving this assistance it would be necessary to expend a certain amount of money annually. In commercial language it would "pay" the empire to expend money in this manner, because the sum expended in assisting a portion of the surplus population to move from England to a part of the empire where their labour would be of high value, would be more than recouped by the large increase that would be made to the "taxable fund" at the command of the empire on account of these emigrants becoming independent and productive citizens, instead of, as formerly, being themselves burdens on the community.

After a few years of such assistance as this the surplus popu-

lation of England would have been gradually and quietly transferred to another part of the empire, while during the same time the pauper population would have been gradually dying off or absorbed into the community again. When the pressure of population had once been adjusted by these artificial means it would of itself maintain a true balance by the action of the laws of supply and demand.

Without some such system of assisted emigration as that above indicated it is impossible for the true surplus population—those for whom there is no work, or only partial employment—ever to leave the country. For by the very fact of their being unemployed, or only partially employed, it is impossible for them to raise the necessary capital, small though this may be to make a start. Under the present system of leaving emigration to take care of itself those who emigrate are the industrious, energetic, far-seeing members of the labouring community—those who, ambitious of a greater success than is likely to be obtained in England from their hard-earned wages, by abstinence and self-denial, contrive to save sufficient money to start them in the new country. They are not of the “surplus population”—they are the flower of the labouring classes of the community, men of energy, pluck, and determination above the average of their fellows, and who evince their superiority by boldly striking out for themselves a new line. When England has annually for the last half century poured thousands of such men into the United States, can we wonder at the amazing strides that country has made in manufactures, arts, and sciences, at the extraordinary energy and activity of her people, or at the very high average of intellectual vigour that obtains among her labouring class? Rather should we wonder were it otherwise.

To this it may be objected that the United States and the colonial dependencies of the empire have stood in the same position relatively to England in regard to emigration, that England has neither encouraged nor obstructed emigration to either the one or the other, that therefore the colonies had as good a chance to obtain “the flower of the labouring classes” as had the States; and if they have not obtained a proportionate share of this emigrant population it must be owing to the inferiority of the colonies as places of settlement. This, however, is an erroneous view. The true cause of the great flow of emigration to the United States lies in the fact that for a hundred years the United States has been a compact and energetic nation (or, until lately, twin nation), whose great object has been to attract emigrants to her shores. As population is, of course, the backbone of any country, so no money was grudged, and no labour

withheld if the result attained was the addition of permanent settlers in the country. Means often the reverse of honest, agents frequently the most unscrupulous, were employed to induce emigrants to shape their course to her land: once in the country it was an easy matter to find employment to keep them there. Against such a force as this what could a few scattered and disconnected provinces do in the battle for emigrants? It is only within a comparatively few years that the Canadian provinces have enjoyed "responsible Government"—that is, Government by the election of popular representatives. It is only since the establishment of this form of Government that the various provinces have been in a position to offer inducements to emigrants—have been in a position to enter the lists with the United States in the struggle for the much-coveted labourer. And even then, what could a few weak and poor provinces do separately and single-handed against the united strength, wealth, and energy of the States? Clearly, any one of these provinces was incompetent to deal with the great question of the internal settlement of the country—the larger matters of emigration—involving as this settlement does the opening up of the country by the construction of canals, roads, and railways. And when we reflect that it is barely ten years since these separate provinces were united under one central parliament; that for barely ten years have they known the strength that comes of union; that it is less than ten years since the great wheat lands of the North-West have been placed under such control as to allow of their being settled at all—we must own that Canada has had to fight a most uneven battle with the States in the struggle to obtain emigrants. Indeed, had the diplomatists of England desired to form a great and powerful nation out of the United States, they could have hit upon no surer expedient for doing so than that of splitting up all the neighbouring British territory into small provinces, each with its independent governmental centre, while the emigration from England was left to itself—to flow to the country that could send out the most energetic emigration agents, and afford to spend the most money in attracting emigration to its shores.

But how different would the tale be had England thrown all her wealth and energy in the scale against the United States, had she, instead of looking on in an indifferent manner as though it were no concern of hers, used all her endeavour to induce her surplus population to move to her own territory, had spent her money for the purpose of opening up the treasures of her distant possessions? There can be little doubt but that the greater number of those who left her shores would have remained in the

empire, and the population of the colonies might to-day have numbered its tens of millions.*

It is useless, however, to cry over "what might have been" unless to deduce therefrom lessons for the future.

Emigration from England will go on in the future as in the past. If it is left unheeded as heretofore the greater number of emigrants will go to the United States, and, as formerly, they will be the flower of the labouring class. But if England exercises a wise control over emigration, if she exerts herself to induce her surplus population to emigrate to her own territory, if she gives her money to open up the vast resources of her possessions, the stream of emigration will rapidly be diverted to the fertilizing of her own land. She will then find herself possessed of lands capable of supplying tenfold all the food that is required for the support of her people at home. She will find rapidly growing a population that in the near future will outnumber what the most sanguine dreamer may even have foretold; she will find at her feet wealth more stupendous than any nation has ever known.

But for the fulfilment of this there must be established a federation of the empire by which the whole empire would be held together under one governmental control. Under no other system could England be recouped for the day made in developing the colonies. Under the present system, as pointed out before, every pound that England spends on her colonies, every man she sends thither only hastens the day when her colonies will be independent nations. It is natural, therefore, that she should refuse to spend any money on their development, or grudgingly allow her people to emigrate thither.

The question of emigration has been dwelt upon thus fully, because it is apparent that upon it hangs the question of the federation of the empire. The matter placed in brief stands as follows:—Every year a large number of people must leave the United Kingdom in order to find room to live in other parts of the world. Shall England control this emigration and direct it to her colonies, or shall she pay no heed to it? If she pays no heed to it, then annually the flower of her population will be drained away to enrich a foreign Power or to build up new nations in the colonial possessions of England. And at no very distant day, perhaps, England will find herself circumscribed to the narrow

* The population of the American colonies (now included in the United States), at the accession of George III. (1760), is given in Greene's "History of the English People," at about 1,500,000. It now numbers close on 45,000,000, an increase of thirty times in a little over 100 years, while in the same period the population of England and Wales has increased barely four times.

limits of the United Kingdom, weighted with the burden of a large pauper population, forced to pay immense sums annually to foreign countries for food, while possibly at the same time her manufactures are excluded from all countries by inimical tariff regulations, or by the development of manufactures in other places. On the other hand, if England controls this emigration, if she expends large sums of money in developing her colonial possessions, in transporting her surplus population to these outlying parts of the empire, how is she to be reimbursed for this outlay? how is she to benefit by the increased wealth of these outlying parts unless she is empowered to collect revenue from them? and, again, how can she collect revenue from these places unless she accords to them a proportionate voice in the Government of the empire—in other words, unless there is established a federation of the empire?

From a purely colonial point of view a federation of the empire would also be of great benefit. Though the colonies are not like the mother country dependent on other places for food, though they have within themselves undeveloped resources which will ultimately afford all the manufactured articles they may require—though by slow accretions and natural growth their population will reach immense proportions—yet their progress will be much slower than if assisted by the energy and wealth of the mother country. In the case of Canada alone the immense outlay of money required to open up the resources of the North-West by the construction of the Pacific Railway will be a burden almost too great for the present comparatively small population to bear, while if this work were largely assisted by the Imperial Government, as no doubt in the event of a federation of the empire it would be, the burden would be but lightly felt, while the increase in the general wealth of the nation by the settlement of this valuable country would more than balance the outlay.

No doubt, in the event of a federation of the empire being adopted there are many difficult and delicate matters which would require very skilful handling for their proper adjustment. Prominent among these we may mention—

1. Apportioning of the National Debt.
2. Adjustment of taxation.
3. Mode of raising the revenue.

It is to be presumed that all duties between various parts of the empire would be abolished, and as each part could supply what the other lacked there would be less necessity to import from foreign countries, and the revenue derived from custom dues would consequently be much diminished. These and kindred matters, though not insurmountable obstacles, yet offer great

difficulties, and open up questions large enough and interesting enough to require a separate article for their treatment.

In a previous article it was shown that the development of the colonies under the present colonial system can result only in the establishment of independent and separate nations. In this article it has been shown how necessary it is for the material well-being of England as a nation that these outlying parts of the empire should be retained. In each article it has also been shown how the retaining of these outlying parts can only be effected by the adoption of a federation of the empire; and the question which daily becomes more vital is whether this vast agglomeration of loosely-connected States shall be moulded by some master hand into one grand, stupendous empire, unparalleled in its extent, unequalled in its wealth, and unrivalled in its political institutions, or allowed slowly to melt away and break up into numerous third-rate Powers.



ART. III.—ARYAN SOCIETY.

1. *The Politics* of ARISTOTLE. Bekker's Text. Second Edition. Berlin. 1855.
2. *Ancient Law*. By Sir HENRY SUMNER MAINE, K.C.S.I., LL.D., F.R.S. London: John Murray. 1861.
3. *Village Communities in the East and West*. Six Lectures delivered at Oxford. By Sir H. S. MAINE. London: John Murray. Third Edition. 1876.
4. *Lectures on the Early History of Institutions*. By Sir H. S. MAINE. London: John Murray. 1875.
5. *The Effects of Observation of India on Modern European Thought*. The Rede Lecture, delivered before the University of Cambridge, May, 1875. By Sir H. S. MAINE. London: John Murray. 1875.
6. *Comparative Politics*. Six Lectures read before the Royal Institution; with *The Unity of History*, being the Rede Lecture delivered before the University of Cambridge, May, 1872. By E. A. FREEMAN, D.C.L. London: Macmillan & Co. 1873.

WE fear that by attempting, within the limits of a single article, to examine some of the leading features in the works of which the titles are recited above, we are necessarily laying ourselves open either to a charge of ostentation, or to an

imputation of levity. We have no wish to be ostentatious, and the subject which we propose to treat is certainly not one to be lightly approached; but it appears to be not impossible, and if possible most desirable, by comparing the views expressed by the greatest of ancient writers and thinkers on the nature, origin, and history of some of the most important institutions of civilised society, with the conclusions of modern inquiry in the same department, to call attention to a most interesting subject, and one which promises to repay investigation with the most valuable results. The science which, despite Mr. Freeman's protest, and in spite of the circumstance that Mr. Herbert Spencer has employed the same word from a somewhat different point of view, most persons will probably be satisfied to describe as "sociology," has in recent years made rapid progress. By its agency we have learnt to perceive the significance of facts otherwise devoid of import; customs and ceremonies, signs and symbols, apparently inexplicable or frivolous, have been traced to an origin often far from trivial; institutions which in one country have degenerated into empty "survivals" have, for the first time, been duly appreciated on the discovery that in another country, perhaps in a less developed state of civilisation, they exercise an organic social force; and the comparative method of inquiry here, as in every other province to which it has been applied, has reduced apparent confusion to order and proportion, and shed a new light on much which has hitherto been wrongly explained, or at best imperfectly understood. But, while these investigations are being diligently and successfully prosecuted by a limited number of students, delusions, often most pernicious in their tendencies and effects, which the most elementary knowledge of sociology would effectually dispel, appear to flourish with undiminished vigour. Such being our feeling, we can scarcely hope, within the narrow limits of space to which we are confined, to shed much new light on a subject at present far from exhausted; our object will be fully attained if, by means of this article, the knowledge of facts already firmly established is more widely diffused, and their important bearing on many of the great and complicated questions of modern civilisation more generally perceived.

Mr. Charles Austin is said,* some years ago, to have expressed an opinion that the course of study required by the University of Oxford from candidates for Classical Honours would be quite perfect if the study of the *Politics* of Aristotle were made compulsory. We are not altogether sure, from what we have ourselves heard of the course of reading for "Greats," that we can

* See *Fortnightly Review*, March, 1875.

endorse this almost unqualified approbation ; but the one condition which Mr. Austin considered wanting at Oxford has recently been fulfilled at Cambridge. A very minute acquaintance with both the language and the subject-matter of this great work has recently been expected from candidates for the Classical Tripos ; while, in the newly-established Historical Tripos, which promises in time to attract a large proportion of the ablest men, the *Politics* has judiciously been selected as a leading subject of examination. On the whole, there is fair reason to expect that the next few years may witness, at all events at Cambridge, a great revival of interest in one of the master-pieces of antiquity, in a work which may be characterised, without extravagance, as a possession for all time, fully worthy of comparison in permanent value and interest with the great history which was thus justly described by its own author. The comparative neglect which has been the undeserved fate of the *Politics* would, indeed, be quite inexplicable were it not partially accounted for by the fact, that while the language and connection is often, even for Aristotle, exceptionally difficult and obscure, no critical and exegetical commentary of real merit has ever been published in the English language. That this should be the case is not to the credit of our Universities, and particularly of that University which is popularly regarded as specially devoted to the study and exposition of Aristotle ; and we earnestly trust that a want long and increasingly felt may be shortly supplied.* There are many minds to which the study of political is more attractive than that of mental philosophy ; and Aristotle himself regarded politics as in some sort the master-science, round which all the other branches of inquiry were grouped. Ethics, he explains, at the very outset of his moral treatise, is to be regarded as a sort of politics;† while the function of the art or faculty of rhetoric is entirely ministerial and subordinate. No error could be more serious than to suppose that, because our views on political science are based on a more enlarged experience, the observations and conclusions of Aristotle have lost their practical utility ; and those who disparage the value of his *Politics*, because of their alleged "parochial" character, strangely under-

* In an advertisement of works in preparation, at the Clarendon Press we find, among others, "Aristotle's *Politics*," by W. L. Newman, M.A., Fellow and Lecturer of Balliol College, and Reader in Ancient History." This advertisement is contained in Mr. Campbell's edition of Plato's *Theaetetus*, a book published in 1861 ; and we are under the impression that it was not the first announcement. We do not know whether Mr. Newman and the delegates of the Clarendon Press are aware how anxiously this edition is expected by all students of Aristotle.

† πολιτική τις οὔσα. Eth. i. 1.

rate their real significance. A more respectful and discriminating study of the work would, we feel sure, convince them that great minuteness of detail in investigation, if not essential to, is at least not inconsistent with a profound and philosophical insight into principles. The real error of Aristotle—if we may venture to use such a word of such a master—is of another kind, and one into which, considering the political circumstances under which he wrote, he could scarcely fail to fall. If he considered, as he appears to have considered, that experience had completed its work, and that nothing remained to be done but to apply the inductive method of inquiry to the results of previous, contemporary, and personal observation, he was undoubtedly wrong; but we may add that if he had not made this erroneous supposition we should probably have lost the benefit of his most valuable and fruitful treatise. He seems to have considered that the Greek city—the *πόλις*—was the ultimate point of social development; the idea of the nation was produced at a later period and on a very different soil. We may at least rejoice that he has transmitted to us a philosophical and, from his own point of view, an adequate account of one of the principal stages in Aryan civilisation.

We are glad to feel assured that it is no longer necessary to direct the attention of the student of comparative sociology to the works of Sir Henry Maine. The impetus which in recent years has been given to scientific inquiry in this department is in great measure due to his influence and example. It would be difficult to over-estimate the value of his researches into some of the most interesting questions of history and jurisprudence, or of the suggestions which he has promulgated as to the nature and origin of some of our principal institutions—legal, social, and political. His writings are at once philosophical in their spirit and method, and popular in their lucidity and grace of form; and, while he is always ready to acknowledge obligations to the labours of German and other writers, whose works, but for his intervention, would probably have long remained inaccessible to the great majority of English students, there is at the same time very much that is strikingly original, the result of personal observation and independent inquiry, in all that he has published. Perhaps the greatest merit of Sir Henry Maine's works is that they are so eminently suggestive; while on many points his conclusions must be accepted as irrefragable, the general effect of his books is to stimulate further investigation in the same direction, and produce that co-operation which he on more than one occasion invites.*

* Sir Henry Maine appeals for fellow-workers both at Oxford and at Cambridge. See "Village Communities," p. 200, and Rede Lecture, p. 11.

We may say, in brief, that he was the first to attract general attention to the vast results obtainable from the application of the comparative method to this branch of inquiry, and to the powerful character of the instrument thus placed in the hands of the investigator. Much hitherto regarded as established has been shewn to rest on most unsubstantial proof, often on the random guesswork of technical lawyers who felt themselves bound to furnish an explanation for every anomaly in practice and custom, and who were driven to *à priori* conjecture of the wildest sort, because their own knowledge seldom extended beyond a familiar acquaintance with the black-letter law-books. On the other hand, it has been discovered that much which on a superficial glance would appear to be totally unconnected in the institutions of different countries, often widely removed from each other in degree of civilisation and geographical position, and bound together only by a common origin of race, really rests on facts and causes which are at bottom completely identical. It is not too much to say that the political writings of Aristotle received a fresh value when the general subject of political and social philosophy was developed and illustrated by the works of Sir Henry Maine; while, on the other hand, it seems scarcely possible for those unfamiliar with the views of the Greek philosopher adequately to appreciate the theories of the modern writer. Sir Henry, too, has wisely followed the example of Aristotle in declining to be satisfied with drawing philosophical deductions from the observations of others; his practical experience, as Legal Member of the Council of the Viceroy of India, increases the value of the theories as to the social and political economy of the inhabitants of that country of which he is the exponent; and few British residents in India have turned to such good account the opportunities which their position afforded to them of studying the feelings and opinions of the natives, and discovering the real import of much which to a hasty observer might appear arbitrary, barbarous, or irrational.

We should strongly recommend the student of the history of institutions to read the "Comparative Politics" of Mr. Freeman in connection with the works of Sir Henry Maine. In this book a course of six lectures read before the Royal Institution is republished, together with the Rede Lecture on "The Unity of History," delivered in 1872 before the University of Cambridge. We know of no better introduction to our subject than that which Mr. Freeman furnishes in his first lecture, the subject of which is "The Range of the Comparative Sciences." He there clearly explains the standpoint of our science, which, without pretending to be exact, at least claims to remove investigation from the airy region of gratuitous hypothesis. "These six

lectures," Mr. Freeman remarks in his preface, "are an attempt to claim for political institutions a right to a scientific treatment of exactly the same kind as that which has been so successfully applied to language, to mythology, and to the progress of culture. But of course they do not themselves attempt to do more than make a beginning, by applying the comparative method to some of the most prominent institutions of those amongst the Aryan nations whose history was best known to myself, and was likely to be best known to my hearers." Sir Henry Maine enforces the same doctrine:—"If such a science as I have endeavoured to shadow forth in this lecture is ever created, if the comparative method applied to laws, institutions, customs, ideas, and social forces should ever give results resembling those given by comparative philology and comparative mythology, it is impossible that the consequences should be insignificant."*

It is, however, to be especially observed that while Mr. Freeman's inquiries are for the most part confined to the Græco-Italic and Teutonic branches of the Aryan stock, Sir Henry Maine's investigations are of wider scope. He is the most eminent living authority on the history of Roman Law and its influence on modern civilisation. He shews himself well acquainted with the leading characteristics and the inherent defects of the judicial systems of Greece, and particularly of Athens. The English reader who wishes to study the Teutonic "Mark" necessarily turns to his work on "Village Communities." But, besides all this, he has devoted a special and searching examination to the institutions of the extreme East and the extreme West, to the ancient Brehon laws of Ireland, and the Brahminical codes of Hindustan. We must also add that, while Mr. Freeman's studies are mainly directed to political institutions, Sir Henry Maine's works deal more directly with the development of social custom and the history of jurisprudence.

* Mr. Freeman begins his first lecture with the assertion that "the establishment of the Comparative Method of study has been the greatest intellectual achievement of our time." We cannot help remarking that Mr. Freeman sometimes permits his conviction of this fact to carry him too far. His analogies are often striking only from the vast amount of miscellaneous erudition for the display of which they afford an opportunity; while the juxtaposition of different periods and remotely analogous events, which is meant to be impressive, occasionally tends to be grotesque. For example, it is important for Mr. Freeman to shew that the *comitatus* is a common Aryan institution; but the note to p. 262—"We seem to be at Ilos or at Maldon when we read how, in the fight by the Granikos, the companion *Démarratos* (Arrian i. 15, 9) gives his spear to Alexander when his own is broken"—here follows the Greek—is, to say the least, superfluous. The incident is sufficiently commonplace; and it would be easy, if it were necessary, to find a hundred parallels to it from the history of warfare in all times, without an incongruous combination of Troy and Essex which seems to be harsh and almost ludicrous.

Aristotle, within his own range of experience, touches on all these points, and often appears instinctively to apply that method of inquiry which is supposed to have been first discovered in the present century.

The comparative method has at present been applied—with varying degrees of perseverance and success—to three subjects; to language, to legends, and to institutions. From its application to legends by scholars like Professor Max Müller and Sir George Cox has arisen the science of comparative mythology. The significance of legends is nowadays fully appreciated, and “every intelligent schoolboy” is aware that all the ancient gods, demigods, and heroes were really solar myths, with the exception of a few who may possibly have been rivers. No doubt theories have been advanced on this subject which are at least unsubstantiated, and their supporters have in many cases pushed their views to unjustifiable lengths. There is, however, every reason to believe that their allegations contain a solid substratum of fact, and it is extremely probable that in the course of the next few years positions now doubtful will become assured, and that discoveries of the most valuable character will be made by inquirers in this department. Comparative philology—the application of the comparative method to the study of language—stands at the present day on a very different and far more secure footing. The antagonism which its pioneers, Franz Bopp and Jacob Grimm, had to encounter in the days when “Sanskritist” was a term of reproach and comparative philologists were styled with a sneer “circumnavigators of the world”* has been long since subdued. All classical scholars have long recognised the new light which the comparison of kindred languages, and especially of Sanskrit, has thrown on etymological research. If the theories of Pott and Benfey do not command universal assent they at least meet with intelligent and respectful criticism, while the works of scholars like Fick and Corssen, George Curtius and Auguste Schleicher in Germany, Mr. Whitney in America, Professor Max Müller, Mr. Peile and Mr. Sayce in England, are widely circulated, epitomised and translated. The publication of the “Petersburg Dictionary” may be said to constitute an epoch in the history of philology, and no well-informed man can now afford to be ignorant of the main results of the science. It is indeed somewhat amusing that the proper appellation of our lineal ancestors should be still

* Die vergleichenden Sprachforscher hat man nicht ohne Spott Weltumsegler genannt, ein Beiwort das sie sich gefallen lassen könnten, wenn es nicht ungeziemend wäre das im Vergleich zu der Masse menschlicher Sprachen überhaupt winzige Gebiet der Indogermanischen Sprachen, um das es sich hier handelt, eine Welt zu nennan: Curtius, Grundzüge der Griechischen Etymologie; Vorrede.

a matter of uncertainty. The affinity of the different members of the race is fully established, but it is not yet decided whether the people from whom we claim descent are to be styled "Indo-Germanic", the title which Curtius and Mommsen patriotically confer on them, or "Indo-European" with Schleicher and Peile, or "Aryan" with Max Müller, Maine, and Freeman. The objection to the latter designation, which signifies "the fitting," and so "the good" or "worthy" race, is that it is uncertain whether the self-complacency which led to its adoption was not confined to some of the Oriental branches of the family.* Without expressing any individual preference, we shall employ this latter title in the course of the present article, partly because by so doing we shall follow the example of the authors whose works we have to discuss, and partly because it has at any rate the merit of being the least cumbrous of the three. Not only is the descent of the various branches of the Aryan race from one original stock fully established, but the comparison of languages enables us approximately to determine the periods at which they separated. Of course, some persons are still to be found who shut their eyes to the light, just as there is at least one gentleman who has devoted his life to the task of convincing an unbelieving public that the sun goes round the earth. The irrational chatter which has recently filled the columns of some of the less intelligent among the "religious" newspapers, and the object of which is to prove that the people of England are ethnologically connected with the ten tribes of Israel, is an example of what we mean. The ignorance which it evinces is the more inexcusable, because it might have been dispelled by perusing the introduction of almost any elementary Latin grammar which has been published within the last ten years. This delusion perhaps receives its most complete embodiment in a book entitled "Lectures on our Israelitish origin," by a Mr. John Wilson. It is a melancholy fact that in 1876 Messrs. Nisbet and Co. published a *fifth* edition of this work.

The indirect light which the history of language throws upon the history of institutions is of course extremely valuable. Comparative philology has proved so much about the manners, customs, and mode of life of our forefathers, that the only difficulty is to select illustrations from among the results which it has obtained. Thus Mr. Freeman takes the one word "mill," and points out that its occurrence in various branches of the original language proves that the use of mills must have been discovered before the separation of those branches.† Dr. Mommsen, in one of the ad-

* See Peile's "Introduction to Greek and Latin Etymology," pp. 30, 31.

† Greek *μύλη*, Latin *mola*, Gothic *muli*, Church-Slavonic *melja*, Lithuanian *mulù*, Old Irish *melun*. The word, however, does not occur in Sanskrit. As

mirable introductory chapters of his *History of Rome*, obtains from a comparison of languages much valuable evidence as to the habits and culture of the Græco-Italian people in the period which preceded their separation. He observes, for example, that the original home of the Aryan stock, which has been placed by some among the Highlands of Asia, but which was perhaps more probably situated on the banks of the Euphrates, must necessarily have been inland, "as there is no name for the sea common to the Asiatic and the European branches."* The development of pastoral life in the earliest period is proved by the identity of the Sanskrit, Greek and Latin names for domestic animals. The original Aryans must have known, not only how to grind corn in mills, but how to build houses, huts, and wagons. The words which signify "clothing" are alike in all Aryan languages, but the art of weaving appears to have been independently developed at a later period. The great diversity which we meet with in the names of cultivable plants, and especially of cereals, would seem to disprove the existence of a common system of agriculture. "No less do we find extending back into these times the fundamental ideas on which the development of all Indo-Germanic States ultimately rests; the relative positions of husband and wife, the arrangement in clans, and the priesthood of the father of the household. . . . On the other hand, the positive organisation of the body politic, the decision of the questions between regal sovereignty and the sovereignty of the community, between hereditary privilege in royal and noble houses, and the unconditional legal equality of the citizens, belong altogether to a later age."† Passing from "Indo-Germanic" to "Græco-Italian culture, Dr. Mommsen proves from the common inheritance of language a most intimate connection between the agriculture of the Italians and the agriculture of the Greeks. The hypothesis that the former borrowed from the latter either their method of cultivation or their method of speech has been long since exploded. We are, therefore, bound to conclude "that the transition from pastoral life to agriculture, or, to speak more correctly, the combination of agriculture with the earlier pastoral economy, must have taken place after the Indians had departed from the common cradle of the nations, but before the

Curtius observes, "it is of importance for the history of culture that these words are common to all the European members of the family of languages, but to these alone." See *Grundzüge*, p. 339, whence the above list is taken.

* "It is worthy of notice also that the name for the sea is common to most of the European stocks—Latin, Kelts, Germans, and Slavonians; they must probably, therefore, before their separation, have reached the coast of the Black Sea or of the Caspian."—*History*, Vol. i. p. 33.

† *Ibid.* p. 18.

Hellenes and the Italians dissolved their ancient communion." Aristotle himself compares the Cretan *syssitia* with the common mid-day meal of the Italian husbandmen. The whole question, however, of the distinction between the common inheritance of the race and the subsequent independent development and discovery which each individual nation effected for itself is at present far from wrought out; and there is too much truth in Dr. Mommsen's remark that "the investigation of languages, with this view, has still scarcely begun, and history still derives in the main its representation of primitive times, not from the rich mine of language, but from what must be called for the most part the rubbish-heap of tradition."*

We have said sufficient to shew that the application of the comparative method to language is almost as useful to the student of institutions as it is to the philologist himself. An ingenious French scholar has indeed made a comprehensive and not unsuccessful attempt to deduce the primitive culture of the Aryan race from a study of language alone.† In fact, as Mr. Freeman observes, all three sciences—that is, comparative philology, mythology, and sociology—hang together; "all are branches of one inquiry; all are applications of one method, of that method the introduction of which marks the nineteenth century, like the fifteenth, as one of the great stages in the development of the mind of man." It is obvious, however, that the direct application of this method to the institutions of society, and the comparison of their growth and history, in different countries and under varying conditions, must necessarily produce far more coherent and satisfactory results. It is by this means alone that we can attain a true philosophy of history; it is scarcely too much to say that it is by this means alone that history can be made the subject of intelligent and fruitful study. Those, however, who view history in this broader aspect should carefully endeavour to avoid an error to which modern methods of inquiry appear to be liable, and for which it is probable that the comparative method is in part responsible. No mistake can be more fatal than to devote an exclusive attention to general tendencies and causes, and to regard what may be called the "accidents" of the history of individual nations as comparatively insignificant. Such accidental influences, often purely fortuitous in their original occurrence, have frequently become efficient causes themselves, and have in many cases affected and modified the whole course of national development.

Neither must the investigator of Aryan civilisation forget the

* *Ibid.* p. 21.

† Pictet, "*Les Origines Indo-Européennes, ou les Aryas Primitifs.*" Paris, 1859, 1863.

modest disclaimer of Curtius, which we have already quoted. Some modern writers, such as Mr. Lewis Morgan, the author of a work entitled "Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity in the Human Family," published by the Smithsonian Institute of Washington, and Mr. McLennan, with whose views on "Primitive Marriage" every student of sociology should be familiar, have more right than those who confine themselves to the study of our own branch of the human family to the title of "Circumnavigators of the World." The institutions of Turanian races, monosyllabic systems of language like the Chinese, and confixative systems like the Finnish and Basque, will no doubt amply repay, as they furnish rich material for, the fullest investigation. But to the majority of inquirers the field of Aryan and Semitic culture must prove sufficiently extensive; and until it can be distinctly shewn that, as the inflexive system of language almost certainly, in some pre-historic stage, grew out of monosyllabic and confixative methods of speech, so Aryan and Semitic culture is a development of the more barbarous systems of other races, the interest which attaches to the investigation of the latter must necessarily be for the most part speculative. The study, moreover, of pre-historic or primitive society at present affords more scope for the ventilation of ingenious and plausible, but most conflicting, theories than for the determination of fact. We at least are well content to confine our remarks to that Aryan branch of the human family, which alone can fairly claim to be called progressive, from which we are ourselves descended, and for which we may claim without presumption that its history is, for all practical purposes, identical with the history of the civilisation of the world.

Mr. Freeman, in his first lecture, points out that classification of Aryan institutions which must at once suggest itself to every student. The circumstance that the same or similar institutions are found among different peoples must be due to one of three causes. In some cases, one people has directly borrowed or imitated from the other, as, for instance, many of the leading features of the English constitution, and especially our bicameral Parliament—the origin of which may be said to have been almost entirely accidental—have been borrowed or imitated by most of the civilised nations of the West. Under this head, we include those numerous cases in which a conquering race has imposed the whole or a part of its institutions on those whom it has subjugated. In the second place, it has frequently happened that, from like causes, like effects have been produced, and social, legal and political institutions, which must, from their nature, have been entirely unknown to our Aryan forefathers, have been independently developed by various branches of the original family. With regard to institutions of this class, the

comparison of the constitutional history of Athens with the constitutional history of Rome is most instructive. The most valuable lessons are to be learnt from the differences which such a comparison reveals, and which, no doubt, arose from the varying circumstances which affected the two branches of the race, not excluding the influence of climate and geographical position. A third class of institutions are those which are found existing in different times and countries, under circumstances which make it impossible to suppose that the one nation has imitated or borrowed from the other, while the hypothesis of independent development is at least rendered improbable by the apparent absence of any outward necessity for their production. In such cases, we can only conclude that the institution is part of the common heritage of the race, that it, or its germ, existed in the primitive times which preceded the breaking up of the Aryan family, and that it was thence transmitted to the various branches in their diverse paths. Comparative investigation must, of course, be mainly directed to institutions of the second and third class, that is to those institutions which the genius of Aryan man, at widely different periods of history, has, as it were, spontaneously produced.

No examination of the elements of Aryan civilisation can be adequate or fruitful, unless the family is distinctly recognised as the basis of all social growth. In our branch of the human race, we meet with no evidence of primitive promiscuity or polyandrous custom; even of polygyny the evidence is but slight. Modern research has discovered nothing which can discredit the assumption with which Aristotle commences his political treatise. In the true spirit of a philosopher, he regards the lower and simpler social union as the indispensable preliminary to that which is higher and more complicated: in order of thought, indeed, the existence of the State must be prior to that of the family, because the former is the final cause of the latter; but in order of natural development, the larger and sovereign association must arise from the union of its component parts, and must, therefore, be resolved into its earliest beginnings. And so Aristotle first examines the nature of the most elementary association, that between male and female, husband and wife. The husband and wife, the father and child, the master and slave, together constitute the household, and the prominence which is assigned to the latter relation is no doubt far beyond what it really possessed in the primitive period to which the rest of the discussion would seem principally to apply.* It was, however, essen-

* He quotes with approval Hesiod's verse ("Works and Days," 403), "The simplest household requireth a wife, and an ox for the ploughing;" "for the ox," he says, "takes the place of a servant with the poor." *Politics*, i. 2.

tial to the writer's design that an examination of property, both animate and inanimate, should be introduced at an early stage, and the importance of the slave in modern Greek society sufficiently explains the prominent position which he occupies in the category. The step from the elementary family group to the larger associations of kinsfolk which we encounter on the threshold of Aryan society is no doubt one of considerable difficulty. The process through which it took place must have varied according to the special circumstances of each people. We must, however, start from the assumption that the condition of the primitive Aryan was one of entire isolation. Every stranger was an enemy, and the theory of a common humanity connecting together even aliens in birth was entirely unknown. The inviolable religious character of the Greek, the Roman, the Hindu and the Teutonic dwelling can only be regarded as a "survival" of the period when each man's house was, if not his castle, at least his stronghold. The only tie which men recognised was that of community of blood. Sir Henry Maine ingeniously suggests that the writer of the *Odyssey*, in describing the manners and customs of the Cyclops, is describing a lower stage of civilisation, which had possibly come under his personal observation. Among that uncouth race, "each man," says the poet, "beareth rule over children and spouse, and nought do they reckon of each other :"—

θεμιστεύει δὲ ἕκαστος

παίδων ἢ δ' ἀλόχων οὐδ' ἀλλήλων ἀλέγουσιν. (*Odys.* ix. 114, 115.)

But the Aryan family always tended to increase in size; for all its members, the sons and grandsons of the original ancestor, remained under his power as long as he lived, unless they were specially emancipated. On the death of the original progenitor his position was assumed by a member of the family who may, for the sake of convenience, be termed the "eldest male ascendant," and who was usually, although not invariably, the eldest son of the eldest line. The *Patria Potestas* is one of the fundamental points in the early organisation of society. At Rome it was as extensive in its scope as it was protracted in its historical duration; indeed, as Sir Henry Maine remarks, not the least important result of the bestowal of Roman citizenship on all Roman subjects by Caracalla (in 219 A.C.) was that it enormously enlarged its sphere. But this social force was far from being confined to Rome. Teutonic society was held together by the *Mund* of the father of the family; and Mr. Kemble, in his valuable work on the "*Saxons in England*," has shewn how strongly the history of our immediate ancestors was affected by the same institution. Even in the mature jurisprudence of Greece, many traces are to be found of the stringent family obligation of early times. In the far East and the far

West it is alike revealed to us. Of the patriarchal life of Semitic tribes, to which we have the testimony of scriptural history, it is not within our province to speak; but we shall have to shew that the Hindu village community, in at least one of its most important forms, depends on the government of a single head, who either is, or is assumed to be, the lineal representative of the original ancestor; while Sir Henry Maine has recently made it at least extremely probable that the clue to many of the most perplexing points in the early history of Keltic institutions lies in the association of the idea of kinship with the idea of paternal power. The whole subject of the *Patria Potestas* is far too vast to be adequately treated here; for an exhaustive examination we must refer to two of Sir Henry Maine's works, "Ancient Law" and "The Early History of Institutions." We have only to add one word of caution. It is by no means to be supposed that the rights of the eldest male ascendant, unqualified as they were, were exercised in an arbitrary manner; the limits within which it was justifiable to enforce them were well understood, and society could not have held together had they not been rigidly adhered to. His position, as has been well remarked, was representative rather than proprietary. The whole of archaic law was influenced by this circumstance, and the failure to recognise it is one cause of the utter inadequacy of various theories which the natural desire to explain social phenomena and social organisation has from time to time produced. They have necessarily failed, because they were for the most part founded on pure assumption, and were elaborated by writers who failed to attach due importance to the vast influence of the patriarchal system on primitive society. The "Social Compact" of Locke, and the "Original Contract" of Hobbes, are equally open to this objection. Montesquieu, in his "Esprit des Lois," assumes that the nature of man is essentially plastic, and that laws are produced by accidental causes, such as the influence of climate, or belief in a fictitious revelation; his speculations, though often based on misapprehension of facts, or on erroneous information, are always acute; but he would, no doubt, have considerably modified his views had he realised what Sir Henry Maine boldly calls the "international" character of ancient law. Sir Henry shews that ancient law is scanty, because it is supplemented by—or, as we should prefer to put it, it is only intended as a supplement to—the autocratic commands of the *Paterfamilias*. It is ceremonious, because "the transactions to which it pays regard resemble international concerns much more than the quick play of intercourse between individuals." Its principal object, in fact, is to regulate the intercourse of corporations, each represented by a single head; and, as corporations never die, it regards life as

perpetual and inextinguishable. "Ancient jurisprudence," says Sir Henry, "may be likened to international law, filling nothing, as it were, excepting the interstices between the great groups which are the atoms of society. In a community so situated, the legislation of assemblies and the jurisdiction of courts reaches only to the heads of families; and to every other individual, the rule of conduct is the law of his home, of which his parent is the legislator."* It was the duty of the parent not only to legislate for his household, but to protect it; in fact, the position of the *Paterfamilias* will not be properly understood unless we constantly remember that the duties which devolved upon him were at least as responsible and arduous as the rights and powers which he enjoyed were wide and unrestricted. Another consequence of this system of corporate existence was the doctrine that the family was accountable for the acts of its individual members. Hence arose those theories of Nemesis and retribution, and those sombre legends of an inherited curse, which form the principal material of the tragedy of Greece. On the other hand, it is impossible to over-estimate the influence of the doctrine of collective responsibility as a means of orderly government among uncivilised races. We may illustrate this view by a brief reference to the history of the "were-gild," or composition for homicide. In early times, if the individual culprit escaped, his kinsfolk were liable to suffer in his stead; and it was thus directly the interest of each family group to restrain the criminal proclivities of its members. But, although vengeance was in ancient life a great social force, and public opinion was sternly brought to bear on all who failed, through cowardice or indolence, in the sacred duty of revenge, yet its exercise inevitably led to retaliation, and produced those deadly feuds which in modern times have been among the principal causes of the extermination of savage tribes. When life became more settled it was found necessary to impose some restraint on their prosecution; and the system of "were-gild"—the acceptance of which was at first left to the discretion of the injured party, but was eventually enforced by the State—was accordingly introduced. We meet with it in the early Greek society which is depicted in the Homeric poems. We meet with it in the Germania of Tacitus; and the rules by which it is regulated occupy a prominent position in Teutonic jurisprudence. We meet with it among the ancient institutions of the Anglo-Saxons; in the laws of Æthelbert and the laws of Ælfred; we there encounter it in a more elaborate form, and the "were-gild" is regulated by the rank and dignity of the person slain; to murder an eorl is a

* A. L., p. 167.

far more serious matter, and one for which more substantial atonement is requisite, than to take a ceorl's life. In the Brehon laws of Ireland we meet with the same custom under the name of Eric-fine; and Sir Henry Maine shews that the institution of Eric-fine marks a great advance from the barbarism of early times.* We are informed that at the present day a similar custom subsists among the Beduin Arabs. However, in process of time a new and more wholesome doctrine arose. Crime was no longer regarded as an offence against the individual, for which he might retaliate or accept satisfaction as he pleased, but as an offence against the State; or, to employ strictly legal phraseology, torts were converted into crimes. At the same time, as society progressed, the responsibility of the family was replaced by that of the individual; and the sins of the fathers were no longer visited on the children. Those who are interested in the observation of "survivals," may, perhaps, find a trace of collective responsibility in legal penalties, like attainder of issue, and in those "social penalties" which are still inflicted on the families of persons guilty of heinous crime; while they may discover a vestige of the old right and duty of private vengeance in the formula by which the injured citizen is at the present day "bound over to prosecute," in the interest, however, not of himself, but of the State.

The consideration of the ancient system of corporate existence has led us to digress somewhat widely from our immediate subject. We must now, before finally quitting the family, endeavour briefly to examine two conflicting views as to its origin. One theory, which is maintained by M. de Coulanges, the author of *La Cité Antique*, and by Sir G. Cox, the most recent historian of Greece, may be styled the "religious" doctrine. These writers regard almost every feature of ancient society, and especially the organisation of kindred, as the result of the influence of religious feeling. To this view is opposed the "natural" doctrine, the theory of Aristotle, that the family system is not νόμος, but φύσις, which is supported by the great authority of Sir Henry Maine, and also, as far as we are able to judge, by Mr. Freeman. For a lucid exposition of the religious theory, we must refer the reader to the second chapter of Sir G. Cox's history. Each family group, we are told, possessed its own deity, and the deity in each case was the original ancestor, who had on his death become a chthonian god, whom the surviving members of the family were bound to worship and propitiate. His burial rites, above all, must be duly performed; and this could only be done by his eldest son, who was his legitimate representative.

* "Early History of Institutions," pp. 170, 171.

Thus the father and master of each household became its priest, and carried on the sacrifices and observances into which he had been initiated:—

“Hence the continuity of the family became an indispensable condition for the welfare and repose of the dead. These could neither rest nor be rightly honoured if the regular succession from father to son was broken. Hence, first for the father of the family, and then for all its male members, marriage became a duty, and celibacy brought with it in later times, not merely a stigma, but political degradation. . . . If the natural succession failed, the remedy lay in adoption; but this adoption was effected by a religious ceremony of the most solemn kind, and the subject of it renounced his own family and the worship of its gods, to pass to another hearth and to the worship of other deities.”*

Sir G. Cox then proceeds to trace those checks on alienation of land, which we meet with in Hindu, Hellenic, Roman, Teutonic and Keltic law, to the necessity of preserving the original tomb and burial-ground of the race. He accounts for what he calls “the prohibition of wills,” but what may more accurately be described as the absence of the conception of testamentary power, by the fact that the eldest son necessarily obtained a “universal succession to the rights and duties of his deified ancestor.” He attempts to prove that civil and religious penalties were substantially identical, and that the real terror of banishment lay in that exclusion from the family worship which it incidentally involved. To the influence of religious isolation he attributes “the centrifugal tendencies of Hellenic society,” and he represents the religious principle as presenting almost insuperable obstacles to the growth of civil society. It was religion, according to Sir G. Cox, which intensified the horrors of ancient war, hindered the development of the State, and checked the action of the individual. Its malignant influence meets us at every turn, inimical to progress and to civilisation. The burden of the whole chapter is the bitter cry of Lucretius, “*Tantum religio potuit suadere malorum!*”

This theory is, no doubt, extremely ingenious. It accounts for much otherwise inexplicable. It furnishes the easiest method of explaining the prevalence and importance of the custom of adoption in primitive society, a custom which exercised immeasurable influence on ancient history, and which enabled the succession to the imperial crown of Rome to be regulated in a manner which, to those whose views of hereditary monarchy are taken from modern examples, is extremely difficult to understand. Moreover, it is, no doubt, the only way in which we can

* Cox's “History of Greece,” vol. i. p. 16.

account for the tenacity with which Roman law connected succession to landed property with the tradition of the "*sacra*" or family rites, the observance of which became so burdensome in later times, that the juris-consults of the time of Cicero devoted a large portion of their concurring ingenuity to the discovery of methods for its evasion. Among the Hindus the whole law of inheritance centres on a similar institution :

"The right to inherit a dead man's property," says Sir Henry Maine, "is exactly co-extensive with the duty of performing his obsequies. If the rites are not properly performed or not performed by the proper person, no relation is considered as established between the deceased and anybody surviving him. . . . Every great event in the life of a Hindu seems to be regarded as leading up to and bearing upon these solemnities. If he marries, it is to have children who may celebrate them after his death ; if he has no children, he lies under the strongest obligation to adopt them from another family, 'with a view,' writes the Hindu doctor, 'to the funeral cake, the water, and the solemn sacrifice.'"

Plausible, however, as is the religious doctrine of Coulanges and Cox, we may be permitted to doubt whether it has not been carried too far. When we are told that the reason for the organisation of the primitive Aryans into groups of kindred was a religious sanction, we are naturally led to inquire, supposing the religious sanction to have been absent, what form of association is it *à priori* probable that they would have adopted? If we remember the extreme paucity of ancient ideas, the mental sterility and barrenness of imagination which we invariably encounter in primitive systems of language and modes of thought, and if we bear in mind that the principle of *local contiguity* could not possibly be recognised by nomad tribes as a basis for political and social association—a principle which even Aristotle is disinclined to allow,† but which was destined, after passing through many phases and producing many revolutions, to ultimately supersede the ancient system of blood-relationship as the bond of civilised society—recollecting these two points, we shall, on the whole, be prepared to agree with Aristotle, that the family system was the result of natural feeling, and the only method of combination which could suggest itself to the minds of our forefathers. The family, he says, is in the order of nature the primary association ; next comes that association of several households for purposes of mutual advantage, which is not of a merely ephemeral character. This association is the *κώμη*, or Village Community ; and the *natural* form of the Village Com-

* A. L., pp. 191, 192.

† Compare Pol. iii. 3 with the "ideal state" of Book iv.

munity, he adds, is when it is an offshoot or development of the household. When the Community is so constituted its members are called "clansmen" or "foster-brothers." He proceeds, with great sagacity, to account for the prevalence of monarchical government, both in early times and in his own time, among uncivilised races, through the circumstance that the State grew out of the Village Community, which latter was regulated on the patriarchal system.* Sir Henry Maine, in the course of an inquiry into kindred subjects, has come to a similar result. He finds the conception of the family life, as the basis of all social organisation, to be one of great tenacity and permanence. Forms of association which were essentially legal, commercial, or spiritual, are shown to have been assimilated, as much as possible, to forms of association based on consanguinity. This position is illustrated by an examination of the early history of contracts of partnership and contracts of agency, of guilds and companies for trading purposes, of monastic ties and the spiritual relation of baptismal sponsorship, lastly, of the institution of "literary fosterage," or the connection between teacher and pupil, of which we find numerous traces in Irish, as in Hindu custom, in the tracts of the Brehons and the tracts of the Bráhmans. Sir Henry thus sums up his opinion :—

"We have thus strong reason for thinking that societies still under the influence of primitive thought labour under a *certain incapacity* for regarding men *grouped together by virtue of any institutions whatsoever* as connected otherwise than through blood relationship. We find that through this barrenness of conception they are apt to extend the notion of consanguinity, and the language beginning in it, to institutions of their own not really founded on community of blood, and even to institutions of foreign origin. We find also that the association between institutions arising from true kinship and institutions based on artificial kinship is something so strong that the emotions which they respectively call forth are practically indistinguishable."†

We are now perhaps in a better position to appreciate the real significance of the organisation of ancient society into isolated groups of kinsfolk. Every alien, as we have said, was regarded

* See Pol. i. 2,—*δὲ καὶ τὸ πρῶτον ἐβασιλεύοντο αἱ πόλεις καὶ νῦν ἔτι τὰ ἔθνη ἐκ βασιλευσμένων γὰρ συνήλθον* πᾶσα γὰρ οἰκία βασιλεύεται ὑπὸ τοῦ πρεσβυτάτου, ὥστε καὶ αἱ ἀποικίαι διὰ τὴν συγγένειαν. We should paraphrase the last sentence thus: "Every household is under the rule of the eldest male ascendant, whence it is that the offshoot of the household, the village community (*ἀποικία* being explained by the previous expression *κώμη ἀποικία οἰκίας*) is similarly governed, owing to its basis being that of blood relationship." Aristotle then proceeds to quote the Homeric description of "paternal government" among the Cyclopes which we have already cited.

† E. H. of I., p. 247. Sir Henry is not responsible for the italics.

as a foe; and to rely upon the partially recognised obligation of hospitality to strangers was precarious indeed. For the primitive Aryan there was indeed neither peace nor safety except among his own kindred and in his father's house. If we fully recognise this fact we shall perhaps see our way to another explanation of the prevalence of the custom of adoption, which, without pretending to displace Sir G. Cox's theory—which certainly supplies the only clue to some of the phenomena which ancient society presents—will at least contract its scope. There surely must have been many reasons for men entering into association with one another besides the desire of making provision for the due performance of their obsequies. And when we observe that the only possible association was that of real or assumed consanguinity, we seem to find a sufficient reason for the frequency with which the latter was produced by the ceremony of adoption. Its efficacy, indeed, must always remain a problem, which can only be explained by an examination—which we cannot now undertake—of the vast and interesting subject of legal fictions, and of their influence on the growth of society in its earlier stages.

With the exception of adoption, the only relation which could possibly subsist between persons unconnected by blood was that of superiority and subjection. An equal might be adopted, but an inferior could only be subjugated. When a family was feeble it recruited its strength by adoption; when it became powerful it enslaved its weaker neighbours. In the same way, it is probable that many ancient cities began, like that of Romulus, with an Asylum, and ended, like Rome, with an exclusive franchise of hereditary burgesses. When this latter period arrived, those struggles between aristocracy and democracy commenced which form so large a part of the Constitutional history of Rome and Athens. They for the most part ended in the triumph of the demos, and the supersession of the principle of consanguinity, as a title to political power, by the principle of local contiguity. We are, however, anticipating. For the present it is sufficient to remark that it is not difficult to trace the steps by which the family, not separating into fractions like its modern counterpart, but held together by the authority of the eldest male ascendant, strengthening itself when necessary by adoption, and availing itself of every opportunity which fortune presented for the reduction of less powerful groups into the position of subjects and dependents, rapidly developed into the clan or tribe. It remained a nomad tribe so long as its mode of life was pastoral. So long as the pasturing of stock, the fishery and the chase, were the main sources of subsistence, little advance in civilisation, or improvement in the material condition of the tribesmen, could

be expected. But in process of time agriculture was introduced ; and its introduction is no doubt one of the benefits which the institution of slavery has, in its day, conferred upon mankind.* Thus it was that the wandering clan developed into the more or less settled Village Community, an institution which we meet with in the early history of every Aryan society, which has left its mark on English law and the names of English places, and which is still to be observed in India, Russia, and Croatia.

When the Village Community establishes itself on a definite situation a new importance at once attaches to the ownership and cultivation of the land. The principal difference between the ancient and modern village appears to be twofold. In the first place, the ancient village was composed of real or artificial kinsfolk, whilst the only tie which binds together the members of its modern counterpart is that of common locality, and the common obligations which common locality involves. Secondly, land in modern times is for the most part held in severalty—that is, by individual proprietors ; but in ancient times, and in those communities which still retain some of the features of primitive society, the prevalent system is that of ownership in common. It has already been shewn that a failure to recognise the corporate nature of archaic existence is responsible for many erroneous theories which have from time to time been promulgated as to the origin of the law of persons ; it is equally easy to shew that the greatest misconceptions have prevailed as to the origin of the law of property, simply because the fact that its primary condition was one of joint proprietorship has not been generally perceived. The principles of occupancy enunciated by the Roman juris-consults have supplied an explanation of the origin of property which is at once the popular theory and the theory which most speculative jurists, from Blackstone downwards, have been contented to accept. Gratuitous as are the assumptions which these doctrines involve, they are perhaps sufficiently disproved by the observation that the ownership which they pre-suppose is not joint but separate. “It is each individual who for himself subscribes the social compact. It is some shifting sandbank in which the grains are individual men, that according to the theory of Hobbes is hardened into the social rock by the wholesome discipline of force.”† The Great Leviathan is not an artificial family, but an artificial man.‡

* No one can properly appreciate Aristotle's discussion of slavery—*Politics*, Book i.—who has confined his observation to the modern abuse of the institution, or even to its working among the Romans.

† “Ancient Law,” p. 257.

‡ “That Great Leviathan, called the Commonwealth or State, which is but an artificial man, though of greater stature and strength than the natural, for whose protection and defence it was intended.”—Hobbes' “Leviathan.”

The best evidence as to the system of land tenure which once universally prevailed in Aryan society is to be found in the system of co-ownership which still prevails in India. From this point of view the study of Indian social life—especially when we consider that many of its most characteristic features are passing away before our eyes—becomes of pre-eminent importance; and those who had the privilege of hearing the Rede Lecture for 1875 will not readily forget the striking language in which its claim on our attention was pointed out.

“India has given to the world comparative philology and comparative mythology; it may yet give us a new science not less valuable than the sciences of language and of folk-lore. I hesitate to call it comparative jurisprudence because, if it ever exists, its area will be so much wider than the field of law. For India not only contains an Aryan language older than any other descendant of the common mother tongue, and a variety of names of natural objects less perfectly crystallised than elsewhere into fabulous personages, but it includes a whole world of Aryan institutions, Aryan customs, Aryan laws, Aryan ideas, Aryan beliefs, in a far earlier stage of growth and development than any which survive beyond its borders. There are undoubtedly in it the materials for a new science, possibly including many branches. To create it, indeed, to give it more than a beginning, will require many volumes to be written and many workers to lend their aid.”*

For an exhaustive examination of the Indian village community we must refer to the lectures of Sir Henry Maine and to the last chapter of Dr. Hunter's admirable work on Orissa.† We can now make only the briefest mention of some of the principal features in its organisation. In the first place, it must not be regarded as a subject of merely speculative interest: it is a living institution; and its practical working is under the careful observation of those British functionaries who endeavour to carry out the principle of “governing India according to Indian ideas.” For fiscal as well as for legal purposes it is the proprietary unit of the most important provinces; and it is the source of a vast and complicated land law.‡ We may assert with some confidence

* R. L., p. 11.

† “Orissa,” by W. W. Hunter, LL.D. London: Smith, Elder and Co. 1872. See vol. ii. c. ix. pp. 200—278. “Village System and Growth of Private Rights in the Soil.”

‡ While writing this article we have received a work on “The Law Relating to the Land Tenures of Lower Bengal,” by Arthur Phillips, M.A., Officiating Standing Counsel to the Government of India. Calcutta: Thacker, Spink and Co., 1876. We should say that this volume—which consists of the course of “Tagore Law Lectures” for 1874-5—ought to become in India a standard work, and occupy a position similar to that which “Williams' Law of Real Property” holds among our own law students. Mr. Phillips performs

that the comparison of this land law with early Teutonic systems will probably have much influence in modifying some theories as to the origin of our own law of real property which have long held unquestioned sway in the minds both of statesmen and of lawyers. Members of the latter profession will, perhaps, in the future be more cautious in the use which they make of some of their fundamental assumptions—of the assumption, for instance, that all land is held primarily of the Crown, and that the oldest form of ownership which calls for their recognition is the manorial couple of landlord and tenant. Recent investigation has made it extremely probable that, so far from the rights of villagers to commonable lands being the result of unchecked encroachments on the manor of the lord, the enclosure of commons and occupation of waste by the feudal lord are often themselves most unjustifiable encroachments on the ancient rights of Village Communities.

The lands of the Indian Village Community, as in its Teutonic and Scandinavian counterparts, are most frequently divided into three portions. In the arable land each householder has a separate lot, which he is, however, obliged to cultivate according to minute customary rules. The second part, where the nature of the soil admits of it, consists of pasture meadows, which are more or less the subject of private occupancy, but which no family is allowed to permanently appropriate. Thirdly, there is the waste or common land which is held by the whole community *pro indiviso*. Passing from the land which the community cultivates, and the tillage of which is its chief bond of union, to the persons of whom it consists, it may be defined as an aggregation of families, each ruled by a despotic paterfamilias. The affairs of the village are managed, and disputes as to custom determined, either by a council of Elders, or, perhaps more frequently, by a Headman, whose office is either hereditary, or acquired by purchase, or, as in the Russian Mir, by election, "the choice being generally, however, in the last case confined in practice to the members of a particular family, with strong preference for the eldest male of the kindred if he be not specially disqualified."* "The hereditary village heads," says Dr. Hunter,

the same service for Bengal in discussing its "Village System and Growth of Rights in the Soil"—though more fully and from a more strictly legal point of view—as Dr. Hunter has performed for Orissa. The first lecture, moreover, contains an admirable account of the salient features of the Village Community in all parts of India. We may also refer to an interesting paper on "Tenure of Land in India," by Sir George Campbell, which forms one of a series of essays (pp. 149—233) on "Systems of Land Tenure in Various Countries," published under the sanction of the Cobden Club. London: Macmillan and Co., 1870.

* Maine, "V. C.," p. 122; see also pp. 155, 156.

“formed the most numerous class, and, according to popular opinion and tradition, represented the normal state of things. So far as can be calculated from the papers, between one-third and a half of the whole villages in Orissa had a hereditary Headman. A deeply-rooted, although not very well-defined, impression ascribed to them lineal descent from the original founder of the village; an impression which their local titles seemed to perpetuate. The lands pertaining to their office bore the name of the fields of their father's house.”* The Headman, like the Elder of the Russian Mir, represents the Community in its transactions with the Government, with the revenue courts and officers, and with other village groups. The great sources of the law by which its affairs are regulated are stated to be custom, tradition, or authority—anything, in short, but mutual agreement and contract. Even the wares which its members produce are sold at a price determined by usage, and to bargain with a Hindu tradesman is to insult him. Amongst the members of the family, partition of goods is in certain cases theoretically allowable, but in practice the property constantly remains undivided through several generations; while, as between the different families, no such thing as private proprietary right in the cultivable land is ever admitted. And the great security against its growth is the maintenance of a uniform system of cultivation. Traditions remain of customs which are still to be observed in Russia and Croatia, of the periodical repartition of lots within the cultivable area, and of the “shifting of the Arable Mark.” As soon as the family lot becomes separate and irremovable—a process which has been rather hastened than commenced by British rule—the Village Community is on its way to dissolution.

The Community includes within itself multifarious trades and occupations—mostly hereditary—and is thus enabled to maintain its collective life independently of all external aid; there is an organised village police and a village accountant and surveyor; there is an hereditary blacksmith and an hereditary shoemaker. It is, perhaps, scarcely surprising that in a tropical climate we find no mention of hereditary tailors. We meet with the same features in the early Teutonic groups, which appear to have been similarly self-sufficing; and this may, perhaps, account for surnames amongst ourselves, and the names of certain fields and districts being so frequently borrowed from the names of trades. Thus, the Indian village, though sometimes acknowledging its connection with a larger body or clan, is always so organised as to be self-complete.† It is not always, or indeed

* “Orissa,” vol. ii. pp. 249, 250.

† It is scarcely necessary to remark that to attain this self-completeness (*αὐτάρκεια*) is, according to Aristotle, the great object of the State. And

frequently, the case that its members are all of the same social position; on the contrary, it usually contains an aristocracy, who alone claim descent from the original founder. The amount of blood relationship which really subsists between its members is usually a matter of great uncertainty. That the Communities have been very generally adulterated by the absorption of strangers is well ascertained; but the extent to which the newcomers have been assimilated in position to the original group differs greatly in particular cases.

The mutual rights of the various classes which compose the Indian Village Community are highly complex; and they form one of the most difficult problems which British functionaries, amid conflicting traditions and contradictory claims, are called upon to solve. The growth, however, of private rights necessarily involves the modification and ultimate dissolution of the ancient Aryan system of rural communism. Individual proprietors are gradually supplanting co-owners; repartition of lands is obsolete; in a word, modern law is, step by step, usurping the place of primitive custom. The change is one which neither public policy nor political economy can view with regret; but a most interesting field of inquiry is being withdrawn from the observation of the historical student; and we can only rejoice that intelligent Anglo-Indians, like Sir George Campbell and Dr. Hunter, have given us the result of the "concrete study of individual localities," and thus furnished rich material for that synthesis of Aryan village systems from which so much may be expected.

The simplest form of rural organisation which has come under Dr. Hunter's personal observation is the Kandh Hamlet of Orissa. His description of it is substantially identical with the results at which Sir Henry Maine, from a more general comparison, has arrived. He describes individual rights as unknown; the household is the primary unit, and the housefather is the lawgiver and representative of the household. When we read his description of Kandh society, partly taken from the report of the first British official who studied the customs of the tribe, we might fancy that we were reading an account of the family life of Ancient Rome:—

"The outward order of Kandh society—all its conditions, its texture, and its colouring—necessarily derive their distinctive character from the ideas which produce or which spring from this remarkable system of family life. It is a Kandh maxim that a man's father is his

so Plato, who (Republic, book ii. p. 369) makes "the smallest possible city" (*ἡ γὰρ ἀναγκαῖοτατὴ πόλις*) consist of four or five men—the husbandman, the builder, the weaver, and the shoemaker.

god, disobedience to whom is the greatest crime; and all the members of a family live in strict subordination to its head until his death. Before that event a son cannot possess property of any kind. The fruit of his labour and all his acquisitions go to increase the common stock. . . . On the death of the father, each son becomes a separate Family Head, inheriting an equal share of the land and common stock which the joint industry of himself and his brethren had accumulated during his father's lifetime."*

The only essential difference between the hamlet of the Kandhs and the organised Hindu village lies in the circumstance that the former race have not advanced from a nomadic to a settled system of agriculture. And so—

"in the primitive organisation of the Kandh hamlet the Family is all in all, and the individual nowhere appears. In the Hindu Village the Family in its undivided state still forms the ultimate unit; but a unit self-acting only in domestic concerns, and subject in its outward relations to the higher organism of the Village Guild. In the Kandh system we see only Families; in the Hindu system we see Families and Village Guilds."†

How far the prevalence of the Family system among the Kandhs and other non-Aryan tribes makes it probable that consanguinity, as a basis of the social union, so far from being an exclusively Aryan institution, is common to all mankind, is a point on which we do not at present possess nearly sufficient evidence to speak with confidence.‡ It is, however, worthy of remark that, as in the Kandh hamlet no rights and no authority external to those of the family were recognised, so it never grew into "that firmly-defined territorial entity which is the great characteristic of the Hindu village." It was a mere group of homesteads to which Aristotle would probably have refused to allow the name of *κώμη*, on the ground that the association of its component parts is not other than ephemeral.§

The vestiges of the Village Community in ancient Hellenic

* "Orissa," vol. ii. p. 204.

† Ibid. p. 254.

‡ "For the features of primitive life we must look, not to tribes of the Kirghiz type, but to those of Central Africa, the wilds of America, the hills of India, and the islands of the Pacific: with some of whom we find marriage laws unknown, the family system undeveloped, and even the only acknowledged blood-relationship that through mothers. These facts of to-day are, in a sense, the most ancient history. In the sciences of law and society, old means not old in chronology, but old in structure; that is most archaic which lies nearest to the beginning of human progress considered as a development, and that is most modern which is farthest removed from that beginning."—"Primitive Marriage." By J. F. McLennan, M.A. Edinburgh: A. and C. Black. 1865.

§ ἡ δ' ἐκ πλείωνων οἰκῶν κοινωρία πρώτη χρησιμὰς ἔσκεν μὴ ἐφ' ἡμέρου κώμη.—Pol. i. 2.

society are far from slight ; but we principally encounter them in methods of nomenclature and of social classification which in the period of Greek history with which we are best acquainted had become practically insignificant. The tradition of the Synoekia which Theseus effected no doubt recalls the memory of a period when there was no City of Athens, but many Village Communities in Attica. Thucydides, in relating the story, describes these small groups as having possessed independent systems of local government, as having held no regular communication with each other, and as having been occasionally engaged in mutual hostilities.* He acutely observed that the City of Athens had gradually grown up around the Acropolis, which must at first, as in other primitive communities, have been regarded merely as a temporary stronghold for the race in the event of foreign invasion. What Mr. Grote calls the "cantonal" mode of life no doubt long prevailed in Attica, a fact which is especially attested by the great suffering which the rural population experienced when, on the occasion of the Persian invasion, and, fifty years afterwards, on account of the Peloponnesian war, they were compelled temporarily to abandon those village homes to which on the first opportunity they returned. "It was the standing habit," says Mr. Grote, "of the population of Attica, even down to the Peloponnesian war, to reside in their several cantons, where their ancient festivals and temples yet continued as relics of a state of previous autonomy. Their visits to the City were made only at special times, for purposes religious or political, and they still looked upon the country residence as their real home." But Greek life, as we know it best, was essentially a City life, a form of society which seemed, to statesmen and philosophers alike, the highest to which human nature could attain. "The association," writes Aristotle, "of several Village Communities forms the perfect state, and we may define it as possessing self-completeness in the highest degree ; it arises from the desire to live, and it is maintained by the desire to live worthily and well."† We need scarcely remind the reader of Kant's parallel description of the social concert as "pathologically extorted from the necessities of the situation, and subsequently exalted into a moral union founded upon the reasonable choice." In the City life, the clearest evidence which we find of the stage in social progress out of which it grew lies in the perpetual disputes—not, as in India, about proprietary rights and the ownership of the soil—but as to the proper basis of political power. In Sparta, it appears probable that the ancient division of the three Dorian Æ Hylleis, the Pamphyli, and the Dymanes—was

* Thuc., ii. 15.

† Pol., i. 2.

eventually superseded by a topical classification; in regard to Attica, we can speak with more precision. The population, as in most Ionic races, was originally divided into four tribes. The Phylai, or tribes, consisted of Phratriai, or "brotherhoods," and each of the brotherhoods was an aggregate of Gené, or "clans." The nucleus of the race was no doubt the clan, or group of families. The Phratriai, like the Roman *Curia*, was simply a collection of clans bound together, for purposes principally religious. The Phylé was an association of Phratriai, just as the *Tribus* was an association of *Curie*. The Greek clan was held together by common religious ceremonies and a common burial-ground, by mutual rights of succession, by reciprocal obligations to assist and redress the injuries of clansmen, by the right and obligation, in particular cases, to intermarry, and by the possession of certain property on the principle of co-ownership. Until the reforms of Cleisthenes (B.C. 509) every Athenian burgess was necessarily a member of one of the original clans. Cleisthenes took a step which, considering the date of his legislation, must be regarded as extremely bold. For many important purposes, he introduced the principle of local association in place of the principle of consanguinity. He may be said to have substituted an aggregation of fellow-demots for an aggregation of fellow-gentiles. It must not, however, be supposed that the opposing claims of aristocracy—or rather nobility—and democracy were then finally settled. Long after the constitution of Cleisthenes, the citizenship of Athens remained an extremely exclusive institution, and was always a matter of hereditary descent, except in the rare cases when "the freedom of the City" was conferred by public grace. Aristotle's high estimate of the *vox populi* would be, if not incomprehensible, at least strikingly inconsistent with his general tone, if we did not remember that it is the *vox populi*, and not the *vox plebis*, the voice of the burgesses, but not the voice of the multitude, the voice, indeed, of a limited class with more outside its pale than within it, that he is discussing. The idea of residence conferring a claim to citizenship is incidentally dismissed as on the face of it absurd; "it is not, as I suppose will be admitted, by residence that the citizen is such; for of residence both denizens and slaves partake."* That Cleisthenes enfranchised many persons who could advance no other claim he readily admits; but this was in consequence of a revolution (*μεταβολή πολιτίας*),

* ὁ δὲ πολίτης οὐ τῶ οἰκεῖν που πολίτης ἐστίν· καὶ γὰρ μέτροκαὶ καὶ δοῦλοι κοινωνοῦσι τῆς οἰκῆσεως.—Pol. iii. 1. Whether *που* has here a local force or that hypothetical sense which we have assigned to it in the text is practically immaterial.

and, while recognising the *status quo*, he seems to deny that such enfranchisement was in the abstract just.* One of the most curious chapters in his treatise is that in which he discusses "the identity of the City." He then goes so far as to admit that *γνησιότης*, which is, in effect, the preservation of the original race of inhabitants, is an insufficient test; but if continuity of race is unsatisfactory, continuity of site is equally inadequate. His only resource is to fall back upon what is, according to modern views, a scarcely tenable solution, a solution which certainly would not commend itself to our neighbours across the Channel, and to affirm that identity of the City or State depends upon identity of the Constitution.†

Crossing the Hadriatic, we now come to those "Village Communities by the Tiber" out of which Rome arose. An excellent account of them has been given by Dr. Mommsen. There is not the slightest doubt that the Latin territory was once divided into a number of clan villages similar in their general features to the clan settlements of Attica and India. While each household had its allotted portion of the land belonging to the clan, certain parts of it were held in common on the system of joint possession. "Whether it was in Latium itself that the clan households developed into clan villages"—that is, that the stage in social progress was reached which distinguishes the Hindu Village Community from the Kandh Hamlet of Orissa—"or whether the Latins were already associated into clans when they immigrated into Latium, are questions which we are just as little able to answer as we are to determine how far, in addition to the original ground of common ancestry, the clan may have been based on the incorporation or co-ordination from without of individuals not related to it by blood."‡ The clan settlements possessed their *capitolium* or *arx*—connected with *arcere*, ἀλέξω, &c., to ward off, defend—which served as a place of common assembly, and, like the Acropolis of Athens, was used as a refuge in time of war for the clansmen and their cattle. It resembled the Athenian Acropolis, too, in another respect. A city or *urbs* gradually arose beneath its shelter, and perhaps derived its name from the *orbis* or ring-wall with which the citadel, for purposes of defence, was girt. Such were the beginnings of Rome, as of all other Latin cities. Her rapid growth and the commanding attitude which she was able to assume—first towards the Latin League, afterwards towards Italy, finally towards the world—appear to have been due in great measure to accidents of site, to the exceptional facilities for defence which her hills supplied,

* Pol. iii. 2.

† Ibid. iii. 3.

‡ "Mommsen's History," vol. i. pp. 39, 40.

and to the opportunities for traffic which the Tiber presented, and which soon made Rome the emporium of Latium. But while, through various causes, the Romans became a comparatively urban and commercial people, they never forgot the family organisation of their ancestors. We have already said something as to the absolute power of the Roman *Paterfamilias* over all his household, and the important position which the *Patria Potestas* occupies in Roman Law. The State was based on the model of the household; it is no mere figure of speech to say that the King was regarded as the father of his people; the community was nothing but the union of the clans; out of the union of their fields arose the public domain; and the union of their members produced the burgesses of Rome.

To the student of Aryan Society no race is more interesting than the Teutonic. To the Englishman, at least, the investigation of the institutions of his own immediate forefathers should be pre-eminently attractive, especially when we consider—as Mr. Freeman has conclusively shewn—that the primitive customs, both political and social, of the Teutonic race are more faithfully reflected and preserved in England than in any other country.* Of the three great solvents of ancient institutions—Roman Law, Christian Ethics, and Feudalization—we in England have been comparatively unaffected by the first and perhaps the greatest. The Teutonic clan settlement has left traces, not only, as we shall immediately shew, on English agriculture, but on our local nomenclature as well. It has been remarked by more than one writer that the names of many parishes (like Tooting, Gillingham, and Woking), are clearly derived from the patronymics of the Teutonic clans—the *Totingas*, *Gillingas*, and *Wocingas*—which there found a local habitation and presented it with a name.

The Teutonic village community, or *markgenossenschaft*, is, like the analogous Indian society, an agricultural association held together partly by the assumption of kinship on which it is based, and partly by the land which its members cultivate in common. Here, too, the community is an aggregate of families, each living under the *mund* of its own father. As the Greek clans grew into *Phratriai* and *Phylai*, and those of Latium into *Curie* and Tribes, so out of the combination of the Teutonic Marks arose the "Hundred" and the "Shire."† We may add that, although the *Scirgemót*, or "Assembly of the Men of the Shire," may be said to have come to an end when Mr. Gladstone's Administration took the opportunity which the introduction of vote by ballot afforded to abolish the "hustings," the Assembly of the Mark still undoubtedly remains and flourishes in every

* "Comparative Politics," pp. 45-47. † *Ibid.*, pp. 117-119.

English parish; and when we couple with this fact Sir Henry Maine's incidental observation* that the rural machinery for impounding stray cattle, with which we are all familiar, is certainly older than the King's Bench, and probably more ancient than the Kingdom itself, we hope that we shall have succeeded in investing with at least an antiquarian interest two institutions of the modern village which are commonly regarded as sufficiently prosaic—the Vestry and the Pound.

The merit of being the first to discover the system of co-ownership which prevailed in the Teutonic Mark belongs to Von Maurer; the vestiges of collective property which may still be traced in England have been more recently the subject of a careful examination by Professor Nasse, of Bonn. The volume† on Land Tenure, to which we have already referred,‡ contains an interesting paper by Mr. R. B. D. Morier, C.B., then Chargé d'Affaires at Darmstadt, in which the leading results of Von Maurer's researches are embodied. The principal features of the Mark are thus described by Sir Henry Maine:—

“The ancient Teutonic cultivating community, as it existed in Germany itself, appears to have been thus organised. It consisted of a number of families standing in a proprietary relation to a district divided into three parts. These three portions were the Mark of the Township or Village, the Common Mark or waste, and the Arable Mark or cultivated area. The Community inhabited the village, held the Common Mark in mixed ownership, and cultivated the Arable Mark in lots appropriated to the several families. Each family in the township was governed by its own free head or paterfamilias. The precinct of the family dwelling-house could be entered by nobody but himself and those under his *patria potestas*, not even by officers of the law, for he himself made law within and enforced law made without. But while he stood under no relations controllable by others to the members of his family, he stood in a number of very intricate relations to the other heads of families. The sphere of usage or customary law was not the family, but the connection of one family with another and with the aggregate community.”§

The equitable enjoyment of the Common Mark by the various members of the community was insured by the supervision of an elective or hereditary officer, whose position, in many respects, corresponds to that of the Hindu Headman. But the salient

* E. H. of I., p. 263.

† The Professor's Treatise, “Ueber der mittelalterliche Feldgemeinschaft und die Einhegungen des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts in England,” has been translated, under the sanction of the Cobden Club, by Col. H. A. Ouvry, C.B. London: Williams and Norgate. 1872.

‡ See page 77, note †. Mr. Morier's Paper is entitled “Agrarian Legislation of Prussia during the Present Century.”

§ V. C., pp. 78, 79.

peculiarity of the Teutonic community was the method in which the Arable Mark was cultivated. It was divided into three great fields; each householder had a share in each field, a regular rotation of crops was enforced, and one of the fields was left fallow every year. The rules which regulated the cultivation of the separate shares—which, as it is important to observe, contained the first germ of the tenure of property in severalty—were extremely intricate and minute. The proprietary equality of the several families was as far as possible secured by a periodical redistribution of their respective assignments, exactly corresponding to the custom of repartition, which to this day prevails in the Russian Mir; whilst the Arable Mark itself appears to have been occasionally shifted from one part of the village domain to another. Sir Henry Maine proceeds to shew that a method of occupation, precisely corresponding to the divisions of the Arable Mark, is still to be traced in the “common” or “commonable” fields which are found in various parts of England, and which the reader, when next he goes to Cambridge by the Great Northern Railway, may observe for himself in the neighbourhood of Baldock. The “lot meadows” or “lammas lands,” which are frequent in many counties, shew similar vestiges of the Common Mark.

Our remaining space scarcely permits us to do more than mention the bare fact that traces of the Village Community, which we have followed from India to Greece, from Greece to Italy, from Italy to Germany and England, have recently been observed among the peasant proprietors of France,* that it is the form of association which was, as it were, instinctively adopted by the first English settlers in North America,† that its popular Assembly has been identified not only with the English Vestry, but with the Landsgemeinden of Vri and Unterwalden,‡ that, under the name Clan or Sept, it forms the essential unit of all Keltic society, and that it is still open to observation, in several of its most striking aspects, in Russia and the Slavonic provinces. Much new light has been thrown upon the organisation of the Sept by the translation of the ancient Brehon laws—the Book of Aicill, the Senchus Mor, and the Corus Bescna—which has recently been published under the sanction of the Irish Government. These laws may be said to form the text on which the “Early History of Institutions” is a commentary. They enable us to trace in Ireland the same phenomena as we have elsewhere observed. We find the family as the unit; we meet with ample evidence of its having been constantly recruited by adoption;

* See Maine, *E. H. of L.*, pp. 6, 7. † *Ibid.*, p. 94, and *V. C.*, p. 201.

‡ Freeman, *C. P.*, p. 45.

and, with reference to the religious theory, of which we have already endeavoured to restrict the application, it is instructive to observe that such adoptions appear to have frequently occurred long after Ireland had become a Christian country; and therefore under circumstances in which it is impossible to attribute them to a desire to make due provision for the worship of an eponymous ancestor. We are enabled to trace many of the stages of transition, as well from the Family to the Tribe, as from the joint ownership of land and the periodical repartition which it involved, to the system of property in severalty. We may add that the ancient laws of Ireland, no less than the ancient laws of Rome, furnish a clue to some of the peculiarities of our own law of real property. As we can scarcely doubt that the custom of Borough English originated in the *Patria Potestas*, so the custom of Gavelkind, in its various forms, must be looked upon as a survival of the primitive system of inheritance in the Sept or Fine.

In Croatia, *Servia*, and Dalmatia, we meet with what may be more correctly described as a House, than a Village, Community.† The family group exactly corresponds with the "joint undivided family" of the Hindus. Like the members of the *Kandh* hamlet, it preserves a common hearth and common meals during several generations. It is joint, according to the phrase of the Hindu law, "in food, worship, and estate." The association of these families constitutes the village, and the system of co-ownership is here carried to the fullest extent. It is rather primitive socialism than primitive communism. The villagers combine to cultivate the village domain, and separate lots are unknown. The produce is preserved in a common store-house, and is annually distributed among the various households. The only further step in communism which we can conceive is said to have existed among some of the Highland clans, with whom it was customary for the chieftain to day by day provide the heads of households with small quantities of food out of the common stock.† Aristotle, in discussing the communistic theories of Greek philosophers, remarks that co-ownership of land may assume three forms. He says, that among some nations—

* "In Slavonia, where the patriarchal economy is retained up to the present day, the whole family, often to the number of fifty, or even a hundred, remains together in the same house, under the control of the house-father, chosen by the whole family for life (*Goszpodar*). The property of the household, consisting chiefly of cattle, is managed by the house-father; the surplus is distributed according to the family branches."—*Csaplovics, Slavonien*, quoted by Mommsen. We have no hesitation in identifying *Goszpodar* with the Sanskrit *Gaspatis*, "master of the family"; the Greek *θεσπότης* is an etymological riddle: see Curtius, *Grundzüge*, &c., pp. 283, 284.

† Maine, *A. L.*, p. 268.

the allusion is, we believe, unknown—the lands are held in severalty, and the produce brought into a common fund; among others, the land is possessed in common, and a common method of cultivation adopted, while the produce is divided into separate shares; it is also possible for both land and produce to be common to all. The second system is clearly that of the Slavonic communities; the third is that of the Highland clan. He himself seems to think that it would, theoretically, be best for the land to be the subject of private ownership—which, as he clearly perceives, is the only way to encourage individual enterprise, and promote improvement in methods of agriculture, while its use—a word which he employs in a very indefinite sense—should be shared by all the members of the community.*

We must leave untouched the interesting subject of the Russian Mir. It furnishes most striking analogies, in its practical independence of external control, in the management of its affairs by an elective officer and a popular assembly of the heads of houses, in the relation of the villagers to the land which they cultivate, in the division of the latter into three portions exactly corresponding to the Mark of the Township, the Arable Mark, and the Common Mark; lastly, in the annual redistribution of the pasturage and the periodical repartition of the arable land, to many of the communities which we have already noticed. But we feel the less regret in omitting a detailed examination of the Mir, since an account of its organisation, which leaves little to be desired, has recently been published in *Macmillan's Magazine*, by so accurate an observer as Mr. Wallace. The reader desirous of further information should consult his book on Russia, and the valuable articles of M. Leroy Beaulieu in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*. We have found it quite impossible, in the course of the present article, to go over all the ground which we had intended to traverse. We had hoped to shew how, as the Family developed into the Village Community, so out of the Village Community arose the State, which among Greeks and Italians took the form of the City, while among the Teutonic races arose the conception of the Nation. We wished to point out how the life of the City, though frequently glorious, was necessarily brief, and how, through the absence of the idea of Representative Government, its greatness contained the seeds of its destruction. Lastly, it was our wish to give some account of the growth and history of some of the leading institutions of the Aryan race, of Sovereignty, for instance, tribal, imperial, and territorial, of Nobility, and of Slavery. But the subject has proved too vast, and we trust that we have said sufficient to

* Pol., ii. 5.

vindicate the claim of comparative sociology to the careful study of the statesman, of the jurist, and, indeed, of all who possess political power. It is not too much to say that it is impossible fully to understand either the constitutional history, the political system, or the common law of England without at least some knowledge of the primitive institutions of the Aryan race. And it is, indeed, much to be desired that the vast diffusion of political power, which the last forty years have witnessed, and which has certainly not yet reached its limits, should be accompanied by an increased diffusion of political intelligence. We can scarcely fail to study the progress of legislation and watch the course of Parliamentary debates with a keener and more enlightened interest when we learn, for instance, that the appointment of a public prosecutor is necessary, if only in order to abolish a meaningless "survival" of the right of private vengeance, when we observe that the present Government, by its Act for preserving the appellate jurisdiction of the House of Lords, has succeeded in retarding that complete separation of legislative from judicial functions at which all civilised nations in process of time arrive, and which Aristotle, more than two thousand years ago, regarded as essential to the well-being of the State; or, lastly, when we discover in a well-drawn Bill to regulate and check the inclosure of commons an attempt to protect against the encroachments of the feudal lord the ancient premanorial rights of the Village Community.

Let us conclude with two observations. The first is that the comparative study of various forms of social life shews that we should be most cautious in stigmatising customs and institutions as barbarous or grotesque merely because they happen to be strange or unfamiliar to ourselves. Nothing is more likely than that they were practised by our own ancestors at no very remote period. This lesson of toleration is perhaps of special value to two classes—to the English in India and the English in Ireland. Had it been learnt in time many a bitter page of our national history might have been left unwritten. It is most painful to observe the harshness with which Irish law and custom were treated by English settlers, judges, and writers, who rarely hesitated to condemn what they failed to comprehend; and the recollection of these intolerant proceedings has probably never ceased to rankle in the minds of the Irish peasantry. Sir Henry Maine shews, for example, how in Ireland there existed an elaborate law of distress, which was in many respects decidedly superior to that which, at the same time, but in a much more limited class of cases, was practised in England; but when the English settled in Ireland they failed to recognise the custom, and made it felony for the Irishman to follow it. The same

writer's examination of primitive legal remedies makes it clear that "both the Irish law which it was a capital crime to obey, and the English law, which it was a capital crime to blunder in obeying, were undoubtedly descended from the same body of usage once universally practised by both Saxon and Kelt."* The Brehon laws of Ireland are characterised by Spenser and Davis as "unreasonable" and "lewd;" but we must agree with Sir Henry Maine that "there will some day be more hesitation in repeating the invectives of Spenser and Davis, when it is once clearly understood that the 'lewd' institutions of the Irish were virtually the same institutions as those out of which the 'just and honourable' law of England grew."†

Let us now turn for a moment to India. No Indian custom is more frequently the subject of denunciation than that of caste; and no doubt it is frequently responsible for the most deplorable results. But none of those who assail the institution appear to have taken the trouble to investigate its origin; it is apparently regarded as the product of pure caprice, or the account which attributes it to the injunctions of Manu is accepted without hesitation. We cannot, of course, here attempt to examine the subject in detail; but we have ourselves no difficulty in recognising in caste a peculiar development of the Family life. To man in a certain stage of civilisation it seems no less natural that trades should be hereditary than that political power and proprietary rights should be based on hereditary descent. We may add that English notions respecting caste are often based rather on the Brahminical theory of its nature than on the actual observation of its working. In point of fact there is only one perfect caste, that of the Bráhmans themselves; and the word usually signifies nothing more than an association, sometimes of a clan or tribe, sometimes of a trade, profession, or guild. Its members are, more or less, "joint in food, worship, and estate;" and they intermarry amongst themselves. There can be no doubt that the system has been mainly instrumental in preserving in India that old social order which in Western Europe has long since decayed. In India it is still the case that if men unite together for almost any conceivable purpose they base their association on the old system of the family, and call themselves a caste. As Sir Henry Maine points out, such a tie "conceived as of the nature of kinship" must "tend infallibly to become one of real consanguinity."‡

Another custom which has most justly met with reprobation and repression on the part of the English in India is the custom

* See E. H. of I., pp. 292—295.

† *Ibid.*, p. 19.

‡ See E. H. of I., pp. 244—247; V. C., pp. 56—58; A. L., pp. 19, 20.

of widow-burning or Suttee. None can wish to palliate the horrors of so barbarous a rite ; but even Suttee acquires a fresh interest when we trace in it, as some endeavour to trace, an attempt to enhance the solemnity of that worship of the dead, which M. de Coulanges regards as the primary cause of so many Aryan institutions. Suttee, in this view, is merely the culminating point of those funeral observances, or *sacra*, which formed so burdensome an incumbrance on landed property at Rome. Moreover, there seems some reason to believe that the custom of Suttee was not confined to India. The poets both of Greece and Rome record the story of Evadne, wife of Capaneus, who threw herself on her husband's funeral pile :—

“ Coniugis Eudæne miseros elata per ignes
occidit, Argivæ fama pudicitiaë.”*

In another passage, Propertius describes the practice in extremely beautiful and touching language. He looks upon “the funeral law which wife with husband shares” as a privilege eagerly claimed—as no doubt it sometimes was—by the devoted affection of the Indian's spouse, and contrasts her sublime self-sacrifice with the callous indifference displayed by Roman matrons under similar circumstances † There is, however, very much to be said for a somewhat different view of the origin of the custom, which is suggested in the “Early History of Institutions.” Sir Henry Maine finds in it one out of many indications of the policy of the Bráhmans. The Brahminical writers appear to have constantly endeavoured to limit those powers and privileges of women which they found in existence ; and this was particularly the case with the tenure of land by widows. The Bráhmans held that expiatory rites were necessary for the repose of the dead, and thus the connection between the right of inheriting property, and the duty of performing the funeral obsequies, which, as we have already observed, is peculiarly characteristic of Hindu law, was always becoming closer. It was through a similar doctrine—the doctrine that the best destination for a dead man's goods was to purchase masses for his soul—that the Church acquired much of its landed property in early times, and the testamentary jurisdiction of the Ecclesiastical Courts arose. The Brahminical theory was strongly opposed to the ownership of property by women, since the weaker sex, owing to their secluded life, were considered incapable of duly performing the funeral ceremonies of the dead owners ; and so the rule of law, which made widows tenants for life of their

* Propertius, l., 15, 21. The legend forms the subject of the *Supplices* of Euripides.

† *Ibid.*, iv., 13, 15—22.

husband's property, was obviated by the introduction of a rule of religion, which made it their duty to sacrifice themselves on their husband's pyre.*

The last Indian custom to which we would refer is that which sanctifies the ox and makes it sacrilege to use his flesh as food. This rule is sometimes classed with the grotesque deification of certain animals and insects, which was characteristic of the ancient religion of the Egyptians; but it finds a much more probable explanation in the importance which anciently attached to cattle as the principal instruments of agriculture. The value of cattle among primitive agricultural communities is indicated by the number of words originally signifying horned herds, which were used among various Aryan peoples as synonyms for "money" or "property."† It is also attested by the checks which the ancient Roman law imposed on their alienation. They were classed among "things which required a mancipation"—that is among things the conveyance of which, being extremely ceremonious, intricate and technical, was resorted to as rarely as possible. But that which to the genius of the Romans naturally took the form of a legal sanction was amongst the Hindus as naturally effected by a sanction of religion. We are thus led to regard as an interesting survival what we should otherwise look upon as a barbarous superstition, and to appreciate the force of that religious feeling which was one of the causes of the Indian Mutiny.

The study of Aryan Society enables us not only to draw a lesson of toleration, but to discern a law of progress. We have probably said enough to show that the whole history of property is really a history of the disentanglement of individual rights from the more ancient rights of joint proprietors.‡ Similarly the law of persons seems to shew a gradual but regular progress from a state of society in which its units are corporate bodies to a state of society of which the individual is the unit. If we wished to be poetical, we might sum up this change by saying that the Family withers and the Individual is more and more.

* See Maine, *E. H. of I.*, pp. 325—336.

† *Ibid.*, pp. 147—149, 171, 172.

‡ "Nobody is at liberty to attack several property, and to say at the same time that he values civilisation. The history of the two cannot be disentangled. Civilisation is nothing more than a name for the old order of the Aryan world, dissolved, but perpetually reconstituting itself under a vast variety of solvent influences, of which infinitely the most powerful have been those which have slowly, and in some parts of the world much less perfectly than in others, substituted several property for collective ownership."—Maine, *R. L.*, p. 30. On the obstacles to agricultural improvement which the Village Community presented, and the indirect benefits which feudalization conferred, compare *V. C.*, pp. 161—165.

Instead, however, of closing this paper with a flippant parody, we prefer to adopt the juridical expression of Sir Henry Maine, and to characterise the transition of which we speak as a passage from Status to Contract. Each man's lot in life is no longer the result of circumstances which he is powerless to alter; on the contrary, modern society recognises to the utmost the volition and enterprise of its individual members. "Starting, as from one terminus of history, from a condition of society in which all the relations of persons are summed up in the relations of Family, we seem to have steadily moved towards a phase of social order in which all these relations arise from the free agreement of Individuals."* These phenomena cannot be regarded as unsatisfactory by the student of political economy; they are, however, directly opposed to certain modern theories, such as those of which the International Society is the exponent. The judgment of experience is decidedly unfavourable to the communistic doctrines of those who style themselves "advanced reformers;" and the evils inseparable from co-ownership, the obstinate conservatism which characterises it, the resistance to improvement and obstacles to enterprise which it presents, and its inherent tendency to prevent its best and ablest members from rising above the level of the weakest and least intelligent, do not appear to have been obviated by any system of co-operation which has been as yet discovered. However that may be, we feel certain that in the law to which we have referred lies the true explanation of many modern problems. It may, perhaps, in some degree account for the complaint which we occasionally hear, that the "domestic instinct" which was once supposed to be an especial attribute of the Teutonic race is, in England at least, becoming continually more weak. It certainly furnishes the key by which we may in time hope to solve some of the questions which are continually in dispute between employers and employed. Upon at least one of its modern results we can look with unqualified satisfaction. By far the greatest social blessing which the last few years have bestowed upon England has been a vast amelioration in the position of the agricultural labourer; and the only method which occurs to us of expressing the general result of that amelioration is to say that he has passed from a Status which at no distant date appeared unalterably fixed to a condition of free and independent Contract.

* Maine, A. L., p. 169.

ART. IV.—STATE PAPERS. CHARLES I.

Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series of the Reign of Charles I. Preserved in Her Majesty's Public Record Office. Edited by JOHN BRUCE, Esq., V.P.S.A., and WILLIAM DOUGLAS HAMILTON, Esq., F.S.A. 1625-6, 1627-8, 1628-9, 1629-31, 1631-3, 1633-4, 1634-5, 1635, 1635-6, 1636-7, 1637, 1637-8, 1638-9, 1639-40. Fourteen volumes. Longmans and Co., London; Macmillan and Co., Cambridge; A. and C. Black, Edinburgh; and A. Thom Dublin. 1858-77.

IT was in the exercise of a sound discretion that the authorities at the Record Office resolved upon calendaring the State Papers of this period. The times embraced by these bulky volumes are among the most momentous in English history. Whatever opinions may be entertained with regard to the character of Charles the First, there can be no doubt that his reign dealt a severe blow to the institutions and associations which Englishmen had cherished for centuries. For the first time in our history a Sovereign had ascended the throne determined upon maintaining the majesty and independence of the Prerogative. Other kings had dissolved Parliaments, imprisoned refractory members, and forced hostile votes to be rendered null, but with the exception of Charles no English monarch had dared for eleven long years to dispense altogether with Parliamentary aid and advice. Other kings had tampered with the purity and independence of the Judicial Bench, but save Charles none had dared to acknowledge only as justice, decisions which interpreted and confirmed the Royal policy. Other kings had laid upon their subjects the heavy hand of taxation, but, save Charles, none had dared to raise loans, enforce benevolences, and revive obsolete fiscal customs without the will and sanction of the Legislature. Other kings had allowed themselves to be unduly influenced by their favourites, but none save Charles had placed such blind faith in the judgment and control of a favourite as to render him not only the sole Minister of the Crown, but the actual Sovereign of the country. The history of Charles is the history of Personal Government as opposed to Constitutional Government. Since the King could not obtain his ends with the assistance of Parliament he resolved to pursue his course independent of the Legislature. By the light of the State Papers now before us, the history of England under Personal Government stands out with a photographic distinctness, which renders doubt and confusion respecting

the period henceforth impossible. We listen to the grievances of Parliament and watch the miserable sums it doles out to defray the expenses of a necessitous Monarch. We see the coquettish Queen idolised by her husband, but drawing upon herself dangerous suspicions from her open advocacy of the creed of her ancestors, amongst an alien people, the professors of an alien faith. We mark the hold gained by the haughty, dissipated Buckingham over his Royal master, and observe how all who oppose the designs of the favourite are crushed and thwarted in their efforts. We take part in the expeditions that sailed against Spain and France, and read of the causes which led to failure and disastrous retreat. We see the dreaded plague infecting the land with its pestilential breath and sparing neither town nor shire in its progress. We are admitted into the most intimate confidences of Laud, and watch him carrying out in all its narrowness the letter of the ecclesiastical law, and enforcing the strictest obedience to all ceremonial observances. At the ancient city of York and across St. George's Channel we are made to tremble at the despotic policy of Thorough; beneath the stern rule of Wentworth all obstacles melt away—taxes are levied, unjust decisions are upheld, vested interests are ignored, and the self-respect of a vassal race crushed and stamped out. North of the Tweed we see a proud and bold people banded together to defend with their lives the simple faith of their forefathers. Not a single incident during this eventful period is omitted; not a link in the chain is missing. We have spread out before us like a map, which gives with marked clearness every village, every hill, and the course of every stream, the whole history of the personal rule of Charles, with all its discontent and prosperity, all its favouritism and oppression, all its contempt and adulation, all its resistance and servility. With these exhaustive Calendars before the writer, the history of the reign of Charles the First becomes no longer dependent upon that pre-judice or sympathy which colours the stream of narrative with spite or partiality, according to the prejudices of the individual; but must henceforth be based on evidence so clear and sound as not to admit of dispute or of conflicting opinions.

The series begins with the accession of Charles. After slowly recovering from a severe attack of the gout, James, when pronounced by his medical advisers as convalescent, fell a victim to tertian ague. No immediate danger was apprehended, but the King, who had always been nervous about himself where his health was concerned, took a graver view of his illness than did those around him, and said, "I shall never see London more." Remembering that Buckingham had derived great benefit from the prescription of a country doctor at Dunmow, James was anxious to adopt the same remedies. A messenger rode post-

haste into Essex and brought back the village quack's recommendation. The King was to be kept in bed, to be given a posset, which would promote perspiration, and to have a plaster placed upon his stomach and his wrists. The advice was faithfully carried out, but instead of relieving the invalid, only aggravated his malady. The Court physicians, irritated at this interference with their treatment, declined to visit the King unless he would place himself unreservedly in their hands, and abandon the Dunmow posset and plasters. A returning fit of great severity now compelled James to listen to his recognised medical attendants, and under their skill and care his health began gradually to mend. But with regaining vigour came back the short-sighted obstinacy which had always been one of the evil features in his character. In spite of all opposition the King resolved to give the Dunmow treatment another trial. Once more he poured down his throat the posset, and applied the plasters to his stomach and his wrists; from that hour the improvement that had taken place in his condition became checked, and he grew rapidly worse. Fit succeeded fit, and it was evident to all the end was nigh. The divines in attendance upon the Royal bedside told the sufferer that his recovery was now despaired of. "I am satisfied," said James, "and I pray you to assist me to make ready to go away hence to Christ, whose mercies I call for, and I hope to find them." On the 27th of March, 1625, he passed away. "He died at twelve at noon," writes Chambermaid to the Queen of Bohemia, "and before six at night the accession of King Charles was proclaimed, and all persons commanded to see the King's peace duly kept, and to be obedient to his laws."

Of the young King little was known. Shy, reserved, and accustomed to stand much upon his dignity, except to the very few friends who possessed his confidence, as Prince of Wales Charles had never come prominently before the nation. The grasp of his mind was limited, he had many prejudices and few ideas, the flow of his thoughts was slow and laboured, and he was by nature reticent and reserved. Conscious that his gifts did not tend to shed a lustre upon his father's Court, he had held himself aloof from its more boisterous festivities, and from the homage of the vulgar. The loquacity, the pedantry, the vanity of his coarse self-asserting sire jarred upon the sensitiveness of the young prince, and caused him to withdraw from the society of those who by their servile flatteries had wormed themselves into the intimacies of the throne. The select and limited few, however, who had been afforded the opportunities of judging the character of Charles were strongly impressed in his favour. He was not a ready talker, but when he spoke he showed that he was able to bring to bear upon the subject under discussion, if not much

original thought, at least much reading. He had a keen appreciation of the fine arts, and in his travels on the Continent had struck those who surrounded him by the depth and judgment of the criticisms he passed upon the different paintings that met his view. In an age of much licence he had worn the white flower of a blameless life, and had been sneered at by the wits of Versailles as being as virgin as his sword. So far as externals went Nature had been most kind to him. His face was expressive, and the features marked by that purity and refinement which are termed aristocratic, his figure was graceful, his manners, though somewhat haughty, were eminently courtly and winning. As it was said of his unhappy descendant, the Young Pretender, on his first entrance into Edinburgh, so it could be said of Charles, he "not only looked like a king but like a gentleman."

His accession to the throne had occurred at a season which required no ordinary capacity to contend with the surrounding difficulties. Both at home and abroad dark clouds had sprung up, obscuring the political horizon. On the Continent England was engaged in a war to oppose the might of the Austrian family, and to crown the Palatinate. Spain, irritated at the rupture of the marriage-treaty between Charles and the Infanta had become our bitter enemy. France, though she had consented to the union of the Princess Henrietta with the young King of England, hovered between her hatred of Spain and her hatred of the Huguenots, and declined to give any decided support to the English policy in Europe. Whilst at home the opposition of the House of Commons to the claims of Prerogative, which had embittered the relationship between the Crown and the people during the latter part of the preceding reign, was now again being mischievously agitated. To add to these difficulties, the question of religious toleration was demanding an immediate settlement. Shortly after his accession Charles had united himself in marriage with the Princess Henrietta Maria, the daughter of Henry IV. of France, whose beauty, it is said, had attracted him at a ball in Paris, whilst *en route* for Madrid to pay his court to the Spanish Infanta. The young Queen was a devoted Catholic, and it was expected that her elevation to the English throne would result in the removal of those penalties and restrictions which at that time visited severely upon the adherents of the Holy See. These hopes resolved themselves into certainty when the private views of the King became known. On the day of his marriage he had issued instructions to the Lord Keeper "to cease all manner of prosecution against Roman Catholics, as well on their persons as goods, for the exercise of the said religion, provided always that they behaved themselves moderately therein, and yield us

that obedience which good and true subjects owe unto their King." It was soon found, however, that in the present temper of the English people it would be most unwise to carry these concessions into effect. The war in the Palatinate and the attitude assumed by the Huguenots had aroused both the Protestant sympathies and jealousies of the nation. Throughout England the recent alliance with France was looked upon coldly, men fearing that the union had been purchased at the expense of the established religion of the country. Charles, at the very outset of his marriage and in the face of his instructions to the Lord Keeper, was bidden to put in force the statutes for the suppression of Popery, really to "execute the laws against the wicked generation of Jesuits, seminary priests, and incendiaries ever lying in wait to blow the coal of contention." He hesitated and dallied with the demand, hoping that time might extricate him from the embarrassment. Nor did the conduct of the young Queen tend to smooth over the difficulties of the situation. Her beauty was acknowledged by both friend and foe, yet from such brilliant personal attractions much danger was to be apprehended. It was known that the King was deeply attached to her, that his disposition caused him to give an undue weight to the counsels of those by whom his affections were engaged; and it was felt that the influence of his young and beautiful consort might be very detrimental to the activity of Protestantism. Henrietta had surrounded herself by a little band of advisers of her own creed, to whom she always referred before entering on any act, private or political. At the instigation of her confessor she had made a pilgrimage across Hyde Park to the gallows at Tyburn, where she had prayed to the Catholic victims executed there in the two preceding reigns, as to so many saints and martyrs. She had declined to be crowned by the Archbishop of Canterbury, but had requested that the ceremony might be performed by her own bishop, which had been refused. "His Majesty was yesterday crowned," writes Sir Benjamin Rudyard. "The Queen was not crowned (i.e. Church not recognising our Bishops), but stood in a window at Sir Abraham Williams's to see the show." The feelings of the people were excited against her, and she was called a Daughter of Heth, a Canaanite, and an Idolater. So pernicious was the influence of her advisers that at last it became imperatively necessary for the King to interfere. Attended upon by the Duke of Buckingham and the Earls of Holland and Carlisle, Charles came to Somerset House, where the retinue of the Queen had assembled to await his orders. "Gentlemen and ladies," said the King, "I am driven to that necessity as that I am personally come to acquaint you that I very earnestly desire

your return into France; true it is the department of some amongst you hath been very inoffensive to me, but others again have so dallied with my patience and so highly affronted me as I cannot, I will not, longer endure it." In vain certain of the officials of the Queen's household raised their voices in earnest protestation against this summary dismissal, they were ordered to quit the kingdom and not to irritate further the Royal will. "On Tuesday," writes Sir Benjamin Rudyard, "the Queen's French attendants were suddenly commanded to quit the Court; the Queen takes the act very passionately, but having prevailed for the return of her nurse is reasonably pacified." With the departure of her mischievous advisers the influences that had been at work to create a breach between husband and wife were silenced, and the domestic life of Charles, which at one time had been gravely threatened by the bigotry and obstinacy of the Queen, was restored to that harmony and affection which ever afterwards characterised it.

Whilst these private differences were being settled matters of great public moment had made large claims upon the temper and discretion of the young King. Into the thrice-told story of the reign of Charles we have no intention of entering, except as a new light is shed upon it by disclosures from the State Papers. On the 18th of June, 1625, the King opened his first Parliament at Westminster. In his speech from the throne he frankly acknowledged the necessities of his position; he had received on his accession the legacy of a war approved of by the nation; he had entered into arrangements with Denmark, the Low Countries, and the Palatinate, which made heavy calls upon his exchequer; he had spent large sums upon the navy; the debts of his father remained still to be discharged; and he confidently expected his faithful Commons to freely vote him the supplies he required. His confidence was misplaced. In the Lower House the leaders of the country party were the dominant section. They ruled the assembly, and gave the tone to the debate. To these men the situation of their Sovereign was full of promise for the redress of grievances they had long complained of. They resolved that the power of Parliament should be re-established, and the Prerogative reduced within more reasonable limits. They required that the Penal Acts against the Roman Catholics should be put in force, and demanded that full information as to the future expenditure of the sums to be voted should be laid before the House. To these requests the King declined to give any decided answer, and the Commons retaliated by voting two miserable subsidies, about 140,000*l.*, to meet the heavy expenses incurred by the Crown.

For the moment, all negotiations between the Sovereign and his subjects were brought to an end by the hasty adjournment of the Parliament owing to the plague which was then devastating the metropolis. Of the havoc made by this terrible visitation the State Papers are full. Entry after entry in the Calendars before us reveals the terror and distress caused by its appearance. "The plague spreads, Parliament is in suspense;" "the sickness in London increases in a remarkable manner;" "the sickness has spread into all parts of the City, and has broken out in the house of the Lord Mayor;" "the sickness increases more and more, the bill specified 500 and odd last week;" "the increase and general spread of the plague in London and Westminster cause such distraction and consternation that the like was never seen in that age. The number of deaths for four weeks was answerable to those in the first year of the late King, but this last week it is near a thousand greater, which makes all men hasten away." "A few days since there died two of the sickness at Windsor, in a house where the Queen's priest was lodged: it is very much about Kingston and its neighbourhood;" "the sickness so violent in London that there is no intercourse of boats from Kingston, those that go to London must not return into the country. Last week's deaths were 4855; of the plague 4133, not counting Westminster and the outlying parishes where there died about 1000;" "few adventure into London: the Lords are about to send to the Mayor that the infected shall be sent out of the City to tents and cabins in the fields. No man comes into a town without a ticket, yet there are few places free;" "Sir Francis Howard's lady took the infection from a new gown she had from London, so as she died the same day she took it." "I believe," writes the Dean of St. Paul's, "that in the City of London, and in a mile compass there died 1000 a day. The citizens fled away as out of a house on fire, and stuffed their pockets with their best ware and threw themselves into the highways, and were not received so much as into barns, and perished so; some of them with more money about them than would have bought the village where they died." And then we read how the fell visitation spread in spite of all precaution, from county to county, and town to town, till the whole kingdom was infected, how trade was paralysed, how piteous were the applications to the authorities for relief, and how stringent were the regulations for the prevention of the disease. "On deaths of persons of the contagion of the sickness," writes the Justices of the Peace for Westminster, "the searchers go with white wands in their hands, the red cross, and the bill 'Lord have mercie upon us' set apparent on the doors. With every such house there is a warder, and every day some of the Justices

visit and examine to see them do their duty. They be so kept up forty days, and in that time purge and cleanse their houses with lime and such-like. From the State Papers we collect the following Table of mortality:— In 1592, the interments from the plague were 11,505; in 1603, 30,583; in 1625, 35,428; in 1630, 1317; in 1636, 12,102; in 1637 down to the end of July, when the disease was beginning to slacken its ravages, the number of deaths had been 2876.

To escape infection the Parliament met at Oxford, and Charles, nothing daunted by past failure again appealed to the generosity of the Commons. He had scarcely the means to supply the necessary provisions for the Royal household. He was about to equip a fleet against Spain. He had to pay large subsidies to the King of Denmark, to the army of Kamfeldt, to the army of the Low Countries, and for the security of Ireland. It was necessary if the war was to be carried on that large supplies should be voted. In his appeal Charles was supported by all the arguments and specious eloquence of his admirers. The Commons however declined to reconsider their decision. They had been angered by an attempt on the part of the Court to employ certain English vessels, which had been despatched to Dieppe ostensibly to attack the Genoese, in the service of the French king against the Huguenots of Rochelle: a design which had only been frustrated by the mutiny and desertion of the crews. They again demanded to know how the past subsidies had been expended, and requested a full and detailed account of the warlike operations that were meditated by the Court. If the King gave them his confidence and accepted their advice, they would then see how far they would be justified in meeting the Royal wishes. The struggle was thus between the inquisitorial power of Parliament and the despotism of Prerogative. Charles declined to recognise the pretensions of his Parliament; he placed his confidence in his Ministers, and not in the representatives of the people; it was the duty of the Commons to obey, and not to pry into the commands of their Sovereign; to place the right of inquiry in the hands of Parliament, was to accord a favour most detrimental to the interests of the Crown. Holding these views, and, finding that no object was to be gained by further discussion, the King took advantage of the appearance of the plague at Oxford to dissolve the Houses.

With the vast mass of documentary evidence now before us it is not difficult to account for the opposition of the Commons to the demands of the Crown. In the Lower House there were men hostile to the Royal Prerogative, and who were anxious to embrace every opportunity of inflicting slights and humiliations upon their Sovereign, but they were in a minority. To the larger section of

the assembly the Throne was still the emblem of all that was sacred and dear, and opposition to the Sovereign did not so much imply disloyalty on their part, as hate and distrust of the mischievous adviser who then enjoyed the Royal confidence. The leaders of the country party did not war against Charles, but against Buckingham. It has been the fate of many who have exercised supreme sway, either in the Court or the Cabinet, to encounter the bitter hostility of a people; but seldom has any Minister met with such fierce detestation as was now excited by the conduct of Buckingham. About the middle of the last reign a younger son of an old Leicestershire family had come up to Court, and had purchased the office of Cup-bearer. Few men were more impressed by the external advantages of a handsome person and an elegant address than James. It was not long before the graceful bearing, the winning manner, and the charming face of George Villiers attracted the attention of his Sovereign. The young cup-bearer was not one of those who lose an opportunity; he speedily ingratiated himself in the good opinion of his master, and his rise was rapid. The favourite Somerset was dethroned, and dismissed, and George Villiers reigned in his stead. Honour after honour was rapidly conferred upon him; office after office was entrusted to him. He was knighted; he was created Baron Whaddon and Viscount Villiers; he was created Earl of Buckingham; he was created Marquis, and then Duke of Buckingham. He had been sworn of the Council, he had received the insignia of the Garter, he was Master of the Horse, he was Lord High Admiral, and he was the bosom friend and trusted counsellor of his Sovereign. A man made only to shine in the salon and the boudoir, the power now placed in the hands of Buckingham turned his head. His arrogance, his abuse of authority, his dangerous counsels, offended all. He was hated with the bitterest of all hates, the hate that knows it is powerless to wound. Neither James nor Charles would listen to a word said against the favourite. It was useless for men grown grey in the service of the State to expose the incapacity of Buckingham for the high offices he filled—to point out the mischief he had effected between England and Spain, and to show how he was wanting in tact, foresight, and discretion—James turned a deaf ear to all such insinuations, and continued to be fonder than ever of his "Steenie." As was the sire, so was the son. On the accession of Charles to the throne, Buckingham was the adviser who guided the Royal policy. "During Buckingham's presence at Court," writes Mr. Bruce, "he reigned there as the King's absolute and single Minister. Every act of the Government passed by or through his will. Except formally, the King was little seen or heard of in State affairs. He seldom

even attended a sitting of the Privy Council, except to carry some project of his favourite." It was this elevation of a dangerous and domineering incapacity that had so angered the Commons, and forced them into a disloyalty they regretted, in order to curb the mischievous activity of the one adviser of the Crown. By the nation at large the favourite was as much hated as was Bute in the days of George the Third. He was a traitor, a Papist, a poisoner, a Frenchman, the cause of England's heavy taxation, and of all her distresses. Such were the accusations brought against the Duke by an infuriated people. "The whole island," writes one Gabriel Browne, "is so sharpened against him that even ridiculous toys inflame them with offence. The multitude were bitterly disgusted because, being sickly, he suffered himself to be carried in a covered chair upon his servant's shoulders from Whitehall to Denmark House, and the Commons House took it ill; because, at a Committee, he was a little more gaillard, trim, and wantonly great, 'after the French fubb and garb,' than stands with the national gravity of the noble English." The King, we are also told, "is a most sweet and gentle Prince, saving as he is mislead by that great man." "Who governs the land?" it was asked. "Why, the King. And who governs the King? Why, the Duke of Buckingham. And who governs the Duke. Why, the Devil." The conflict that now ensued between the Executive and the Legislature was not, therefore, so much an antagonism between the King and the Parliament as between the Parliament and the favourite Minister.

To supply the want of Parliamentary assistance, Charles now issued Privy Seals for borrowing the necessary money from his subjects. The sum required to be lent, we learn, was "to be sent to the collector within twelve days, and was to be repaid within eighteen months." This form of compulsory contribution created the liveliest dissatisfaction from those on whom levies were made—still it excited no open resistance, and the amount thus raised enabled the ill-starred expedition against Cadiz to set out upon its work of destruction. Concerning this expedition, the State Papers are full of interest, but, inasmuch as they threw little new light upon Cecil's undertaking, it is not necessary to dwell upon the matter they contain. We know that the expedition was a complete failure; Puntal was taken and abandoned, a march was made against the enemy outside the walls of Cadiz, but "the men being faint and without provisions, the Marshal (Sir Edward Cecil, created Viscount Wimbledon in anticipation of the successes he did *not* achieve), gave them wine, under the influence of which they became unmanageable." It was found that the town could only be taken by siege, "for which we were unprepared. We, therefore, embarked our men, to our great dis-

honour." The Plate fleet, with their splendid treasures on board, eluded the search of Wimbledon, and safely anchored in Cadiz Bay, and thus, having failed to carry out a single one of the numerous plans it had proposed to execute, the expedition returned home. When we read a few of the entries from the State Papers, we are not surprised at the result that attended its efforts. Buckingham, though he remained at home, was "Generalissimo of the Fleet;" whilst Cecil, its actual commander, was an excellent soldier, who had seen much service in the Dutch army, but who naturally had had no experience of naval warfare. The details of the expedition were managed with the usual carelessness and incompetency of Buckingham. "Great wrong," writes Sir George Blundell, "has been done to the King and his service by pretending the ships were fit to go to sea; they were leaky and rotten, and every man cries out for victuals. Some drink beverage of cider that stinks worse than carrion, and have no other drink. They have been much wronged and abased." "The landsmen," writes Wimbledon himself, "are so ill-exercised, that they killed more of their own men than of the enemy. The sickness is so great that there are not seamen enough to keep the watches. The ships leaky. We feel the want of a competent number of pinnaces, which in Queen Elizabeth's time were always furnished; but now, to save charges, we have ketches, which men are afraid to go in. Our beverage of an ill-quality, and victual growing short. I anticipated all these difficulties and wants before setting out; but, being commanded by the Duke, I resolved to undertake anything." "I speak out of anguish," moans Sir William St. Leger, "to see so brave and chargeable a business so foully miscarried. The army is in wretched poor condition for want of health and clothes, and much decayed in numbers." The expedition had sailed from Plymouth early in October, amid the hopes of a proud and high-spirited nation; it returned a few weeks later, ship straggling after ship; their crews decimated by disease; whilst the soldiers, on landing, had barely rags enough to satisfy the demands of decency. "We request," write the Commissioners at Plymouth to the Privy Council, "that the soldiers may be speedily clothed, the greatest part not having therewith to cover their nakedness, which is the greatest cause of their miseries. Orders should also be given for the maintenance of the captains and officers, whose complaints are equal to those of the soldiers." The men thus returned were distributed throughout the different counties, and, in defiance of all law, billeted upon the people.

The expedition to Cadiz a failure, his supplies squandered away, his necessities daily becoming more urgent, the King had no alternative but to call a new Parliament. The House of

Commons was, however, in no more generous or pliant mood than its predecessor. It bitterly complained of the reverses of the past, of the secrecy in which all the accounts relating to the expenditure were enveloped, of the manner in which the Constitution had been strained, and of the incompetency of the sole Minister of the Crown. After much debate, it was resolved that three subsidies and three-fifteenths should be granted to the King; but that the vote should not be converted into a Bill until all grievances had been redressed. The Commons demanded that the favourite should be removed; that a statement as to the expenditure of the future should be presented them; that the religious question should be definitely settled; and that the claim of Parliament to control the Crown, as well as to advise it, should be recognised. Buckingham was impeached, but Parliament was dissolved before the charges brought against him had been fully inquired into. Charles, who regarded himself as the centre and force of all Government, declined to be responsible for his actions to his Parliament, to permit an inquiry into the expenditure of the past, or to throw over his mischievous adviser. In a fit of temper he dissolved the Houses; and, since his faithful Commons would grant no subsidies without being taken into the Royal confidence, he determined to carry out those "*new counsels*" he had threatened his Parliament with adopting. He compounded with the Catholics for the suspension of the penal laws against them. He demanded a loan of 100,000*l.* from the City of London. He required each of the maritime towns, with the aid of the adjacent counties, to equip so many vessels as were appointed them. He begged pecuniary assistance from the peers and from all friends to his cause. These expedients, however, did not meet with the success he had anticipated; and, after some deliberation, an Act of Council was passed which enforced a general loan from the subject according as every one was assessed in the rolls of the last subsidy. Against this taxation, and the inquisitorial manner in which it was conducted, a violent outcry was raised. Many declined to contribute to the loan, and the State Papers of these years (1626, 1627) are full of the remonstrances and sufferings of those who opposed the Court. All who refused to comply with the King's demands were thrust into prison.

And now, as if domestic matters were not grave enough, the country was plunged into a new war. To avenge himself against Richelieu, who, jealous of the favour accorded to Buckingham, then Ambassador Extraordinary at Paris, by the beautiful Anne of Austria, had interrupted the amorous designs of the gallant Envoy, the Duke threw down the gauntlet to France. He gave orders that all the French servants of Henrietta Maria

should be dismissed. He encouraged the English men of war to seize upon French merchantmen. He made overtures to Spain for peace. These injuries produced only remonstrances across the Channel, or at the most reprisals, and failed to excite that declaration of hostilities which the Duke had anticipated. Since France kept her temper, and declined to be provoked, Buckingham now resolved to show his hand, so that no mistake should arise as to his intentions. Nothing daunted by the fate of the Cadiz Expedition, he fitted out a fleet of 100 sail; he embarked an army of 7000 men; he appointed himself commander of this naval and military force, and bent his course to the West of France. Rochelle, garrisoned by the Huguenots, was then besieged by Richelieu; and it had been the intention of Buckingham to relieve the town, and make common cause with the beleaguered against the foe. The Rochellois, however, distrustful of the scheme of the English commander, refused to admit the Duke; and the baffled commander, concealing his mortification as best he could, steered farther west, intent upon subduing the Isle of Rhé.

Of the various historical incidents relating to this period recorded in the State Papers there is none more minutely treated than this, the second ill-fated enterprise of Buckingham. The whole facts relating to the expedition to Rhé are brought so vividly before us that there is not the slightest break in the continuity of the narrative, or a single omission which the historian can regret. We read all the details of the preparations that were made; of the departure and landing of the troops; of the endeavours at home to support the expedition with new levies and continued supplies; of the feverish anxiety in which England and France were kept for several months by the progress of the siege of the citadel of St. Martin; of the final abandonment of the siege and the return to England of the shattered forces. The expedition under Buckingham is but a repetition of the expedition under Wimbledon. The ships were deficient in accommodation and in sanitary arrangements, and utterly unseaworthy. The commissariat department was miserably attended to. "There was no bread and beer thought of for the soldiers," writes one; "wheat instead of bread, but no means to grind or bake it, and wine instead of beer." "The present condition of Buckingham's army," says a second, "is such, that without a speedy supply, they will not only be disabled from gaining anything, but will hazard the loss of what they have got." "The army," mourns a third, "grows daily weaker, victuals waste, purses are empty, ammunition consumes, winter grows, their enemies increase in numbers and power, and they hear nothing from England." The men wanted hose, shoes, and clothing; their ammunition was

scarce; their pay was in arrears, and disease was doing more harm in their ranks than the attacks of the enemy. Nor is the story of the siege of St. Martin, the chief town of the Isle of Rhé, one that Englishmen will care to remember. The men, ill and discouraged, were not anxious to fight; there was no order or discipline maintained amongst them; they refused to obey their commander, and we read of Buckingham, cudgel in hand, going about "beating some and threatening others," in order to rouse them to their work; the officers had little confidence in their chief, and being deprived of the materials calculated to render a siege successful, they conducted their duties in a feeble half-hearted manner, which could not but act disastrously upon the men under their command. The only cheering incident in the history of the expedition is the courage that its General displayed. From all quarters the bravery of Buckingham was acknowledged. "[The Lord-General," writes Sir Allon Apsley, "is the most industrious and in all business one of the first, in person, in danger. Last night the enemy's ordnance played upon his lodging, and one shot lighted upon his bed, but did him no harm." "Our General," writes Henry de Vic, "behaves himself to admiration, making those parts appear which lay hid before. His care is infinite, his courage undauntable, his patience and continual labours beyond what could have been expected. Himself views the grounds, goes to the trenches, visits the batteries, observes where the shot doth light and what effect it works. He is partly constrained to exertion by the carelessness of some officers. None of extraordinary credit in the army besides himself." "He has shown," cries the Abbé Scaglia, "that he possesses the courage of Scipio!"

Whilst superintending the operations before the town of St. Martin, the Duke received certain letters which have been preserved amongst the State Papers, and which in their strictest sense may be classed in the *domestic* series. On his departure from England the Duke had quitted his wife without taking any formal leave, though promising that he would see her shortly again. He had even assured her that he would not accompany the expedition. The Duchess was then in a condition of health which rendered the absence of her lord particularly distressing, and she thus upbraids him:—"I confess I did ever fear you would be caught," she writes, "for there was no other likelihood after all that show, but you must needs go. For my part I have been a very miserable woman hitherto, that never could have you keep at home. But now I will ever look to be so, until some blessed occasion comes to draw you quite from the Court. For there is none more miserable than I am now, and till you leave this life of a courtier, which you have ever been since I knew

you, I shall ever think myself unhappy. I am the unfortunatest of all other, that even when I am with child I must have so much cause of sorrow, as to have you go from me, but I never had so great a cause of grief as now I have. God of his mercy give me patience, and if I was sure my soul would be well I could wish myself to be out of this miserable world, for till then I shall not be happy. Now I will no more write to hope you do not go, but must betake myself to my prayers for your safe and prosperous journey, which I will not fail to do and for your quick return, but never whilst I live will I trust you again, nor never will put you to your oath for anything again. . . . I pray God never woman may love a man as I have done you, that never may feel that which I have done for you. . . . I would to Jesus that there was any way in the world to fetch you off this journey with your honour. If any pains or any suffering of mine could do it I were a most happy woman; but you have send (*sic*) yourself and made me miserable. God forgive you for it." Then she signs the letter, "your poor grieved and obedient wife, K. Buckingham." Hearing of the indifference of the Duke to danger and of his freedom in exposing himself to the enemy, the Duchess entreats Dr. Moore, Buckingham's physician, to watch over her fickle lord. "I pray keep him," she pleads, "from being too venturous, for it does not belong to a General to walk trenches; therefore have a care of him. I will assure you by this action he is not any whit the more popular man than when he went, therefore you may see whether these people be worthy for him to venture his life for." On the return of the expedition her eagerness to welcome her husband thus breaks out. "Since I heard the news of your landing, I have been still every hour looking for you that I cannot now, till I see you, sleep in the nights, for every minute, if I do hear any noise, I think it is one from you, to tell me the happy news what day I shall see you, for I confess I long for it with much impatience. . . . My lord, there has been such ill reports made of the great loss you have had, by the man that came first, and your friends desire you would come to clear all, with all speed. You may leave some of the lords there to see what you give order for done, and you need not stay yourself any longer. Thus beseeching you to come hither on Sunday or Monday without all fail, I rest, your true loving and obedient wife." Among the papers of this interesting collection we also light upon a letter to the Duke from his mother, Mary, Countess of Buckingham, written at the time when the troops were before the walls of St. Martin. It is in reply to one penned by Buckingham, begging for money, and saying that he is so busy that he has no time to spend in prayer. "I hope your eyes will be opened to see," warns the Countess,

“ what a great gulf of business you have put yourself into and so little regarded at home, where all is merry and well pleased, though the ships be not victualled as yet nor mariners to go with them. As for moneys, the kingdom will not supply your expenses and every man groans under the burthen of the times. At your departure from me, you tell me you want to make peace, but it was not from your heart. This is not the way; for you to embroil the whole Christian world in wars, and then to declare it for religion, and make God a party to these woeful affairs, so far from God as light and darkness, and the highway to make all Christian princes to bend their faces against us, that otherwise, in policy, would have taken our parts. You know the worthy King, your master, never liked that way, and as far as I can perceive, there is none that cries not out of it.” She then bids him spend some of his hours in prayer and meditation, and to quit “ this bloody way in which you are crept into,” and return to his virtuous wife and sweet daughter. She also regrets, that having recently purchased property, she is unable to comply with his request for money.

Though the leader and originator of the expedition against Rhé had failed in carrying out a single detail of the campaign he had set before him, he did not lack the applause of the servile and the interested. Had Buckingham been the most successful general or the most far-seeing statesman, he could not have listened to more fulsome flattery. He was a Cæsar, an Alexander, the most brilliant of commanders; what he had achieved at Rhé was even, in the opinion of the Earl of Exeter, “ miraculous.” The Duke had hesitated to accept a gift from the Bishop of London, whereupon his Lordship assures his Grace that to refuse his offering would break his heart. “ When God,” he writes to the Duke, “ returns back again a man’s sacrifice, it is because He is offended with him; therefore the Bishop cannot live if the Duke returns him his.” Field had been raised to the See of St. David’s on the recommendation of Buckingham. Accordingly he writes to Laud to tell his patron that the Duke had imitated God Himself, who “ very oft as he passes by and seems to turn from us leaves his blessing behind.” This recently created bishop is the most effusive of toadies. He compares the late parliamentary opposition to “ dogs in a village, barking for company with full and foul mouth,” and “ burns with desire to turn soldier, and encourage the soldiers to cry St. George, to pray and fight for the Duke.” Men of ancient race, soldiers of proved courage, statesmen who had seen much service, clergymen who professed that their kingdom was not of this world, mindful of the power and patronage of the great favourite, did not blush to grovel in the dust

before the Duke, and, in the hope of advancement, to sign themselves his "creatures" and his "slaves." A few—a very few—dared boldly to protest against the policy of Buckingham, and the measures he had suggested to raise supplies.

Success had not crowned the efforts of the expedition against Rhé; the besieged had been relieved, the assistance expected by the English General had not arrived, and Buckingham felt that he had no alternative but to embark his troops and return to England. The loss of life that this expedition entailed has been variously estimated. The following entry among the State Papers settles the question:—"Statement of the number of the several regiments embarked at Portsmouth for the expedition to the Isle of Rhé, with the numbers of subsequent supplies, and the numbers which returned to England. Embarked, 5934; subsequent supplies, 1899; returned, 2989."

In the meantime the unconstitutional proceedings instituted by Charles, though they inflamed the country with wrath and sedition, failed to replenish the coffers of his exhausted exchequer. The general loan had been well subscribed to, but all its proceeds were swallowed up by the pressing necessities of the Crown. In the expenditure of the past year there was a vast deficit. The preparations for war now amounted to a fearful total. The pay of the soldiers and the seamen was rated at some 200,000*l.* a year, and if Rochelle was to be relieved in the Spring, another 100,000*l.* would be required. How, and from whom, were these sums to be obtained? The King was aware that the inevitable must be boldly faced, and he summoned his memorable third Parliament. We all remember the scenes that took place. The Commons, conscious of their power and of the justness of the grievances they complained of, refused to be brow-beaten, or to yield one jot of their demands. Five subsidies were voted, but before they were handed to the King, the representatives of the people determined to obtain a guarantee against the abuses of the past. The Petition of Right was drawn up. Charles was asked to pledge himself that he would never raise loans or levy taxes without the consent of Parliament; that his subjects should be free from arbitrary imprisonments; that soldiers should not be billeted upon the people; and that martial law should be abolished. The King attempted to evade the clauses of the Petition. Instead of pronouncing the usual words which signify the royal assent to a bill, he, inspired by Buckingham, replied, "The King willeth that right be done according to the laws and customs of the realm, and that the statutes be put into execution; that his subjects may have no cause to complain of any wrong or oppression contrary to their just rights and liberties, to the preservation whereof he holds himself in conscience as much obliged as of his

own Prerogative." The Commons were not to be hoodwinked by so elastic an answer; they did not want the statutes confirmed by simple words, but interpreted according to the hard and fast limits they had assigned to them. For a time the King refused to return any other answer, and threatened the House with instant dissolution. Then after some delay, advised by Buckingham, who had been concerned at the fierce censure poured upon his conduct by the Commons, and pressed by a joint application from the two Chambers, Charles came down to Westminster and agreed to the terms of the Petition, by pronouncing the usual form, "Let it be law as is desired." "The King came to the House at two o'clock," writes Secretary Conway, "and gave an answer which begat such an acclamation as made the House ring several times. I never saw a more general joy in all faces than spread itself suddenly and broke out into ringing of bells and bonfires miraculously." "It is not possible," writes Sir Francis Nethersole to the Queen of Bohemia, "to express with what joy this answer was heard, nor what joy it causes in all the city, where they are making bonfires at every door, such as were never seen, but upon his Majesty's return from Spain." This frantic delight was however soon checked.* In the struggle between the inquisitorial power of Parliament and the despotism of Prerogative the Commons had been victorious. Flushed with success they now pressed the Crown still further with their demands. They requested that the penal laws against the Catholics should be fully enforced, that the Arminians should be silenced, and that the Duke of Buckingham should be removed. To satisfy the religious prejudices of the Commons the King had no objection, but to dismiss the Duke from his Councils was an interference with the Royal Prerogative which Charles declined to entertain for a moment. Irritated at this refusal, the Lower House now proceeded in a spirit of mischievous intrusion to meddle with the grant of tonnage and poundage (the duties on exports and imports), which ever since the days of our sixth Henry had been voted by Parliament during the lifetime of each successive monarch, on the ground that the King had relinquished his claim to this taxation by his assent to the Petition of Right. Charles loudly raised his voice against this strained interpretation of the favours he had recently granted, and seeing that the position of affairs was now reversed, that it was the Commons who were encroaching upon the rights of the Crown, and not the Sovereign upon the rights of the subject, he hastily prorogued the Parliament.

And now he who had been the head and front of all the evils under which the country was then labouring was to fall a victim, not to the vengeance of a justly angered Legislature, but to the

hand of an unknown assassin. The Duke of Buckingham had gone down to Portsmouth to superintend the preparations for an expedition to relieve Rochelle. Whilst engaged in conversation with one of his colonels, a man, who had long been on the watch for his opportunity, suddenly pressed against him and stabbed him in the breast. The blow had been well directed; the Duke unsheathed the knife from his wound, crying out, "Villain!" and attempted to pursue his murderer, but he was mortally struck, and after an unsuccessful effort to steady himself fell to the ground a dead man. The assassin was John Felton, a young Puritan officer who had conceived a deadly hatred against Buckingham on account of having been disappointed of his promotion when serving in the expedition against Rhé. "Our noble Duke," writes Lord Dorchester to the Queen of Bohemia, "in the greatest joy and alacrity I ever saw him in my life, at news received about eight o'clock in the morning of Saturday last, of the relief of Rochelle, wherewith he was hastening to the King, who had that morning sent for him by me, at his going out of a lower parlour, in presence of many standers-by, was stabbed into the breast with a knife by one Felton, a reformed lieutenant, who hastening out of the door, and the Duke having pulled out the knife and following him out of the parlour into the hall, with his hand put to his sword, there fell down dead with much effusion of blood. The Lady Anglesea, then looking down into the hall, went immediately with a cry into the Duchess's chamber, who was in bed, and there fell down on the floor. The murderer in the midst of the noise and tumult slipped out into the kitchen, when a voice being current in the court, 'A Frenchman! a Frenchman!' his guilty conscience making him believe it was 'Felton! Felton!' he came out of the kitchen, said, 'I am the man,' and rendered himself to the company." So terrible a tragedy, its victim the foremost man in the kingdom, created a profound sensation, and not a detail respecting the history of the murderer, the sorrow of the King, the grief of the widow, the burial of the Duke, and the sentiments of the nation upon the dread event is omitted in the State Papers before us. There we learn how Felton had come "from London expressly the Wednesday, arriving at Portsmouth the very morning, not above half an hour before he committed the deed;" how "he gloried in his act the first day, but when told that he was the first assassin of an Englishman, a gentleman, a soldier, and a Protestant, he shrank at it, and is now grown penitent;" how it was wished to have him racked, should the law sanction such punishment, to find out his accomplices; how "he confessed his offence to 'be a fearful and crying sin,' and requested that he

might do some public penance before his death in sackcloth, with ashes on his head and ropes about his neck ;" how verses were written in his honour, and how he was hanged at Tyburn and the body then carried to Portsmouth to be suspended in chains. There we read how "the King took the Duke's death very heavily, keeping his chamber all that day as is well to be believed ; but the base multitude in London drink health to Felton, and there are infinitely more cheerful than sad faces of bitter degree ;" how "there never was greater demonstration of affection than his Majesty showed to the deceased Duke in all which concerns his honour, estate, friends and enemies, whom he cannot well look upon if any come in his way ;" how "the King omitted nothing which may in any way concern the doing honour to the body of the Duke," and how the corpse was privately interred in the Abbey to escape the fury of the mob ; and how passionate was the sorrow of the bereaved Duchess. Still to the nation at large, though it regretted the act of the assassin, few beyond the King and the widow mourned the death of the Duke. "The stone of offence being now removed by the hand of God," writes a courtier, "it is to be hoped that the King and his people will come to a perfect unity." The following epitaph, suggested by the Duke of Buckingham, is among the State Papers :—

"Ænigma mundi morior.

- " Omnia fui nunc quicquam habui ;
- " Patriæ parens et Hostis audio ;
- " Deliciæ idem et ludibrium Parliamenti ;
- " Qui dum Papistis bellum infero, insimulor Papista ;
- " Dum Protestantium partibus consulo, occidior a Protestante."

The vacancy left in the councils of the King by the murder of Buckingham was soon to be filled up by a far more dangerous favourite. Few characters of this period have been more misjudged and less understood than the designer of the famous policy of Thorough. It has been the fashion for historians and biographers to represent Wentworth as the most flagrant of political apostates. In his early life, it is said, he stood forth as the champion of the liberties of the people of England, as the most formidable of the antagonists of the Crown, as the representative of the power of Parliament in contradistinction to the claims of Prerogative. Then, when his name had been known throughout the country as the friend of freedom and as the staunch ally of those who had made war against the arbitrary proceedings of the sovereign, he shamelessly deserted his party and enrolled himself in the ranks of those who were the warmest supporters of a dangerous despotism. This conventional view of the character of Wentworth becomes at once disproved when we study his life and acts by the light of the

evidence brought forward by the State Papers and by the valuable Strafford correspondence. We see him imperious, stern, sweeping in the measures he advocates, untiring in his industry, mischievous, uncompromising, but inconsistent never. He was not an apostate, but a disciple whose faith had been hidden for a time behind the clouds of personal hatred. In the first three Parliaments summoned by Charles he had sided with the country party not because he was opposed to the policy of the Crown, but because he detested with a malignity which knew no rest the man who was then the adviser of the King and the sole Minister of the nation. He is the first on the list of those English statesmen who have gone into factious opposition not because they disapprove of the measures of the Government, but because they hate the Minister who suggests them. What was the origin of the feud between Buckingham and Wentworth we know not, but at one time, from the Papers before us, it is evident that no such antipathy existed. Early in the year 1626 we find Wentworth writing to Conway respecting the Presidentship of York, which Lord Scrope was on the eve of resigning, and suggesting the appointment of himself as Scrope's successor. In that letter he states that he will not move further in his suit until he knows how it may please the Duke of Buckingham, "*from whose bounty he acknowledges much already, and still reposes under the shadow of his favour.*" Whether the Duke declined to further the applications of Wentworth for personal advancement, whether he was jealous of him as a probable rival near the King, whether he feared his intellectual superiority, or whatever may have been the cause of the quarrel, it is certain that Buckingham essayed his utmost to crush the ambitious Yorkshire knight. Through underhand influence he endeavoured to deprive him of the office of *custos rotulorum* which he held; he attempted to disqualify him from serving in the second Parliament by causing the name of Wentworth to be pricked as Sheriff of his county; and on every occasion he tried to prejudice the King against him. To a man of Wentworth's imperious will and keen ambition, this hostility of Buckingham which effectually barred all the approaches to Court favour was intensely galling. He resolved to be avenged, and there were few in the House of Commons who could compare with him for fierce denunciations against the policy of the Crown, or for bitter invectives against the Minister. Yet, after a careful perusal of his speeches and letters, it is absurd to class Wentworth in the same category with the leaders of the popular party—with Eliot, with Pym, with Hampden. He was no friend to democracy; he had no wish to see the Prerogative domineered over by the Parliament; if there was to be battle between the Sovereign and the subject, he did not desire to see the latter supreme. In his sympathies, in

his prejudices, in his views of government he was thoroughly the aristocrat. When he stood forward as the opponent of the Crown he was always most careful to distinguish between the acts of the Sovereign and the acts of the Minister. It was not the King who was ever at fault, but his dangerous and shortsighted adviser. The whole blame of misgovernment, the illegal measures that had been introduced, the grievances under which the country was then labouring were the work of Buckingham, and of Buckingham alone. "This hath not been done" cried Wentworth, after passionately inveighing against the loans that had been levied, the imprisonments that had been put in force, and the soldiers that had been billeted upon the people. "This hath not been done by the King (under the pleasing shade of whose crown I hope we shall ever gather the fruits of justice), but by projectors : these have extended the prerogative of the King beyond its just limits so as to mar the sweet harmony of the whole." So little did he consider himself as the enemy of the Sovereign, "under whose smile he would much rather live than the frown," that he begged Weston to use his good offices with Charles to remove the Royal prejudice against him, and owned himself to be an "honest, well-affected loyal subject." After the passing of the Petition of Right Wentworth severed himself entirely from his colleagues. He had no sympathy with the course the House of Commons was then pursuing. All the grievances complained of had been redressed, and it appeared to him that it was now the Lower House who were trying to tyrannize over the Sovereign, and who were imitating some of the worst precedents that Charles had set. "The authority of a King" he said, "is the keystone which closeth up the arch of order and government, which contains each part in due relation to the whole, and which once shaken and infirmed all the frame falls together into a confused heap of foundation and battlement of strength and beauty." The position of affairs was now reversed, it was the House of Commons which was on the side of despotism and unjust encroachments, whilst the King had assumed the true position of a wise and benevolent Sovereign. Wentworth made overtures to the Court which were accepted, the death of Buckingham removed the great bar to his progress, and henceforth the chief author of the Petition of Right was to be the firm friend and confidential adviser of the King.

We now enter upon those memorable eleven years when for the first time in our history the personal will of the Sovereign and his advisers was to supplant the direction of Parliament, when justice herself was to be domineered over by the decisions of arbitrary and illegal courts, and when the people, harassed by inquiries and burdened by taxation, were to find themselves rudely deprived of

the constitutional protection their forefathers had enjoyed. Irritated at the tone adopted by the Commons respecting the right of levying the duties on tonnage and poundage, and at the attacks directed against the Papists and the Arminians, "whereby the King and his regal authority and commandment have been so highly contemned as our kingly office cannot bear nor any former age parallel," Charles hastily dissolved Parliament, condemning by fine and imprisonment those who had taken a foremost part in the late opposition. Peace was made with France and Spain, and the whole attention of the Sovereign was now confined to the domestic concerns of his kingdom. The events embraced by the State Papers during this period divide themselves naturally into three heads: the ecclesiastical policy of Laud, the fiscal policy of Charles, and the despotic policy of Strafford. The character of Laud will always be open to a diversity of opinions and estimated variously according to the sympathies of the critic. To the political layman he represents the worst type of the meddling ecclesiastic, always interfering in matters foreign to his province and careless of all consequences provided the pride of his order be upheld. To the Protestant he is the type of that sacerdotal arrogance which seeks to create a marked distinction between the clergy and the laity, and to control the affairs of men and nations by calling into play the terrorism of the unseen and the exercise of a special and peculiar authority. To the High Churchman he is the type of a true son of the Church, anxious to maintain a proper discipline within her fold, firm in his resolve to repress the mischief of dissent and the vagaries of latitudinarianism, and conscious of his right to wield that power which belongs, and alone belongs, to the consecrated priest of the Most High. Viewed apart from sectarian prejudices and partialities, Laud was a man of great industry, of much business-like capacity, of little knowledge of human nature, and consequently deficient in tact, zealous, hasty, unsympathetic and severe. His worst enemy could not, however, deny that his life was pure and his honour stainless. "My lord of Canterbury," writes Sir Thomas Roe to the Queen of Bohemia, "is an excellent man, and if your Majesty has no relation to him, I wish you would be pleased to make it, for he is very just, incorrupt, and, above all, mistaken by the erring world. For my part I do esteem him a rare counsellor for integrity, and a fast friend and one that hath more interest in his Majesty's judgment than any man." Laud had completely ingratiated himself in the affections of his master, and his opinion carried such weight with the royal mind that, in the judgment of Roe, he was the "one man" whom those who wished favours from the Court should conciliate. At the time of the dissolution of the third Parliament he was

Bishop of London, but further honour was in store for him. On the death of Abbot he was raised to the See of Canterbury, and on the death of Lord Treasurer Weston he was appointed First Lord of the Treasury.

In the volumes before us there is little connected with the history of Laud which is not the subject of the fullest and most minute comment. We listen to his frequent counsels to his Sovereign; we hear his congratulations upon the abolition of Parliaments, and his delight that "that noise is silenced for ever;" we read his letters to Strafford; we watch him making his narrow inquiries at the Treasury into the national expenditure, passing his stern judgment upon some unhappy offender brought before the Star Chamber or the High Commission Court, punishing vagrants, restoring churches and cathedrals, and persecuting Low Churchmen because they fail to carry out the rubric of the Prayer Book to the very letter. There in these Papers stands his picture painted both by friend and foe—we see him the fussy politician, the stern judge, the uncompromising Churchman, the staunch friend to his order, the hard, intolerant man. The portrait may be flattered or distorted, but not a single feature is permitted to escape without minute criticism. Whatever opinion may be held as to the ability of Laud, it is impossible after perusing the evidence preserved in the State Papers to doubt his industry. His energy, to copy Lord Exeter's phrase, is "miraculous." Nothing sacred or secular, civil or criminal, was beyond his province. He would come fresh from the composition of a State Paper to discuss with the authorities at Oxford the best means for the suppression of dissipation among the undergraduates. At one moment he would be sitting in solemn state as presiding judge in the Star Chamber or High Commission Court, and the next he would be as keen as a hound on the slot of a deer in pursuit of disobedient Nonconformists. "We took another conventicle of Separatists," he writes to his private secretary with all the glee of a successful sportsman, "in Newington Woods, on Sunday last, in the very brake where the King's stag should have been lodged for his hunting the next morning." Now he would occupy himself with putting down wakes, issuing writs for ship money, or interesting himself in the embellishment of his favourite Oxford, and then he would be busy interfering with the churches of the English residents in Holland, or with the churches of the Protestant refugees in England, or with the form of worship north of the Tweed. One month we find his attention entirely engrossed with the care of cathedrals, the patronage of a learned literature, and the proper exercise by his brother bishops of their ordination duties; the

next he is engaged in regulating the Sunday recreation of the people, superintending the ecclesiastical matters of the Inns of Court, and solving the difficult problem of the double duty to King and Pope of the Roman Catholic subjects of a Protestant country. "Nothing," writes Mr. Bruce, "was too lofty, too distant, or too mean to escape his regulating hand."

The chief feature, however, in the policy of Laud is his conduct as a Church reformer. As the most rigid of ceremonialists he was exceedingly pained at the lax discipline maintained by the clergy, and the evasions of the rubric of the Book of Common Prayer, to be met with in the churches scattered throughout the country. He was determined to put down, by the severe ruling of the Star Chamber and High Commission Court, the Puritanical element which was then leavening the doctrines of the Church of England with its Calvinism, till they were hardly deserving of the name of "Catholic." He bade all bow at the name of Jesus. He gave orders for the removal of the altar from the centre of the aisle to the east end of the church. He visited with punishment the clergyman who refused to call himself "priest," to wear the surplice, to teach the doctrine of the Real Presence, to uphold the Apostolical Succession, to maintain the efficacy of Confession, or to use the sign of the Cross. Equally severe was he upon the conduct of the congregation of the clergy. He exacted the most outward reverence from the laity during the hours of Divine Worship; they were to bow at the sacred name, to turn to the east during the recital of the creeds, not to laugh or talk, or to wear their hats at morning prayer, or to receive the sacrament non-kneeling. How the Archbishop carried these views of his into effect is well known from the memorable prosecutions he instituted against offenders, and which are the common facts of history. Into these—the sentences passed upon Peter Smart, Alexander Leighton, Henry Sherfield, William Prynne, and others—we need not enter, as the evidence before us is not of so novel a nature as to justify, within the limits of a review, special comment. Among the State Papers there is, however, a document which certainly deserves attention. In the year 1635 Sir Nathaniel Brent, the Vicar General, reported to Laud the result of his visitation throughout the dioceses of Norwich, Peterborough, Lichfield, Worcester, Gloucester, Winchester and Chichester. From the pages of this report we have an insight into the condition of the country, the state of the clergy, the grievances complained of, the punishments inflicted, all of which are of the deepest interest. At Norwich we read that "the cathedral church is much out of order, the hangings of the choir

are naught, the pavement not good, the spire of the steeple is quite down, the copes are fair but want mending;" that "many ministers appeared without priests' cloaks, and some of them are suspected of nonconformity, but they carried themselves so warily that nothing could be proved against them:" and that the mayor and his brethren were "convented" for "walking indecently in the cathedral church every Sunday in prayer time before the sermon." At Lynn we learn that the three churches are exceeding fair and well kept, but that "there are divers Papists who speak scandalously of the Scriptures and of our religion; they are already presented for it, and I have given order that they shall be brought into the High Commission Court." At Bungay "Mr. Fairfax, curate of Rumborough, was charged with divers points of inconformity, but hath renounced all upon his oath, and hath faithfully promised to read the King's declaration for lawful sports. Mr. Daines, lecturer of Beccles, a man of more than seventy years of age, did never wear the surplice, nor use the cross in baptism." At Ipswich "I suspended one Mr. Cave, a precise minister of St. Helen's, for giving the sacrament of the Eucharist to non-kneelants." At St. Edmund's Bury, which was "formerly infected with Puritanism, but now is well reformed," the licence of a young curate was taken away "in regard of his great ignorance, being not able to tell me what Ecclesia did signify." At Stamford "the ministers were generally in priests' cloaks, and they, with the laity, were all the time of Divine Service uncovered and still bowed at the pronouncing of the blessed name of Jesus." At Oundle a canonical admonition was given to the schoolmaster "for instructing his scholars out of a wrong Catechism, and for expounding the Ten Commandments out of the writings of a silenced minister." At Northampton the parish priest and his congregation were threatened with the terrors of the High Commission Court if the laity continued to wear their hats during Divine Service and refused to bow at the name of Jesus. At Wolverhampton a young curate was suspended for declining to call himself curate, but assistant. At Bridgenorth the vicar was suspended for marrying one couple before the canonical hour. In the town of Derby several of the clergy were suspended for drunkenness, and for "making many very foul clandestine marriages to the great offence of the country." At Worcester the state of the cathedral and of the much walking about during the hours of Divine Service are complained of. At Stratford-upon-Avon the vicar was suspended "for grossly particularizing in his sermons, for suffering his poultry to roost and his hogs to lodge in the chancel, for walking in the church to con his sermon in time of Divine Service," &c. At Gloucester it is complained that "they are much given to straggle from

their own parishes to hear strangers." Throughout the pages of this important report we see how zealous the Archbishop was not only that irreverence and disorderly proceedings should be discountenanced, but that the churches and cathedrals should by repairs and restoration be made worthy of the sacred purpose for which they were intended.

Side by side with this investigation of Brent we have, as a most valuable supplement to the information drawn up by the Vicar-General, four original Minute Books of the proceedings of the High Court of Commission. The first volume runs from 1634 to 1635; the second from 1635 to 1636; the third from 1639 to 1640; and the fourth, which contains fair transcripts of entries in the preceding book, runs from April to June, 1640. Of this Court Laud was the chief judge and moving spirit, and from the punishments inflicted by it, we see what were the grievances complained of, and the light in which they were regarded. Turning over the pages of these Minute Books we read how certain vestrymen were fined 10*l.* for their misconduct in publishing a new table of church fees; how the King's printers were fined 300*l.* "for errors in printing the Bible;" how one Nathaniel Barnard was fined 1000*l.* for seditious preaching at St. Mary's College, Cambridge; how the Lady Eleanor Touchet was fined 3000*l.* for "publishing fanatical pamphlets;" how Amy Green was fined 2000*l.*, "subject to consideration for notorious adultery;" how John Laverock, clerk, was imprisoned in Bridewell for "preaching in London without licence, and living a vicious life;" how Henry Deane, of Greenwich, fisherman, was committed to Newgate for "receiving men and young women to be transported beyond seas without leave." And then we read the punishments and penances that were inflicted upon men guilty of flagrant immorality; of contempt of court and refusal to pay wages to their curates; of preaching after deposition and degradation; of building houses upon consecrated land; of cock-fighting taking place in front of the communion table before an admiring audience of villagers; of hindering the officers of the court in the performance of their duty; of circulating Popish tracts and the like; records of offences which afford us no little information as to the state of morality and the social customs of the age. Respecting the proceedings in the Star Chamber, ample information is supplied by the Papers calendared in these volumes. In the hearing of the cases before this court the Archbishop is characteristically conspicuous, and when his judgments are compared with those of the other judges, it will be seen that he is inclined to take a severer view of the offences brought before him than the rest of his colleagues.

In all his efforts for the restoration of Church discipline, and

the rendering the King independent of his Parliament, Laud was ably assisted by the imperious will of Wentworth. The alliance entered into between the King and Wentworth had resulted in the good of the two contracting parties. The King henceforth was to command the devoted services of one of the ablest of his subjects, whilst the servant was to be honoured with titles and splendid advancement. On severing himself from the demagogues of the House of Commons, Wentworth had been raised to the peerage as Baron Wentworth, but shortly after the death of Buckingham he had been created Viscount Wentworth, and appointed Lord President of the North. The post was one especially suited to his pride of power and train of thought. He saw that the contest was no longer between Prerogative and the control of Parliament, but between the abolition of the Royal supremacy and the extinction of Parliament. During the debates before the dissolution of the third Parliament, his loyalty and aristocratic sympathies had been disgusted at the offensive tone adopted by the Lower House, inspired by Eliot and his party, towards the Crown. He admitted the principle that Parliament was to be assembled for counsel and advice, but he declined to recognise the new political creed then put forth, that Parliament should control and domineer over the Crown. Since the House of Commons refused to keep within its proper limits, the King was fully justified in resolving to govern without its advice. It was the province of the King to rule and not that of the Legislature, and Wentworth henceforth ranked himself as the stoutest upholder of the absolutism of the Prerogative, in the face of Parliamentary innovations. He soon displayed the nature of the opinions he held. The jurisdiction of the Council of York, or of the North, extended over the counties of York, Northumberland, Cumberland, and Westmoreland, the bishopric of Durham, the cities of York, and Hull, and over the town of Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Originally established to crush the northern rebellions which had broken out on the suppression of the monasteries, its authority had gradually developed, till it now included within itself the powers of the Courts of Common Law, the Courts of Equity, and even of the Star Chamber. This despotic authority had been still further increased in the time of James by rendering the President independent of the forms of law, and subject only to "secret instructions," which were transmitted from Whitehall to the Northern Council. Upon his arrival at York, Wentworth proceeded at once to carry out the policy he had designed. Save the King he acknowledged no master, or tolerated any interference with his actions. As the representative of royalty he exacted the most absolute reverence and respect from all.

One young man, the son of Lord Faulconberg, declined to remove his hat in the presence of Wentworth; he was imprisoned and forced to apologize. A barrister, who had expressed dissatisfaction with the ruling of the Lord President, was sternly admonished and compelled to expiate his offence by the most servile submission. Sir David Foulis, a man holding a high position in the county, had opposed the jurisdiction of the Lord President, and had spoken disrespectfully of the Council, he was summoned to appear before the Star Chamber, and the sentence passed upon him was that he should be degraded from his various offices; be fined 5000*l.* to the King and 3000*l.* to Wentworth; and be condemned to offer a most abject apology to the King and "the Lord Viscount Wentworth not only in this Court, but in the Court of York, and likewise at the open assizes in the same county;" and finally be committed to the Fleet during the Royal pleasure. His son, who had participated in the father's offence, was also heavily fined and imprisoned. From Wentworth's judgments there was no appeal; lawyers objected to his absolute proceedings, but he overruled their remonstrances with a high hand, and declared that he would lay any man by the heels who ventured to sue out a prohibition in the Courts at Westminster. Knowing how dependent a despotism is upon the military element, Wentworth embodied an effective militia and speedily drilled it into a splendid state of discipline. He enforced the rigid payment of all taxes, fines, and Government exactions, so that the revenue of the Presidency was quadrupled. Never had the North contributed so handsomely to the Exchequer; never had its people been cowed into such a spiritless condition. Bitter remonstrances against the rule of Wentworth had been addressed to the Royal ear; but Charles, fully satisfied with the devotion of his servant, declined to pay heed to them. The praise of his Sovereign was the only reward that Wentworth desired, and so long as he enjoyed the confidence of the King, he feared not the abuse of enemies or the malice of intriguers. "That his Majesty rest satisfied," he writes to the Earl of Carlisle in a letter to be found only amongst the State Papers, "in the course I hold in this Government is my chiefest exaltation before men and my fullest contentment in my inmost retirements. And surely I will never omit continually to serve him his own way, when I once understand it, and when that beam leaves me, serve him the most profitable way the dimmer lights of my own judgment shall by any means be able to lead me unto. In this truth I will live and die; all the devils of hell, all their ministers on earth, shall never be able to impeach or shake it."

Such devotion was soon to be repaid with advancement.

and Wentworth, after a brief but brilliantly successful reign at York, crossed St. George's Channel as Lord Deputy of Ireland. As at York, so now at Dublin, he carried out those designs which, in their frequent letters to each other, Laud and he had called by the name of Thorough. The policy of Wentworth was that of a vigilant and well-intentioned despotism. Since men were prone to discontent and sedition, they required the strong arm of the military power to suppress their dangerous murmurs, he was therefore in favour of a standing army. The prejudices of the lawyer, the parade of precedents, the adherence to obsolete practices were foreign to his mode of administering the law; in their stead he preferred the exercise of "sound discretion," and the ruling of the statesman to that of the judge. He had no faith in national sympathies, he had no respect for vested interests, he cared not for individual opinion and independence of judgment, but he believed in the welfare that could accrue to a nation from the control and suggestions of one firm, far-seeing and eminently capable ruler. "It was a chaste ambition," he said, when remonstrated with for his absolute proceedings, "if rightly placed, to have as much power as may be, that there may be power to do the more good for the place where a man serves." Wentworth was desirous of doing good, but unfortunately for those who had to obey his rule the "good" was only what appeared in his eyes as wise and beneficial. He knew better than the judges how the law should be administered; he knew better than the whole bench of bishops how the policy of the Church should be carried out; he knew better than the merchant or the economist how the commerce of a country should be stimulated and restricted. Every question was to pass in review before his keen, fertile mind, and in every question the control and reformation suggested by the policy of Thorough was to be sweepingly exercised. From his correspondence both in the Strafford and the State Papers we see what this policy really signified. Absolute power was placed by the King in the hands of the new Lord Deputy to do what seemed to him best for the maintenance of the Prerogative and the extension of Irish prosperity. On the arrival of Wentworth in Dublin he was received with royal honours; he established a guard and ordered the ceremonies of the English Court to be observed within the Castle. To the joy of the nation he gave his sanction to the assembling of a Parliament, but we who are behind the scenes, thanks to the Strafford Papers, see how little reason the Irish had to congratulate themselves upon this permission. The plan of Wentworth was as simple as betrayal and repudiation could make it. He would convene a Parliament; it would be divided into two sessions; during the first session the attention of the Houses

would be exclusively occupied with the question of supplies; during the second session the redress of Irish grievances would be brought forward. In his despatches we see Wentworth calmly discussing the base policy he intends to carry out. The first session is the one that interests him. Ample subsidies, he feels sure, will be voted him by a House anxious to propitiate the Crown and smooth the path for the redress of the grievances complained of. Once ample subsidies supplied, the second session can be dispensed with! He resolves to play off Protestant against Roman Catholic, so as to manage both parties in the House of Commons. He intends to fill the House with his creatures and dependents, so that the requisite majority may be obtained. He has no fear as to the result of his machinations, and is full of confidence at the future.

His hopes were not disappointed. Parliament met, and ample subsidies were voted in the first session by the Irish, expectant of having their grievances redressed. During the second session, Wentworth, with his exchequer full, laughed to scorn the grievances that were brought before him; the indignant Catholics now broke out into opposition, but they were defeated by the Lord Deputy throwing all his weight into the scale of the Protestants; the Protestants then, in their turn, claimed their reward, and were cruelly snubbed for their pains. In his correspondence with Laud, Wentworth chuckles over his dishonourable victory, and expresses no shame at the tortuous course he had pursued. He had nothing to do with Catholic or Protestant grievances; all that interested him was to make the Prerogative absolute, to obtain ample supplies, and to render Ireland prosperous according to the form of prosperity he desired. His next step was to re-organize the army. He supplied it with clothes, arms, and ammunition; he paid up all arrears; he restored discipline within its ranks; he strengthened its numbers, and at the end of a short time he had at his disposal a powerful and well-drilled force. To establish a permanent revenue now occupied all his attention. He freed commerce from the pirates that had infested the Irish coasts, he levied fines, he raised taxes, he established monopolies, he planted new districts, he introduced the general cultivation of flax; by his iron will and his determination to make Ireland follow industries, not which she liked best, but which paid her best, he raised the fortunes of the Emerald Isle to a high pitch of prosperity. Within four years the produce of the Customs rose from 12,000*l.* a year to 40,000*l.*, and in the fifth year of his power he wrote home that the annual revenue would exceed the expenditure by 60,000*l.* "My Lord Deputy of Ireland," writes Sir Thomas Roe to the Queen of Bohemia, "doth great wonders, and governs like a king, and hath taught that kingdom to show us an example of envy by having Parlia-

ments and knowing wisely how to use them. . . . This is of great service, and to give your Majesty a character of the man—he is severe abroad and in business, and sweet in private conversation; retired in his friendship, but very firm; a terrible judge, and a strong enemy; a servant violently zealous in his master's ends, and not negligent of his own; one that will have what he will, and though of great reason, he can make his will greater when it may serve him; affecting glory by a seeming contempt; one that cannot stay long in the middle region of fortune, but *entreprenant*, but will either be the greatest man in England or much less than he is."

The policy which Wentworth was exerting all his energy and industry to carry out in Ireland was being feebly imitated by Charles in England. Assisted by a few confidential advisers the King reigned supreme. The one check upon the arbitrary exercise of Prerogative, the Parliament, had been struck out of the English Constitution. The will of the Sovereign was the law of the nation; by it the judges, removable at the Royal pleasure, framed their decisions; by it taxes were levied and exactions imposed; by it ecclesiastical discipline was enforced; and by it the Privy Council, whose acts of State had now superseded Acts of Parliament, regulated the affairs of the country. Nothing more impresses the student of these exhaustive calendars than the attention which the King, during the long interval when Parliament was suppressed, paid to affairs of State. The Privy Council was now the only public deliberative body in matters of Government, and if we are to place any faith in State Paper evidence, Charles was always a constant and most diligent member at its proceedings. Under Buckingham, the King entrusted everything to the favourite; the Duke governed whilst Charles scarcely ever appeared upon the scene; it was the Duke who advised the Council, who laid down the law, and who conducted the domestic and foreign policy of the country. But since the removal of his trusted adviser the King had become well versed in the affairs of Government; he was informed of all that his Ministers had undertaken; he directed the decisions of committees, and was consulted on all important matters of State. The era of Ministerial responsibility had not been ushered in. To men like Laud in England, like Hamilton in Scotland, like Wentworth in Ireland, the duty of obedience to the Royal mandate was the corner-stone of their school of politics. "Thorough" signified a full and complete devotion to the views and desires of the Sovereign. Inflexible, narrow-minded, mistaken, yet believing in all sincerity that the course he had mapped out was the right one to pursue, Charles resolved to render himself independent of all control. He had

acceded to the demands of Parliament; his generosity in concession had failed to satisfy the Legislature; to grant more would be to menace the might of the Prerogative and to endanger the welfare of the country. He declined to be more submissive to his Parliaments than his ancestors before him had been submissive; and since the Houses refused to be kept within their constitutional limits he would reign independent of their aid and advice. It was his aim, he asserted, to be actuated in all that he promoted from the purest of motives; the welfare of the country was his one object, and not the gratification of any vindictive feelings; he wished so to govern the country that he might have not only the good opinion of man, but the approval of God. Among the State Papers is a form of daily, morning and evening, prayer, written in the handwriting of the King, and doubtless the outpourings of his own heart, which is particularly interesting, as reflecting the personal character and opinion of the man. Whatever were the faults of Charles, and in spite of the inconsistencies his career display, no one can doubt but that he was a sincere believer in Christianity, and anxious in all his actions to be illumined by the light of the Divine wisdom. As this prayer is unknown to all, save the few who read these calendars, it is a discovery which may, we hope, justify its insertion in these pages. We have altered the spelling to that of the present day; but it is a curious fact that Charles in writing out this prayer has adopted his own peculiar style of orthography—a spelling founded on the Scottish pronunciation which adhered to him throughout his life:—

“ Good Lord, I thank Thee for keeping me this day [night]. I humbly beseech Thee to keep me this day [night] from all dangers or mischances that may happen to my body, and all evil thoughts which may assault or hurt my soul, for Jesus Christ his sake. And look upon me thy unworthy servant, who here prostrates himself at thy throne of grace; but look upon me O Father through the merits and mediation of Jesus Christ thy beloved Son, in whom Thou art only well pleased; for, of myself, I am not worthy to stand in Thy presence, or to speak with my unclean lips to Thee, most holy and eternal God; for Thou knowest that in sin I was conceived and born, and that ever since I have lived in iniquity, so that I have broken all Thy holy Commandments, by sinful motions, evil words, and wicked works, omitting many duties I ought to do, and committing many vices which Thou hast forbidden under pain of heavy displeasure; as for sins, O Lord, they are innumerable; in the multitude therefore of Thy mercies, and by the merits of Jesus Christ, I entreat Thy Divine Majesty that Thou wouldest not enter into judgment with Thy servant; nor be extreme to mark what is done amiss, but be Thou merciful to me, and wash away all my sins with the merits of that precious blood that Jesus Christ shed for me, and not only wash away

all my sins, but also to purge my heart by Thy Holy Spirit from the dross of my natural corruption; and as Thou dost add days to my life, so, good Lord, add repentance to my days, that when I have past this mortal life, I may be a partaker of Thy everlasting kingdom, through Jesus Christ, our Lord."

Deprived of the supplies of his faithful Commons, it was necessary for the King to fill his empty exchequer by a system of direct taxation proceeding from the Crown. He levied the tonnage and poundage dues, ordering all those who resisted to be imprisoned during the Royal pleasure. He revived the obsolete knighthood fines. He created monopolies, and exacted new licenses. He forced Papists to pay for the suspension of the laws against their religion. He laid claim to lands, and to the towns that had sprung up thereupon, on the pretence that they had been filched from the Royal forests. But all these exactions are dwarfed by the issue of his memorable writs for ship money. Under the Plantagenets it had been the custom to call upon the port towns to furnish ships manned and equipped for the defence of the kingdom. Acting upon the advice of his attorney-general, Charles determined to levy this tax, and to lay before the country plausible reasons for so doing. The aid was not new, for so late as in 1626 a fleet had been created in this manner, with this difference that then the country was at war with Spain, whereas now it was in perfect peace. The delicate task of convincing the Council and the nation of the necessity of this imposition was entrusted to Secretary Coke. Nor did the arguments of the Secretary lack a certain weight. He spoke of the increase of English commerce; of the powerful navy of the Dutch Republic; of the fleet being gathered together by France. "Allnations," he said, "desire to be served by their valour, yet our ancient reputation is not only cried down, but we submit to wrongs in all places which are not to be endured." Then he alluded to the injuries the English had to sustain in Constantinople, "where the ambassador's house had been searched, and merchants had been imprisoned without colour of justice, ships burnt and sailors made slaves;" in Spain, "where our ships and goods are confiscated if they find them Holland built;" in France, "contrary to the late treaty of peace endeavours are made to drive our trade out of the country, and at the same time to inveigle our gunfounders and shipwrights into France;" and to the injuries sustained by our fishings from the intrusion of the Dutch. The only course for the King to pursue to obtain justice was, he said, to reinforce his guards so as to recover his undoubted rights of sovereignty in all his seas. The reasons of Coke were accepted by the submissive Council, and the writs for ship money issued. At first the writs

were directed to sea-port towns only, but the tax was too convenient to remain long thus restricted, and they were soon extended to the whole kingdom—each county being rated at a particular sum, which was afterwards assessed upon individuals. The information upon this subject to be found in the *State Papers* is most voluminous. Every detail in the history of the levy of ship money—the opposition the tax encountered, the sums annually raised by the tax, the mode in which it was collected, are all described, either by the officials of the Government or by private persons, with great minuteness. A bulky volume, containing new and interesting matter could be written alone upon this subject from the mass of materials now brought to the light by the careful editors of these *Calendars*. Like our income-tax, ship money was not only a wealthy addition to the revenue, but it was collected with great facility. Within the limits of his jurisdiction the Sheriff was made personally responsible for the collection. His instructions from the Council were comprised in two words—demand, and in cases of non-payment distrain. By a writ which ran in the King's name, he was directed to have a ship of a certain tonnage, armed with so many guns, manned with such a crew, and supplied with provisions for six months, ready for the service of the King at a particular sea-port on a certain day. But as in the case of the inland counties the command to furnish a ship with ordnance and crew was altogether illusory, the Sheriff was informed that as he might find some little difficulty in obeying the command which had been addressed to him, the King would lend the county which the Sheriff represented the ship of war required, on payment of so many thousand pounds, ten pounds for every ton of the burthen of the demanded ship, and that the Sheriff, therefore, was to assess and levy that sum as the expenses mentioned in the writ. The strictest supervision was maintained so that the Sheriffs should not neglect their duties. One Edward Nicholas, who had been Secretary at the Admiralty, and who was now one of the clerks of the Council, was appointed to correspond with the Sheriffs and specially to watch their payments. Every Saturday the Treasurer of the Navy, to whom the Sheriffs remitted their money, made up his books, and forwarded to Nicholas a written account of all the sums received by him under the current writs, and also of the amounts which still remained unpaid from every county, whilst Nicholas, in his turn, was directed to submit these accounts every week to the personal cognizance of the Sovereign at the customary meeting of the Council held every Sunday. By this system of checks, the whole facts connected with the levy appeared at a glance. The Sheriff were responsible to the Treasurer of the Navy, the Treasurer of

the Navy was responsible to the Clerk of the Council, the Clerk of the Council was responsible to the Sovereign. If any Sheriff failed to duly render his accounts, he was at once reprimanded by Nicholas and ordered to pay in his moneys by a certain day, or in default to appear personally before the Council. In important cases he was even summoned to appear before Charles himself to give account of his stewardship.

The sums raised by this tax were expended on the Navy ; but as the imposition was entirely arbitrary, the majority of the country though of opinion that a powerful fleet was very desirable, both for the credit and safety of the kingdom, yet considered the establishment of a naval force as a very unequal recompense for the national liberties which were thus being sacrificed in the cause of maritime protection. In the correspondence preserved amongst the State Papers, this feeling of hostility towards the tax is one of the most important features in the history of the period. Sheriff after Sheriff complained that they could not get the chief constables of the Hundreds to assess the inhabitants. Several of the Sheriffs, like Francis Goddard of Wiltshire, aware of the unpopularity they incurred in levying this detested tax, were "full of fear at keeping so large a sum in a single weak house, standing far from neighbours, and all the country being acquainted with the fact of the money being in their possession," and were most anxious to know how such large amounts should be transmitted to London. This difficulty of remittance seems to have been so great that several Sheriffs, afraid to trust the sums they had collected with such distasteful labour out of their own hands, begged permission to bring the moneys themselves up to London, a request which was uniformly granted by the Council. The power of distress given by the writ was fully used, but we read complaint after complaint from the different Sheriffs, that the people, banded together by the sympathy of oppression, refused to purchase the articles thus distrained. In Northamptonshire, in Oxfordshire, in Yorkshire, in Wiltshire, in Essex, in Derbyshire, in Shropshire, in London, grave difficulties arose ; individuals assessed refused to subscribe their amounts and cheerfully suffered imprisonment in the sacred cause of liberty. Every obstacle was placed in the way of the Sheriffs whilst in pursuit of their duties—the parish authorities withheld from them the necessary information, the constables were rebellious, collectors could not be found to gather the tax, and as the unhappy Sheriffs were rendered personally liable for the amount they were instructed to obtain, many of them who were short in the sums received, preferred to make up the deficiencies themselves rather than appear before the King and his dreaded Council. "Scarcely a county," writes Mr. Bruce,

“was without its complaint; and what with charges of over-assessment on the one hand, and refractoriness, as it was termed, in non-payment on the other, the Council, Nicholas, and the referees in cases of difficulty were kept fully employed in this naval business.” Of the great opponent to this tax little is to be ascertained from a perusal of the State Papers. The information touching Hampden and his memorable resistance is so meagre, whilst petty and insignificant details are related at full length, as to appear intentional. There is one entry in these volumes headed “Papers relating to the case of ship money between the King and John Hampden,” but the papers contain only what can easily be obtained elsewhere—notes of the arguments of the law advisers of the Crown and of the Judges. The cause of this blank in the continuity of the State Paper evidence is thus briefly accounted for by Mr. Bruce:—“It was a case,” he says, referring to the trial, “which official people not engaged in it were probably not very willing openly to notice.”

By his arbitrary proceedings, his forced loans, his unconstitutional courts of law, the King had aroused a dangerous spirit of disloyalty in the nation, which only wanted opportunity to break out into revolt. He was now to cross the Tweed, and wound where they were most vulnerable the feelings of a people whose temper was as bold as their religious prejudices were strong. Worked upon by the mischievous suggestions of Laud, Charles resolved to carry out the ecclesiastical policy in Scotland which his father before him had endeavoured to establish. He would crush the dangerous independence of Presbyterianism by forcing every kirk and assembly from Wick to Berwick to accept the hated Five Articles which James had drawn up. The Holy Communion was to be received kneeling; in cases of sickness or other necessity the Lord's Supper was to be administered in private houses; under similar circumstances Baptism was to be administered in the same manner; the great fasts and feasts ordained by the Church were to be observed; and children were to be brought to the bishop for a blessing. These Articles had been obeyed in some districts, disobeyed in others, but everywhere had given rise to much revolt and dissatisfaction. Charles now determined that the same uniformity which existed in Church matters south of the Tweed should be maintained throughout north Britain. On July 23, 1637, an order was issued from the Privy Council that the English liturgy was henceforth to be used in all churches and cathedrals of Scotland. The storm of indignation with which the command was received is well known. The congregations refused to listen to the formal words of prayer, and in such places where the minister insisted upon using them he was mobbed, and his church half

wrecked by the angry assembly. Riots ensued, and the people, led by the aristocracy and their chief ministers, banded themselves together, and openly opposed the hated innovation. The clauses of the Covenant were framed and eagerly subscribed to by a furious and offended nation. Resistance so overt and determined created considerable consternation in the Council Chamber at Whitehall. The Marquess of Hamilton was sent post haste to Edinburgh with power to grant ample concessions, and to withdraw the Service Book, the Book of Canons, the Five Articles, and to admit the setting up the Confession of Faith of 1580, as a substitute for the Covenant recently entered into. He was also authorised to publish the proclamation of a General Assembly, to meet at Glasgow on the 20th November next, and a Parliament at Edinburgh on the 15th May, 1639. These measures failed to throw oil upon the troubled waters; they were regarded by the stern Covenanters as symptoms of weakness rather than of evidence of the Royal clemency. The whole history of the religious conflict that now ensued is described by the State Papers so fully, and with such detail, as to be literary treasure-trove of the deepest value to the future historian of this period. The General Assembly was held, and the Covenanters, assured of an overwhelming majority, offered no opposition to its meeting. Scarcely had it commenced its deliberations than it was evident that the Episcopalian element was hopelessly beaten. The Covenanters brought forth their resolutions, and they were passed by immense majorities. All the Acts of the Assembly, since the accession of James VI. to the Crown of England, were declared null and void. The Acts of Parliament which affected ecclesiastical affairs were repudiated as having no authority. The Covenant renouncing Popery and Prelacy was ordered to be signed by every one under pain of excommunication, and the press was set to work to promulgate the Acts of the General Assembly. Thus fell at once to the ground that scheme of ecclesiastical policy which James and Charles, with so much thought and with so little consideration for the feelings of certain of their subjects, had originated and attempted to carry out.

The success which had attended upon these measures now caused the Covenanters to quit the defensive and assume the aggressive. "We are busy here," writes a Mr. Craig from Edinburgh to Lord Stewart, "preaching, praying, and drilling; and if his Majesty and his subjects of England come hither they will find a harder welcome than before, unless we be made quit of the bishops." Instructions were now issued for the defence of the kingdom against the English marching north. Edinburgh was to be the centre, and communication was to be constantly

maintained between the shires and the capital by the appointment of commissioners "to be entertained at the public charge of their shires, and each commissioner to have allowance of pay for furnishing the watch when it falls upon his shire." A committee of war from the different presbyteries was selected, which was to have "a very special care to oversee the trying of all the people able to bear arms in all the shires, in choosing out soldiers, and taking course for the way of their payment," &c. All the regiments to be enrolled were to be commanded by men of skill, "and must be sent for out of Germany and Holland." Every parish was to furnish its quota of men, so that an army be levied in every one of the four quarters of the kingdom. The instructions then concluded with orders as to the manner in which the payment for the troops was to be raised, and a solemn assertion that the soldiers thus massed together were to be employed for no other purpose than "for the defence of their religion and laws."

Matters having now come to a crisis, Charles prepared in earnest for war. The State Papers throw much new light upon his proceedings. We see the King accumulating magazines of powder, the monopoly of which he held in his own hands; storing arms in convenient places in the northern counties; and taking measures for the levying and disciplining of the trained bands which were to be equipped and transported at the charge of the several counties, but upon reaching their places of rendezvous were to enter into the King's pay. We read how the guns were taken down from Landguard Fort, from Harwich, and from some of the castles in the Downs, to be applied to the fortification of the northern towns; how the roads between England and Scotland were stopped to intercept the letters written by the disaffected in England to the Covenanters; how the master gunner, in a petition to the King, "dares to his great regret to say that there are few gunners in your kingdom at this time who understand the several ranges of ordnance or the use of the mortar;" and how Sir Jacob Astley, the military commissioner, regarded the state of the northern counties—their capacity for defence, the points most threatened, and the route most eligible for the marching and support of an army. After holding many meetings of the Council, and listening to various suggestions how to raise money, a force consisting of 24,000 infantry and 6000 cavalry was collected by the King. Before starting forth upon his campaign he issued a proclamation declaring the immediate grounds of his quarrel with the Scots.

"We cannot but hold it requisite," began Charles, "to give our good subjects timely notice of the Scots' traitorous intentions, which

in very many ways appear to us. As, first, by the multitude of their printed pamphlets, or rather, indeed, infamous libels, stuffed full of calumnies against our Royal authority and our most just proceedings, and spreading of them in divers parts of this our kingdom; secondly, by their sending of letters to private persons to incite them against us, and sending some of their fellow-Covenanters to be at private meetings in London and elsewhere to pervert our good people from their duty, and some of these meetings we know, and some of those letters, lewd enough, we have seen; thirdly, by their public contemning all our just commands, and their mutinous protesting against them, a course not fit to be endured in any well-ordered kingdom; fourthly, by their rejecting of the Covenant commanded by our authority, because it was commanded by us; and, lastly, by their most hostile preparations in all kinds, as if we were not their King, but their sworn enemy."

The "traitorous Scots" were not unprepared to resist their foe. Letter after letter among the State Papers shows the measures they had adopted to make a sturdy fight, and the spirit that animated them. With the exception of a small district under the Marquis of Huntley, the whole of the south of Scotland was in the hands of the Covenanters. The few castles which belonged to the King, being inadequately provisioned and garrisoned, were either seized or voluntarily surrendered. The Earl of Argyle, after long temporizing, subscribed to the Covenant, and became the chief leader of the party, which now numbered among its adherents the Earls of Rothes, Cassilis, Montrose, Lindsey, Dalhousie, and Lothian, and the Lords Sinclair and Balmerino. The Scotch officers who had acquired fame in the German wars, especially under the great Gustavus, were invited over, and the chief commands in the army entrusted to them. Colonel Leslie, a soldier of great experience, and who had seen much service on the Continent, was appointed General-in-Chief. Forces were regularly enlisted and disciplined, and the Scottish Borders put in a state of defence against England. Nor were the men ill-equipped. "I have inquired," writes Sir Jacob Astley, who had been sent north to prepare the country for the campaign, "what arms the Scotch Borderers are armed withal. They have all muskets and pikes, so as our Bordering men must be so likewise, and think no more of bows, spears, jacks, and skull caps." This energetic action was strongly stimulated by the religious prejudices of the people. To the staunch Presbyterian, who refused to bow at the Sacred Name; who regarded the sign of the Cross as one of the devices of the Scarlet Woman; who hated prelacy; and who detested all prayers that were not extempore, death was far more preferable than the extinction of his ancient form of worship. In the

private letters among the State Papers we see how stern and uncompromising was this feeling. The people will have nothing to do with "scurvy priests;" they hope "that the same God that strengthened the arm of the land of Sweden against Germany will strengthen Scotland against England;" both "the King and England are rending that they will never knit again, and it shall be seen hereafter that it is to their great prejudice;" there "were never any bishops in the old time before, neither will they have any now; for they have banished them all out of Scotland, and swear that they shall never come in more, for if they do the women will beat out their brains with stones." The fury of the Scotch-women against the innovations meditated by Laud rose almost to insanity. "They say," writes Lady Westmoreland, "the women of Scotland are chief stirrers of this war." According to Edward Norgate, the women cursed and swore, "wishing their husbands' and children's flesh to be converted into that of dogs, and their souls annihilated, is the word, or damned the meaning, if they refuse to come into the Covenant, or ever consent to admit of the bishops."

The storm which the bigotry of Laud and the short-sighted policy of Charles had aroused considerably disconcerted the Government at home. "We daily meet in Council," writes the Lord-Admiral Northumberland, "but to little purpose, for, in my opinion, we are but just where you [Viscount Conway] left us. Divers trivial things have been argued amongst us, but yet the King declares not where he expects to have the money that must defray the expense of his army." The question of supplies was the most harassing of all the difficulties that the King now had to contend with. He had resolved not to appeal to the hated system of Parliament, yet the troops now massed together to subdue Scotland must be maintained. Encouraged by the triumph he had gained in the case of the ship money he now revived a still more obsolete custom. The feudal claim to military service was re-established. Letters were issued to all members of the aristocracy requiring them in person to attend the King in his march northwards with their retinues. By this course, Charles was assured that twelve hundred horse could be raised and maintained without any charge upon the Royal purse. Similar letters were sent to the "Judges, Inns of Court, and Inns of Chancery," but instead of military service they were required to lend the King such sums as they thought fit. The clergy were also assessed; "every Dean and Chapter at 200 marks, and the rest of the clergy at three shillings and sixpence in the pound. The bishops were left to a voluntary contribution." Thus, what with forced loans, voluntary contributions, and the revival of mediæval taxes, the army was ready to take the field by the end

of March, 1639. Disintegrating influences were, however, strongly at work in the camp. The distribution of the military commands had given great dissatisfaction to many of the nobles; the presence of the King was strongly disapproved of, and was declared by the Earl of Bristol to be "against all rule of military and politic discipline," whilst the soldiery were a disordered rabble, who, on their march north, amused themselves by robbing the districts they passed through, and offering rude caresses to the women. The plan of the campaign had been drawn up by Charles with no little skill. At the head of a considerable force he was to march into Scotland from Berwick; Wentworth, with an army of Irish recruits, was to land in the Clyde; the Marquis of Hamilton was to command a fleet of sixteen sail, which was first to land 5000 men in the north of Scotland, and then to take up a station for general assistance in the Firth of Forth; the Marquis of Huntley, the head of the Roman Catholic party in Scotland, was to secure the north of Scotland, and then to march southwards and unite with the King; whilst the Earl of Antrim was to invade Argyleshire with another Irish army of 10,000 men.

This military programme, like many other military programmes, was excellent on paper, but when it was being practically carried out, failures and deficiencies which had not been anticipated were painfully visible. Hamilton "anchored betwixt the two little isles or Inches" in the Firth of Forth, and did nothing, or, according to the narrative of one James Gordon, he did worse than nothing, for "the fleet did more hurt to the King who sent them than the enemy." The Irish recruits did not arrive. Huntley in the north was powerless against the tactics of the lords of the Covenant. The soldiers were ill-fed, their pay was in arrears, sickness broke out in the camp, whilst both amongst officers and men the war was unpopular, being regarded as impolitic and unconstitutional, and as a threat against the civil and religious liberties of England. On arriving at Berwick, Charles, who seems to have felt keenly that the sympathies of his soldiers were in favour of the foe, was not indisposed to come to terms. Nor were the Covenanters opposed to attaining their ends by pacific means. From the State Papers before us it is evident that Leslie might on several occasions have snatched an easy victory during this campaign had he so wished. It was, however, his object to avoid as long as possible actual hostilities, for, whether vanquished or triumphant, he deemed either result would be detrimental to the cause of the Covenant; if victorious, the martial spirit of England would be aroused and a new and more powerful army speedily collected; if vanquished, the hopes of the Covenanters would have been dashed to the ground. "General Leslie," writes Dr. Watts, chaplain-in-chief of the

Scotch forces, "is absolutely of opinion not to come to a pitched battle with the King's army, not of conscience but out of judgment, his reason being that if the Scotch army be beaten they will hardly be able to draw another army into the field; whereas, if the King should chance to lose the day his Majesty might easily raise another army." Between enemies, one of whom is averse to fight, whilst the other is in favour of a pacific policy, the conclusion of a peace is seldom a matter of much difficulty. Interviews took place between the King and the Scotch Commissioners, and it was at last stipulated that Charles should withdraw his fleet and army; that within forty-eight hours the Scotch should dismiss their forces; that the forts of the King should be restored, the Royal authority be fully recognised, and a General Assembly and a Parliament be immediately summoned in order to redress all grievances. In his turn the King agreed to remove the great stumbling-block of offence; he confirmed his former concessions, abrogating the canons, the liturgy, and the High Commission, and abolished the order itself of bishops for which he had so zealously contended. To those who wish to study the history of the negotiations that occurred, on this occasion, we beg to refer them to the State Paper, June 14th, 1639, containing "Journal of Events at the English Camp, extending from the 6th to the 14th June, 1639," written by the Lord-General for the information of Archbishop Laud. This peace is called the Pacification of Dunse Law, or more commonly the Treaty of Berwick.

The truce was, however, of short duration, for soon after the pacification had been signed the conduct of the Scotch again aroused all the bitterest feelings of the King. He complained that, in spite of his past clemency, his subjects north of the Tweed were doing all in their power to excite the resumption of hostilities. They circulated amongst the English aristocracy seditious papers against the Royal authority; instead of disbanding their forces, as agreed upon, they continued to keep all their officers in readiness, and in their pay; they refused to make full restitution of the forts, castles, and ammunition, as stipulated; they continued to hold unlawful meetings upon matters of State; they proved their disloyalty by their actions at the meeting of their General Assembly; and they refused to recognise the Royal authority over their Parliamentary proceedings. But what excited most the anger of the King was his having intercepted a letter, subscribed by certain of the leading Covenanters, to the French King, asking for aid. It was addressed, "Au Roy," a subscription only employed in France from those subject to their natural prince, and thus implied that the Covenanters had intended to transfer their allegiance to Lewis XIII., and had "practised to

let in foreign power into our kingdom of Scotland." It has been generally supposed that the original letter had reached its destination ; but from the declaration of the King, preserved among the State Papers, such appears not to have been the case. "For my part," says Charles, "I think it was never accepted of by him. Indeed it was a letter to the French King, but I know not that ever he had it ; for by chance I intercepted it, as it was going unto him ; and thereupon I hope you will understand me right in that. But because the world shall see that we charge the Scotch not but upon very good and sure grounds, we have thought it fit to set down here their own letter ; of which we have given our good brother, the French King, an account, being confident he will not assist any rebels against us." Hence it is clear that the letter was made known at the French Court, not through the Covenanters, but through the channel of the English Embassy.

Distracted by conflicting opinions, anxious to uphold his Prerogative by a war against Scotland, yet ignorant how to obtain the supplies for such an undertaking, Charles had recourse to the advice of one whom hitherto he had seldom consulted upon English affairs, but whose brilliant rule in Ireland had now proved him to be the most consummate statesman around the throne. He wrote to Wentworth. He wished, he said, to consult him respecting the army, "but I have much more," he added, "and, indeed, too much to desire your counsel and attendance for some time, which I think not fit to express by letter more than this—the Scots' Covenant begins to spread too far." Wentworth, though shattered in health, hastened at once to obey the Royal wish. He arrived in London in the November of 1639, and became the most prominent member of that secret council, composed of the King, Laud, and Hamilton, which now managed the affairs of the nation. He had been opposed to the first campaign against Scotland, wishing the King to obtain his ends by any other course "than that of shedding the blood of his Majesty's own natural, albeit rebellious subjects ;" but when the conduct of the Scotch subsequent to the treaty of Berwick was laid before him, he declared at once for war. His next counsel has never before been divulged, until the State Papers have been made to yield their secrets. Wentworth, the imperious, the despotic, the man who hated all interference with control, advised *the immediate calling of a Parliament!* "I believe," writes the indefatigable Nicholas to Sir John Pennington, who was then absent in the Downs in command of the Channel fleet, "you will have heard before this can come to your hands of His Majesty's resolution to call a Parliament about the end of March or beginning of April next, whereof His Majesty made a public

declaration this day se'night (Dec. 5), sitting in Council, and it is said that it hath been *the Lord Deputy who hath persuaded the King to a Parliament*. I pray God it may succeed as well for the good of the Kingdom as the news of it is acceptable to all men in this kingdom." The raising of supplies now occupied the attention of Wentworth. He pledged himself to bring over a large subsidy from Ireland. He proposed a loan in England, and subscribed to it, by way of example, the enormous sum of 20,000*l.*, equal to 100,000*l.* of our money. "Divers of our great Lords, Councillors," writes Nicholas, "have declared to His Majesty that they will lend him large sums of money—viz, the Lord Deputy, 20,000*l.*; the Lord Keeper, 10,000*l.*; The Lord Privy Seal and Earl of Newcastle, 10,000*l.* apiece, and so divers others, to the value of 300,000*l.* in all." Then, after having superintended the preparations for the organising of an army, Wentworth proceeded to return to his own kingdom. He was now to have his reward. He had frequently solicited an Earldom, but Charles, whether he preferred to grant favours without being asked, or whether from some peculiarity in his mental constitution he liked at times to snub those who had served him best, had invariably turned a deaf ear to the request. Wentworth, however, had no occasion to grumble that all arrears due to past service were now not fully paid up. He crossed St. George's Channel as Earl of Strafford and Baron Raby, the Star of the Garter glittered upon his breast, whilst, for the first time since the days of Essex, he was invested with the title of Lieutenant-General of Ireland. On his arrival he performed what he had promised. The obedient Irish Parliament agreed to levy 8000 men for the King's service out of Ireland, and voted a supply of four entire subsidies from the laity of 45,000*l.* each, and six subsidies from the clergy, who already owed them more, "so that their nine subsidies and our four subsidies," writes Lord Thomas Cromwell, "will all be paid in three years if God say Amen." These generous proposals settled, the practical Strafford returned to England to assist the King in organising the army and selecting the officers.

Here we take our leave of these deeply interesting Papers. The volumes relating to the termination of the second Scotch campaign, the proceedings of the Long Parliament, the Civil War and the execution of the King, remain still to be calendared. It is, however, no secret that the Domestic State Papers, after the year 1640, are as meagre in bulk as they are in interest. Various causes have led to this result. During the Civil War numerous documents were purposely destroyed by the Parliamentary party, the officials appointed to preserve the Papers were not in power, whilst their unguarded repositories were

[Vol. CXII. No. CCXXI.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. LVI. No. I. K

freely ransacked by the enemy. Ministers of the Crown, anxious that their documents should not be lost or fall into hostile hands, took charge of them themselves (hence the existence of official papers in private collections), whilst many of the State Papers, which travelled about with the King, were captured by the foe and destroyed or subsequently printed in different collections. "During the early years of Charles the First," writes Mr. Bruce, in his preface to the first volume of these Calendars, "the number of Papers is very great. It continues to be so during the administration of the Duke of Buckingham, and until after the peace with Spain. For a few years after 1630 the Papers are much less numerous. From 1634 there is again an increase, and as the time of the final public troubles approaches they are greatly augmented. For 1639 and 1640 they are as numerous as in 1625 and 1626. From an early period in the succeeding year there is a great falling off, and the Papers of the last eight years of the reign will not occupy more space than those of the two bustling years which are included in the present volume (1625-1626). The cause of this inequality is obvious. The greater the variety and importance of public business, the larger the number of Papers. The early years of the reign, which were years of war and foreign and maritime expeditions, produced most extensive collections; the endeavour to defray the expenses of Government by the levy of ship-money gave rise to much new business and to many Papers. But the State Paper Office, it will be remembered, was the King's repository, and the officers who transmitted Papers thither were his servants. When the fatal quarrel arose between the King and the Parliament, and the King retired from London, these officers followed his person to York, to Oxford, and elsewhere. They carried about their Papers with them, or deposited them in places not within the enemy's quarters. Few found their way into the State Paper Office, except those which were captured on the field of battle, or came into possession of the Parliament by some of the other chances of a state of warfare."

It is impossible to study these huge volumes without being struck by the great care and erudition displayed by their accomplished editors, the late Mr. Bruce and his able successor Mr. W. D. Hamilton. These Calendars are among the best specimens of the work turned out by the Record Office, and should serve as models to all future editors engaged in arranging and condensing our State Papers. The historical introductions to be found in the preface of each volume are written as such introductions should be—clearly, impartially, and with much literary ability; the reader is directed to the more important incidents of the period, whilst at the same time being furnished

with a valuable commentary upon the proceedings of the Government, and upon such events, as illustrate the social and political condition of the country. To make a *précis* of a document is not so simple a matter as may at first sight appear. What one writer considers important, another considers irrelevant; one man gives us the document almost in its entirety, another furnishes us with a condensation useless for every purpose except that of an index. We have to congratulate the joint editors of these volumes upon the happy mean between the two extremes that they have adopted. Always concise, their information is yet never scanty; they are masters in the art of knowing what to accept and what to reject, of being brief and yet intelligible. They have succeeded in placing before the historian, the biographer, and the antiquary, a mine of wealth upon which they can both freely and easily draw. The methodical system of arrangement pursued by the editors throughout their work, the clearness with which each entry is described, and the fullness of the indexes at the end of each volume, render reference the simplest of tasks. Messrs. Bruce and Hamilton are not only fortunate in the manner in which they have performed the important literary duties entrusted to them, but they are also equally fortunate in the manner with which their work is being interpreted by the valuable history of this period now being written by Mr. Rawson Gardiner.



ART. V.—THE LIFE OF THE PRINCE CONSORT.

The Life of His Royal Highness the Prince Consort. By THEODORE MARTIN. Volume the Fourth. London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1879.

ON each occasion of the appearance of the former volumes of this work, we devoted a considerable portion of our space to an examination of their contents,* and with the publication of this volume we resume our task. We said of the third volume† “that it is less a biography of the Prince Consort than a history of the present reign during the years 1854-1856, *i.e.*, the period of the Crimean war.” As regards the years this fourth volume comprises, *i.e.*, 1857-59, this is equally true, and

* WESTMINSTER REVIEW, New Series, No. CII., January, 1877.

† *Ibid.*, No. CVI., April, 1878, p. 431.

what we further said of the third holds equally good of the fourth volume—viz., “Mr. Martin gives us far more of the Queen’s views, opinions, and correspondence, than those of the Prince; and the volume is rather an autobiography of the Queen during the two years of her reign than the life of the Prince Consort.” Indeed, Mr. Martin, in his prefatory letter to the Queen admits that “from the moment it became necessary to go into the history of her Majesty’s reign, in “order to enable the world to form an estimate of what the Prince was in himself, and of what he did for England, the compass of my task ceased to be within my control. It could be regulated only by the importance of the events to be discussed, and by the amount of detailed explanation necessary to make them fully understood.”* Our comment on this statement we borrow from Mr. Gladstone. In the lately published volumes of his collected writings—not less valuable than interesting—he says of Mr. Martin’s book,—“The consequence, however, is that it assumes, as we proceed, the character less of a biography and more of a history. It may also be stated with some confidence [and to this statement we heartily assent] that for a final history of the times, and of the great events it touches, it is both too near and too brief. It may, nevertheless, supply, and we think it has thus far supplied, a valuable contribution to, and an indispensable part of, such a history.”†

We shall, in dealing with this fourth volume, take the same course as we took with the third—namely, “We decline to follow Mr. Martin into the history of the portion of the Queen’s reign to which the volume relates, and confine ourselves to the personal life of the Prince Consort.” Before doing so we must express our satisfaction at finding that Mr. Gladstone agrees with us in thinking that the Prince in his conception of his own position was wholly wrong in describing himself as “the Permanent Minister of the Sovereign.” “Minister to the Queen,” says Mr. Gladstone with resistless logic, “he could not be, because his conduct was not within the reach and control of Parliament.”‡ Mr. Gladstone, writing as one who has been a Minister in the past, and who, to say the least, is a possible Minister in the future, and mindful therefore of his consequent relations with the Queen, calls this “one venial error of a word.” Those who remember the views heretofore expressed in these pages on the subject of “Irresponsible Ministers,”

* “Life,” vol. iv., Prefatory Letter.

† “Gleanings of Past Years,” by the Rt. Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P., vol. i. pp. 96, 99.

‡ Ibid., p. 37.

will understand that in our opinion this error of the Prince's was rather more than venial.* "The Cabinet," writes Mr. Gladstone with the authority and the experience of a member of many Cabinets, "is the three-fold hinge that connects together for action the British Constitution of King or Queen, Lords and Commons—upon it is concentrated the whole strain of the Government, and it constitutes from day to day the true centre of gravity for the working system of the State, although the ultimate superiority of force resides in the Representative Chamber."† It is obvious that if the regular turning "of this three-fold hinge" be impeded by the interposition of another self-acting hinge, altogether independent of that on which is concentrated the whole strain of the Government, that strain is likely to become extreme, and the true centre of gravity for the working system of the State is liable to be upset. This fourth volume abounds even more fully than the earlier ones with proofs of what we have before ventured to call the "Prince's meddlesomeness," and to justify the language in which the situation is described by the writer of the remarkable pamphlet quoted in our last article on this work. He says, and we cordially agree with him:—

"In reading the story of the Prince Consort's interference with the machinery of the Government as told in these volumes, I am amazed at the forbearance of our public men. I wonder that one Cabinet Minister after another did not fling up their places in disgust, and bid 'the Queen and the Prince' conduct the affairs of the country themselves. Bothered with long-winded memoranda, and badgered with letters of expostulation, their lives must at times have been a burden unto them. As if the burdensome work of their departments was not enough, with the immense addition of their Parliamentary duties, they had day by day to listen with a deference and civility which, I trust, were always sincere, to the encyclopædic dissertations of an irresponsible personage, and thus had their official toils doubled on the side where it was supposed they were entirely free."‡

This forbearance of our public men of all parties is certainly very remarkable and equally praiseworthy—showing a desire to make the delicate and complex machinery of our Constitution work with as little jar or friction as possible, for it should ever be borne in mind that had any one of the Ministers who successively were Premiers, from 1840 to 1861, resigned office, stating his reason to be the interference with his discharge of his duties by foreign and irresponsible counsellors, and appealed

* *Vide* WESTMINSTER REVIEW, "Ubi supra and the article on Baron Stockmar." *Ibid.*, 76, April, 1873.

† "Gleanings," vol. i. p. 224.

‡ "The Crown and the Cabinet," by Verax, p. 20.

to the English antipathy to foreigners—he would have been carried back to office on the shoulders of the people. Stockmar would have been driven back to Coburg, and the Prince taught a lesson which, on the whole, it would have been better for him and the country if he had been taught. The reason why our Statesmen acted with such prudence and self-restraint we shall hereafter give in the words of one of the most distinguished of them, Lord Palmerston. Mr. Justin McCarthy, in his lately published "*History of Our Own Times*," accurately describes the Prince's position, and the regard in which he was held amongst us.

"It was long before he was generally understood by the country. It was long before he became in any degree popular, and it may be doubted whether he ever was thoroughly and generally popular. To the public in general he seemed formal and chilling; with all his ability, his anxiety to learn, his capacity for patient study, and his willingness to welcome new ideas, he never, perhaps, quite understood the genius of the English political system. His faithful friend and counsellor, Baron Stockmar, was not the man best calculated to set him right on the subject. Both were far too eager to find in the English Constitution a piece of symmetrical mechanism, or to treat it as a written code from which one might take extracts or construct summaries for constant reference and guidance. . . . He was fond of suggesting small innovations and improvements in established systems, to the annoyance of men with set ideas, who liked their own ways best. Thus it happened that he remained for many years, if not exactly unappreciated, yet not thoroughly appreciated, and that a considerable and very influential section of society was always ready to cavil at what he said, and find motive for suspicion in most things that he did. Perhaps he was best understood and most cordially appreciated among the poorer classes of his wife's subjects. He found, also, more cordial approval generally among the Radicals than among the Tories or even the Whigs."*

With this agrees the testimony of Mr. Gladstone, who writes of the Prince:—

"A German by birth, he never lost the stamp of Germany; no true man can wholly lose the stamp of his own country. A mildly foreign mark upon his exterior and manner, together with the perpetual presence of a manifest endeavour to turn every man's conversation, every man's particular gift and knowledge, to account for his own mental improvement, most laudable as it was, yet may have prevented his attaining that charm of absolute ease in his intercourse with the world he is known to have possessed in the circle of his family.

* Vol. i. p. 153-4-5. We have heard on good authority that the Prince looked with interest on the proceedings of the Manchester School of politicians, and expressed a wish personally to know its leaders. He never, however, took any steps to form acquaintance with them.

They certainly retarded the growth of his popularity among the wealthy and the great, who are, and may, we fear, always remain not the least censorious among the several classes of society.*

Another remark of Mr. Gladstone's we here transcribe, because we think it is eminently just and accurate, and also because we wish our readers to bear in mind that what follows in these pages is written under the influence of the idea thus expressed.

"It was as a social philosopher and hero that he was qualified to excel, rather than as a political or military athlete.†

Unfortunately the Prince was in later years ambitious to figure rather in the last two-mentioned characters than in the first two. Of his ability as a social reformer, the first chapter of this fourth volume supplies an excellent illustration in 1857. Mr. J. M. Clabon, a Parliamentary solicitor, if we remember rightly, was moving in that difficult matter—How to attract the working man from the public-house, a question which has hitherto baffled all the efforts of all our social reformers.

Mr. Clabon had written a pamphlet entitled "Leisure Houses for the Labourer." This had been brought to the Prince's notice, and he granted the author an interview for the purpose of discussing the subject. We condense Mr. Clabon's account of this interview.

"The Prince was announced. I was introduced; he made his way past me and Colonel Grey, shook hands with Lord Torrington, and established himself with his back to the fire and hands behind him in true English fashion, we three standing before him. I opened the talk by saying that I felt it a great honour to be permitted to address his Royal Highness on the subject of my pamphlet; that, admitting that Mechanics' Institutes did much good, it was to the middle classes, and that I thought the two great mistakes which had been made were that we thought too much of educating the adult poor, whereas we should begin with amusement, and having tempted them by that, introduce instruction by classes, lectures, and so on very gradually, and that the poor were not sufficiently consulted, were kept too much at a distance. The Prince said he had read my pamphlet, that it was important to consider the rules of political economy, that any departure from them would tend towards failure, that these rules required the *commercial principle* to be introduced, that the institution must be self-supporting, and that, in fact, people of good character must be persuaded to open such a house as that described, with a licence from the magistrates, and to conduct it so as to make it remunerative. I thanked him for the suggestion, and said that I appreciated its value.

"The Prince then said it should be a reformed public-house. He quite agreed there should be smoking, but did not agree that it need

* "Gleanings," vol. i. p. 48.

† *Ibid.*, p. 69.

be in a separate room. He said it was important that *the wife and family should come there*, as well as the labourer himself. The women of England were excellent wives and mothers. Now they had to do their best to keep their husbands from the public-house; with such an institution they might encourage them to go there, and go with them. As to the mingling of class with class, he said that he doubted whether it could be carried out. The lower classes would always feel a restraint in the presence of the higher classes.

"The Prince then asked what would I do on Sunday. I said I had not considered that part of the question. He said it must be open. I said yes, it should be open, no games being carried on, and an attempt made to improve the day in some way, but without giving the institution the character of a chapel. I mentioned the reading-room on Surbiton Hill, and that the curate preached there once a week, and the poor kept away from it and called it a chapel. Lord Torrington said something on the Sunday question, advocating national amusement on that day. The Prince said a few words, but not indicating directly his approval of what Lord Torrington had said. I then said that I did not wish any clergyman to take a lead in the management, that if he took any part it must be only as an individual, and that the Dissenting minister should equally be admissible. There was to be no distinction of creed, every one was to be free to come. The Prince agreed."

We commend the extract which next follows to the attention of all and sundry who would at the sword's point enforce total abstinence on an unwilling people.

"There was a momentary break, and I asked whether his Royal Highness had observed that I proposed to have an occasional dance. I said that our labouring population were far behind those of other countries in polish, and I thought an attempt might be made to introduce dancing. He agreed, but doubted whether they would enjoy it or enter into it with spirit, *unless they had something to drink*. I said let them have tea, coffee, or lemonade. He said that in Scotland they were fond of dancing, but they wanted to have whiskey; that at Osborne there was an entertainment to all persons employed there and the household once a year, generally on his (the Prince's) birthday, that last year one or two had too much, and that this year the beer given was not therefore so strong, and there was much dissatisfaction; they did not seem to enter into it with spirit. But he agreed that spirituous liquors must be excluded."

Although the Prince had acquired such a veneering of English habits as to receive a deputation with his back to the fire and his hands behind him, and *more Georgii tertii* to keep them standing, yet, notwithstanding his seventeen years' residence in England and his frequent speeches in public,

"The Prince's English," as Mr. Clabon noted, "is not perfect, he speaks with a decidedly foreign accent, and once or twice he hesitated

for a word. Lord Torrington said that this was unusual, that he was generally very fluent and that he was a little nervous at seeing a stranger, as he generally is. I felt nervous at first, but the Prince's demeanour on his first entrance put me at once at my ease."

This same first chapter also supplies us with an illustration of Mr. McCarthy's statement that the Prince was "best understood and most cordially appreciated among the poorer classes of his wife's subjects." Before the Prince's election to the Mastership of the Trinity House, that very hard-working class of labourers, the ballast-heavers of the port of London, to quote their own statement of their case in a memorial presented to the Queen after the Prince's death,

"could only get work through a body of river-side publicans and middle-men who made us drink before they would give us a job, made us drink while at it, and kept us waiting for our wages, and drinking after we had done our work, so that we could only take half our wages home to our families, and that half often reached them, too, through a drunkard's hands. The consequence was that we were in a pitiable state; this truck drinking system was ruining us body and soul, and our families too."

They appealed to the Prince, who consulted with Lord Cardwell, then President of the Board of Trade, and a clause was inserted in the Merchant Shipping Act, 1853, which placed the ballast-heavers under the control of the Corporation of the Trinity House. The result we will describe in the words of their own memorial:—

"At once our wrongs were redressed, and the system that ruined us swept away. The good Prince and the Brethren† whom he led framed rules for our employment which secured us a fair wage for our very hard toil, they let us take it home to our families unclipt; they gave us a room to wait in for our work, and supplied it with papers and books; they encouraged us to form a sick benefit society, and in every way strove to promote our welfare. Your Majesty may well imagine what a change this was to us; from the publicans and grasping middle-men seeking our money at the cost of our lives, to Albert the Good and his generous Brethren desiring only our good! At one dead lift they raised us from the drunkard's life and the drunkard's fate to the comfort and respectability of the fairly paid, hard-toiling English working man. We should like (they add) to have a representation of him in the room that he and the Brethren gave us; we should like to

* "Life," vol. iv. pp. 8, 9, 10. It is evident from the *Life passim* that the Prince's Diary and his letters to the Queen and to other members of the Royal Family were always written in German, and we suspect that German was the language in which the family usually conversed.

† *I.e.*, of the Trinity House.

see his kind and earnest face looking on us as we daily partake of the boon he has secured us, 'and they asked for a framed engraving of the Prince' as a remembrance of our benefactor, and as a 'reminder that we, in our humble way, should strive to be, as husbands, fathers, and men, what he was.'"

This request was at once granted, and the engraving sent with an assurance "that of all the tokens of sympathy submitted to the Queen in her grief, none was more in harmony with her feelings than the simple and unpretending tribute from these honest, hard-working men."*

We have spoken of the Prince's qualifications as a social reformer and of his eminent services in that capacity, but there is another subject also lying outside the political arena in which the Prince's influence was strongly and beneficially exerted—viz., the sphere of Art—he laid no claim to be a distinguished artist. Persons in our position, he said to Lady Bloomfield, can never be that.

"It takes the study of a whole life to become that, and we have too many other duties to perform to give the time necessary to any one particular branch of art. Our business is not so much to create as to learn, to appreciate and understand the works of others, and we can never do this till we have realized the difficulties to be overcome."

What follows admirably illustrates the painstaking character of the man and shows that if genius be rightly defined "as unlimited capacity for taking pains"

"then the Prince was, beyond all controversy, a man of genius. Acting on this principle myself, I have always tried to learn the rudiments of art as much as possible. For instance, I learnt oil painting, water-colours, etching, lithography; and in music I learnt thorough bass, the pianoforte, organ, and singing—not, of course, with a view of doing anything worth looking at or hearing, but simply to enable me to judge and appreciate the works of others."†

From the Prince's Address at the opening of the Art Treasures Exhibition at Manchester (1857) we make this extract, as showing the spirit in which he suggested important reforms in the arrangement of the pictures in our national collections.

"If," he said, "art is the purest expression of the state of moral and religious culture and of general civilisation, of any age or people, an historical and chronological review given at one glance cannot fail to impress us with a just appreciation of the peculiar characteristics of the different periods and countries, the works of which are here exhibited to us and of the influence which they have exercised upon each other. In comparing these works with those of our own age and country, while we may well be proud of the immense development of knowledge and power of production which we possess, we have reason

* "Life," vol. iv. p. 34. † *ibid.*, pp. 15, 16.

also for humility in contemplating the refinement of feeling and intensity of thought manifested in the work of the older schools.”*

In conformity with the principle here enunciated he had previously made this suggestion to the Executive Committee of the Manchester Exhibition.

“If the collection we propose to form were made to illustrate the history of art in a chronological and systematic arrangement, it would speak powerfully to the public mind, and enable, in a practical way, the most uneducated eye to gather the lessons which ages of thought and scientific research have attempted to abstract.”†

This principle of “chronological and systematic arrangement” he ceased not to impress upon the governing bodies of all the national collections, with the result thus stated by Mr. George Scharf in his “*Essay on the Royal Picture Galleries.*”

“All the pictures are now in the course of a better system of arrangement. These changes are the result of a thoroughly matured scheme laid down by the late Prince Consort, and it may indeed be said that all the good now performed in respect to our national collections of art is but a realisation of his wise and beneficent intentions.”‡

Mr. McCarthy remarks that “the death of William IV. may be fairly regarded as having closed an era of our history. With him we may believe ended the reign of personal Government in England.”§ In face of the disclosures as to the relations between the Queen and the Prince on the one hand, and successive Ministries on the other, contained in the first three volumes of the “*Life,*” it was difficult to hold this belief, and by the publication of the fourth, that difficulty is much increased. Here, again, we adopt the language of Mr. Gladstone—the language, as he says himself, of “one whose own life has been greatly absorbed in working with others the institutions of his own country,” and who therefore has had opportunities of observing and acquiring experience as to their working, which Mr. McCarthy has not enjoyed.

“The weighty business of kingship has in modern times been undergoing a subtle and silent, yet an almost entire transformation, and in this country at least the process has reached its maturity. Neither the nature nor the extent of this change appear as yet to have become familiar to the ordinary run of observers. . . . Many did not advert to the fact that the character of the royal office had been altered, while those who believed in the change for the most part believed also that this great function was now emptied of its force, and reduced to an illusion. Both were alike in error; in an error which

† “*Life,*” vol. iv. p. 39. † *Ibid.*, p. 85. † *Ibid.*, p. 15.

§ “*History of Our Own Times,*” vol. i. p. 1.

it is not easy to correct by a summary description. The nearest approach to an account combining truth and brevity would, perhaps, be found in the statement, that while in extent the change has been at least inwardly nothing less than a transformation, its substance may chiefly be perceived in a beneficial substitution of influence for power."

Again—

"The amount of that influence must vary greatly, according to character, to capacity, to experience in affairs, to tact in the application of a pressure which is never to be carried to extremes, to patience in keeping up the continuity of a multitudinous supervision, and, lastly, to close presence at the seat of Government; for in many of its necessary operations time is the most essential of all elements and the most scarce."*

The present volume from beginning to end is full of proofs of Mr. Gladstone's statement.

We will now proceed to comment on the chief sayings and doings of the Prince, which are recorded in this volume. It opens with the year 1857—a year memorable for many events, one of the earliest of which was the defeat of Lord Palmerston's Government on Mr. Cobden's resolution—as to the affair of the *Archa Arrow*—the Dissolution of Parliament and the consequent General Election, when Mr. Cobden, Mr. Bright, and Mr. Milner Gibson, and many of the Peelites lost their seats. The Prince, writing to the Duchess Dowager of Coburg, says:—

"Our elections will be over this week, the Ministry have gained twenty-four counties and twenty towns, and the apostles of peace have been turned out by the people neck and crop. Not because the people do not love peace and are not greedy of money [These last words are significant, the Prince writing privately to another foreigner cannot resist the opportunity of a sneer at the people of the country, which had adopted him], but because they love their own importance and their own honour, and will not submit to be tyrannised over by the peace-at-any-price people."†

This is equally inaccurate and unjust. The resolution which brought about the dissolution did not deny that England might have cause of complaint against China for non-fulfilment of treaty obligations, it merely affirmed that the papers laid on the table failed to establish satisfactory grounds for the violent measures resorted to in the affair of the *Arrow*, and resolved that a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the state of our commercial relations with China.

Those who are well informed on the opinions of Mr. Cobden, Mr. Bright, and Mr. Gibson, will be amused at the Prince apply-

* "Gleanings," vol. i. pp. 35, 36, 41, 212. *Vide* also Lord Beaconsfield's Speech quoted in WESTMINSTER REVIEW, No. CI.

† "Life," vol. iv. p. 26.

ing to them the irrational and vulgar phrase of "peace-at-any-price people," but the resolution, though drawn up by Mr. Milner Gibson and moved by Mr. Cobden, was supported by the speeches and votes of men to whom this slang term could in no sense be applied. These were—Lord John Russell, Sir E. B. Lytton, Mr. S. Warren, Mr. Whiteside, Sir James Graham, Sir R. Phillimore, Sir Frederick Thesiger, Mr. Sidney Herbert, Sir Roundell Palmer, Mr. Henley, Mr. Gladstone, and Mr. Disraeli. In fact, as has been well said, by the whole character and oratorical power of the House, save what was possessed by Ministerialist office-holders and office-seekers.*

The same letter contains also the first of many intimations scattered through this volume, that the Prince's health was even then declining. "I get on pretty well in spite of a weak stomach, with which I came into the world, and which I shall take with me to my grave."†

Much of the Prince's energy this year was given to the counter-acting the plots, real or imaginary, of Russia to undermine the Anglo-French Alliance. The only overt act that could be laid hold of was the visit to Paris of him, whom Lord Clarendon called "that extremely well veneered-gentleman, the Grand Duke Constantine," but of whom the Prince, in a letter to the Emperor of the French to which we shall again refer, said :

"For him *Holy Russia*, its beliefs, its prejudices, its errors and its faults, the Paganism of its religion, the barbarism of its populations, are objects of the most profound veneration. He adores them with a blind and ardent faith. In a word, he appeared to me, in all the conversations which I had with him, so profoundly Oriental in all his views and aspirations, that it struck me as impossible to make him comprehend the ideas and the sentiments of the West, or to get him to appreciate and still less to like them."

On occasion of the birth of the Princess Beatrice, the Emperor of the French wrote to the Queen a cordial letter of congratulation, in which, referring to the approaching visit to Paris of the Grand Duke Constantine, he said :

"I am grieved to see that the English wish to attach a significance to this visit which does not belong to it. We are gratified here by the good will and courtesy shown to us by Russia, but this in no way weakens the interest and the feelings by which we are bound to England."

This very reasonable remark gave opportunity to the Prince, who, on behalf of the Queen, replied to the Imperial letter to

* *Vide* Sir Louis Mallet's Introductory Essay to "The Political Writings of Richard Cobden." London: W. Ridgway. 1878.

† "Life," vol. iv. p. 26.

improve the occasion by addressing to the Emperor a lecture in the very style and spirit of a German professor. We can quote only its principal argument.

"In the present case what renders the English public and press more sensitive is the fact that, possessing as they do great political knowledge and experience, they probe to their foundation the bases of our alliance; they study the causes which render it so desirable, and so work with all the greater ardour to preserve it. Now they find that this alliance is based upon the two nations being on the same level of civilization, upon a mutual desire to develop as much as possible sciences, arts, letters, commerce, &c. &c., upon our close vicinity to each other, which makes a good understanding necessary, and upon the well-being and the happiness of the two countries, which are bound so intimately together.

"If, on the other hand, they ask what might be the basis of an alliance with Russia, they find that there is a complete dissimilitude of views, of feelings, and of ideas; that in the eyes of Russia Western civilization, far from having any title to be encouraged, is the enemy that ought, above all others, to be resisted; and that there exists between the two such an absence of mutual interests that in truth if the one ceased to exist the other would scarcely be affected. Thus they conclude that, notwithstanding these fundamental differences, the Russian alliance is desired or sought for, this alliance can have for its basis nothing but an external and purely political motive. Immediately all Europe sets to work to reflect, and asks itself what this motive is; confidence is shaken; England naturally is the first to take the alarm which is soon shared equally by the rest of the world. The Queen and myself personally are convinced your Majesty has no intention of this kind, as, so far as we are concerned, the fresh assurances on this subject which your Majesty has been pleased to give in your last letter were superfluous."

The Emperor's reply was equally calm and statesmanlike.

"Your reflections (he wrote to the Prince) appear to me most just, but I answer them by this simple remark, when one is following a plain straightforward course, when without making advances one is simply meeting civilities with civilities (de bons procédés par procédés équivalents), why disgust oneself about the mistakes of public opinion? And, besides, how are they to be prevented, if they exist, although one's conduct gives no kind of warrant for them."

"This," says Mr. Martin, "was no doubt written in all sincerity." We agree with Mr. Martin, but it is plain that from this time the Emperor and his policy were the objects of the ever-increasing jealousy and suspicion of the Queen and Prince.

This spring of 1857 saw the final departure from England of

Baron Stockmar, who announced to King Leopold that he should this year be seventy, and "that he was no longer equal, mentally or physically, to perform the laborious and exhausting office of a paternal friend and trusted confessor. I must say good-bye, he adds, and this time for ever."*

He accordingly departed, but as Mr. Martin says, "however unfit he might think himself, Baron Stockmar was nevertheless to be to the last the Prince's paternal friend and trusted confessor." This is true, unless, indeed, it be not more accurate to say that he was rather the Prince's director than his confessor. Be that as it may, both offices are as unknown, indeed repugnant, to the British Constitution as is that of "Permanent Irresponsible Minister."

We only notice the Prince's complaint that, during the few days the Court were in London this spring, "he was almost done to death with questions and stupid details for the season (all crammed into so short a space), for levees, drawing-rooms, the christening, balls and concerts, the Crystal Palace festival, royal visits, Bertie's Continental tour, &c."† for the purpose of observing that it shows that the activity of his mind and his growing love of personal interference in everything almost amounted to a disease. Surely, there were around him officials who could have arranged those "stupid details" without the Prince being "almost done to death about them."

This season was a more than usually busy one for the Prince, who, amidst his many engagements, found at least one more congenial to him than the "stupid details," of which he complained. He presided over the first meeting of the Educational Conference of 1857, the main object of which was to consider what means could be devised to induce the poorer classes to keep their children at school a sufficient time to give them a chance of real education. "Political and theological antagonisms" the Prince wrote to Stockmar, "make the subject an extremely ticklish one. . . . One's nervous system, therefore, has something to endure." In fact, as the Prince, in his Address stated, "he should have thought it inconsistent with the position which he occupied and with the duty which he owed to the Queen and the country at large "to take the chair at the conference" if the conflicting views of those who favoured State schools, or voluntary schools, where the instruction should be purely secular, or those where religious instruction was the basis of the education, were to have been discussed at the Conference." The necessity of neutrality on these questions justifies Stockmar's

* "Life," vol. iv. pp. 40-41.

† *Ibid.*, p. 56.

opinion of the Conference in which those who remember its proceedings will concur that in "dealing with a difficult subject, for the practical solution of which no measures could be proposed or set in motion, the Conference, according to his (Stockmar's) notions, could have no result beyond furnishing a sound view of the state of the case, and pave the way to its being dealt with hereafter." We have space for one extract only from the Prince's Address, and we select it not only as another illustration of the Prince's ability as a social reformer, but because it points out a difficulty to which some of the more zealous friends of compulsory education do not, we think, give sufficient weight. To the lethargy and indifference of parents as to the duty of educating their children much of the evil the Conference wished to remedy is to be ascribed, but much also is due to several economical conditions of an intricate and difficult kind. The lethargy and indifference of parents might in time be overcome; but to give the Prince's own words:—

"The other root of the evil is a more delicate question and will require the nicest care in handling, for there you cut into the very quick of the working man's condition. His children are not only his offspring, to be reared for a future independent position, but they constitute part of his productive power, and work with him for the staff of life, the daughters are especially the handmaids of the house, the assistants of the mother, the nurses of the younger children, the aged and the sick."*

This is the true statement of the difficulty which can only be appreciated by those who live in our country parishes, and it is one of which up to the present time social science seems unable to find a solution.

At this time the Prince had a full and interesting interview with M. De Tocqueville, whose panegyric on the Prince, contained in a letter to the late Lady Theresa Louis, we cannot forbear to transcribe.

"Je ne saurai vous dire (surtout dans un postscriptum) combien j'ai été frappé et charmé de la justesse de son esprit. J'ai rarement rencontré un homme aussi distingué, et n'ai jamais approché d'un Prince qui m'a paru, à tout prendre, aussi remarquable, et j'ai pu lui dire sans flatterie, en le quittant; qui parmi toutes les choses dignes de souvenir que je venais de voir en Angleterre, celle qui m'avait le plus frappé était la conversation que nous venions d'avoir. Vous êtes heureux de trouver un tel homme si près du trône."

The nature and spirit of the conversation between the Prince and the philosopher we gather from a sentence of the Prince's letter to Stockmar, sending him the passage above quoted.

* "Life," vol. iv. pp. 57-61.

"I maintained your views and principles, which have become my own."*

At the close of the session the Prince devoted himself to the more practical object of preventing the rupture of the Anglo-French Alliance, which on account of the difficulties which arose in carrying out the details of the Treaty of Paris, and especially the arrangements as to the Danubian Principalities, had lately seemed to be imminent. The Emperor of the French, who was sincerely desirous of preventing the rupture, proposed a friendly visit to the Queen at Osborne, for the purpose of a conference on the points in dispute between the Powers. After some slight demur on the Queen's part, the visit took place in August, 1857. The official negotiations were, of course, left in the hands of Lords Palmerston and Clarendon, who came to Osborne to conduct the negotiations with the Emperor and his Ministers, M.M. Walewski and Persigny, who accompanied him to England. Ultimately a compromise was agreed on, and the threatened rupture of the Alliance averted. But although the negotiations proper were conducted according to Constitutional usage by the Queen's responsible Ministers, private Conferences took place between the Emperor and the Prince with the full consent of Lord Palmerston, who remarked to the Queen, "The Prince can say many things which we cannot." We deviate from our narrative for a moment to corroborate Lord Palmerston's opinion by that of Mr. Gladstone, who, speaking of the political influence of the Sovereign, says: "Personal and domestic relations with the ruling families abroad give openings, in delicate cases, for saying more, and saying it at once more gently and more efficaciously, than could be ventured in the more formal correspondence and wider contacts of Governments."† At these conferences the Prince notes in his Diary that the Emperor explained his whole policy, and "I honestly gave him my opinion on all points." The Prince's memorandum of these conversations fills thirteen pages of the volume before us, and though interesting, is too long for us to transcribe.

The chief subject discussed at these conferences was the union of the Danubian Principalities, a subject which has lost the interest which it had in 1857. On general political questions we make the following extracts from the Prince's memorandum.

The Prince put to the Emperor the following question, to which he says:—

"I begged he would give me an honest and an open answer. Do you really care for the continuance of the integrity of the Turkish Empire? This is with us a principle for which we have entered into the French

* "Life," pp. 69, 70.

† "Gleanings," vol. i. p. 41.

Alliance, for which we have made endless sacrifices in blood and treasure, and which we are determined to maintain with all the energy we possess.

"The Emperor said he would be quite honest and open. If I asked him as a private individual, he did not care for it, and could not muster up any sympathy for such a sorry set as the Turks. I interrupted, that I thought as much. But he added—If you ask me as an *homme politique c'est une autre chose*. . . I am, of course, not prepared to abandon the original object of our Alliance for which France also has made great sacrifices."

The Emperor in another conversation regretted how often England and France misunderstood each other.

"I (the Prince) joined in this regret, but thought the circumstances not unnatural considering the difference of the nations. Nations had their natural history like animals, which must be taken into account, if they are to judge of each other correctly, just as a sparrow did not eat meat, and an owl could not be expected to live on seeds, so the ruling point with France was the *point d'honneur* which she often placed on matters which Englishmen could not understand. On the other hand, England was ruled by interest and principle. The English are slow in taking up a line, which must itself be first proved to them to be just in principle and for their real interest. When this is done, and the line is once taken, they will cling to it with persevering tenacity, and no change of Ministers or men will have the slightest influence upon it."

The announcement, by the Emperor, of an approaching meeting between him and the Emperor of Russia drew from the Prince the following characteristic remarks upon the English Press:—

"I said, he must not be astonished if our Press should not show much reserve on the occasion, for although understanding general politics, and the special interests of England very well, and although most ably written, it was not written by men conspicuous for *les sentiments tres élevés*. We then talked at length on the state of France, and on French politics. I asked him whether he had read Tocqueville's book 'L'ancien régime et la Révolution.' He answered that he had, and praised its style, but complained of the difficulty of doing anything, as the *esprit de la nation* was so contrary to any self government, of which he gave me some curious and even ludicrous instances. He added, however, that what made France weak within, viz., *la centralization*, made her strong without. He preferred the state of England, but it could not be imitated in France."

The Emperor's mind was at this time much exercised as to the revision of the Map of Europe, and he more than once referred to this topic in these conversations with the Prince. "He said that he adhered to this conviction that the peace of Europe could never be lasting until the Treaties of 1815 were revised, but he admitted that he had seen again, that these were much greater difficulties than he had supposed."

This broaching by the Emperor of what Lord Clarendon called his "map-making projects," drew from the Prince the following straightforward and business-like reply:—

"I said that this was a most delicate question, and so full of danger, that it required the greatest care how it was touched. As for myself I could not see for the life of me how it was to be done. No one would run the risk of resettling the legal status of Europe, without great advantages to himself. Now, if everybody was to get great advantages to themselves at the expense of the others, they would defend themselves to the last."

The Prince expatiated "a little on the Holstein question which appeared to bore the Emperor as '*très compliqué*.'" In holding this opinion, the Emperor was not solitary. "At one time, said Mr. Cobden to a friend, I used to glance through the pamphlets on the Schleswig question, but I have grown wiser by experience and I never feel safe now until I have put them in the fire. I am sure that no friend would send me the nonsense that is written on that subject, were I even a clerk in the Foreign Office, or a German bibliomaniac."*

The Prince also ventured to express his opinion on the danger to which the Emperor "exposed himself by not taking a Minister with him, when he stayed away from Paris, and then treating important and complicated affairs quite by himself. The Emperor's habitual indolence is shown in his reply. He answered,

"He felt this; but he could not correspond with so many different Ministers, and he could not take them all with him. He felt the necessity of getting some one to act as his chief Minister, *mais ou trouver l'homme*."

"I agreed in the difficulty, but urged also the necessity of having an organ capable of seizing his views and giving them that form which would ensure their success. No Monarch had been great without having a great Minister."

The immediate result of this intercourse between the Emperor and the Prince was to revive and deepen the strongly favourable impressions made on Louis Napoleon by the Prince at their first acquaintance.

"I believe (wrote the Emperor to the Queen a few days after his return to France) that after passing a few days in your Majesty's society one becomes better; just as when one has learned to appreciate the various knowledge and the exalted judgment of the Prince, one goes away from him more advanced in one's ideas and more disposed to do good. Deign, madam, I beseech you to say to him who so nobly shares your lot, that I entertain for him the highest esteem, and the most unqualified friendship; in saying this, I say how much value

* "Richard Cobden at Home," by F. M. E., p. 28.

I place upon his *cest à dire combien je tiens à la sienne*. I cannot (replied the Queen) contest the favourable opinion which your Majesty has formed of my beloved husband, because I know that he deserves it, as he has no other ambition than that of doing good and of making himself useful where he can. In a position so isolated as ours we can find no greater consolation, no support more sure than the sympathy and counsel of him or her who is called to share our lot in life, and the dear Empress with her generous impulses is your guardian angel, as the Prince is my true friend."

"You are already aware (wrote Lord Cowley* from Paris to Lord Clarendon†) of the high opinion which the Emperor entertained of the Prince Consort's judgment and abilities, and this opinion appears, if possible, to have been augmented. I cannot doubt that H.R.H. made a deep impression on, and I trust will exercise a salutary influence over, the Imperial mind. This at all events must be said for the Emperor, that he is open to conviction, and that good judgment and sound sense make an impression on him. Unfortunately he finds little of the kind to consult in this country."

The Emperor's letter, and also one equally affectionate from the Empress, were sent by the Queen to Lord Palmerston. We extract this sentence from his letter to Her Majesty as an illustration of the intrinsic good nature and generosity of his character,‡ for he certainly had been hardly dealt with both by the Queen and the Prince.

"The fact is, that nobody can come into personal intercourse with the Queen and Prince without being impressed with the same sentiments which these letters convey.§

The pleasing impression made on our Royal family at the first visit of their Imperial guests was deepened by their second.

"Nothing (wrote the Queen to her uncle, King Leopold) could be more amiable, kind, pleasant than both Majesties were. They are most agreeable guests, and as for her we are all in love with her, and wish you knew her. . . . Albert, who is seldom much pleased with ladies or princesses, is very fond of her, and her great ally."||

Another of the great events of 1857 was the outbreak of the Indian Mutiny, the story of which Mr. Martin tells at length; but we must confine ourselves to the Prince's own part in relation to it. He was soon dissatisfied with the action of the Ministry in their dealing with this rebellion. So early after the arrival of the news of the outbreak as the 20th July, the Prince

* Then our Ambassador in Paris.

† Then Foreign Secretary.

‡ "After all Palmerston was a very generous enemy," were among the last words uttered by Richard Cobden.

§ "Life," vol. iv. c. 79, pp. 93-114.

|| Ibid., p. 95.

wrote to Stockmar: "Our Ministry is by no means up to the mark; as little as it was in the last war; and after that experience, still more to blame,"* a remark in which no unprejudiced reader of Mr. Martin's narrative will concur. And a few days after the Prince wrote to the Crown Prince of Prussia: † "The English public is calm and composed, the Ministry too calm for my notion, and therefore we are constantly digging our spears into their sides." ‡ This operation of the "joint digging of the spears" was carried on so persistently and with such spirit that at length—as it appears from Lord Palmerston's letter we are about to quote—it ended in the Queen—no doubt at the instigation of her Permanent Minister—taking the unprecedented step of telling her Prime Minister what on a certain unspecified occasion she would, had she filled his place, have said in the House of Commons, and therefore by insinuation complaining that he had not said it, and blaming him inasmuch as he had not so spoken. This was too much even for the much-enduring Palmerston, and he replied to the Queen in a characteristic letter, which, although it does not relate to the Prince, we cannot deny ourselves the pleasure of transcribing. The many who still remember Lord Palmerston's later years in the House of Commons will, on reading this letter, recall the tone and manner of the replies in which he used good-naturedly to banter a troublesome opponent or get rid of an awkward subject.

"Viscount Palmerston presents his humble duty to your Majesty, and has had the honour to receive your Majesty's communication of yesterday, stating what your Majesty would have said if your Majesty had been in the House of Commons.

"Viscount Palmerston may perhaps be permitted to take the liberty of saying that it is fortunate for those from whose opinions your Majesty differs that your Majesty is not in the House of Commons, for they would have had to encounter a formidable antagonist in argument; although, on the other hand, those whose opinions your Majesty approves would have had the support of a powerful ally in debate. But with regard to the arrangements in connection with the state of affairs in India, Viscount Palmerston can assure your Majesty that the Government are taking, and will not fail to continue to take, every measure which may appear well adapted to the emergency; but measures are sometimes best calculated to succeed which follow each other step by step." §

There can be no doubt that Lord Palmerston's generous forgetfulness of the events of 1851–52, was not met by the Queen and the Prince in the same spirit. Mr. M'Carthy well describes

* "Life," p. 84. † Now the Emperor of Germany. ‡ "Life," vol. iv. p. 88.
§ *Ibid.*, p. 78.

the relation between the Queen and the Prince on the one hand and the Premier on the other. "That the feeling of the Queen and the Prince had long been against him (Lord Palmerston) can hardly admit of dispute. Prince Albert seems not to have taken any pains to conceal his dislike and distrust of Palmerston."* From his "confessor" he certainly did not. "Palmerston (he wrote to Stockmar) is once more possessed by all his juvenile levity. It is the misfortune of all speakers in large assemblies, that because fluency and a certain patriotic tone produce great effect there, and gain great applause, nay, even political influence, they imagine they have mastered the essentials of actual fact; which, however, give themselves no concern about mere talk. The French Convention and the Paulus Kirke† are the latest and most striking illustrations. I cannot sit quietly and see such things."‡ It did not occur to the self-satisfied man of 38 who wrote this, that the man of 73 whom he treats thus lightly had had 35 years more experience than his critic, and that out of his 73 years 51 years had been uninterruptedly passed in the practical work of political life.

No two men could be more unequally yoked together in public life than the Prince and Lord Palmerston, in whom, as was said at the time of the formation of his first Ministry in 1854, "the nation, guided by an unerring instinct reposed its confidence at a time when no one seemed left to confide in."§ In addition to the radical and insuperable differences of the Prince being a Foreigner and the Minister an Englishman of Englishmen, there were other differences, and even incompatibilities between them which are graphically sketched by Mr. M'Carthy.

"Even his (the Prince's) liberalism, undoubtedly a deep and genuine conviction, did not lead him to make much allowance for any disturbing impulses. His orderly intellectual nature, with little of fire or passion was prone to estimate everything by the manner in which it stood the test of logical argument. He could understand arguing against a bad system better than he could understand the risk of making things worse by resisting it. Some of the published memoranda or other writings of Prince Albert are full of a curious interest as showing the way in which a calm, intellectual, and earnest man could approach some of the burning questions of the day with the belief apparently that the great antagonisms of systems and of opposing national forces could be argued into moderation and persuaded into compromise. . . . The influence of Prince Albert

* "History of Our Own Times," vol. ii. p. 156.

† Note by the author of the "Life," "Where the Sitzings of the National German Parliament were held in 1848-9." ‡ "Life," vol. iv. p. 125.

§ "Annual Summaries for a Quarter of a Century," reprinted from the *Times*, p. 39.

would therefore be something very different from the impulses and desires of Lord Palmerston. It is hardly to be doubted that Palmerston sometimes acted upon this conviction. He thought he understood better than others not only the tendencies of events in foreign politics, but also the tendencies of English public opinion with regard to them. He well knew that so long as he had public opinion with him no influence could long prevail against him. His knowledge of English public opinion was something like an instinct. It could always be trusted. . . . He was, it seems almost needless to say, an incomparably better judge of the direction English sentiment was likely to take than the most acute foreigner put in such a place as Prince Albert's could possibly hope to be again.

"Lord Palmerston was rapid in forming his judgments as in all his proceedings, and when once he had made up his mind was impatient of anything which seemed to him superfluous. Prince Albert was slow, deliberative, reflective, and methodical. Lord Palmerston was always sure he was right in every judgment he formed, even if it were adopted on the spur of the moment; Prince Albert loved reconsideration and was open to new argument and late conviction."*

It was not to be expected that two such men could act together without the relations becoming often and highly strained. * That no public rupture ever took place between them may be accounted for on a similar principle to that on which Lord Palmerston justified his reticence at the time of his dismissal, in 1851: that a personal quarrel between a Minister and his Sovereign is "a step which no subject ought to take if he can possibly avoid it; for the result of such a course must be either fatal to him or injurious to the country. If he should prove to be in the wrong he would be irretrievably condemned; if the Sovereign should be proved to be in the wrong, the Monarchy would suffer."†

In consequence of the necessity for passing an Act of Indemnity to the Ministers for their action in reference to the financial crisis of 1857, the Session of Parliament was opened on the 3rd December, and on the 17th December, Lord Palmerston laid before the Queen the heads of the plan for the future Government of India, by its transfer from the East India Company to the Crown. "In framing the measure, which was subsequently submitted to Parliament, Lord Palmerston (we are told) courted the opinion of the Prince on many points of detail, and he was not backward in acknowledging the advantage which it derived from the Prince's suggestions."‡

At the close of 1857 and the opening of 1858, the Prince was engaged in the preparations for the marriage of the Princess

* "History of Our Own Times," vol. ii. pp. 128-30. † *Ibid.*, p. 136.

‡ "Life," vol. iv. p. 146.

Royal with Prince Frederick William of Prussia. "The last year," he wrote to the Dowager Duchess of Coburg, "has again brought so much trouble that one is quite glad to leave it behind. The new year begins for us with the separation from a beloved daughter which will be especially painful to me. I do not, however, let any hint of this be seen, and I rejoice for her in the prospect of a happy future."

The view, we may here remark, which this volume gives of the relations between the Prince and his eldest daughter, more than anything we have seen, increases our admiration alike of his amiable disposition and his moral excellence.

The Prince's love of meddling with what he himself called "stupid details," is again shown in this letter, from which we have just quoted: "We have innumerable visitors (he writes) for the wedding, and to find room for them all in a very limited palace will be a real feat of dexterity. If I succeed in doing this, I may take a professional tour as a conjuror, for the countless bouquets from Herr Dobler's hat are not more remarkable than the Princes without number in Buckingham Palace."*

The troubles which arose out of the attempt of Orsini on the life of the Emperor of the French began a few days before the 25th January, 1858, the day fixed for the marriage of the Princess Royal. The details of the wedding and the events which accompanied it are given from the Queen's Diary with a fullness which we confess astonishes us. We must, however, pass them over, and confine ourselves to the Prince and his proceedings. To Baron Stockmar, who "had a large share" in bringing about the marriage, the Prince wrote on the wedding day:

"It is just 18 years since you subscribed my marriage contract, and were present at the same Chapel Royal on my union with Victoria. Uncle Leopold, whom you now forty years ago accompanied to London on the occasion of his marriage, will with myself be one of the bride's supporters. These reminiscences must excite a special feeling within you to-day, with which I hope is coupled the conviction that we all gratefully revere in you a dear friend and wise counsellor. Your son will accompany Vicky; my brother, who was my bridegroom's man will be present. We shall all miss you. Our festivities and visits, which have almost knocked me up, have gone off extremely well, and without the smallest hitch. The Prussians seem to be greatly pleased and to have a high opinion of England. Bridegroom and bride are greatly moved, the interest shown by the public is lively and cordial. 4 P.M., the ceremony is over. It was very solemn, all well. . . . God's blessing be upon the young people, do you say Amen."†

* "Life," p. 150. † *Ibid.*, p. 165.

A few days later the Prince wrote to the Dowager Duchess of Coburg:

"I am now a real father-in-law, our child a real wife. That this looks somewhat strange to us you will comprehend; not less you will feel that the separation for ever of our dear daughter from the family circle makes a frightful gap in our hearts. I do not trust myself to think of Tuesday, on which day we are to lose her."*

The account of the Princess's departure with her husband is given with the same fullness of detail from the *Queen's Diary*. The day after, the Prince wrote to her:

"My heart was very full when yesterday you leaned your forehead on my breast to give free vent to your tears. I am not of a demonstrative nature, and therefore you can hardly know how dear you have always been to me, and what a void you have left behind in my heart; yet not in my heart for there assuredly you will abide henceforth, as till now you have done, but in my daily life which is evermore reminding my heart of your absence."†

And, again, a few days later—

"Thank God everything goes on apparently to a wish and you seem to gain golden opinions in your favour; which naturally gives us extreme pleasure both because we love you, and because this touches our parental pride. But what has given us most pleasure of all was the letter so overflowing with affection which you wrote while yet on board the yacht.

"Poor child! well did I feel the bitterness of your sorrow, and would so fain have smothered it.

"Throughout all this agitated, serious, and very trying time (wrote the Prince to Stockmar) the good child (the Princess) has behaved quite admirably, and to the mingled admiration and surprise of every one. She was so natural, so child-like, so dignified and firm in her whole bearing and demeanour, that one might well believe in a higher inspiration. Of the touching enthusiasm and sympathy of all ranks of the people you can form no conception. Down to the humblest cottage the marriage has been regarded as a family affair."‡

We regret that we cannot afford to give further extracts from the Prince's letters to his daughter at this time. The correspondence of the Prince (says Mr. Martin) with such a child could be of no ordinary kind. All that thought and experience, prompted by the deepest affection, could suggest, were sure to be placed at her service (p. 175). The Prince, at the first, continued his supervision of her studies, and as a fit study for her new position gave to her for translation a pamphlet called "*Karl August und die Deutsche Politik*." The Princess performed this

* "*Life*," p. 166.

† *Ibid.*, p. 169.

‡ *Ibid.*, 171.

task so much to her father's satisfaction, that he sent the translation to Lord Clarendon, who, in acknowledging its receipt, wrote:

"The fact of its being translated by the Princess Royal made me suspend all other occupation in order to read it, which I have done with peculiar interest, for I felt all the time that being engaged in works which convey knowledge and stimulate inquiry and demand reflection has, under the guidance of your Royal Highness, made the Princess what she is. Her manner which charms everybody would not be what it is, if it were not the reflection of a highly-cultivated intellect, which with a well-trained imagination leads to the saying and doing of right things in right places."*

The Houses reassembled, and at once proceeded to deal with the subject of the Government of India. The Ministerial measure was met with strong opposition by the Conservatives; but they were defeated by a majority of 145 votes. In consequence of the representations of the French Government as to the conspiracy against the Emperor, which had been hatched in England, the Ministry introduced a Bill to Amend the Laws relating to Conspiracy to Murder. The first reading of the Bill was carried by a majority of 200 votes. On the second reading, however, Mr. Milner Gibson moved as an amendment a resolution which expressed regret that the Government, before inviting the House to amend the laws of conspiracy, had not felt it to be their duty to answer a somewhat haughty and overbearing despatch of Count Walewski in reference to the Orsini affair. On a division, in which no less than 459 members voted, the amendment was carried by 19 votes, and the Palmerston Government was at an end. The Premier contributed not a little to his own fall by his speech in reply to Mr. Gibson, which was marked by over-confidence in his own success, and by its haughty and even contemptuous treatment of Mr. Gibson, who listened to the Premier with calm indifference, and to quote Lord Palmerston's own words, in reference to himself and Lord Russell, soon had his "tit for tat" with the Premier.†

Of these events the Prince thus wrote to Stockmar:

"Here we are in the middle of a Ministerial crisis, and of a bad state of matters in politics. Lord Palmerston, who only two days ago had still a majority has been hit on the same question. For this we have to thank the heedless men of Louis Napoleon, who ought to have known better than to suffer England to be insulted by his Lieutenants. The

* "Life," p. 174.

† At the General Election of 1857, Mr. Gibson and Mr. Bright lost their seats for Manchester, and Mr. Cobden was defeated at Huddersfield, in both cases through Ministerial intrigues. Mr. Bright was elected for Birmingham in the summer of 1857, and Mr. Gibson for Ashton in December following.

excitement in the country is tremendous, and at this moment Lord Palmerston is the most unpopular of men. It is quite ludicrous to hear his old worshippers talk of him. In the Lower House they would scarcely let him open his mouth, but regularly hooted him down.* The motion on which Radicals, Peelites, and Tories were able to unite against the Ministry, was framed with extreme dexterity by Lord John in concert with Sir James Graham, and given to Milner Gibson to fire off."

Here the Prince was wrongly informed. Within forty-eight hours of the division on his amendment Mr. Gibson stated to a friend that it was his own composition, and it has the internal evidence of being worded in his own style.

"Victoria (continues the Prince) has entrusted Lord Derby with the formation of a new Ministry. . . . The Peelites and Lord Grey have refused to join, him and declined office. Thus, we have a reputation of the old patriotic spirit (?), and no prospect of getting a stable Ministry. Lord Ellenborough is a new inauspicious element in the Derby Administration. He wishes for himself India or the War Department. . . . What did Lord Palmerston immense harm was the appointment of Lord Clanricarde as Privy Seal."†

The sneer at some distinguished politicians conveyed by the note of interrogation in this letter shows the Prince's ignorance of the practical working of English Parliamentary and political life. Tories, Peelites, and Radicals could honourably and conscientiously join in expressing disapproval of the conduct of the Palmerston Ministry in reference to the Orsini affair, and equally honourably and conscientiously decline to join a Ministry whose leaders had "pronounced violently" against the annexation to the Crown of the Government of India which had been approved by a majority of the House of Commons, and whose views on Reform, which it was then admitted must be soon dealt with, were unknown. The Second Derby Government was now formed, of which the Prince wrote to Stockmar: "It is somewhat better than the last, viz., *his* last, but whether it can stand, 'the gods only know.'" The new Ministry, in spite of their opposition to the Indian policy of their predecessors, felt compelled to propose immediate legislation on the question, and accordingly introduced a Bill of their own. This measure, for which Lord Ellenborough, who had taken the Indian Department, was responsible, contained a proposal which was opposed equally by the Queen, the Prince,

* Mr. Evelyn Ashley in his "Life of Lord Palmerston," admits "that his manner had become more brusque and dictatorial than was altogether pleasing to the Members," quoted by Mr. Martin, vol. iv. p. 189.

† *Ibid.*, p. 492. "It will take the appointment of a great many Low Church Bishops to enable the Government to get over the appointment of Clanricarde," was Sir James Graham's comment on hearing of it.

Mr. Roebuck, and Mr. Bright. With the characteristic plainness of speech common to both these eminent men, Mr. Roebuck called it "a sham," and Mr. Bright said it savoured of "what was generally called clap-trap."

This proposal was that of a Council for the Government of India, five members were to be elected. London, Manchester, Liverpool, Glasgow, Belfast, were each to have the power of electing one. The Prince's objection to it will be found stated at p. 201, but the interest of the subject is gone by. We refer to the proposal only because of the singular combination of political thinkers who opposed it, and because it further illustrates Mr. M'Carthy's remark that there was greater sympathy between the Prince and the Radicals than between the Prince and either the Whigs or the Conservatives. At this time the Prince wrote to Stockmar:

"I never remember to have had so much to do as I have had lately. The change of Government, the India Bill, the French difficulties, the Educational requirements, &c. &c., have especially contributed to this. With France matters have once more been put upon a good footing. Her ruler, however, required a lesson."*

This and similar complaints or statements in this volume force on us the conviction that had the Prince concentrated his energies on fewer objects, and not diffused it so widely, his influence would certainly have been on the whole more effective and his life probably longer. It was not on political subjects only that the Prince unbosomed himself to his "confessor." He kept him informed on the most trivial subjects connected with the domestic life of the Palace. He tells him that at the Prince of Wales's examination before confirmation—

"Wellesley prolonged it a full hour and Bertie acquitted himself *extremely well*. To-day we take the Sacrament with him, that when he returns to London he is to take up his residence at the White Lodge, in Richmond Park, so as to be away from the world, and devote himself exclusively to study and prepare for a military examination. As to Vicky (the Princess Royal), I think I shall best give you a glimpse into her state of mind by sending you a copy of her last letter to her mother. Unquestionably she will turn out a very distinguished character, whom Prussia will have cause to bless. I write to her every Wednesday by the courier, and every Monday receive a letter from her by the same channel. We discourse in this way on general topics, whilst she writes to her mother almost daily, frequently twice a day, and gives the details of her life. Little Beatrice is an extremely attractive, pretty, intelligent child, indeed the most amusing baby we have had."†

* "Life," p. 204.

† *Ibid.*, pp. 206, 7.

To his sympathising "confessor" he reveals his rooted distaste for Parliamentary Governments and a Free Press.

"The Ministers obviously came to a private understanding with Lord John. The object of the manœuvre possibly was merely to take the reins out of Lord Palmerston's hands. The Radicals still entertain a bitter hatred towards Lord Palmerston. Meanwhile a weak Government leads as it always does, to a further weakening of the power of Governments which again leads to the advantage of the Press."*

From one of the Prince's letters to the Princess Royal we extract the following passage, which Mr. Martin truly says is full of calm practical wisdom :—

"I am delighted to see by your letter of the 24th, that you deliberate gravely upon your budget, and I will be most happy to look through it, if you send it to me; this is the only way to have a clear idea to one's self of what one has, spends, and ought to spend. As this is a business of which I have had long and frequent experience, I will give you one rule for your guidance in it—viz., to set apart a considerable balance *pour l'imprévu*. This gentleman is the costliest of guests in life, and we shall look very blank if we have nothing to set before him. Therefore, keep a large margin upon which you can draw for all that cannot be calculated before hand, and reduce all the expenses capable of previous estimate, courageously so low as to obtain for yourself a considerable margin. Fate, accident, time, and the world care very little for a previous estimate, but ask for their due with rude impetuosity. Later retrenchments to meet them do not answer, because the demands of ordinary life have shaped themselves a good deal according to the estimates, and have thus acquired a legitimate power."†

To Stockmar the Prince writes again in May, 1858: "Bertie is at Richmond for the sake of study. His *entourage* and the system are complete."‡ The *entourage* and the system were highly, though not exclusively, military. Had the Prince lived and carried out the system pursued with his sons to the extent he would have liked, which, perhaps, he would have found not so easy as he anticipated, the habits of the English Royal Family and of the Court would have resembled those of the Prussian—which Sir James Clark, who, later in the year accompanied our Royal Family to Germany, thus describes :—

"None of the Royal Family or princely class ever appear out of the stiff military dress. In all places and situations you meet military. . . . The upper classes seem to think of nothing but military matters. This is very sad."§

* "Life," p. 217. † Ibid., p. 218. ‡ Ibid., p. 219.

§ From "Sir James Clark's Diary," quoted by Mr. Martin, vol. iv. pp. 289-90. Notes.

For the stability of our English Monarchy—which every sensible man wishes to see maintained and handed down to future generations unimpaired—we think it fortunate, that in the case of the Heir Apparent, this system did not produce its possible effects. The thoroughly English character and genial manner of the Prince of Wales, his love of all English sports, and his selection for the early training of his sons in the Navy, ever the most popular of the two Services, joined to both the inclination and the ability to use his high position and influence for higher and better things—witness his chairmanship of the British Commission at the late Paris Exhibition, and his more recent speeches, are invaluable safeguards of the Monarchy. Far different might, probably would have been, the prospects of its stability, if his tone of thought and line of action had been those of a Prussian marinet, thinking only of military matters.

The Ministerial measure for the Government of India had made by June, 1858, such progress in the House of Commons that the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Disraeli) wrote to the Queen that it might be considered safe. Although it is a deviation from the line we laid down for ourselves, we must extract from this letter a passage most characteristic of the writer. It reminds us of Mephistopheles whispering in the ear of Marguerite, and it throws light on the origin of the much-disputed measure of the present Government, as to the assumption by the Queen in India of the Imperial title.

“It is, the Chancellor of the Exchequer really thinks, a wise and well-digested measure, ripe with the experience of the last five months of discussion: *but it is only the anti-chamber of an Imperial Palace*, and your Majesty would do well to deign to consider the steps which are now necessary to influence the opinions and *affect the imaginations of the Indian populations*. The name of your Majesty ought to be impressed upon their native life.”*

In this same month of June the Prince paid a flying visit to his daughter in her new home. “I have been much gratified—he writes to Stockmar, “by my visit here; the harmony between the young couple is perfect.” The mysterious and vacillating policy of the Emperor of the French, at this time again imperilled the Anglo-French Alliance, and as a remedy for the evil, another interview between the two Sovereigns was suggested. “I feel confident (wrote Lord Cowley to Lord Malmesbury†) that nothing does the Emperor so much moral good as seeing the Queen and Prince. His confidence in the judgment of His Royal Highness is unbounded.”‡ It was accordingly arranged

* “Life,” p. 233.

† Then Foreign Secretary.

‡ “Life,” vol. iv. p. 251

that the Queen with the Prince should visit the Emperor at Cherbourg, where a great naval display was then in contemplation. The visit took place in August of that year. It was on this occasion that the sensitive nerves of Mr. Roebuck received such an alarming shock. Speaking to his constituents at Sheffield shortly afterwards, when he bestowed on himself the nickname of "Tearem, the watch-dog," he spoke of "the horror and alarm with which he had seen his (the Emperor's) perjured lips touch her (the Queen's) hallowed cheek." The Prince was not without a portion of the watch-dog spirit; when he saw the new works at Cherbourg and the French Fleet, he and the Queen called the attention of Lord Malmesbury and Sir John Pakington to the "necessity of strengthening our munitions of war, as Cherbourg must become a very great peril to us." Owing to the ill-feeling at this time existing between the two countries, this interview—the last between these illustrious persons—was not without its embarrassments. "The Emperor (notes the Prince in his Diary) looked ill, he is out of humour at all that is said about him in England." At a dinner given by the Emperor to the Queen and Prince on board the *Bretagne*, both host and guest were much embarrassed, by having in this state of international feeling to make speeches on the subject of the Alliance. The Emperor during his speech "changed colour," the Prince in his reply "once hesitated." Nor were the wives of the orators exempt from the tremors to which on such occasions the wives of less illustrious speakers are subject. "I (writes the Queen) sat shaking with my eyes *cloué's sur le table*. The Empress also was very nervous. I shook so I could not drink my cup of coffee." The Emperor in his speech was at pains to express in the strongest terms his unaltered devotion to the English Alliance. The Prince, speaking for the Queen, skilfully caught up the tone of the Emperor's speech.

"You are aware, he said, that a good understanding between the two countries is the constant object of the Queen's desires as it is of yours. She is, therefore, doubly happy to have the opportunity by her presence here at this time of joining with your endeavour to knit as closely as possible the bonds of friendship between the two nations. This friendship is at the root of the prosperity of both, and the blessing of Heaven will not be denied it.

"This over (continues the Queen), we got up, and the Emperor in the cabin shook Albert by the hand, and we all talked of the terrible 'emotion' we had undergone. The interviews, writes the Prince in his Journal, must have done good, though I am conscious of a change in the Emperor."*

* "Life," pp. 263-275.

The alarm, wisely or unwisely felt by the country at the naval demonstration at Cherbourg was shared by the Prince. "The war preparations in the French Marine (he wrote to the Duchess of Kent) are immense! Ours despicable! Our Ministers use fine phrases, but they do nothing. My blood boils within me."*

More agreeable was the visit of the Queen and Prince to their married daughter and her husband which followed their State visit to Cherbourg, and on their return they were gratified by the news that, after a particularly hard examination for the Navy, "Affie,"† had passed and received his appointment. The Prince sent his son's examination papers to Lord Derby, saying, "They may interest you. He solved the mathematical papers without a fault, and did the translations without a dictionary."

In his reply, returning the papers, Lord Derby in his usual vein, wrote: "As I looked over them I could not but feel very grateful that no such examination was necessary to qualify Her Majesty's Ministers for their offices, as it would very seriously increase the difficulty of framing an Administration."‡ The autumn was spent by the Prince in impressing on the newly-formed Government of India the great principles on which the efficiency of the military force in any country, and under any circumstances, must depend—viz., *simplicity, unity, and steadiness of system, and unity of command* §

"I am at this time (he writes to Stockmar) but so-so; much troubled with sleeplessness and with my stomach. We are terribly worried with our new Indian Government."||

In fact, by his attempt to supervise every department of the Government, the Prince was wearing himself to death.

"We find (he again writes to Stockmar) the greatest satisfaction is having with us General Peel, who is now here as Secretary of State. His likeness to his deceased brother¶ in manner, in his way of thinking, and in patriotic feeling is quite touching; he is a pearl in the Ministry, for he is fearless, and holds the service of the Crown to be his first duty. He stands by us in our difficulties with regard to the organization of the Indian army which the Indian Council are seeking to withdraw from the authority of the Crown, and to deal with as their own property."**

This and other passages in the volume show that the second Derby Administration had far more of the confidence of the Queen and the Prince than was heretofore known. In the midst of all the Prince's public occupations, he could find time to give his daughter lessons in practical wisdom.

* "Life," p. 278. † The Duke of Edinburgh. ‡ "Life," p. 301. § *Ibid.*, p. 311. || *Ibid.*, p. 223. ¶ The late Sir Robert Peel. ** "Life," p. 313.

"I am quite of your opinion (he writes to her) that true worldly prudence enjoins us to make *no settled plans*, but at the given moment to adopt the course which *may* appear to feeling and to reason to be the most appropriate; and that by so acting the most disappointments will be avoided, and the greatest peace of mind maintained."

The Prince might be said to take all Europe for his province, and not content with the affairs of this country and its dependencies, he took, to borrow Mr. Gladstone's words, "an active, almost an officious, but a thoroughly patriotic interest in German politics;"† and Mr. Martin fills many pages with correspondence as to the assumption by the Prince of Prussia of the title and office of Regent, to which we have not space to allude at length.

Towards the close of 1858 the Prince had an attack of illness; these attacks now frequently returned, and were the forerunners of his last and fatal illness. By a singular coincidence, on the 14th December, the day which three years afterwards was his last, he wrote his daughter warning her to take precautions against the disease which proved fatal to himself. "Fever (he wrote) is a very wasting illness, because it stops all the functions by which the nourishment of the body is maintained." The same letter contains one of the Prince's literary judgments, of which we should be glad to have more.

"The poet is only great by reason that he is great as a philosopher. 'Two Years Ago,' a book which I think you have read, has given me great pleasure by its profound knowledge of human nature: an insight into the relations between man, his actions, his desires, and God."‡

Our space is rapidly contracting, but we must find room for the Prince's criticism of Kingsley's "Saint's Tragedy:"—

"I was certain (he wrote to his daughter at Berlin) it would not only interest and impress you, but that you would comprehend and grasp the inner spirit of the work. The substitution of doctrines made by stupid men for laws of God made nature is the core of Catholicism; the good God did not understand how to make His own world; nature is wicked, given over to destruction, a thing to be abhorred. Yet stay, not so. The good God made it in the beginning altogether good, and the devil has spoiled His handiwork; it is, to speak properly, the workmanship of the last, and God is unable to help Himself. Then comes the Church and helps Him out of His trouble; she destroys this wicked, degenerate nature for him, and magnanimously gives Him his own.

"This is the true meaning of the flesh and the devil, as presented to the Church. Kingsley has depicted this work of the Church in all its purity in Elizabeth the Saint, and the reader's own nature shudders before the image of what the Church has substituted for God's own

* "Life," p. 314. † "Gleanings," vol. i. p. 64. ‡ "Life," vol. iv. p. [Vol. CXII. No. CCXXI.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. LVI. No. I. M

work.* "A determined and even far-reaching Protestantism (writes Mr. Gladstone of the Prince) with his marked earnestness of character, a certain degree of theological narrowness inherited rather than personal, may have formed an ingredient in his views of the religious system of the Latin Church."

Elsewhere we are told on the same high authority that "The Prince was regarded with some jealousy and apprehension by Churchmen." The letter we have quoted shows, we think, that these apprehensions were not without foundation.†

The Prince seems to have been a great novel reader. We find that "Barchester Towers" was no unpleasant relief to the perusal of Archbishop Whately's Work, "On the Mind,"‡ and the "Memoirs of Prince Eugene," with which it disputed his attention.—All novels of character had for him an irresistible charm. He was a great admirer of George Eliot. "He revelled in her humour, and the sayings of Mrs. Poyser especially were on his lips and quoted with an aptness which brought out their significance with added force." In sending Stockmar a copy of Adam Bede soon after its publication, he wrote "It will amuse you by the fullness and variety of its studies of human character. By this study, your favourite one, I find myself every day more and more attracted." But fond as the Prince was of high class works of fiction—to read them was only permissible as a relaxation. "I should be very sorry (he wrote to the Prince of Wales's tutor) that he (The Prince) should look upon the reading of a novel (even of Sir Walter Scott), as a day's work. . . . I am for his reading a good novel, but would allow this to him as an indulgence."§

With the opening of 1859 it became evident that the Emperor of the French intended to make war on Austria in Italy. The history of that event and of those which preceded and followed are told in full by Mr. Martin. We must still confine ourselves to the Prince's part in the matter. To understand this it should ever be borne in mind that, as Mr. M'Carthy remarks—

"In Prince Albert there were two tendencies counteracting each other. His natural sympathies were manifestly with the authority of Thrones. His education taught him that thrones can only exist by virtue of their occupants recognising the fact that they do not exist of their own authority, and taking care that they do not become unsuited to the time."||

* "Life," p. 340.

† *Vide* "Gleanings," vol. i. pp. 52-59, and *Ibid.*, pp. 88-96, form a very interesting criticism on the religious position of the Prince and Stockmar.

‡ "Life," vol. iv. We presume Mr. Martin means Whately's "Logic;" we are not aware that the Archbishop published any work "On the Mind."

§ *Ibid.*, vol. iv. p. 341, and Note. || "History of Our Times" vol. ii. p. 128.

We doubt, therefore, whether the movement for Italian Unity had the entire and cordial sympathy of the Prince. It was too democratic in its spirit and operation. With the first signs of the coming war came a modification in the opinions held of each other by the Emperor of the French and the Prince. The Emperor, in a conversation with an agent of the King of the Belgians, without a shadow of reason accused the King of Prussia, the Prince and his brother, the Duke of Saxe-Coburg, of "actively promoting a German League against France." The Prince, on his part, writing to Lord Malmesbury, thus described the Emperor: "He was born and bred a conspirator, and at his present age will never get out of this turn of mind, scheming himself and suspicious of others."*

In our review of Mr. Martin's third volume we called attention to the fact that the Prince's state of mind was habitually melancholy and morbid.† A letter to Stockmar of the 27th of January, 1859, illustrates this: "The Ministry up to this time have not been able to settle a Reform Bill. Parliament meet on the 5th. I am weary and out of heart."‡ The birth of his eldest grandson at this period made him for a time forget all weariness and misgiving. In the serious complication of affairs brought about by the Italian policy of the Emperor of the French, the Prince Regent of Prussia consulted the Prince as to the steps to be taken by Prussia in certain eventualities. Adding that the Prince's answer would decide the Regent's action.

"You impose a very heavy task upon me, as well as a terrible responsibility (wrote the Prince in reply), nevertheless this shall not deter me from letting you read my thoughts, begging you, however, to regard them as purely personal to myself. The Ministry will clothe theirs in their own language, and what they think can only be exposed through their own organs."

We note with satisfaction this frank disclaimer of any right to speak in the name of the country, and also what follows as showing on the Prince's part a greater appreciation than anywhere else expressed by him of the benefit and advantages of free discussion in Parliament and the country.

"A short time ago all sorts of different opinions existed here, but time and public discussion have created a popular unanimity in the popular mind under the influence of which Lord Palmerston and Lord John Russell felt they had no alternative but to become the echo of Lord Derby. Had you fourteen days back asked me the opinion of England I could not have answered you in the decisive terms which the Queen's

* "Life," vol. iv. pp. 354-5. † WESTMINSTER REVIEW, No. CVI. p. 436.

‡ "Life," vol. iv. p. 368.

speech and the Parliamentary discussion upon it now enable me to do.*

"What I have first indicated, proves wherein the real strength and security of Government in these days lies,—namely, in public opinion formed and enlightened by free discussion. In that is to be sought the guiding star, and also the warrant for the action of Governments."†

Attachment to the memory of the Duke of Wellington led the Prince to give much time and attention to the affairs of the Wellington College, which was opened by the Queen on the 29th January, 1859, on which occasion he presented to it "a library for the use of the boys, selected by himself, and which was the nucleus of the excellent library now belonging to the College." Foreseeing that military science would be a chief if not decisive agent in any future European war, he devoted many thousand pounds to build a library at Aldershot for the use of the officers in camp, and to provide it with a collection, as complete as he could make it, of every work of value on military history or science.‡

The Session of 1859 will be ever memorable as that in which the Conservative party first appeared in the character of Parliamentary Reformer. Mr. Martin tells the history of the Reform Bill of the year at excessive length, and with the un concealed desire of a partisan to glorify the Ministry. He, moreover, quotes a letter from Mr. Disraeli to the Queen, and a speech of Lord (then Sir Hugh) Cairns, for no other discernible purpose than, of depreciating the memory of Lord Russell as in his previous volumes he attempted to do. The Prince's view of the matter we learn in a letter to Stockmar :

"A Radical Reform Bill of a Conservative Ministry is denounced as not Radical enough by the Liberal party (who want no Reform and are especially afraid of a Radical one), headed by Lord John, whom they will not have as leader. . . . I am thoroughly disgusted, and yet I have just completed for the Princess Royal a treatise on the advantages of a Constitutional Government."

We confess we should like to see this treatise founded, no doubt, on Stockmar's celebrated letter to the Prince, for the Prince gloried in avowing himself Stockmar's disciple. It must needs be a singular exposition of Constitutional Government and its advantages.§

* This is explained by another passage in the letter—viz., "To come back to England for the moment, the wish is general to keep out of a controversy about Austria and Italy."

† "Life," vol. iv. pp. 383-4.

‡ Ibid. pp. 386-7.

§ For Mr. Gladstone's scathing exposure of Stockmar's Constitutional Theories, see "Gleanings," vol. i. pp. 83-88.

"It is dealt with here just at this moment with an utter absence of moral principle, and our statesmen even regard moral principles as not at all necessary on their part, because, owing to the good sense of the country, and the general loyalty and contentment and prosperity, the consequences of the want of it are not immediately felt. While this is so, the public is perilously apathetic and indifferent for and against Ministers, and the press is,—well, as it always is."*

We do not know which most to admire in this wholesale indictment against our English statesmen—its folly, its falsehood, or its injustice. If there was any want of moral principle among our statesmen it was entirely on the side of the Conservatives, for they, under the name of a Reform Bill, proposed a measure which would have curtailed rather than extended popular rights. The Liberals, on the other hand, were desirous that any Reform Bill should be a reality, not a sham, but unfortunately their leader, Lord Palmerston, was, as he is accurately described by Mr. M'Carthy, a "Conservative in home politics," and "one who never even professed the slightest personal interest in any projects of Political Reform in England."† In fact, what Lord Brougham unjustly said of Lord Melbourne he might truly have said of Lord Palmerston, that "he had a sovereign contempt for everything of the kind." It was inevitably, therefore, as naturally became the duty of Lord John Russell to act on this occasion as the leader of the Liberal party.

In the end it will be remembered that the Bill was defeated and Parliament dissolved. At the General Election which followed "the six years' Parliament" was elected, whose first act was to pass a vote of want of confidence in the Derby Government. This change of Government was certainly not acceptable to the Queen or the Prince. "We are greatly pleased with our Ministry (he wrote to Stockmar in April, 1859) in these trying circumstances; they are wide-awake, and take a great deal of trouble."‡ The Sovereign had no course open to her but to defer to the vote of the representatives of the people; but "the whole power of the State (remarks Mr. Gladstone) periodically returns into the Royal hands whenever a Ministry is changed,"§ and on this occasion the Queen, no doubt at the Prince's suggestion, determined to exercise this power according to her own judgment. Lords Palmerston and Russell were reconciled, and had agreed to act under whichever of the two the Queen should entrust with the task of forming a new Government, but the Queen seems to have been unaware of the fact, though the Prince, before the fall of Lord Derby, wrote to Stockmar,

* "Life," vol. iv. p. 410.

† "History of Our Own Times," vol. ii. p. 124.

‡ "Life," vol. iv. p. 434.

§ "Gleanings," vol. i. p. 38.

“that Palmerston seems to have settled matters with Lord John.” “It appeared to the Queen (writes Mr. Martin) that an arrangement, likely to be most agreeable to their (Lords Palmerston and John Russell) feelings, and at the same time not unacceptable to their respective followers, would be one by which they could act under a third person.” The Queen and Prince were not warned by the failure of their previous experiment of the kind when they selected Lord Aberdeen for Premier, in preference to either Lord Palmerston or Lord John Russell.

“Lord Granville was accordingly sent for by the Queen, as a Statesman in whom they had both been in the habit of placing confidence and entrusted with the task of forming an Administration. Autograph letters by the Queen to Lords Palmerston and J. Russell, explaining her views and soliciting their co-operation were at the same time placed in Lord Granville’s hands.”

“In taking this course, the Queen and the Prince no doubt acted from a desire to have as Premier a statesman more pliant and more amenable to Court influence than either Lord Palmerston or Lord John Russell. Lord Palmerston “deemed it his duty to afford Lord Granville his assistance and co-operation in forming an Administration.” Lord John Russell, however, mindful of the mistake he had committed in consenting to serve under Lord Aberdeen, refused to serve under Lord Granville. In the end the task of forming a Ministry was given to Lord Palmerston. This was the last change of Government during the Prince’s life.*

“Our new Ministry (wrote the Prince to Stockmar) is formed and in office. It is looked upon as the strongest that ever was formed (so far as the individual talent of its members is concerned), and it is true that down to the most subordinate offices important people have been appointed.”† Into the details of the Palmerston-Russell policy with regard to Italy we must decline to follow Mr. Martin. The death of the young Queen of Portugal, whose marriage had been brought about by the Prince, and in whom both he and the Queen felt the deepest interest, was “a deep sorrow” to them both. From a letter of the Prince to his daughter at Berlin, in reference to this sad event, we extract the following characteristic passage :—

“Royal personages, to whom services are being constantly rendered, often forget that these involve all sorts of sacrifices to those who render them, which if those to whom they are rendered would only keep their

* “Life,” vol. iv. pp. 442, 449, 452, comp. E. Russell’s *Recollections*, &c., p. 7270.

† *Ibid.* vol. iv. p. 454.

eyes open, might be obviated and spared. But it is just the most faithful servants, and the worthiest friends, who are most silent upon their own affairs, and must therefore be thoroughly proved before we get at the truth. He (the King of Portugal is referred to) will turn out an altogether wretched man if he live long enough, which I doubt his doing; for without the love of others man cannot be happy, and one must himself be capable of loving, and must love in order to be loved."

The sayings and doings of the infant Princess *Beatrice* were always chronicled by the Prince for the benefit of her sister at Berlin. Here is another characteristic passage, an application of German metaphysics to childish prattle!—

"The little aunt makes daily strides, and is really too comical. When she stumbles, she calls out in bewilderment, 'She don't like it, She don't like it!' And she came into breakfast a short time ago (with her eyes full of tears) moaning. 'Baby has been so naughty, poor baby' 'so naughty,' as one might complain of being ill, of having slept badly, &c. &c. How much sound philosophy is in this expression; the child felt she was not responsible for her naughtiness, and regarded it rightly as a misfortune, for the 'I,' which appears to her still as a third person, that is as something outside herself."*

† That the Philo-Italian policy of the Government had not the entire sympathy or confidence of the Prince appears from many passages in his letters—*c.g.*, writing to Stockmar about the Peace of Villa Franca, he says:—

"Palmerston is furious about the position of Austria, and Lord John about the way Italy has been deceived. The former is even bent on taking vengeance on Austria, and very unwisely wants to use the Emperor Napoleon for the purpose, and to force him to recall the concessions which he has made. The latter is anxious for a Congress in London, where he may play the liberator and benefactor of Italy."†

Spite of his expressed opinion of the benefits of Parliamentary Government, yet he never really liked it. "To-day (he writes to Berlin), we have the Council for the Prorogation of Parliament (my blessing go with it)." On the 14th September of that year, the British Association for the Promotion of Science was to hold its yearly meeting at Aberdeen, and the Prince (the President of the year), was engaged in preparing his Opening Address. "I read (he says in the same letter) a thick volume; write, perspire, and tear what I have written to shreds in sheer vexation; a quite charming addition to my usual occupations."‡

The summer did not pass without a renewed warning of the result of this excess of occupation in the shape of another

* "Life," p. 467-8.

† *Ibid.*, p. 477.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 480.

attack of illness. "For two whole days (he wrote to his daughter) I was unfortunately not quite well, and I am not right yet. I have had a cholera attack, accompanied with great *malaise*, which it will take some time to shake off; I believe worry about political affairs . . . is chiefly to blame." Even on his birthday—always a fête day in the Royal family—the Prince notes in his Diary, "We had, alas! discussion (on the Italian question) during the day with Lord Palmerston." The next day, writing to his daughter to acknowledge her birthday gift to him, he says: "The finest present which you can make me is that which you have made—the assurance that you are happy. Fain would I have embraced you that day. Beatrice was charming at table in the evening for the first time."* At Edinburgh, on his way to Balmoral, the Prince held "an Educational Conference with all the persons who are taking part in the Education of the Prince of Wales. They all speak well of him (he writes to Stockmar), and he seems to have shown zeal and good will."† Another member of the family showed zeal and good will in another field. The Prince concludes a long letter to his daughter on the affairs of Germany and Italy in these words: "Yesterday we had the Gilhes' Ball, at which Arthur distinguished himself, and was greatly applauded in the Highland reels; next to Jemmie Gow he was 'the favourite in the room.'"‡

The Prince's Address to the British Association, the product of much pains and labour, and the failure of which he had much dreaded, gave great satisfaction. The Prince's return to the south was followed by another gastric attack, which this time compelled him to keep to his bed for some days. We read with surprise the following remark of Stockmar's in a letter to the Prince on the subject of his illness:—

"All round you, there is a want of thoughtful care for the repose, the tending, and the nursing which are so necessary for the sick and convalescent.§ One would have thought that in the first family in the kingdom such a state of things was impossible." It was long, if ever, before the Prince recovered from his latest attack.

"I am very well (he wrote Stockmar, December 8th), all but my stomach, which is decidedly *not* better;" but he would not relax his exertion, though warned by Stockmar "to avoid for a great length of time all disturbing agencies." In his weekly letter to his daughter he thus apologizes for its brevity. "I am overwhelmed with papers,

* "Life," p. 484.

† H.R.H. was then a Student of the University of Edinburgh.

‡ "Life," 491.

§ *Ibid.*, p. 501.

and can scarcely wrestle through them, therefore, even to you, I must say farewell so soon."*

His New Year's letter to Stockmar contains another proof of failing health.

"We are quite well except my stomach, which is in a state truly pitiable, and is responsible for my waking early in the morning, and being unable to go to sleep again, 'a shocking bore,' as the popular phrase here says. In politics every thing continues to pursue its confused course. You will have read the pamphlet, 'Le Pape et le Congres.' It is so reasonable that it must do the Emperor the greatest harm, although, and perhaps because, he owns to being the father of it."

With the end of 1859, a year to the Prince "of private sorrow and of public care," the present volume closes. When the conclusion of the work appears we hope to return to our task as its Reviewer.

ART. VI.—THEOPHRASTUS SUCH.

Impressions of Theophrastus Such. By GEORGE ELIOT.
Edinburgh and London: 1879.

THIS is a very difficult book to review, for the reviewer must not only feel the full force of a book, but he must be able to put his feeling into articulate language, which will enable a reader to form some conception of the cause of the intellectual and emotional effect which the work has produced.

Theophrastus Such is, no doubt, a man of ability, but we question whether any injustice would be done him if the public estimated him a little less highly than he does himself. Shrewdness is to be discovered upon every page of his "Impressions," and doubtless upon every page of his earlier work, which we have not seen, although it has been translated, as Theophrastus mentions with a little pardonable vanity (p. 10) into Cherokee; but then, is shrewdness all we want from a writer, even when that shrewdness is combined, as it is in this case, with a deft and rich style? No doubt Such is candid, as candid as any man can be about his own failings and defects. His description of his personal appearance is by no means wanting in candid criticism. His feet, he admits frankly, are awkward (p. 10), and have an odd habit, like ladies' thumbs, of turning

* "Life," p. 510.

up in places where they would be least expected. His upper lip is long, and he does walk with his head foremost, and like animals who walk upon more limbs than Theophrastus does, and with his chin projecting (p. 11). There are other peculiarities in his appearance which use may have blinded Such to, but which have been marked by the candid eye of friendship, for all men are more or less flattered by their friends' shortcomings.

But, after all, Theophrastus' candour leads to little. His anxiety seems to be a wish to deprecate criticism of his mental faculties by means of an exceptional candour as to his physical defects. Thus, we find him, upon an early page of the work before us, admitting that he is "tempted to remonstrate when the physical points I have mentioned are apparently taken to warrant unfavourable inferences concerning my mental quickness" (p. 11). And again, on page 306, he requests, that the justice of his ideas may not be estimated by his facial expression. But we would all of us admit ugliness if you would credit us with genius, and consequently we cannot think that Such's candour was more self-sacrificing than the abnegation of the little girl who refused oranges which she knew to be sour, with a view to an invitation to partake of apples which she had experience to tell her were of exceptional quality. One thing Such does make out with all his self-depreciation, and that is, that of all the fellows mentioned in this book he is the cleverest and nicest. He has a conscience and beautiful memories, while all his friends—Touchwood, Mixtus, Mordan, and the rest—have only foibles. His conscience may be a little out of proportion, just as his features are, and the lower jaw may be as prominent in it, as it is, by his own confession, in his face—if we may judge of him by his *Essay upon Moral Swindlers*; but even if it is a little out of perfect symmetry, we are glad to recognise it. All consciences are like bowls, and have a strong bias. They would run crooked even over a perfectly smooth world, but over the world as it is there is an element of incalculableness about their motions which has in it the possibility of astonishing surprises or dire disappointments. Theophrastus Such has a conscience and a fine eye for scenery.

Were this the only work which we had to judge him by, we might not form such a superlative estimate of his powers as a landscape painter, for here he treats rather of men than of meadows, and of the deformities of mental portraits rather than of the beauties of those fat, quiet midlands he knows so well and loves so dearly. Still there are some descriptions here which will compare favourably with almost anything which has been

done by that great Master of the School, George Eliot. Here are some passages from "Looking Backward," and that is Theophrastus Such's real gift:—

"Indeed, my philosophical notions, such as they are, continually carry me back to the time when the fitful gleams of a spring day used to show me my own shadow as that of a small boy on a small pony, riding over the breezy uplands, which we used to dignify with the name of hills, or along by-roads with broad grassy borders and hedgerows reckless of utility, on our way to outlying hamlets whose groups of inhabitants were as distinctive to my imagination as if they had belonged to different regions of the globe" (p 41).

On this delightful glimpse into pleasant parochial journeyings we desire to say nothing that could be construed as derogatory criticism, but we may remark that the description of hedgerows "reckless of utility" is too suggestively like a similar description in that fine first chapter of "Felix Holt," where they are spoken of as "the liberal homes of unmarketable beauty." Here is another fragrant sentence about the country:—

"But our woodlands and pastures, our hedge-parted cornfields and meadows, our bits of high common, where we used to plant the wind-mills, our quiet little rivers, here and there fit to turn a mill-wheel, our villages along the old coach-roads, are all easily alterable lineaments that seem to make the face of our mother-land sympathetic with the laborious lives of her children."

One more quotation from the pleasantest of these papers. It also has the smell of earth, and the scent of the meadows and the hay-field about it:—

"Our rural tracts—where no Babel chimney scales the heavens—are without mighty objects to fill the soul with the sense of an outer world unconquerably aloof from our efforts. The wastes are playgrounds (and let us try to keep them such, for the children's children who will inherit no other sort of demesne); the grasses and reeds nod to each other over the river, but we have cut a canal close by; the very heights laugh with corn in August, or lift the plough team against the sky in September. Then comes a crowd of burly navvies, with pick-axes and barrows, and while hardly a wrinkle is made in the fading mother's face, or a new curve of health on the blooming girl's, the hills are cut through, or the trenches between them spanned, we choose our level, and the white steam-pennon flies along it.

"But because our land shows this readiness to be changed, all signs of permanence upon it raise a tender attachment instead of awe; some of us at least love the scanty relics of our forests, and are thankful if a bush is left of the old hedgerow. A crumbing bit of wall, where the delicate ivy-leaved toad-flax hangs its light branches, or a bit of grey thatch with its patches of dark moss on its shoulder, and a troop of grass-stems on its ridge, is a thing to visit. And then

the tiled roof of cottage and homestead, of the long cow-shed, where generations of the milky mothers have stood patiently, of the broad-shouldered barns, where the old-fashioned flail made resonant music while the watch-dog barked at the timidly venturesome fowls making pecking raids on the out-flying grain—the roofs that have looked out from among the elms and walnut-trees, or beside the yearly group of hay and corn stacks, or below the square stone steeple, gathering their grey or ochre-tinted lichens, and their olive-green mosses under all ministries—let us praise the sober harmonies they give to our landscape, helping to unite us pleasantly with the elder generations who tilled the soil for us before we were born, and paid heavier and heavier taxes with much grumbling, but without that deepest root of corruption—the self-indulgent despair which cuts down and consumes, and never plants.”

The picture of the upland team against the high September sky; of the fowls about the flying “pickles” which rebound from the noisy bruises of the whirling flail, while the watch-dog, from a stern sense of duty, barks at the peccolations of the marauding hens, whose hungry temerity is perhaps due to their knowledge of his being “on the chain,” are incomparable except with similar etchings in other works from the same hand. The former reminds us of F. Walker’s pictures, while the latter brings Hoendikætur vividly before us. But this “Looking Backward” is the only paper in the volume which abounds in these pleasant glances into the memories of older date, for it is these memories which are in truth the mother of the Muses and not Such’s memories of more recent date—memories of clubs and drawing-rooms—which form the staple of the rest of this work. Perhaps these latter memories are too young to be the mother of anything but affectation. But this book invites attention not so much as a panorama of landscapes, but as a kind of portrait gallery. These “Impressions” are concerned with men, as we said, more than their environment by Nature. There are likenesses of men and women which may hurt the feelings of those who sat for them, much as one’s face, seen in a glass when one’s expression is not at its best, jars upon one. Lowering brows, twitching muscles, the flush of anger, may all be useful upon occasion, but one does not desire to have those phases of character made prominent in portraiture. A man tries to show the pleasanter side of his character to the artist or photographer. But many of the subjects of these sketches have shown the one side of their disposition which was defective to Mr. Such; and he has sketched their defects with a flattery rather of the defect than of the person. He looks upon men much as a hospital-surgeon might. They are subjects which illustrate with more or less instruction the phases of disease. Even some of the titles of

his essays invite attention to their claims to be pathological studies of portraiture. They remind one more of an anatomical plate of the muscles and veins and nerves, which go to make up our features, than a wholesome modelling of the features as they meet the eye of ordinary acquaintance. No one was more capable than George Eliot of painting men in their vital reality—men as men, and not as subjects of dissection or vivisection. No one has peopled the world of books with more veritable men and women whom we know as such, and love as friends or hate as enemies; and although in this mature work she has taken to the scalpel instead of the brush, and has made men as "interesting cases," instead of human beings with claims upon our admiration, our pity or contempt, we question much whether she is doing work at all comparable in excellence in this Pathological Theatre, to that which she did in the artist's studio in which her earlier works were written.

One thing which we always felt in reading works from her hand was, that they were works from the heart too. There was a large motherly sympathy with the poor, the paltry, even with the erring, which we can ill spare from these pages, and the absence of which is but ill compensated by accurate knowledge of psychological constitution, and the morbid tendencies of healthy minds. But here the writer has concealed all that large-heartedness and feminine tenderness which before was so conspicuous. We confess to a sense of sorrow that Theophrastus Such should have written so harshly in this book. In speaking of Mordan (the Watch-dog of Knowledge, p. 149), he says:

"I cannot feel sure how my voting will affect the condition of Central Asia in the coming ages, but I have good reason to believe that the future populations there will be none the worse off because I abstain from conjectural vilification of my opponents, during the present session, and I am very sure that I shall be less injurious to my contemporaries. On the whole, and in the vast majority of instances, the action by which we can do the best for future ages is of the sort which has a certain beneficence and grace for contemporaries."

But we have sought these pages in vain for the grace and beneficence to the literary contemporaries of Theophrastus Such, which will be best for future ages. He tells us that he has learned "to care much for foreign countries, for literatures, foreign and ancient, for the life of Continental towns dozing round old cathedrals, for the life of London, half sleepless with eager thought and strife, with indigestion or with hunger, and now," he adds, "my consciousness is chiefly of the busy, anxious, metropolitan sort. My system responds sensitively to London weather, signs political, social, literary, and my bachelor's hearth is imbedded where by much craning of head and neck I can catch

sight of a sycamore in the Square-garden. I belong to the nation of London" (pp. 51, 52). But although Theophrastus has had this wide experience of rural scenes and city life, of the dreamy country and the delirious town, of the quiet past and the noisy present, his impressions in this volume are only gathered from the narrow Square-garden of literary life, where vegetation is of a rank, forced sort, and where over all there is a deposit of foul blackness. All these portraits are of literary men, or men who live and breathe that they may say something, and that the whole world may hear them when they say it. Merman has the quick, glib pen of the magazine-writer, and turns it from its facile course to the great work of setting Grampus right as to the Magicodumbras and Zuzumotzis. Lentulus is potentially a literary man of mark in his own estimation; Hinze is of the same set. Mixtus, the half-bred money-making man who marries Scintilla, has had his literary ambition, and has his unfinished manuscript by him. Ganymede too is a writer, who has youth on his side until he is surprised by old age, which is upon him. Pepin is a too ready writer. Vorticella has written a work on "The Channel Islands, with Appendix and Notes." The whole interest of the book is connected with literary achievements, or rather with literary failures. There is no genuine success mentioned in the book. Each essay carps cleverly enough at some small vice of character, some small failing of temper, some sacrifice of ideals, some predatory instincts in authorship or conversation, or some small vanity of the pen. Is this, we wonder, all that the great nation of London can produce in its literary circles? Are there no virtues to be seen and admired, no noblenesses to be known and imitated? Does the execution of literary work spoil men, as it seems to have spoiled Pepin, or Vorticella, or Lentulus? or does it ruin lives as it did that of poor Merman, who concentrated himself for his great work of setting Grampus right, and was rewarded with contumely and penury for himself, and after a time the appropriation of his idea by Grampus himself? Is there no redeeming trait in these men, who sway the sceptre of the pen? Is there, nothing kingly about these modern monarchs of the press, or are they all like the paltry subjects of these scathing portraits? Was it worth Such's while to accumulate these instances of defects, and make his book a sort of Greenwich Hospital for lameness of the literary sort? Was it necessary to make the pen, which has done so much in literature, into a whip to lash such men as Sir Gavial Mantrap? Was it really necessary to tell us that a man who builds churches and distributes alms,

but who robs widows and orphans by the cat's-paw of a Company, is not moral, and that he may be more wicked than a man whose life is loose in social bonds, and who takes a view of the relation of the sexes which would not be approved by a Church dignitary? Was it worth his while to write this essay upon "Moral Swindlers," to enlarge the meaning of the word "immorality," which Theophrastus seems to believe is limited to libertinism in some minds, and make it include those haggard crimes which wreck a hundred or a thousand homes, which convulse a commercial world, and destroy a national credit? We confess that we think there would be few persons who would call such public malefactors, even if they lived at Tip-Top, on the paltry income derived from the one or two hundred thousand pounds settled on their wives—moral. Then, again, why does Such laugh so uncontrollably at Vorticella, who wrote the book on the "Channel Islands, with Notes and Appendix?" Was the disease of her stupid vanity in that one production, and in the critical notices of it in the Pumpeter newspapers worth including in this nosology? And besides, is the disease rightly diagnosed? Was it the book that made her vain and gave her this disease of small authorship? or was not the seed-germ in Vorticella's pompous bosom before? To us it seems that she was none the worse for her research into the question of "Dragnets," and we can scarcely believe that the disease was caused by the Quarto or the opinion in the "Medley Pie." But even if it were, was it necessary to write this essay about her paltry vanity—was it right to look only at the overgrown side of Vorticella's character, without attempting to form a conception of the fine healthiness which, we doubt not, flourished alongside of this gairish weed of disease? We can imagine her a kind mother for all her vanity, we can imagine her an upright woman and a devoted wife, although she has the "Channel Islands" handsomely bound and laid on a table by itself. And little is gained by looking at the worst side of things, or men, or women. There are crimes which deserve our indignant loathing and articulate censure, but there are faults which merit our merciful silence; or if we must speak about them, let us do justice to the other qualities of head and heart which redeem these peccadillos.

But is it only "small authorship" that has faults? When we have written a dozen great books which have been praised by the London Dailies, and by the many Quarterlies, are we free from that itch of vanity which Vorticella laboured under? Has great authorship not its failings and diseases? We should say that even Theophrastus Such has some vanity. He might

not show his craving as stupidly as Monas, the author of "Here and There, or a Trip from Truro to Transylvania," did (p. 274). We confess that we think few people would, and that we believe that the sketch of Monas is "imaginary" in the same sense that much that Callista said was credited to imagination, but was really the result of inaccuracy (p. 234). Is not one of the diseases of great authorship shown in a persistent disregard of advice? An author may have views as to "dragnets" to begin with, but however vain he is, he will, while he is still in the category of "small authors," learn something from his critics in whom he discerns honest purpose and capable criticism. But when one has written many books, and is sure of much Pumpeter, John o' Groats and Land's End praise, one is less willing to believe one's critics, even when they speak the truth. The disease of vanity—infantile and curable in early authorship—may in the great authors become chronic, and defy the physiological efforts of the most salutary medicine. Has not Theophrastus this disease? His career has had two distinct phases, as has been noted before. His earlier career was marked by artistic productions of incomparable merit, redolent with an ability, a genius which was beyond all learning. His later life has been marked by works of a curious second-hand erudition in science and philosophy, and the pride of this paltry knowledge and these small attainments keeps him from becoming again the scholar of his younger self, and imitating the great works of his freshness and youth. Is there no vanity, no disease of great authorship in continuing in this course in defiance of public opinion? True, public opinion is very often valueless in such matters, and an author must be above the stimulus or guidance of clamour; but an author must at the same time be receptive of truth, although it may be uttered in the hubbub of false and misleading noises. It is at one's peril that one misses a true word, although it is spoken in a Babel. Surely Such's own nice appreciation, if he had still been in the healthy condition in which he was when "Scenes in Clerical Life," or "The Mill on the Floss" were written, would have known that his later works did not satisfy the canons of the highest art. Is it not a disease of great authorship which has vitiated his nice taste? Again, may not this disease account for a defect of style which becomes more conspicuous in each successive work? There is a lavish use of words, not to say wordiness, in this book, which is peculiarly misleading in its attempts to be copiously perspicuous. Formerly it was difficult to miss his crisp and direct meaning. There were depths in his style which gave possibilities of thought and feeling which were not on the surface. A

suggestion is often more to a good mind than an explanation. But Such explains so fully as almost to become wearisome at times, and with his occasional verbosity he sometimes fails to make his meaning as clear as he might if he said less and hinted more. An epigram would be safe enough in the hands of most of his readers. We confess, for instance, to a difficulty in following this:—

“Depend upon it, vanity is human, native alike to men and women; only in the male it is of denser texture, less volatile, so that it less immediately informs you of its presence, but is more massive and capable of knocking you down if you come into collision with it; while in women vanity lays by its small revenges, as in a needle-case, always at hand. The difference is in muscle and finger-tips, in traditional habits and mental perspective, rather than in original appetite of vanity” (p. 275).

We may be writing ourselves down asses by our confession, but we believe that we shall have associates in the category. And again:—

“Merely to maintain an attitude and gait which I notice in certain club-men, and especially an inflation of the chest accompanying very small remarks, there goes, I am convinced, an expenditure of psychical energy little appreciated by the multitude—a mental vision of self and deeply-impressed beholders which is quite without antitype in what we call the effect produced by that hidden process” (p. 276).

If we understand this sentence, it seems scarcely worth the trouble which went to its elaborate construction. No doubt men have tricks which have been consciously planned, which fail of their effect upon those upon whom they are played. A heaving of the chest before speaking, or taking breath even before uttering a commonplace, may be one of them, although it can scarcely be called an attitude or a gait, and it may have been thought over by the actor in full view of contemplated consequences on his auditors; but was it worth while telling us so, in so many words and with such fine phrases as “psychical energy?”

Of course the reviewers will say that this book will not be popular, with the “ordinary reader.” Such an opinion has the advantage of safety from refutation, and it is rather pleasant to speak about a class of people who are “ordinary readers,” and mentally to separate yourself from the class. Much of our censure of others is only a delicate way of praising ourselves. But is there any meaning in such a criticism? Is there one superlatively great work that has been popular with the ordinary reader? We pretend to believe that Shakspeare is read, but do we not know that merit is generally in the inverse ratio to the sale of a book? But, besides, this is not an ordinary book, it is not addressed to

ordinary readers, it is not to be tried by the canons of criticism which are applicable to novels. The purpose of the work was not narrative, but criticism. No doubt George Eliot's tales appeal to a much larger audience than such a work as this would. In a novel there is action, and the commonest minds are pleased if they can see something being done. It is a higher class of minds which has pleasure in reflecting on character, on the obscure springs of action, and the occult sources of disposition. It is to these latter that this book—a book of valuable essays on feelings and foibles—a book of drastic criticisms of men and manners, which is enlivened here and there with fine free play of the most genial humour—is addressed. Nothing, for instance, could be better in the way of humour than the sketch of the cunning Pummel—although the sketch appears to occur without much appropriateness in the essay on “The Watch-dog of Knowledge.” Here is one of Pummel's circumspect answers to a puzzling question, “What is the cause of the tides, Pummel?” “Well, sir, nobody rightly knows. Many give their opinion, but if I was to give mine, it 'ud be different” (p. 153). True, many of the sketches are not genial, but rather punitive. But then the essayist is dealing with faults and follies, with presumptions and vanities; but when he comes to a true woman's love and sacrifice, as in the case of Julia—Merman's wife—we see what an intense sympathy the author has with the good and the true.

We cannot but think that the unpersonal papers in this volume will be read with most pleasure and profit. That is surely a curious remark to make of an author whose power to interest us in persons—whether those persons were high or low, rich or poor—was paramount; but it is, we believe, true. Here we find much less to delight us in these strained sketches of men or half-men with their faultiness and naughtiness, than in the essays which deal exclusively with other topics. We have read with interest the essay upon the future of the Jews (the Modern Hep-hep-hep), and are in close agreement with its argument, an argument which is eloquently worded and vigorously enforced. Again, the essay on “Debasing the Moral Currency” (p. 173) is a trenchant protest against a phase of our so-called civilisation, which is disgusting to every man who has a taste for the beautiful, a love for the sacred, or a sense of the right. There is at the present time a perilous attempt to turn all that is sacred, all that is awe-inspiring or love-moving, to the ephemeral purposes of paltry laughter, and there is a need for some such protest as that which Theophrastus has hurled into words in this paper. Nothing in these times is serious or sedate, nothing is full of

the springs of compassion or moral motive, that is not turned to the poor purposes of trivial ridicule. Our children are taught to laugh at everything and to tremble at nothing. We ourselves frequent theatres and books for the pleasure of fanciful and facetious fooling, which leaves us with nothing but the ashes of the thorns which crackled under our simmering-pot of imbecile enjoyment. A protest against this burlesque movement was wanted, and it is here in eloquent words:—

“The art of spoiling,” says Such, “is within the reach of the dullest faculty, the coarsest clown with a hammer in his hand might chip the nose off every statue and bust in the Vatican, and stand grinning at the effect of his work” (p. 177).

“I have been amazed to find that some artists whose own works have the ideal stamp are quite insensible to the damaging tendency of the burlesquing spirit which ranges to and fro, and up and down on the earth, seeing no reason (except a precarious censorship) why it should not appropriate every sacred, heroic, and pathetic theme, which serves to make up the treasure of human admiration, hope, and love. This is what I call debasing the moral currency, lowering the value of every inspiring fact and tradition, so that it will command less and less of the spiritual products, the generous motives which sustain the charm and elevation of our social existence—the something besides bread by which a man saves his soul alive.”

But did Theophrastus Such think that he too had grave responsibilities, which were scarcely discharged by these sketches? Did he comprehend the power for good which he would be to his fellow-men if he increased our compassion, if he knit the infinite links of love and friendship which unite us with our fellow-men? and if he understood that he was a Priest to make such divine marriages between men and men, between men and ideas, why did he become a light-minded Divorce Court, with his sneer for a decree, and dissolve our unions by such drastic ridicule of men who had qualities in them which could have commanded our love and reverence? Is not this work conceived in the burlesquing spirit? Is there any high purpose to be gathered from it? is there any stimulus to action, any guidance for conduct, any hope to cheer us, any wisdom to comfort us? Has Theophrastus Such, before he dipped his pen into his rather bitter ink to make pleasant fooling for our meagre smiles out of his friends and acquaintances who do not come up to his standard of intellectual or moral perfection—has he asked himself whether he purposed any real good by his work? True, he has passed judgment upon some men, but will not all men, if we judge them by our speculative knowledge, be found wanting? and if we judge men by the practical working of our theories, may we not find some

saints to worship still? May it not be then in this light that these culprits have merits beyond these estimates, and that Theophrastus, for all his genius, has been guilty of faults for which he stands self-condemned? Has he not been tampering with a currency whose integrity ought to have been dear to him? Has he not been burlesquing men and women, who had much laughter-and-sneer-worthy in them, no doubt, but who had claims upon our respect, our admiration or love? Is there not something sacred in these men which Theophrastus has overlooked in his sneering?

INDEPENDENT SECTION

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

AN UNRECOGNISED ELEMENT IN OUR EDUCATIONAL SYSTEMS.

MOST thoughtful Englishmen must be convinced that few articles of our social creed need a more radical reform than the conventional morality of sex. The profound yearning after a purer public life, which Sir Arthur Helps has so beautifully expressed, in his musings on "the great sin of great cities," must awaken the sympathy of all men of culture and intelligence. There is, too, a growing conviction that more light is needed on the subject, and that a wider diffusion of sound physiological knowledge among all classes of society, and an honest attempt to build up a new theory of morals on the basis of scientific truth rather than on mere authority and convention, are the things most needed to meet the growing evils of the age. But these two classes of social reformers appear to be widely separated; and for the most part the advocates of scientific inquiry stand forward as representing the spirit of rebellion against all hitherto received social ethics. Yet I feel convinced that an exhaustive study of the laws of our physical being will lead to results altogether in harmony with the highest aspirations of our spiritual nature, and will at the same time render such aspirations less vague and unpractical than those set forth in "Companions of My Solitude;" while, as a result of such study, we shall find a clue to the solution of difficulties which at present seem to the philanthropist well-nigh insuperable.

I cannot hope to do more than attempt to indicate a path in a new and unexplored region. The science of physiology, as a whole, is in a very undeveloped state, and the physiology of sex is, perhaps, the most backward of all its branches. Wisdom is a safer guide than mere knowledge; and the morality of mankind is founded rather upon the inspirations of healthy instinct than the dry light of scientific induction. But knowledge and

wisdom ought to go hand in hand, and the complicated conditions of modern civilisation render it no longer safe or wise to trust to mere fineness of feeling if unfortified by the inexorable logic of facts.

But, further, I cannot help thinking that in all stages of human society the community at large ought to know all that can admit of any practical application in the physiology of sex. It seems clear that the enforced ignorance in which Englishmen grow up is unnatural and vicious, and that this fundamental falsehood is one chief root of the social evils we deplore. The ancient lamentation of the prophet holds good here: "My people is destroyed for lack of knowledge."

If we consider the following facts we can hardly refuse our assent to the position just stated. The instinct of sex is the strongest and the most active element in nature. Nothing is stronger save the instinct by which we cling to life itself. It is perfectly Protean in its capacity for concealing and cloaking itself under every imaginable variety of form. Until we have studied the subject we have no idea of the extent to which this instinct underlies every department of thought and feeling, modifying and colouring the play of emotions and affections, of physical function and mental activity. It does not, as many suppose, delay to come into existence until the maturity of youth; its blind beginnings operate throughout childhood, and its conscious workings are the most powerful just at the very age when all the faculties of body and of mind are unfolding themselves and the character is being formed for life.

If mankind were sinless and healthy this instinct might perhaps be trusted to develop itself without any guidance derived from observation and experience. But such is far from being the case. The world is very evil. Not only is there a vast amount of external wickedness with which we must sooner or later come into contact, but the most serious point of all is that every man inherits and carries with him from the cradle to the grave diseased and vicious tendencies derived from remote and unknown ancestors. We are thus brought face to face with this singular absurdity, that while we know that the whole character and welfare of man depends on the right direction given to the most powerful element in his nature, and while we well know that this element will probably be misdirected by forces operating both from within and from without, yet we think we have discharged our whole duty in education if we leave this power to take care of itself, and spend all our social energies in securing satisfactory guarantees that when our folly has produced its inevitable fruit the result shall at least be kept carefully concealed. So that all be fair without we reck nothing of the rotteness within.

Nay, more, we do worse than this. We do in an indirect way give our boys lessons on the subject which we know must most powerfully awaken their natural curiosity. We set them to study a literature, which, however invaluable and indispensable as an instrument of education, has this most serious drawback, that almost all of it is more or less permeated with a spirit of falsehood and licentiousness such as would never be tolerated in the literature of the day, but which is glorified and excused because it is classical. There would be no harm in this if boys were trained in the knowledge which would enable them to detect the falsehood and to despise the licentiousness. But here the schoolmaster is silent.

We must not however imagine, because parents and schoolmasters say nothing, that no teaching goes on. The time comes sooner or later in a boy's life when he must exchange the safer atmosphere of home for the little world of a public school. Common sense tells us that curiosity is one of the most irrepresible tendencies of human nature, and that, at the time of life when the animal instincts begin to develop into conscious activity, curiosity in regard to all matters pertaining to that instinct is sure to be specially strong. The only remedy possible is to destroy curiosity by giving such full information as will leave nothing to be inquired about. That this information will very soon be obtained in one way or another is matter of absolute certainty. No boy ever remained for a month in any school, public or private, without learning all the salient points in the physical relation between the sexes. We have no choice in the matter except between true and wholesome information given by the parent, the schoolmaster, the clergyman, or the family physician on the one hand, and the one-sided, false, and sensual teaching which boys are certain to derive from each other. Let no one imagine that this curiosity can be or ought to be suppressed and stamped out by any measures of supervision and restraint. It is indeed God's voice within the boy, crying out for light; for light to know and understand God's will; and if we refuse to answer that dumb, inarticulate cry, or endeavour only to stifle it because it troubles us, we are fighting against God, and the guilt of whatever consequences may ensue will rest upon our heads.

There are two grave evils in connection with this unlicensed and unrecognised instruction in the rudiments of physiology. First, the lessons thus learned are learned surreptitiously, and thus there is inevitably attached to them the prurient zest which belongs to whatever is secret and forbidden. But a far graver evil is opened up to us if we ask the question, "Whence do the doctors in this contraband school derive their own knowledge?" Partly, no doubt, from tradition. There is a complete

cycle of physiological maxims illustrated by filthy stories handed down from time immemorial in all the schools of the land. But whenever any additions are made to this common stock, they can only come from the same source as the common stock itself. The only boys who are in a position to give any original information on the subject are those who are older and more vicious than the rest; those who have matriculated in the university of vice and taken their degree in the house of the harlot. Such boys having the exclusive monopoly of the much coveted lore, necessarily acquire an immense ascendancy over their fellows. A schoolboy always worships a boy older than himself who knows something which to him is a profound mystery, and who has dared to do that which he has not even ventured to imagine.

When the boy leaves school, influences of an analogous kind still surround him. At the universities, or in large towns where young men congregate in sufficient numbers to form a society of their own, this system of unaided and unexamined self-education still goes on. The traditions of the different public schools are merged in one common currency of counterfeit coin. The diligent perusal of Lemprière's Dictionary, of the beauties of Juvenal and Aristophanes, and of selections from the Old Testament histories, is replaced by the study of humanity as exhibited in the music-hall, the green-room, and the police-court. Happy the young man who survives this training with no worse result than the negative one of being introduced to the responsibilities of manhood and marriage with his mind unfortified by a single true idea, but thoroughly and firmly imbued with some half-dozen traditional lies—lies of the worst sort that the devil can put into the heart of man, since they are lies that consist of an ingenious distortion and perversion of half-truths about matters so complicated and difficult that none but the trained student can rightly unravel them. So far as a knowledge of the duties of sex is concerned, an Englishman is born and brought up in Egyptian darkness—a darkness that may be felt, a darkness into which the light of heaven is never allowed to penetrate, but which is in some sort illumined by a sickly glare from the mouth of the pit of perdition.

It does not follow that Englishmen necessarily grow up vicious. Far from it. Morality depends chiefly upon healthy instinct; and the family life and family traditions of Englishmen are proverbially sound. And although our educational systems leave out all reference to the laws of sex, yet our public schools and universities foster a spirit of chivalry and hardihood, and thus prepare a soil fitted for the growth of manly virtues. Mere instruction in physiology will never make a man pure; all we claim for such instruction is that it will save him from being led

astray by delusions and mistakes, and that it will transform the passive and unaggressive purity of ignorant instinct into that active enthusiasm for righteousness which can alone result from an intelligent comprehension of God's will written in the tables of our flesh.

There is another reason why knowledge of this kind is imperatively called for. We have entered upon a period of transition in philosophical and religious thought. Forces which we can hardly measure, and which we are powerless to control, are at work, disintegrating and dissolving all things. Every doctrine is questioned, every sentiment is analysed; nothing can escape the merciless iconoclasm of the spirit of the age on the plea that it has commanded the undisturbed assent of mankind from time immemorial. If the morality of sex were a mere abstract speculation, such as that of the personality of the unconditioned or the automatism of organised beings, there would be no danger in such discussions. But this is a question on the right solution of which depends the equilibrium of the most terrible passions of humanity. It seems little short of insanity to allow interests so momentous to hang on the brittle thread of mere sentiment and habit, however healthy and however deeply rooted. We must be able to give a reason for the faith that is in us, or we shall fail in the day of trial.

Moreover, we must not shut our eyes to the fact that the outward conditions of the problem before us are changing rapidly, and shaping themselves towards issues to which the comfortable conventions of a past age will be hopelessly inapplicable. The moral creed of the orthodox paterfamilias will soon become an obvious impossibility: it has long since, in practice, been renounced by the young men of the day: and the time must come when this dead sultan can no longer be propped and bolstered up on his throne; and when he falls down in the presence of the janizaries of society, ruin and anarchy must ensue, unless meantime a living king can be brought forward to whom the hearts of the people may loyally knit themselves. But while Conservatives are content to let things take their course, the extreme Radicals of sex are wiser in their generation. That knowledge which we ought to proclaim as the heritage of the young they have appropriated and are diligently disseminating after their own fashion and in their own kind. And they have found a new sultan, the lineal heir of the dead man who now mocks the throne; a sultan who promises peace and plenty to the poor; a sultan of insinuating address and philanthropic phrase, who dexterously appeals to all the ignorant prejudices that made his father popular, and who promises to do all that his father did, and far more, to cleanse the cup and polish the

platter, to remove every eyesore, and whitewash every sepulchre, until propriety shall be all in all. It is true we do not allow the adherents of this new prince openly to advocate his claims, for there is one part of his programme which cuts sore against the grain of immemorial instincts; and, moreover, though we know that our lawful sultan is dead, still he is our sultan, and the sultan of our forefathers, and we are sticklers for authority and prescription. We are half-conscious that sooner or later the young prince must come to the throne, and that on one unpleasant point our prejudices must give way before the pressure of the opinion of enlightened political economists: but we especially dislike to have troublesome questions pressed home, and we hate people who are presumptuous and premature.

The time, then, has come when a morality based upon the union of intelligent knowledge with pure feeling must be substituted for the morality of mere convention and tradition. There have been, in different stages of the world's history, different ideals of the relation of the sexes. There was the ideal of Paganism: there was the Jewish ideal: and after the upheaval and dissolution of all ancient systems with the rise of Christianity there came the mediæval ideal, an ideal in some respects the most noble, and in some respects the most diseased, of them all. The conventional morality of Englishmen may briefly be described as an illogical agglomerate, comprising all that was worst, and excluding all that was best, in each of these systems. We do not, of course, mean that the practical morality of the day can be thus described. Our practical morality fortunately has but little to do with our theoretical creed. The one we inherit with our Teutonic blood as a matter of instinct; the other we have evolved from a strange medley of the mediævalism of the Prayer Book and the worse than Pagan animalism of public school tradition.

But in order that a true system of morality may be constructed and generally accepted, there must be, as a preparation for it, a previous diffusion of sound physiological teaching among all classes of society, more especially the middle and lower classes, from whose convictions and habits the weight of national sentiment is derived. It is not merely that knowledge is necessary as a basis for intelligent convictions of duty: but one most important effect of the diffusion of such information will be to purify the fountain of knowledge itself. Any branch of human thought must suffer if it be left exclusively in the hands of a privileged and professional class. Theology, for example, will always be narrow and unpractical—nay, perhaps even immoral—in countries where laymen take no intelligent and active interest in it. It is to be feared that whatever small amount of light

may exist with regard to the theory of the duties of sex has been much obscured hitherto by this professional exclusiveness, which, perhaps, is stronger among medical men than among the clergy. And in this case the consequences of such exclusiveness are more prejudicial than in the case of theology. A clergyman may be narrow and dogmatic, but, as a rule, he is more earnest and spiritually-minded than the average layman, and therefore more capable of finding out theological truth. But the materialism of medical training, coupled with the too prevalent neglect of general culture, has a direct tendency to deaden those subtle inspirations by which in the main the ethics of the relation of the sexes must be determined. Hitherto, perhaps, the influence of the medical profession has, on the whole, been for evil rather than for good. The bulk of the members of that profession take no special interest in the subject. But for one high-minded and enthusiastic surgeon, who probably has no time or energy left to spare for the metaphysical and moral speculations that might be deduced from his knowledge, there are scores of commonplace practitioners who in their daily intercourse with their little world diligently and dogmatically enforce maxims that are either destructive of all morality, or only consistent with its lower developments. One not unfrequently meets with young men who are ready to defend the looseness of their lives by telling you that their medical man has advised them to take the course they have adopted, and has clearly explained that for a bachelor to live a life of purity is a physical impossibility, and that any attempt at such a life would be most injurious to the health.

This poisoning of the well of knowledge seems to be one of the inevitable results of the system by which all public reference in education to the duties and functions of sex is proscribed. Medical men themselves form their first ideas on these subjects from schoolboy traditions; and these ideas are so congenial to the baser aspects of our nature, that no after-training could easily eradicate them, even if such training had this for its express object, which it has not. We must remember that physiology, as a science, is but in its childhood, and that the problems we have to face in the physiology of sex are extremely complicated and hard to investigate, and that in regard to them the most contradictory opinions are advocated. In this region of twilight, therefore, a man is certain to choose his path according to his previous predilections, and as a rule these will be on the wrong side. But if instruction in a system of morality based upon physiology formed a necessary part of every schoolboy's education, then these mists would no longer be allowed to hang over this debatable land.

In brief, the system of education at present adopted, of evading

all that relates to sex, and of trusting to ignorance and innocence as the sole protection of boys and young men against the evils that are about them and within them, issues in this result, that while virtue is left defenceless, vice has all the arguments to herself. All systematic thought, and all shaping of practical popular maxims from the results of such thought, are on the wrong side. Why should this state of things continue? Why should not one of the most influential factors of human nature be recognised and brought within the sphere of educational influences?

One favourable symptom of social progress in these matters is, that in all schools for girls now under public control the study of some simple manual of the science of health is made a necessary part of the course of instruction. Nothing could be more satisfactory, so far as it goes, but a little consideration will show that this is far from being all that is wanted. The science of health is both abstruse and complicated, and the amount of time that can be devoted to it in an ordinary girls'-school extremely small. With the best text-books and the best teachers available, it would be hard to keep the lesson on health from degenerating into mere "cram." And the probability is, that most girls either retain no permanent impression at all, or, if they do, little is left in their minds beyond a few isolated and ill-understood maxims about special points of detail. A branch of knowledge which so far as popular education is concerned is relegated exclusively to the sex which unavoidably enjoys the fewest educational advantages, is not likely to make much permanent progress. The best remedy for these defects is to make the study of hygiene compulsory in boys'-schools as well. There would then be a far greater chance that the knowledge thus acquired would be retained and turned to practical account in after-life.

For boys, the study of hygiene ought to include a clear outline of the broad general principles of the physiology of sex, with so much of detailed information as has a direct bearing on the duties of practical morality. Two principles ought to regulate any such scheme of instruction. First, that the physiology of sex, though necessarily occupying an important position in the course of these lessons, should be carefully subordinated to physiology and hygiene in general. The great aim of the teacher should be to divest a boy's mind of the diseased notion that there is something specially and intrinsically prurient in matters connected with the relation between the sexes; and this can best be done by carefully making the lessons on sex grow naturally and healthfully out of the lessons on the bodily functions in general. Secondly, human physiology should always be treated comparatively, in its relation to the

physiology of all lower forms of animated existence. Those who have never studied the subject can form no idea of the moral leverage that can be gained by taking this standpoint. Throughout the ascending scale of creation nothing is more clearly marked than the gradual evolution of the moral element—the slow, silent preparation for the introduction of spiritual forces in conjunction with the merely physical aspects of nature. A wise teacher will begin with the stamens and pistil of a common flower, and taking that flower as his text will unfold from it the whole mystery of the relation between the male and the female; and as he rises upwards he will with judicious tact fasten on the points of analogy or contrast that most vividly set forth those moral truths on the inculcation of which he constantly fixes his aim.

In regard, also, to the mode of teaching these lessons, two principles should be carefully carried out. First, that instruction and examination should be chiefly or exclusively oral and in class. There must no doubt be text-books for the teacher; but whether there should be such for the pupil is perhaps doubtful. For a boy to read such subjects by himself might be injurious, though it could not do half the harm that is done under the present system. But the fresh air of the publicity of class-room instruction would render the discussion of all necessary details as harmless, and almost as dry, as a lesson in Thucydides. Secondly, the morbid exercise of the imagination should be prevented by using the utmost plainness of speech, by avoiding all ambiguities and euphemisms, and by the actual exhibition of the structures spoken of in prepared and preserved dissections. If drawings are used, they should be mere outline diagrams made to exhibit the theoretical relations of different structures and organs with greater clearness than can be seen in the complications of actual existence.

One great danger that we have to obviate is the effect of ignorance and curiosity at the critical time of life when the latent instincts of sex usually begin to manifest their conscious working. *Omne ignotum pro magnifico*, but on the system we advocate a boy would be delivered from the temptations of idle curiosity and of the vicious companionships to which such curiosity inevitably leads. I believe that nine-tenths—nay, that ninety-nine hundredths—of the immorality that prevails among young men originates primarily in ignorance and perverted curiosity. All men are naturally chaste, paradoxical as such a statement may appear. Just in proportion as a man's animal propensities are strongly developed, in that very proportion has he an intense, if latent, instinct of purity. The moralist need not search in heaven above or in hell beneath for a motive-power to enforce the duty of chastity. That spiritual force is

within, deep in the inmost core of every man who is free from structural disease of the brain. All we have to do is to give light and guidance, to set this motive-power to work in the right direction by forming positive habits of spiritual and physical purity—habits in which the young man, when arrived at mature manhood, will find himself empanoplied as in complete steel. But without such guidance the untrained instinct of maiden modesty will often go astray. The falsehoods that are current among habitually vicious young men are dangerous, because they so closely border upon natural truths. An innocent and ignorant youth, left alone among vicious associates, will often find himself terribly tempted, because his own experience will sometimes make him feel as if the arguments they urged were after all only too true. In such a case how inestimable would be the advantage of having early had the mind imbued with exact and scientific demonstrations of the falsehood of these delusions. In civilised society, even more than among savages, the functions of sex have uniformly and throughout innumerable centuries been so perverted and misused that our humanity has become altogether warped and diseased, and it needs great faith to hold to the truth, when that truth appears at times to be contradicted by all experience, and to be utterly against the grain of our own habitual sensations.

One objection to the scheme we have urged demands a frank investigation. It will be said that instruction in the physiology of sex may perhaps be necessary for a few, for those who are in danger of being led astray; but that for the healthy majority it is unnecessary, and in their case it would introduce the very evils of impurity of thought against which we ourselves wish to contend. In other words, it may be urged that we advocate a sort of moral vaccination; we desire all boys to be made mildly unchaste for the sake of saving the lives of an unfortunate few.

At the outset, we demur to this doctrine about the majority. If we remove from our calculations those men who lead a pure life because they have scarcely any capacity for temptation, it is to be feared that among those who are truly masculine, chastity before marriage is the exception rather than the rule. But for the object we have now to consider we may waive this point, and assume, *argumenti gratiâ*, that the majority of boys are healthy in their inherited moral instincts. We will also waive a few other obvious points—such, for example, as that unless a boy is to be forbidden all access to the Bible, the newspaper, the literature of Greece and Rome, and the writings of all our own standard authors—it is impossible for him to avoid coming across the most pointed allusions to the very ideas to which objection is made; and every one knows that indirect

suggestion influences the imagination much more powerfully than explicit statement.

We waive all these preliminaries, and, going at once to the root of the matter, we contend that the objection itself is a striking illustration of the perversity of conventional ideas on the subject of purity. This perversity is founded in part upon an incapacity to discriminate between scientific and poetical ideas. The words and phrases we commonly use are as a rule poetical; the use of scientific words and phrases implies the power of mental abstraction, and therefore involves a higher degree of education than falls to the lot of the mass of mankind. To illustrate this distinction, let us take an example. The words "daisy," "violet," and "buttercup," are all poetical words which at once call up, not an abstract idea to be examined by the intellect, but a living unity that appeals to the feelings and the senses; in short, to the whole man. Whereas the scientific terms that correspond to these poetical names leave our imagination and our emotions untouched, and merely depict a dry diagram to the eye of the intellect alone.

Apply this distinction to the question in hand. The words and phrases relating to matters of sex which a boy comes across in the study of literature or the experiences of life are all poetical, and therefore dangerous; while what he would be taught in the class-room would be solely scientific, would be the bare skeletons of abstract thought, scraped clean of every trace of living passion. And it is a well-proved fact that the scientific study of natural objects sometimes has a positive tendency to deaden our capacity for their poetical appreciation.

There is therefore not the least incompatibility between complete scientific knowledge of every detail of the physiology of sex and the most perfect purity of thought: on the contrary, strange as the notion may appear to those who have never examined the subject, the former is one of the greatest possible helps to the latter. From what I personally saw of undergraduate life at Cambridge, I am sure that those men who were medical students were, as a rule, more pure-minded and modest than most men of the same standing as regards social antecedents and educational advantages. That prejudice, which the Laureate with the most perfect dramatic propriety has put into the mouth of his wrong-headed Princess:—

" We shudder but to dream our maids should ape
Those monstrous males that carve the living hound,
And cram him with the fragments of the grave;
Or in the dark, dissolving human heart,
And holy secrets of this microcosm,
Dabbling a shameless hand with shameful jest,
Encarnalise their spirits——"

is the expression of a prejudice that springs from ignorance alone.

It may be said of medical men, that their contact with sorrow and suffering tends to purify them, and the consciousness that the acquisition of physiological knowledge is absolutely indispensable to enable them to alleviate pain and suffering saves them from the natural and proper results of that acquisition; but that where physiology is studied for its own sake, and not as a means to an end, its natural tendency to deprave the mind would then become apparent; and that therefore the innocent minds of children who as yet are untouched by the depravity of the world, ought not so to be contaminated, when no urgent reason can be alleged.

We reply that, even were there no important end to be gained, we cannot see how a pure mind could be contaminated by seeing and hearing a complete and exhaustive proof of the truth of the text, "It is He that hath made us and not we ourselves; we are His people and the sheep of His pasture:" or to put the same idea in more modern phrase, that the relation between the sexes is the most perfect, the loveliest chord in the harmony of the universe.

But, furthermore, there is in this case a real necessity for such knowledge, at least for all boys. Just in proportion to the strength of a man's brain, in that very proportion does he inherit the blood of the tiger and the ape. Even if it be allowed that women may safely be left in ignorance, with men this can never be the case. The more healthy, the more perfect a man is, the more certain is it that he will be terribly tempted, even if he be kept in the saintliest seclusion imaginable. Few truly masculine men can lead a life that is at once perfectly pure and perfectly healthful, unless they know the physiological laws that regulate the working of their natural powers. To allow a boy to grow up in ignorance is as sane and as prudent as it would be to allow a person wholly unacquainted with chemistry to go into a laboratory and undertake the manipulation of fulminating silver and nitro-glycerine. That very boy who has been brought up in a Puritan home, whose mother would most earnestly protest, as she would say, against having his mind depraved by the kind of teaching we advocate—that boy, whose shy sensitive nature shrinks from the coarse jests and the foul allusions of his class-fellows—that very boy has perhaps already fallen, or is doomed soon to fall, into the black and silent Charybdis by which so many of the fairest promise are slowly, hopelessly, and helplessly sucked down to the abyss of a moral degradation worse than death itself. To that very boy the knowledge we vain would give may perhaps be the one thing needful to save him from

making shipwreck of body and soul. It is a fact proved by experience, that this morbid physico-moral insanity often originates in habits that have been formed in infancy or childhood, and that it is invariably fostered, and usually created, by the neglect and the reticence of parents and schoolmasters.

We have spoken hitherto of the part which the teacher ought to take in supplementing on this one important point the course of instruction given in public schools for boys. But there is another aspect of this education which must chiefly depend upon the thoughtfulness and common sense of parents and guardians, in the home and beyond the bounds of the schoolroom. This consists in the formation of habits of decency, cleanliness, and reverence for the body. There is an old and very true saying "Manners makyth man." Where the outward forms of courtesy are forgotten or disregarded, the finer feelings of consideration for the welfare of others are sure to suffer in consequence. What forms of politeness are to social goodwill, decent customs are to chastity. How far the reverse of all this our national customs have been is best evidenced by the fact that until lately the bestial indecency of the birch was a recognised institution in our public schools; while the gross ignorance of physiology which prevails among all classes of society receives an apt illustration in the corresponding fact that few schoolmasters are aware that to use the cane in the way in which the cane is proverbially supposed to be used is almost a crime.

There can be little doubt that most of the grave defects and the irrational solecisms of our received systems of education have their ultimate root in the essential viciousness of the ideal from which they have historically been evolved. However much they have become modified in the course of time, our public schools and universities to this day in their main structure and constitution inherit the diseased bias of the monastic institutions from which they have derived their existence. Hence we can hardly wonder that in everything connected with sex they should be so much at fault. One fundamental vice in our orthodox systems of education that obviously originates in monastic influences, is the separation of the sexes. To a certain extent no doubt such separation is natural, and necessary for the due differentiation of the moral, intellectual, and physical characteristics of each; but there is the widest difference between the unforced isolation of a healthful evolution, and the rigorous, the absolute, and the unbroken seclusion of which the bolts and bars and aged bedmakers of our national colleges form the appropriate outward symbol. Many competent judges are of opinion that the low tone of morality which unfortunately prevails among us is largely due to this unnatural custom of the entire separation of

the sexes in school and university life. Nor is this topic so alien as might at first sight appear to the subject we are discussing. For at the bottom of all this cowardly reticence on the part of parents and schoolmasters lies that feeling which was the keystone of the mediæval creed, that feeling which was definitely formulated by the fathers of the Church, and was illustrated with the severest logic in the life of every saint in the Calendar; and that secret and ultimate creed put into plain words is this—that the relation between the sexes was created by the devil.

P.S.—On looking through the proof of the foregoing article, I see that it is on one point open to misconception. My main object is to draw attention to an important principle—viz., that the instinct of sex ought to be openly recognised and openly educated. When this principle has been accepted by society, then the questions of detail as to how it is to be realised in practice will have to be next considered. Probably for a long time to come this part of education will be best carried out at home: it was chiefly for the sake of distinctly explaining what I mean by sex education that I have attempted in this article to give a brief sketch of the way in which hereafter it may be organised in public schools. I have also put aside the question of such education for girls as being beyond the proper scope of the article: but there can be little doubt that for them it is quite as important as for boys, because without such knowledge they cannot develop and use aright their full moral power in the education of men.

J. A. A.



CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

THEOLOGY.

OF a general view of "The History of the Church," by Dr. J. J. Herzog, Professor of Theology at Erlanger, only the second part lies before us.¹ In a certain definite but restricted sense the Protestant author concedes that the antiquity of Catholicism is greater than popular opinion usually admits, recognising it as a result of the reconciliation of the two divergent forms of Christianity—the Jewish and the Gentile, and tracing back the Catholic idea to the close of the Apostolic age. In surveying the historical tract which he now proposes to illustrate, our chronicler divides it into three periods—the first extending from Boniface, the so-called Apostle of the Germans, to the accession of Gregory VII.; the second, beginning with the accession of Gregory and ending with that of Clement V.; and the third, reaching from the year of Clement's enthronement—1305 to 1517—the conventional date of the Protestant Reformation. Though opposed to the doctrine and discipline of the Church of Rome, Dr. Herzog does not fail to do justice to the devotional life, the ideal aspiration, the truth and goodness, and the moral and intellectual tendencies of the Middle Ages; discerning, amid the darkness and confusion, the perplexities and aberrations of the times, the powerful individualities which glorified them by splendid action or quieted them by merciful endeavour. The historical narrative is as rich in detail as is consistent with the limited space allotted to it, and the expository chapters are reasonably instructive on such subjects as the Development of Theology and Theological Science, including the scholastic and mystical phases of Catholic thought. As we turn the pages of Dr. Herzog's volume we find a goodly array of names of saints and holy women, of the Catholic heroes of sword and pen. To St. Elizabeth, with whom Kingley's "Tragedy" long since made us familiar, he does due honour, as a living embodiment of Catholic humility and beneficence, though far from approving of her ascetic extravagances. To the heretical Huss, naturally enough a still more liberal treatment is accorded. The question of the Emperor Sigismund's safe conduct, however, is not very satisfactorily handled. One point, indeed, is pronounced sufficiently clear—viz., the violation of the safe conduct, during the trial, by the imprisonment of Huss. Whether the Emperor was guilty of treachery to the martyr, Dr. Herzog seems to leave undecided. That Huss himself allowed that, should he be condemned

¹ "Abriss der gesammten Kirchengeschichte." Von Dr. J. J. Herzog, Ordentlichen Professor der Theologie in Erlangen, Zweiter Theil. London: Trübner & Co. 1879.

for heresy, he would not refuse to die, does not, in our opinion, dispose of the difficulty. On the day of his condemnation the bishop who preached the occasional sermon, turning to the Emperor, declared that by the execution of that heretic he would be honourably remembered by posterity, and when immediately after Huss affirmed that he had repaired to Constance with the Imperial document in his hands and then confronted the grantor, the Emperor blushed. Are we to suppose that he blushed with the sense of the discredit reflected on his honour by the minor indignation to which Huss was exposed, and not rather at the thought of the disgrace with which the surrender to death of the condemned man would tarnish his reputation?

If Dr. Herzog can write of the Church of Rome without the bitter old-fashioned prejudice which distinguishes the extreme Protestant, Dr. Chr. Wordsworth,² the Bishop of Lincoln, still nurses the ancestral wrath and keeps it comfortably warm. We were hardly prepared to find such inexorable anger in a celestial bosom, or to read a repetition of the obsolete interpretation of the Apocalypse in the writing of a bishop and a scholar, which identifies the Church of Rome with the lady of easy virtue in the vision of St. John, detects in the papal millinery the scarlet, pearls, gold, and precious stones of the apocalyptic specification, and recognises in the Pope the "mysterious rival of God." With these wild speculations we have no sympathy. We can better appreciate some of the bishop's less visionary indictments of Roman Catholic procedure. He tells us, for instance, that a passage beginning "Qui Cathedram Petri," interpolated in the "De Unitate Ecclesiæ" of St. Cyprian, and in 1682 believed to be genuine by the Gallican bishops, was put in a prominent place by Pope Gregory XVI. in his Encyclical Letter in 1832, though the Abbé Migne, in his "Patrologia," acknowledges that it is wanting in the ancient editions. He also relates a story which we presume is true. Certain professors of the Collège de France publicly declared that they had seen with their own eyes a new prophet whom God had sent into the world to regenerate it, and sixty of their hearers, when asked if they had not seen this prophet, replied in a public lecture-room, "Oui, nous le jurons." This "fearful blasphemy" which has gone unrebuked by the Minister of Instruction and his Council, is less instructive, however, than the credulity exhibited in the manufacture of a new saint. An ancient Latin inscription was discovered on April 1st (an ominous day), 1842, in the catacombs at Rome, near the Via Salaria: "Aureliæ Theodosiæ benignissimæ et incomparabili feminae Aurelius Optatus Coniugi innocentissimæ depos. Fr. Kal. Dec. Nat. Ambiana. B.M.F." The sepulchral tablet was torn from its place and subjected to the critical scrutiny of the "Congregation of Relics," when a verdict was pronounced that the remains in question were those of Theodosia, a Christian, a saint, a martyr, and a native of Amiens in France. The sentence was ratified by Pius IX., and the name of Theu-

² "Miscellanies, Literary and Religious." By Chr. Wordsworth, D.D., Bishop of Lincoln. In three vols. London, Oxford, and Cambridge: Rivingtons. 1879.

dosia was added to the ritual of the Church of Amiens. Her mortal remains were transported to that city on 12th October, 1853, and with music, banners, and illuminations, were carried in a magnificent car of triumph to the cathedral church, attended by a concourse of cardinals, archbishops, and bishops. Her first anniversary was honoured by the presence of the Emperor Napoleon III. and the Empress Eugénie. A chapel also was erected to her honour. For the existence of Theudosia the Latin inscription is our only witness. Of her history nothing is known but what the discovered tablet contains. The abbreviation "Nat. Ambiana," may not refer to Theudosia at all. "Nat.," the bishop submits, is not an abbreviation for "Nata," but for "Natio" or for "Natione," and signifies either the Ambian nation or an Ambian by nation, as "Nat. Pan." signifies a Pannonian by nation, and "Nat. Dalm." a Dalmatian by nation. Now, as the Ambiani inhabited a wide track of country, it would be as absurd to infer that Theudosia was born at Amiens because she was an Ambian, as to infer that a man was born at York because he was born in Yorkshire. Though an Ambian by parentage, Theudosia may have been born at Rome. Moreover, it appears from Sigebert that Samanobria or Samanobriua did not receive the name of Ambianis till the time of Gratian, about A.D. 382, Ambianum being a still later form of the name. If, then, Theudosia was a saint and a martyr, the words in question cannot mean that she was born at Amiens, for the age of martyrs had passed away before Amiens received the name of Ambianum. The bishop appears to us to have made out his case, and the amazing discovery of the Congregation of Relics has its fitting counterpart in that of the Pickwick Club, and Nat. Ambiana its appropriate parallel in "Bill Stumps, his Mark," commemorated in the annals of that immortal Society. As to the general contents of Dr. Wordsworth's three substantial volumes, we can only hope that sympathetic readers may be forthcoming to take an interest in the literary conglomerate which he offers them. The pages on the Pompeian inscriptions, Greece, France, and Italy are to us the most attractive; but an omnivorous appetite may find a feast in the various dissertations on the Vatican Council, the Congress of Old Catholics, the Inspiration and Revision of the Bible, Church Music, Worship in Art, Cremation, the Spread of Infidelity, the Decline of Mohammedanism, Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction, Sisterhoods, Celibacy, and Wesleyan Methodists.

Mr. R. H. Hill Sandys, barrister-at law, is sufficiently loyal to an antiquated creed to be permitted to follow immediately in the steps of an episcopal promulgator of the gospel. His quaint volume entitled "In the Beginning" is partly a serious protest, partly a funny philippic directed against certain modern views of the Creation which are displeasing in his eyes. His remarks have little argumentative cogency, but his whimsical travesty of the doctrine of Evolution is almost ridiculous enough to be amusing. Dogs, he informs us, would be first-rate

² "In the Beginning: Remarks on Certain Modern Views of the Creation." By Richard Hill Sandys, M.A., of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister at Law. London: Pickering and Co. 1879.

public speakers if they could speak at all; but dogs cannot even behave decently. Who, he continues, ever saw a rich dog give away a bone in charity to a poor one if he wanted it himself? Ovid he describes as "the Founder of the Anthropological Society," who was the first to show us in his *Metamorphoses* the new fauna of the present order of things scrambling out of the mud, followed in due course by the pleasing discovery of the "Origin of Species by Selection." But his happiest remark is to follow:—"It has become a fashion of late in some quarters to write the name [of God] Jahveh, either because it looks thus something more like a common Hebrew word or because it is covertly suggestive of the heathen Zao or Jove, who may thus have yet one more chance; and one distinguished philologist, now deceased, is said to have usually commenced his morning prayer, "O Jahveh, whom that fool. . . will persist in calling Jehovah."

Diligent research and minute elaboration of chronological detail characterise a dissertation on the dates of important works connected with the life of Jesus from the pen of the late Professor N. W. Ljungberg, of Gothenburg, the editor of an edition of Horace already noticed in this Review. The data for such an attempt are at best fluctuating, and the author's speculations on the original dwelling-place of the parents of Jews, the second governorship of Cyrenius and the synoptical determination of the day of the crucifixion create some distrust of his conclusions. Accepting the conjectural estimate of the age of Jesus (St. John viii. 57) "thou art not yet fifty years old," and supporting that estimate by the chronological indication (St. John ii. 20) "forty and six years was this temple in building," he makes the birth of Jesus contemporary with the foundation of the Herodian structure, and infers that, according to the author of the fourth gospel, Jesus died on 14th Nisan A.D. 29; being then about forty-eight years of age. But he objects, as the evangelist supposes that 14 Nisan A.D. 29 fell on a Friday, and as it assuredly did not fall on a Friday, he betrays the unhistorical character of his intimation. The fact is, he continues, "St. John" made use of a calendar adopted by the Jews only after the second destruction of Jerusalem A.D. 131. The fourth gospel could not therefore have been composed till ten or twenty years after this epoch about A.D. 140 or 150, at the earliest. This curious specimen of the Swedish Professor's chronological science we leave the expert to confirm or refute.

Mr. Voysey, "the Yorkshire vicar, who laid his sacrilegious hand on cherished shrines, and whose impiety was promptly punished," is not only convinced that the fourth gospel is an untrustworthy version of the Life of Jesus written about the middle of the second century or soon after, but is confident that the entire evangelical record is "a degrading picture of the life of one who, for aught we know, was really noble, really grandly humane." His battery, however, is pointed more immediately against that reputed bulwark of Christianity called Prophecy,⁴ and though in the main we cannot but agree with him, we

⁴ "The Sling and the Stone." Vol. VII. On Prophecy. By the Rev. Charles Voysey, B.A., formerly Vicar of Headlaugh, Yorkshire. London: Williams & Norgate. 1879.

submit that it would have been more appropriate to the assumed character of a simple shepherd-lad with unpretending sling and stone, if the impetuosity of his assault had been moderated by an infusion of the "sweet reasonableness" which another Jack the Giant-killer always recommends, but does not always practically illustrate. The argument grounded on the fulfilment of prophecy is one of the most dangerous of the edged tools with which orthodoxy struggles to defend its cause. To show that in many cases so-called predictions are not fulfilled in the events assumed to be foretold, but that to "save appearances" recourse has been had to accommodation, arbitrary application of irrelevant texts, garbled citation and perhaps even to unscrupulous manipulation, is not a very difficult though it is a rather disagreeable task, and this task Mr. Voysey in the seventh instalment of his "Sling and Stone" has accomplished with vigour and success. In a summary of unfulfilled prophecies, drawn from the pages of Dr. Kuenen, he shows that error in prediction was not exceptionally rare, giving instances of failure in the case of Tyre, Damascus, Moab, the return of Israel and the reunion of the kingdoms of Judah and Ephraim. It would seem as if in these latter days even orthodoxy itself lent unwilling testimony to the validity of heterodox assertion, though only within safe limits of course. Thus Dr. Vance Smith, one of the Revision Committee of the New Testament, gravely disputes the applicability to Christ of the text—"He was despised and rejected of men" in the famous liii. chap. of Isaiah; and Rev. Brownlow Maitland (whose publication of his modified views of prophecy occasioned the withdrawal of Lord Shaftesbury from the presidency of the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge) allows that if exact fulfilments of definite and precise predictions are required, it would be exceedingly difficult to establish it. The once popular works of Newton and Keith, he admits, which rested the argument chiefly on supposed predictions of future events have in consequence become quite inadequate to meet modern critical objections. Mr. Voysey's rejection of Prophecy is followed by a reply to Mr. Maitland, which concludes the volume with a natural rejection of the idolatry of Christ, and a proclamation of the superiority of the pure theoretic conception, on which Mr. Voysey with serene confidence reposes.

In a little volume, written in a spirit of faith, hope, and charity, Mr. Horace Field takes a very opposite view of Christianity; for, while Mr. Voysey denounces its dogma, Mr. Field predicts its ultimate triumph.⁵ Reasserting the revelation of the Infinite through the Finite, he insists that the Father can be revealed by the Son alone, and maintains the identity of Christ with the Son of God. Human nature will be elevated through Christian love, yet there is, it appears, "an imperial self-love which daily trains us individually and nationally towards a state in which our whole business energy will be spent in co-operation, or in which we shall live by serving society first, and letting the good of self flow out of service as second."

⁵ "The Ultimate Triumph of Christianity." By Horace Field L.A. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1879.

Mr. W. W. Clark's view of the "Religion of the Future" is somewhat non-latitudinarian than that of Mr. Horace Field.⁶ Having some acquaintance with the liberal theology of our own day, he abandons such doctrines as the Fall, the Atonement, the deity of Jesus, a personal Devil, and an eternal Hell, makes Christianity consist in the conception of God as a Father, and accords Christ the same position in the sphere of the affections as Mozart holds in the sphere of music, and Newton in that of science. We regret that he should use the jargon of the spiritualistic school, and that he should degrade his personification of divine love to the level of a "mediumistic person." But not only does he adopt the vocabulary of the ultra-Brutalists, as Mr. Carlyle would call the disciples of that school, but, while admitting the fraud, the uncleanness, the folly, the vagaries of spiritualism, he accepts the testimony in favour of the phenomena called spiritual as overwhelming proof of their objective reality. Messages received through table-tipping and rappings are, it is allowed, unreliable, but if two or more persons say that portions of a semi-materialised body, from a hand to a complete form, were seen and handled by Mr. Crokes, especially if a mysterious handbell, a flower or a piece of China grass is introduced into the performance, there is no resisting their combined evidence, powerfully reinforced as it is by the "intelligible manipulation" of matter by the floricultural ghost. Of Mr. Clark's disjunctive proposition "there must be a truth underlying spiritualism, or it is one of the most stupendous delusions mankind has ever known," we know which half we should find it easiest to accept.

The Transition Christianity is represented in a much more reasonable form by Mr. Candler, a mathematical schoolmaster.⁷ With the general doctrine of primary proportions, as we should understand it, we have no quarrel, but unfortunately Mr. Candler understands it in a sense which is not acceptable to us. Neither can we allow the validity of his quasi-infallible test, the *quod semper* of Vincentius Lerinensis. We must equally object to his unsatisfactory admission that he partly agrees that observation and experience are the test of axiomatic propositions, believing, as we do, that even the axioms of geometry are inductive propositions which, independently of experience, would not present themselves to the mind; and that such physical axioms as the law of gravitation are, as Sir John Herschell says, obtained by a succession of inductions and abstractions derived from the observation of numerous facts and subordinate laws. As to the *Consensus hominum* we do not admit the existence of inherent elementary truths, though we are far from denying that of inborn mental susceptibilities; and the test of universal assent, as generally understood, is, in our judgment, a wholly fallacious one. The religion of

⁶ "A Forecast of the Religion of the Future," &c. By W. W. Clark. London: Trübner & Co. 1879.

⁷ "Groundwork of Belief: being an Inquiry into the Origin and Foundation of the Religious Sentiment." By H. Candler, M.A., Mathematical Master of Uppingham School. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1879.

savages is, as Mr. Mill says, a blunder of primitive belief; and the supposed intention of Deity is far from being universal either in time or place. The thoughtful adhesion of Socrates and St. Paul, Goethe and Bonaparte, or any number you please of philosophers, saints, and poets, and the inconsiderate acquiescence of the innumerable rabble of Deists is resolvable, in the former case, into convictions arising from some rational demonstration or argument based on the order of nature, and, in the case of the latter, into a more or less unenlightened acceptance of the teaching of cultivated minds. Mr. Candler entirely fails to show that this submission of the many, not of all, is an instinct, a natural faculty or primary proposition; but his attempt to realise for himself a system of reasoned truth is at least commendable.

We are unable to recognise the particular *raison d'être* of Mr. Beet's not unlearned "Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans." After the masterly elucidation of Baun and Pfeleiderer, the Englishman's exposition is to us flat and frigid. Arminians, however, may be pleased to learn that Mr. Beet not only ventures to contradict Augustine and Calvin, but undertakes to disprove what they taught, justifying himself by the plea that the "little ones of a later age are in some points wiser than the great ones of bygone days."

Like Mr. Beet's "Commentary" the "Annotated Bible" by J. H. Blunt may succeed in vindicating its existence to that class of readers which stands in the old paths, and prefers the voice of a dull and virtuous orthodoxy to the dangerous music of her siren adversary. While we observe with pleasure that many of the misrenderings of the ill-translated book of Job are corrected in the notes, we are amused at the stolidly uncscious dogmatism which pervades Mr. Blunt's annotations. The volume before us contains the Old Testament books from Job to Malachi, and the Apocryphal books as well.

We may make favourable mention here of Mr. J. Hamblin Smith's "Short Notes on the Greek Text of the Acts of the Apostles."¹⁰ We cannot, of course, agree with him in his old-fashioned view of the reconciliation of discrepancies, and when he says it is certain that St. Paul wrote four epistles during his imprisonment, those to the Ephesians, the Colossians, Philemon, and the Philippians, he should have spoken for himself and not as the representative of historical truth. Far from being certain, grave doubts are entertained whether he wrote any one of the four, either during his imprisonment or at any other time, and we are certain that he did not write the first or second of the four. The notes, however, are clear, admirably brief, and scholarly. Many references to Thucydides will be found in them, Mr. Smith being certain that the author of the Acts was familiar with a particular part of

⁸ "A Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans." By Joseph Agar Beet. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1879.

⁹ "The Annotated Bible: being a Household Commentary on the Holy Scriptures Comprehending the Results of Modern Discovery and Criticism." By Rev. John Henry Blunt, M.A. Rivingtons. 1879.

¹⁰ "Short Notes on the Greek Text of the Acts of the Apostles." By J. Hamblin Smith, M.A. London, Oxford, and Cambridge: Rivingtons. 1879.

the writings of that historian, apparently the sixth book in which the commencement of the Italian expedition is described.

"Work amongst Working Men" is a rather interesting account of the experiences of Miss Ellice Hopkins as an evangelist.¹¹ The only unmarried daughter of a man of science occupying a permanent position in the University [of Cambridge?] This lady was allowed by her father "to go alone into public-houses and to beat about the streets at night, in the service of the rough men," at whose conversion she appears to have laboured with some success. Known to many as the author of the "Life and Letters of James Hinton," Miss Hopkins is an accomplished and excellent woman, who reads Darwin, Tennyson, and Wordsworth, and believes in eternal punishment and the vicarious sacrifice of Christ. Among the graver matter of this book will be found some touches of humorous character. On one occasion, forty undergraduates having come to mock, but remaining to pray, a dissenting organ expressed a hope that Miss Hopkins might prove the feeble instrument of saving grace to a godless and unbelieving University! Like Miss Ellice Hopkins, Mrs. Maclachlan avows her belief in Everlasting Punishment;¹² but the "limited liability" principle is invoked to mitigate the horror with which respectable people now begin to contemplate that sublime dogma. Our lady theologian regards universalism as irreconcilable with Scripture; and contends that all who rebel and will not obey the gospel will die the second death, that is, will be annihilated. The guiltier principals, however, the Devil and his Angels; the Beast and all who worship the Beast, are to be exceptions to the general rule. They are to live, though, in spirit only (their persons being destroyed) for ever and ever, and are to be tormented day and night. Orthodox members of the Church of England will, perhaps, derive from the contemplation of the sufferings of these angelical and bestial persons a solace, though hardly a compensation, for the extinction of the last hope of everlasting damnation, which a wit attributed some years ago "to an eminent Christian and a still more eminent judge." "The Rigveda, or the Holy Hymns of the Brahmans, translated in its entirety by Alfred Ludwig into his own mother tongue, will be welcome to many students."¹³ It is accompanied with a commentary and introduction. The third volume now before us deals with its origin, metrical form, text, time, country and people, with the characteristic institutions, religion, gods, powers of evil, magic and cultus, illustrated in the sacred poems of which it consists.

"A seventh edition of the first and second volumes of "Supernatural Religion," constituting about two-thirds of the new issue of the work in a complete form, testifies to the favour with which it has been

¹¹ "Work among Working Men." By Ellice Hopkins, &c. London: Strahan & Company, Limited.

¹² "Notes and Extracts on Everlasting Punishment and Eternal Life." By Mrs. Maclachlan. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1879.

¹³ "De Rigveda oder die Heiligen Hymnen der Brahmāna. Zum ersten male vollständig ins Deutsche übersetzt mit Commentar und Einleitung." Von Alfred Ludwig. Dritter Band. London: Trübner & Co.

received by an interested and thoughtful circle of inquirers.¹⁴ In once more reverting to its pages we are impressed with a sense of the laborious and conscientious research, the learning, temper, and manly utterance of its author, and though on points of minor importance we are not always in accord with him, we are satisfied of the general accuracy of the statements and the essential correctness of his conclusions. Occasional inadvertences on his part may be contrasted with the overstrained objections on the forced interpretations on the part of his opponents. Dr. Lightfoot for instance, in his attempt to discredit the testimony of John Malalas, respecting the martyrdom of Ignatius in the Emperor's presence, surely does violence to the obvious meaning of the words, in this particular passage, which he explains the phrase *ἐμαρτορῆσεν ἐνὶ αὐτοῦ* bore testimony during the reign of Trajan; the preceding *τότε*, at that time, plainly excluding such an interpretation, as Zahn, whom he implicitly follows, peremptorily decides. So, again, Dr. Lightfoot appears to be wrong in asserting that Lipsius has retracted his early opinions on the priority and genuineness of the Curetonian version of three epistles of Ignatius. Dr. Wescott, in his turn, censures our author with undue severity for saying that it has been demonstrated that Ignatius was not sent to Rome at all, but suffered martyrdom at Antioch on the 20th December, A.D. 115. The demonstration consists, it is true, not in the citation of undoubted historical testimony, but in the production of reasons which render the Roman journey inadmissible, and though Dr. Wescott has a perfect right to reject the so-called demonstration, if he deem it insufficient, he should not treat the elaborate reasoning of men like Voikman, Baur, and Hilgenfeld, as if it resulted only in "a not groundless conjecture." Volkman, Baur, and we may add our own countryman Davidson, are all of opinion that the martyrdom took place in Antioch. Hilgenfeld regards the Roman journey as incredible, but while he repeats the statement of the martyrology that the remains of Ignatius were buried at Antioch, he offers no express opinion on the subject. Merivale, who does not seem to be referred to by either party in the controversy, in the "Index" to his History of the Romans makes Antioch the scene of the execution, declares that the historical evidence for it is imperfect and conflicting, is at a loss to account for the bishop being sent to suffer martyrdom at Rome, and thinks the narrative of the "Martyrium" has a strong appearance of being moulded into a counterpart of the last voyage of St. Paul. Dr. Farrar's treatment of Mill's criticism on Hume's argument against miraculous intervention is, however, the most astonishing instance of misapprehension that the work before us records. In opposition to Dr. Farrar's inference from Mill's remarks, that Hume's formula is a flagrant *petitio principii*, Mill himself distinctly asserts that it is on *petitio principii*, maintaining in fact with Hume that anything is incredible which is contrary to a complete induction, and that we have

¹⁴ "Supernatural Religion: an Inquiry into the Reality of Divine Revelation." In three volumes. Complete edition. Carefully revised. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1879.

a right to declare the induction complete wherever the scientific canons of induction give us that right, for example in a case of causation. From one of his informal opponents our author admits that he has derived real instruction. Since the sixth edition of "Supernatural Religion" was published, the linguistic test applied by Dr. Sanday has convinced him that Marcion's gospel was based upon our third synoptic, and must accordingly have been in existence prior to the year 140 (?). His views on the absence of evidence, for that of the other gospels, till a very late date, views which we do not altogether share, remain unaltered, but he does not identify absence of evidence with the non-existence of the evangelical records. In preparing a complete edition of his work the author has revised it throughout, not hesitating to make any desirable alterations, omissions or additions, endeavouring to avoid openings for side issues, softening statements which might provoke irrelevant discussion, recasting his argument where he judged it necessary, and introducing data discovered or elaborated since the work was first written. In order more adequately to convey his own views and to withdraw expressions used out of deference to prevalent ideas and feelings, the author has almost entirely rewritten the "Conclusions."

Our anti-supernaturalist, while admitting as one of these conclusions that we may have to abandon "cherished anthropomorphic visions of future blessedness," maintains that "the mysterious Unknown excludes no legitimate speculation and forbids no reasonable hope." Mere speculation and hope that is only reasonable because disengaged from gross extravagance do not satisfy ardent spirits like the Rev. W. M. Westerby, who in a recent public debate with Mr. C. Bradlaugh¹⁵ has sustained with some ability the argument that the soul is immaterial, and consequently, as he alleges, indestructible. Mr. Bradlaugh, on the other hand, contends with an eloquence and ability superior to that of his opponent, that there is no evidence to prove the existence of an immaterial substance entirely distinct from the body both in nature and powers. The discussion is characterised throughout by a temper, a candour, and intelligence very creditable to both the combatants. Occasional misapprehensions, obscurities and questionable affirmations may be discoverable here and there in the pamphlet before us, but there is a general lucidity of statement which enables us to discern clearly the contention of each of the opposing parties, and the nature of the arguments with which they endeavour to enforce it. The result, however, is necessarily unsatisfactory; Mr. Bradlaugh does not convince Mr. Westerby nor does Mr. Westerby convince Mr. Bradlaugh. The orthodox champion challenges the champion of Freethought to show how sensation, thought, and will can be extracted out of inert matter; certainly at present, and as we presume for ever, an impossible achievement, but one which, as Mr. Bradlaugh submits, it is no business of his to undertake. On the other hand the champion of Freethought

¹⁵ "Has or is Man a Soul?" Verbatim report of a Two Nights' Public Debate at Burnley between the Rev. W. M. Westerby and Chas. Bradlaugh. With Appendix. London: Freethought Publishing Company.

requires that his orthodox antagonist should demonstrate the existence of an extra-organic agent, an immaterial entity, a noumenal self, which uses the brain as an instrument of thought, as his opponent's friend Mr. Best uses the organ to manifest his power as a musician! In our opinion Mr. Westerby, who *does* undertake to prove this hypothesis, fails as completely as Mr. Bradlaugh fails to prove what he never undertook to prove. On minor points in the discussion, as that of inert matter, the effect of brain disease on the mental condition, the correspondence between the laws that regulate the structure and action of the brain and the operations of the mind, the victory certainly belongs to Mr. C. Bradlaugh. Both disputants evince considerable acquaintance with physiological writings, and an apt quotation from Draper, who favours the immaterial hypothesis, may be compared with one from Tyndall, who, although disclaiming materialism, defines matter as that mysterious thing which forms the eye with its miraculous retina, and the ear with its lute of three thousand strings.

PHILOSOPHY.

JAMES HINTON was the subject of so much interest while living, that all students of philosophy will welcome the collection of somewhat miscellaneous papers which his son has edited.¹ If the essays contained within the volume cannot be unreservedly recommended to the hasty reader, they will at least prove a mine of suggestive reflection to those who are able to follow and appreciate the subtle and profound ideas in which they abound. Hinton was a many-sided man; but, as is remarked by Mr. Shadworth Hodgson in the introduction which he contributes to Mr. Hinton's work, "a comprehensive mind is one that not only pursues various lines of thought, but pursues them in combination with each other," and the present papers all more or less converge towards the establishment of one main idea. This, as Mr. Hodgson excellently indicates, is the unity of nature. Hinton was profoundly impressed by the parallelism which subsists between the intellectual and the emotional, the natural and the moral, the organic and the inorganic. The very first essay introduces us to this philosophy of identity. The "correction of the premiss" is shown to be the law which regulates at once our reasoning and our conduct. "No less than in the intellectual life, the moral and religious life must also have been a strife, a battle; not of evil and good alone, but one in which good must have seemed divided against itself—a truer right calling for the giving up of that which right itself had brought." This conception of the attainment of right through wrong, meets us frequently in Mr. Hinton's speculations. If he discourses "on two penholders," it is to show that the more convenient could not have

¹ "Chapters on the Art of Thinking. And Other Essays." By the late James Hinton. With an Introduction by Shadworth Hodgson. Edited by C. H. Hinton. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co.

been produced unless the clumsier had preceded; and he finds the expression of all moral and mental progress in the traditionally sacred words, "out of the eater comes forth meat, and from the destroyer sweetness." Thus, then, to Hinton, all truth and all reality imply in some one form or another the unity of opposites. "We must," he writes, "see that everything has two sides. Every action which takes place in nature is like a quarrel, and has two sides to it; two sides also which are opposites, but not for that reason inharmonious." Particularly does the writer insist on the complementary character of the physical and spiritual, the organic and inorganic, world. To him nature is a real unity, amid all its divergent phases; and the divisions which we draw are merely different faces or aspects of one and the same set of facts. "Instead of thinking that we are in two worlds, a physical and a spiritual one, we shall think that we are in *one* world apprehended by two faculties." Similarly again, the organic and the inorganic must be comprehended in one mental act, in order that the real significance of life may be fully reached: neither are truly the one life as it is, but both together give us the key to it.

"In the inorganic we seem to discover uniformity, unchangeableness, necessity; in the organic we seem to perceive spontaneity, action, power. Yet in each as it so appears, something is wanting; each presents to us that which we already begin to know cannot be the truth. So that already there glimmers before our eyes a vision of an action in which also is necessity; of a necessity which does not banish action."

An obvious corollary to this doctrine is the explanation of pain and evil as due merely to a fragmentary consideration of the facts of life; and in the "Mystery of Pain" our readers will find an eloquent exposition of this theory. How far, however, either this or the writer's more general standpoint can be accepted, is a question into which we cannot at present enter. Fanciful is no doubt the epithet which many thinkers will bestow upon it. But to those who hope that one day or other the present "oppositions of science, falsely so-called," will fall away before a fuller comprehension of the universe, these chapters on "the art of thinking" must appear singularly interesting and instructive. The book is altogether one in which metaphysicians must revel.

The complementary character of mind and matter, which is but one of the particular applications of Mr. Hinton's unity of nature, forms the central idea in George Henry Lewes' posthumous volume on the *Study of Psychology*.² The work is a valuable protest against the exclusive and abstract manner in which psychology is often studied, and will be found a clear and comprehensive introduction to the science of mind. The student of Aristotle will particularly recognise with pleasure the similarity between the standpoint of the Stagyrte's *De Anima*, and Mr. Lewes' conception of the object, scope and method of psychology. Striking the keynote of his whole discussion in the words he quotes from Plato's "Phaedrus"—"Do you

² "The Study of Psychology: its Object, Scope, and Method." (Problems of Life and Mind. Third Series.) By George Henry Lewes. London: Trübner, 1878.

think the nature of mind can be adequately studied apart from the nature of the universe itself," Lewes maintains that psychology cannot be studied in the abstract as if it had no further relation to other sciences, and more particularly he regards psychology and physiology as merely different aspects of explanation—different ways of stating the same series of facts. "Physiology," he says, "deals directly and chiefly with the *objective* aspect of sentient facts, and their relation to the visible organism: psychology, with the same facts in their *subjective* aspect as states of feeling, not as organic changes." (p. 13). Organic state and mental state are indeed, we may say, related as cause and effect. But "the relation between cause and effect is simply the relation between two modes of viewing a certain event; and this also is the relation between organic state and mental state. The one does not really precede and call into existence the other; but the one is the objective expression, the other the subjective expression of the same fact." Lewes accordingly finds a place at once for introspection and observation in his study of psychology. Without the former, "all the facts of observation would be as meaningless as the words on a printed page, to the eye of one incapable of interpreting the signs" (page 90): without the latter we are restricted to the study of a merely personal individual consciousness. But, the writer continually reminds us, psychology is a science of the human mind, not of any individual mind; it investigates mind generally, not an individual's thoughts and feelings, and "has to consider it as the product of the human organism, not only in relation to the cosmos, but also in relation to society." The social factor thus comes to occupy an important place in Mr. Lewes' conception of the scope and object of psychology.

"Man is a social animal—the unit of a collective life—and to isolate him from society is almost as great a limitation of the scope of psychology as to isolate him from nature. To seek the whole data of our science in neutral processes on the one hand, and revelations of introspection on the other, is to leave inexplicable the many and profound differences which distinguish men from the animals: and these differences can be shown to depend on the operation of the social factor which transforms perceptions into conceptions and sensations into sentiments." (p. 78.)

Language is of special importance in this work of mental evolution. "Without language, no society having intellectual and moral life: without society, no need of language." Thus, again, the experience of the race in its influence on the consciousness of the individual is a subject which requires to be taken into account in the studies of the psychologist; and Mr. Lewes' work closes with a lucid statement of the place of experience in framing knowledge.

Professor Calderwood³ agrees so far at least with Mr. Lewes's conclusion. Physiology and psychology, he also holds, cannot be dissociated: "only when they are combined can we be said to have a science of the life of man." But the Scotch professor's problem is of

³ "The Relations of Mind and Brain." By Henry Calderwood, LL.D., Professor of Moral Philosophy, University of Edinburgh. London: Macmillan. 1879.

course more definite than that which Lewes put before himself. This problem Dr. Calderwood himself states thus: Given a physiology of brain and nerve, to ascertain whether this constitutes a philosophy of the phenomena commonly recognised as "mental phenomena" (these being thought, emotion, and volition). With a view to the solution of his question, the writer proceeds to state the commonly accepted results of cerebral anatomy. But he soon finds facts which show that brain and mind are not true concomitants. "The dog, with a brain less elaborate in its convolutions, shows a higher degree of intelligence; the horse, with a more ample and complicated series of foldings in the convolutions of the grey matter, shows less intelligence." Thus, then, "advance in intelligence and advance in complexity of brain structure do not keep pace with each other. They are not correlated so as to harmonise." Nor, further, he points out, does brain structure serve to explain sensation itself. "What physiology has done is to account for tactile impression—a sensibility belonging to man's organism. What physiology does not accomplish is to account for that knowledge of himself existing in a particular state, which is for an intelligent being the most simple and ordinary experience accompanying tactile impression" (p. 218). Besides, human experience implies *discrimination*, and "this is not accounted for by the sensibility of nerve-fibre, nor by the sensation which results from the exercise of such sensibility." On this subject Prof. Calderwood's remarks are worth quotation.

"The sensory apparatus provides for diversity of result, but not for comparison of the differences. The law of nerve action implies the contrary, the cessation of one action as the condition of another. Even if physiological hypothesis were ventured in the form of a suggestion that there may be in the sensory cell a *register* of the shock delivered there, this would not help us towards an explanation of the facts of consciousness. Even if there were such a register, and the registration were made on a sensitive surface, and were permanent, this would not meet the requirements of the case. A register contains the materials for comparison, but does not institute comparisons." (p. 219).

The drift of Dr. Calderwood's discussion will now be obvious. It contains a good deal which, though interesting and amusing, is yet more or less irrelevant; but it should be of real service as a clear exposition and a searching criticism of cerebral psychology.

Mr. Samuel Butler will not, we should think, be thought to have improved his literary reputation by his work on *Evolution*.⁴ He has indeed laid his hand on some of the weak points in the Darwinian argument; but he cannot be said to have expressed his objections either forcibly or clearly. His *résumé* of the views of successive evolutionists is too diffuse to interest the scientific, and too loaded with pages of quotations to detain the general and hasty reader. It would be unfair, however, were we not to recognise the way in which he calls attention to the fallacies of words with which Darwin deceives

⁴ "Evolution, Old and New; or, The Theories of Buffon, Dr. Erasmus Darwin, and Lamarck as compared with that of Mr. Charles Darwin." By Samuel Butler, Author of "Erewhon." London: Hardwicke & Bogue. 1879.

at once himself and others. "Natural selection," writes Mr. Butler, "cannot be considered a cause of variation: the variations must make their appearance before they can be selected;" and yet Darwin at once regards selection as a "means" or cause of modification, and simultaneously protests that it is not a cause. Darwin, too, is rightly brought to task for practically identifying evolution with natural selection. "To do this," says Mr. Butler, "leads the reader to forget that evolution by no means stands or falls with evolution by means of natural selection, and makes him think that if he accept evolution at all, he is bound to Mr. Darwin's view of it." On the contrary, however, Mr. Butler is himself an evolutionist, but he is so on the lines of Lamarck, not of Mr. Darwin; and he holds that "Lamarck's system is direct, intelligible, and sufficient, while Mr. Darwin's is confused and confusing."

Professor Haeckel's reply to Virchow⁶ may be taken as a counter-blast to Mr. Butler's criticism on Darwinian theories. Last September, most of our readers will remember, Virchow, at the fiftieth meeting of German Naturalists, at Munich, took occasion to assail the positivism with which the adherents of Darwinism maintained a theory which was far from proved, and to recommend, in the interests of free thought itself, a less pretentious attitude upon the part of scientific teachers. Haeckel now enters the arena against Virchow's assault, and maintains at once the general truth of the Darwinian hypothesis and the groundlessness of the moral insinuations Virchow brought against it. Particularly does he show the unfounded character of Virchow's attempt to show that the doctrine of Descent countenanced social democracy—that bugbear of the German mind.

"Socialism," writes Haeckel, "demands equal rights, equal duties, equal possessions, equal enjoyments, of every citizen alike: the theory of Descent proves in exact opposition to this that the realisation of this demand is a pure impossibility, and that in the constitutionally organised communities of man, as of the lower animals, neither rights nor duties, neither possessions nor enjoyments have ever been equal for all the members alike, nor ever can be."

To the English translation Prof. Huxley contributes a prefatory note, in which he balances the claims of the rival naturalists.

The Baird Lecture promises to supply Scotland with an instructive library of apologetic theology. It has already given us Professor Flint's book on Theism; and now the same writer contributes another volume on "Antitheistic Theories."⁷ The new work is characterised by all that directness of argument and that felicity of expression which accompany whatever issues from Professor Flint. Positivism, Pessimism, and Pantheism are all discussed by the writer; but it is Materialism which is the main subject of examination. The following words will show the vigour with which Dr. Flint expresses his opinions:—

⁶ "Freedom in Science and Teaching." From the German of Ernst Haeckel With a Prefatory Note by T. H. Huxley, F.R.S. London: C. Kegan Paul, 1879.

⁷ "Antitheistic Theories: Being the Baird Lecture for 1877." By Robert Flint, D.D., Professor of Divinity in the University of Edinburgh. Edinburgh and London: Blackwood & Sons, 1879.

"Anthropomorphism in physics was probably never more prevalent than at present, especially among those who denounce anthropomorphism in theology. Confidently deny free will to man, and confidently ascribe it to atoms, and you stand a good chance just now of being widely acknowledged as a great physical philosopher, and are sure at least of being honoured as an 'advanced thinker.' But nonsense does not cease to become nonsense when it becomes popular. The notion of an atom of matter putting itself in motion is a still more glaring contradiction of the law of inertia than an atom eternally and necessarily active. It also confounds reason and mind, and even nature and miracle. It may be taught as a truth of physical science, but it is in reality, a delusion due to metaphysical nightmare."

The University of Dublin has done itself an honour in publishing Mr. T. Cliffe Leslie's "Essays in Political Philosophy." Mr. Leslie's name has been for some years before the public as that of a vigorous critic of our received and orthodox Political Economy; but his writings were scattered about in various periodicals in which their value was likely to be obliterated. Perhaps it would have been better had Mr. Leslie re-written his papers to a greater extent than he has done, and been less careful in preserving his smaller contributions written for the *Athenæum* or *Academy*; but he has, at least, by the completeness of his collections given respectable political economists the bigger bone to gnaw. Mr. Leslie's main point, most of our readers are probably aware, is that political economy has been pursued hitherto on too much of an *à priori* basis, on too abstract principles, and that its progress will depend on the degree to which it follows facts and becomes historical. Thus he writes:

"The bane of political economy has been the haste of its students to possess themselves of a complete and symmetrical system, solving all the problems before it with mathematical certainty and exactness. The very attempt shows an entire misconception of the nature of those problems and of the means available for their solution. The phenomena of wealth may be made the subject of a special inquiry by a special set of inquirers, but the laws of co-existence and sequence by which they are governed must be sought in the great science of Society and by the methods which it holds out" (p. 241).

Such being Mr. Leslie's general standpoint, it follows that he is little disposed to accept many of the pet doctrines of political economists. The common definition of wealth is a "mere abstraction;" the real movements of agricultural wages are in striking contradiction to those generalisations which have become "part of the solemn humbug of 'economic orthodoxy,'" and an equality of profits is as ungrounded as an equality of wages. But it is not only with the doctrines of political economy that Mr. Leslie's Essays are connected. There is an interesting paper on the "Individual and the Crowd," and another on "Utilitarianism and the Summum Bonum." Altogether Mr. Leslie's volume is one which raises a number of instructive questions which should be carefully weighed by those interested in economical philosophy.

"Essays in Political and Moral Philosophy." By Thomas Edward Cliffe Leslie, LL.D., of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-Law. (Dublin University Press Series.) Dublin: Hodges, Foster and Figgis. 1879.

"Max Müller is the only equal, not to say superior, antagonist who has entered the arena against Darwin." So maintains Herr Ludwig Noiré in the Essay which, originally published in *Nord und Süd*, has now been presented in an English dress.⁸ The object of the writer is, as may be supposed, to bring out, by comparison with the views of Feiger and others, the appeal which Max Müller makes to roots as implying general ideas in order to maintain the irreconcilable difference between the brute and human mind. Noiré quite accepts Müller's dictum—"All future philosophy will be a philosophy of language," and his work will be found a valuable contribution towards epistemology.

Philosophy must be a word of liberal extension if it be allowed to cover Mr. Canning's observations on Scott's novels.⁹ The work, however, may have a value in recalling the plots and characters of the *Waverleys*; but we do not see that Mr. Canning's powers of analysis are more than average, and venture to prefer the older work by Nassau Senior.

Mr. Billing¹⁰ is profoundly impressed with the unsatisfactory character of materialistic science, and anxious to show its insufficiency; but we fear his zeal is not quite according to knowledge. He should have taken more care with the expression of his views if he wished them to be generally intelligible.

M. Ribot has applied to the study of the psychology of Germany¹¹ those powers of lucid exposition which he proved himself to have in dealing some nine years ago with the psychologists of our own country. His new work should be of the greatest service in giving information respecting the many thinkers who have recently been prosecuting the study of mental phenomena eastwards of the Rhine; and we shall be surprised if it be not gladly welcomed within Germany itself. Beginning with Herbart and his school, M. Ribot passes to Beneke and Lotze, and after a full discussion of the question between the *nativists* and empirists as to the notion of space concludes with Fechner's Psychophysic and Wundt's Physiological Psychology. The list, it will be noticed, confines itself to the representatives of what we usually call Empirical Psychology; and in a vigorous preface M. Ribot explains and defends the limitation. The old psychology, remarks the writer, remained a science of pure observation; the new psychology has recourse to experiment: the old availed itself of no methods but those of agreement and difference, the new employs particularly the method of concomitant variations. Metaphysic, in short, Ribot will

⁸ "Max Müller and the Philosophy of Language." By Ludwig Noiré. London: Longmans. 1879.

⁹ "Philosophy of the Waverley Novels." By the Hon. Albert S. G. Canning, Author of "Political Progress of Christianity," &c. London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1879.

¹⁰ "Scientific Materialism and Ultimate Conceptions." By Sidney Billing (Barrister-at-Law), Author of "Treatises on the Law of Pews, Awards, and Patents." London: Bickers and Son.

¹¹ "La Psychologie Allemande Contemporaine." Par Th. Ribot. Paris: Librairie Germer Baillière et Cie.

not hear of in connection with psychology; it is psychology "considered as a natural science, disencumbered of all metaphysic, and supporting itself on the science of life" that he deals with; and it is accordingly the representatives of such a science in Germany that he here has set himself to analyse. So successfully has he performed his task that one almost regrets the restriction he has placed upon his labours. But the metaphysical psychologists would not, we fear, have met with very appreciative treatment at the hands of M. Ribot.

M. Guyau, who is already favourably known by his work on Epicureanism, contributes to the same series as gives us M. Ribot's German Psychology a survey and examination of contemporary English ethics.¹² The present work is really a continuation of the volume on Epicurus; and forms along with it a general history and critique of utilitarian ethics. It is, therefore, only with a limited section of contemporary English moralists that M. Guyau's work is occupied, with the exponents—viz., of utilitarianism in some one or other of its phases. Jeremy Bentham—"the man in whom the English mind is best personified, with all its qualities and its defects pushed to extremes"—is the writer with an exposition of whose ethical philosophy the book begins. Then follow Stuart Mill, Grote, Bain, Darwin, and Herbert Spencer. The development of utilitarian ethics at the hands of these successive thinkers is admirably traced, and a luminous account is given of their several contributions to the problems of morality. But exposition forms only the smaller half of M. Guyau's volume. With p. 185 we enter on a lengthy criticism of the assumptions and deductions of our present popular English moralists. M. Guyau has no confidence in mere Induction as a method of explaining moral facts; and he notes that even a physical ethics involves metaphysical postulates. He doubts whether Bentham's "moral arithmetic" in estimating the comparative value of pleasure is possible, or based on more than a metaphorical expression; he notes the unsatisfactory and inconsistent character of Mill's reference to the *quality* of pleasure; and he detects repeatedly the necessity which obliges the utilitarians to introduce into their premisses, in some shape or another, that very ethical idea which they profess to treat as altogether derivative. M. Guyau's work is the most comprehensive and searching examination of English utilitarianism that it has yet been our pleasure to read.

Dr. Kuno Fischer's well-known "History of Modern Philosophy" has reached the third edition,¹³ to which its high merits render it fully entitled; and it is only necessary to remind those few students of philosophy who may not yet have made acquaintance with it that it is the only book which has treated modern philosophy with the same fulness and interest as Zeller has told the story of Greek speculation.

¹² "La Morale Anglaise Contemporaine. Morale de l'Utilité et de l'Évolution." Par M. Guyau. Paris: Baillière et Cie.

¹³ "Geschichte der Neuern Philosophie." Von Kuno Fischer. Dritte neu bearbeitete Auflage. [Erster Band: Descartes, und seine Schule.] München: Fr. Bassermann.

The first instalment of the new edition, after a luminous introduction, in which the relations of Greek philosophy to mediæval thought and of both to the renaissance and the reformation are admirably stated, confines itself to an extensive account of the life and writings of Descartes and an exhaustive analysis of the Cartesian theory.

We have to acknowledge a work by Dr. Emil Arnoldt, directed against Benno Erdmann's hypothesis of a double recension of Kant's *Prolegomena* to all future Metaphysic;¹⁴ an Essay by Dr. Gottlob Frege, likely to interest mathematicians more than logicians or philosophers, and intended apparently to show that all thought may be in the last resort reduced to algebraical or arithmetical expressions;¹⁵ a second and new edition of Dr. Otto Busch's work on Schopenhauer's Philosophy;¹⁶ and revised and enlarged edition of Professor Fraser's *Selections from Berkeley*.¹⁷

POLITICS, SOCIOLOGY, VOYAGES, AND TRAVELS.

THE temporary lull in the public concern for the movements in Afghanistan, brought about by the signature of the treaty of peace, together with the distraction of public curiosity—if not anxiety—in the direction of South Africa, affords an opportunity for a reconsideration of the policy of Lord Lytton's government in a spirit of calmness which it was difficult to maintain when it was discovered that diplomatic and even military action had gone, and was going, far in advance of Parliamentary action and criticism. * Thus, though Captain Eastwick's pamphlet,¹ and the Duke of Argyll's² reprint of that part of his book on the Eastern Question which deals with Afghan affairs, were published before the terms of peace were known, yet the reader has the advantage of studying them as a sort of comment by anticipation of the policy which has now been temporarily consummated. Captain Eastwick—who was formerly Director and Deputy-chairman of the East India Company, and subsequently Member of the Council of India—exhibits considerable alarm at the despotic manner and principles of governing India, both on the spot and at home. Whereas Mr. John Stuart Mill looked to the "forms of business" as the great constitutional security for the good government of India, it is

¹⁴ "Kant's Prolegomena nicht doppelt redigirt. Widerlegung der Benno Erdmann'schen Hypothese." Von Emil Arnoldt. Berlin: Leo Liepmannsohn.

¹⁵ "Begriffsschrift, eine der Arithmetischen Nachgebildete Formelsprache des Reinen Denkens." Von Dr. Gottlob Frege, Privatdocenten der Mathematik an der Universität Jena. Halle: Louis Nebert.

¹⁶ "Arthur Schopenhauer." Von Otto Busch. Zweite, gänzlich umgearbeitete Auflage. München: Fr. Bassermann.

¹⁷ "Selections from Berkeley: With an Introduction and Notes." By A. C. Fraser, LL.D. Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press.

¹ "Lord Lytton and the Afghan War." By Captain W. J. Eastwick. London: R. J. Mitchell & Sons, Parliament Street. 1879.

² "The Afghan Question, from 1841 to 1878." By the Duke of Argyll. London: Strahan & Co., Paternoster Row. 1879.

proved that these forms are no impediment whatever to the instant communication of the private will of the Secretary of State for India to the Viceroy, and to that will being translated into action with or without the assent of the Viceroy's Council. When Parliament, in 1858, took upon itself the direct government of India, and reorganised, in a later year, the Governor-General's Council, it did its utmost to guard against the dangers of autocratic government, and to provide that at the least when a dictatorial policy was called for, full opportunity should be secured for a public hearing of the arguments of dissentient councillors. Nevertheless, under the cloak, partly of urgent necessity, partly of the propriety of treating the smaller adjacent native States as outside the region of international law and courtesy, all these formal safeguards have gone to the winds at the very moment when they ought to have been trusted to. The Vernacular Press Act, the rapid alterations of policy on the North-West frontier, and—latest of all—the despotic repeal of the Cotton Duties in the interest of Lancashire Conservative constituents, prove that the constitutional frontier of Indian administration is frail and unscientific to an extent which even an alarmist could scarcely have feared. Referring to the precedent of Lord Ellenborough, Captain Eastwick says, "it may be confidently affirmed that under the East India Company's direction of Indian affairs, where party prejudices and prepossessions never intruded, Lord Lytton's impulsive action, disregard of established forms of procedure, and tendency to personal government, would not have been lightly passed over."

The time is passing away when the subject of India is taken up as a sort of hereditary property in certain families, the rest of the world being at the same time excluded from knowledge, as indeed from personal interest, in so remote and mysterious a topic. It is interesting, then, to find a true living fossil of Indian prepossession and enthusiasm in Mr. Val. Prinsep, who dedicates his book on *Imperial India*³ to "the memory of his father, one of those members of the H.E.I.C.S who have made our Indian empire what it is." Mr. Prinsep's grandfather left his father's vicarage in Warwickshire for the East more than a hundred years ago. "I have still by me," says Mr. Prinsep, "a letter of warning to the country parson, not to send his boy to India, as Clive was the very devil." Of the next generation no less than seven were in India at the same time. Mr. Prinsep's father was the third son. He was a member of Council, and afterwards Director of the East India Company, from which office he was translated into the Council of India, constituted in 1858. Mr. Prinsep's book, the wide notoriety and popularity of which may be gathered from well-known farcical caricatures which have appeared elsewhere, owes its existence to the author's having received a commission to paint the Imperial assemblage at Delhi as a present to her Majesty on her assuming the title of Empress of India. The book may well be read by those who want to know India from a somewhat less formal and stiffened position

³ "Imperial India. an Artist's Journals." By Val. C. Prinsep. London: Chapman & Hall. 1879.

than that occupied by ordinary travellers and commentators. It is pictorial, and yet thorough.

A Blue-book has been printed by order of the House of Commons purporting to be a statement "exhibiting the moral and material progress and condition of India during the year 1876-7." The subject is a large one, and the Blue-book not bulky; the result of which is rather in the reader's favour. The treatment is as compendious as possible, and the arrangement and indexing most systematic. It has of late become a commonplace, in treating of the Indian revenue, to say that the returns from opium are very precarious. In Oude and Bombay the revenue from opium had increased, but in Bombay smuggling was carried on to a very large extent. In Bengal there was a decrease in the quantity of land engaged for cultivation of opium. In Bombay it is said that hereditary syphilis is increasing to a very alarming extent, both in the capital and throughout the whole Presidency. This may be considered in connection with a statement on a later page, that "experience of the practical working of the Contagious Diseases Acts in Calcutta is said to justify the conclusion that a very fair measure of success has been attained; and in the various cantonments also the working of the Acts was considered to be generally successful." The ratio of admissions into hospitals from venereal disease per 1000 of European troops throughout the Bombay Presidency in 1876 was 75.37, or 20.42 in excess of the ratio in previous years. The maintenance of these institutions cost 3362*l*. In the military hospitals of Madras it is said that 1605 women were treated; but the Report adds that "the Lock hospitals are effecting good, in proportion to the energy with which registration is carried on and clandestine prostitution is detected, but the former is still defective and the latter prevalent." In the Central Provinces orders have been issued that vaccination should be taken up as a regular part of an hospital assistant's work. "Opposition was shown to an attempt to force vaccination upon adults, but prejudices can generally be overcome by management." A good deal of real progress seems to have been made in the matter of female education. In Bengal the numbers of native girls under instruction have risen from 16,876 in 1875-6 to 20,286 in 1876-7. The Report says that female education is capable of very wide extension in British Burmah, and that there were twenty-two girls' schools under State control during 1876-7.

We have received a Parliamentary Paper containing further correspondence respecting the affairs of Turkey.⁴ It extends over the third quarter of the year 1878, commencing July 18th. A good deal of it is rather dreary reading, being composed of Consular Reports forwarded by Sir A. H. Layard, dealing with alleged Russian brutalities and Mussulman sufferings in the provinces still occupied by Russia, or only partially evacuated. The value of these *ex parte* statements,

⁴ Statement Exhibiting the Moral and Material Progress and Condition of India during the year 1876-77. Parliamentary Paper. 1878.

⁵ "Further Correspondence respecting the Affairs of Turkey." Parliamentary Papers, No. 53, 1878. London: Printed by Harrison & Sons.

written in conformity with dictation from home, as has been proved by scandalous experiences in very recent years, may be left to the appreciation of the individual reader.

Mr. Edson Clark's "Races of European Turkey"⁶ attracts the reader, on first opening it, by presenting to him an unusually good map of those provinces which must be illustrated by a good map of the most modern construction if their relations and prospects are to be understood at all. The book contains an historical and descriptive view of every one of the provinces to which late events have called attention. As to the Greeks, Mr. Clark says that those of the Turkish provinces, although they have kept pace with their brethren of free Greece in material prosperity, have fallen far behind them in moral and social advancement. They live under all the demoralising influences of Turkish rule, and are still very much what their fathers were two generations ago. The Greek in Turkey does the work and receives the money. He vitalizes the sluggish mass around him, but is quite as unscrupulous as his masters. The one thing needful for Greece is roads. With roads and a ready access to the markets of the world, Mr. Clark thinks deliverance would come from the tyranny of the tax-gatherer; for it would then be for the interest of the Government and the producer alike that the taxes should be paid in money. Mr. Clark is sanguine as to the future of Greece. "Crete, Samos, Thessaly, and Macedonia, are the parts of the common inheritance of the Greeks, withheld from them as yet by arbitrary power, but sure, wherever their grasp is relaxed, to join themselves to Greece, and so in due time to expand the kingdom into a large, prosperous, and opulent State."

The Reports made to the Admiralty⁷ on the anchorages and general condition of the Island of Cyprus, though infected with the character of a political demonstration in the interest of a Government which is responsible for the acquisition of the Island, nevertheless contains matter which—so far as it goes, and so far as it is trustworthy—is not uninteresting. Thus, in one of his letters, Admiral Hornby says that Famagousta is situated 250 miles from the entrance to the Suez Canal, and that the "maritime Power which holds it must always command that important highway." The Admiral also says that a harbour might be formed there at a small expense which would shelter more ironclads than the grand harbour at Malta, and where they might coal with great facility. Another *couleur de rose* Report is supplied by Captain Rawson, who quotes from the Report of Staff-Commander Millard to the effect that Famagousta is well adapted for both an imperial and a mercantile harbour, and that its natural advantages are great. Mr. Evans, hydrographer, says that the natural features of the sea-board are singularly adapted for the protection of shipping by artificial

⁶ "The Races of European Turkey: their History, Condition, and Prospects." By Edson L. Clark. Edinburgh: William Oliphant & Co. 1878.

⁷ "Reports made to the Admiralty on the Anchorages, &c., of the Island of Cyprus." Parliamentary Papers. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode. 1879.

We have received the *Statistics of New Zealand*⁸ for the year 1877, with abstracts from the agricultural statistics of 1878. The work is well arranged and indexed, though it scarcely competes in interest and fulness with Mr. Hayter's Year-books.

After the present alarm as to the issues of the Zulu war has subsided, the question of the safety of the colony of Natal will survive as one equally pressing and difficult. There are only two alternatives—that suggested by Sir Bartle Frere, of universal conquest up to some unknown point in the interior of Africa; and that of recognising the continued existence of the Zulu race, helping forward their struggles after civilisation, and establishing relations of amity with them on a sound and prudent political basis. Captain Lucas, who served with his regiment, the Cape Mounted Rifles, in the campaign of 1851-3, treats the subject of the "Zulus and the British Frontiers"⁹ rather from the latter point of view than the former. He advocates the institution of a permanent colonial force to defend the frontier boundaries to the north-east. The troops would be distributed over a number of different posts, communication being kept up between them by continual patrols of small parties, carrying the mails and despatches. "In this way a constant surveillance would be exercised over the frontier line without interfering in any way with the susceptibilities of the Zulus or actually crossing the boundary line." He would also appoint residents or magistrates where practicable among the native Zulus, to maintain order and see that justice is done. Native public opinion would always curb tendencies to despotism.

Mr. Farrer¹⁰ has seized the opportunity to collect, in a compendious and popular form, all the most accessible and trustworthy information on Zululand and the Zulus. We have also received the Parliamentary Papers with respect to the affairs of South Africa up to February last. This Correspondence, with the Correspondence which has since taken place, should be studied in connection with the sort of facts which Mr. Farrer describes.¹¹ Thus, there were two arguments in favour of the war in South Africa; one based on the alleged dangerous and unprecedented military organisation which was threatening, or believed to threaten, Natal; and the other on the personal character, ambition, and military policy of Cetewayo. The aggregate value of these arguments must depend upon the extent to which a Zulu king like Cetewayo really represents, for all purposes, the tribes which are formally subject to him. Mr. Farrer gives good proof that a Zulu king's political power is subject to definite checks, and that he never resolves on great State matters without being sure of the approval of the people.

⁸ "Statistics of the Colony of New Zealand for 1877." Wellington: George Didsbury. 1878.

⁹ "The Zulus and the British Frontiers." By Thomas J. Lucas. London: Chapman & Hall. 1879.

¹⁰ "Zululand and the Zulus: their History, Beliefs, and Customs." By J. A. Farrer. Fourth edition. London: Kirby & Endean, 190, Oxford Street. 1879.

¹¹ 1. Further Correspondence respecting the Affairs of South Africa. (In continuation of [C. 2220] of December, 1878); 2. (in continuation of [C. 2222] of February, 1879); 3. (in continuation of [C. 2242] of February, 1879). London: Eyre & Spottiswoode. 1879.

In two Papers¹² read before the Royal Colonial Institute and contributed to the Journal of the Royal United Service Institution, Captain J. C. R. Colomb examines the question of colonial defence, and propounds both the difficulties appertaining to the subject and the kind of remedies which he thinks might be adopted for the purpose of meeting them. Captain Colomb is of opinion that "the supremacy of the sea"¹³ has become little more than a vague phrase, and that between fatal centralisation on the one hand, and false localisation on the other, this supremacy of the sea now stands in the "chill cold shade of national negligence." The main difficulty is that of preserving unity of operations and systematic combination throughout the empire, without paralysing local activity or intruding unduly on the independence of local governments. Captain Colomb notices, for instance, that so far back as 1865 New South Wales passed an Act for maintaining "armed vessels for the service of the colony, for the protection thereof, and for other purposes." These vessels would probably never be allowed to operate beyond the maritime league, and yet the Admiralty at home would be tolerably certain to regard each one of them as a source of British strength in Australian seas.

The recent visit to this country of Mr. Berry, Prime Minister of Victoria, and Mr. C. H. Pearson, who is a Member of the Legislative Assembly, as delegates from the Legislative Assembly of Victoria, has fixed public attention on the Constitutional struggle which now for some years has been proceeding in that country. From the "Further Correspondence"¹⁴ which was presented to Parliament in December, 1878, and was published in the present year, we gather some of the motives of this mission which might not otherwise have been disclosed. The Governor, Sir George Bowen, in writing to Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, at the time of the despatch of the delegates, says that "the public mind is now being educated on this important subject" (that of Constitutional Reform), "and there appears to be a strong and fast-growing reaction against the extreme sections of both parties." It was not unnatural that the Legislative Council, which declined to appoint delegates of their own, should object to a vote for paying the expenses of delegates sent by their opponents. The Attorney-General, Sir Bryan O'Loughlen, on being consulted, gave it as his opinion that the money could be legally appropriated for the purpose, inasmuch as the delegates did not go as mere delegates of a political party, but as Commissioners on behalf of the Victorian Government, with the express sanction of the Legislative Assembly, and with the approval of the mass of the electors of Victoria, on a national mission in respect of the

¹² "Colonial Defence and Colonial Opinion." By Captain J. C. R. Colomb, R.M.A. Dublin and London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co. 1877.

¹³ "The Naval and Military Resources of the Colonies." By Captain J. C. R. Colomb, R.M.A. London: Harrison & Sons, St. Martin's Lane. 1879.

¹⁴ "Further Correspondence respecting the Constitutional Question in Victoria." London: Eyre & Spottiswoode. 1879.

"Victoria. Further Correspondence respecting the late Differences between the Two Houses of the Legislature of Victoria." London: Eyre & Spottiswoode 1878.

adjustment of the legislative powers and functions of the Council and the Assembly. The real issue between the Council and the Assembly is something far more than the mere technical question as to whether, under the original "Constitution Act," the Legislative Council has or has not all the powers, rights, duties, privileges, and functions of the English House of Lords. Even were the utmost technical identity conceded to the Legislative Council, still the actual progress of legislation must largely depend on the temper and spirit in which the rights of the Council were exercised. It is the purpose of Constitutional forms to restrict within definite limits the vagaries and eccentricities of individual or even national temperament; but these forms cannot annihilate the existence of such temperament without abolishing all free action and volition. In England, the House of Lords continues to exist on the condition that it will bring itself into practical conformity with the ascertained will of the people as represented in the House of Commons. If the Legislative Council of Victoria should find itself unable to do as much, no claim to inherit the traditions of the House of Lords can save it from extinction, ignominy, or radical reconstruction.

Sociology has made a great advance since the days of Rousseau, when an imaginary conception of savage life—with all its attractions and few of its subtracted drawbacks—formed the basis and starting-point of the gravest political reasoning. The danger rather now is of knowing too much about savage life, rather than too little, and of erecting vagaries and eccentric peculiarities which really exist in all parts of the earth into types or apologies for a renovated political society. The researches of Sir John Lubbock, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Tylor, and unnumbered German inquirers, have amassed an amount of material on the subject of primitive usages which it will probably need a new generation calmly to digest and turn to valuable political account. Mr. James Farrer's treatise on "Primitive Manners and Customs,"¹⁵ though cast in a more popular shape than usual, is exhaustive in its comprehensiveness, and is based at every point on the latest researches, which are carefully referred to. Mr. Farrer makes some instructive remarks on the impossibility and even the danger of precipitately imposing Christianity on an unprepared race. He does thorough justice to the valuable work effected by missionaries in countries where "native theology takes the form of cannibalism, sutteeism, human sacrifices, or other rites directly destructive of earthly happiness." In these cases the teaching of missionaries affords the only hope of a speedy reform, the only acquaintance possible for savage tribes with a culture higher than their own, save that which is likely to come to them through the medium of the brandy-bottle and the bayonet. But Mr. Farrer points out that the case is entirely different in the case of countries where there already exist established systems of religions undefiled by cruelty. To send missions to countries in this situation "violates the first principle of the faith so conveyed, disturb-

¹⁵ "Primitive Manners and Customs." By James A. Farrer. London: Chatto & Windus, Piccadilly. 1879.

ing the peace of families and nations with the curse of religious animosity." The most extreme case is where missionaries are forced upon a nation, and Mr. Farrer especially alludes to the demands contained in the ultimatum addressed to Cetewayo for the reinstatement of missionaries in Zululand. Some of the facts of Sabbatarian observance by converted savages often recorded with complaisance are, thinks Mr. Farrer, "no proof that we make Christians of savages; they only prove that with some trouble we may make them imbeciles."

It has been a labour of love with Mr. Theodore Bent to describe the Republic of San Marino,¹⁶ still subsisting in North Italy, and in which he spent some weeks, evidently with great gratification to himself, a gratification which was enhanced after his departure by his receiving a piece of parchment making him a citizen of the Republic, and a letter of thanks for the interest that he had taken in its concerns. Mr. Bent writes, in a series of brief but full chapters, the story of the liberty of San Marino, which is now of fifteen centuries' standing. Each chapter brings the little State into curious contact with some section or other of contemporary European and Italian history. It is, perhaps, by such side sketches, faithfully worked out, of places long overlooked, that the truth of history is better tested and established than it is by the more ambitious and comprehensive treatises of historians who alone are dignified with the name.

Mr. Kaufmann¹⁷ sets before us the four stages through which originative effort for social improvement has progressed during as many centuries; beginning with the purely theoretic or fanciful stage exemplified in the work of More and Campanella, and in the "New Atlantis" of Bacon; passing into the true empirical stage in the teaching and practical experiments of Morelly and Babeuf, of St. Simon and Fourier, of Robert Owen and Karl Marlo, and of Louis Blanc; reaching, in the destructive criticism of Proudhon, the intermediate stage between pre-scientific and scientific Socialism; and taking a new start in Germany from the speculative thought of Rodbertus, the imaginative greatness and eager propagandism of the widely-gifted Lassalle,—who could answer proudly to the taunt of Delitzsch, "I write every line that I write, armed with the whole culture of my century,"—and the organised revolutionism of Karl Marx and the International. The principles and work of the last two leaders are naturally treated at greater length than those of the earlier Socialists. The author makes but little original remark on the theories he passes in review before us, as his own views have been fully expressed in an earlier work on Socialism, in which he appears as the exponent of Dr. Schäffle's "Kapitalismus und Socialismus;" but he explains that it has been his object throughout to exhibit, not the whims and oddities of great speculators, but the solid material which they have contributed to modern thought.

¹⁶ "A Freak of Freedom; or, the Republic of San Marino." By J. Theodore Bent. London: Longmans. 1879.

¹⁷ "Utopias, or Schemes of Social Improvement. From Sir Thomas More to Karl Marx." By the Rev. M. Kaufmann. Kegan Paul & Co. 1879.

Mr. Murphy's "Rambles in North-Western America"¹⁸ certainly purports to cover every topic about which the most insatiable reader of travels can be expected to have any curiosity. It describes the physical geography, climate, soil, productions, industrial and commercial resources, scenery, population, educational institutions, arborial botany, and game animals, of Oregon, Washington Territory, Idaho, Montana, Utah, and Wyoming. The writer of a work so comprehensive and exhaustive in its conception almost puts reviewers at defiance, because criticism can only be directed against inaccuracy in point of detail, and it would require a very large number of inaccuracies to counterbalance the mass of useful and unknown truths, which are collected together.

The adventures of Mr. Stevenson and his pack-ass "Modestine"¹⁹ during their fortnight's fellowship in the Cevennes, are related by the former with his usual whimsical grace, and he gives us a frontispiece delightfully Bunyanesque. For the lightest of light reading his book is certainly charming, and he has had the good taste not to make it too long.

We can hardly say the same of Mr. Champion's²⁰ pedestrian tour in Spain. He gives us in a big book pretty much the ordinary bill of fare of an out-of-the-way traveller, and his photographed sketches are too hard to be pleasing.

Mr. Pritchett's sketches of Thames scenery²¹ are very pretty. The chromos please us less, though the view from Richmond Hill is taken from a good point. The letterpress might make an agreeable guide for a rowing tour up the Thames.

Mr. George Combe's remarks on Education,²² which, in Mr. Jolly's edition, amount to a considerable volume, are written for all time. Education itself usually has a special and temporary reference to the defects and needs of an age and a country, and certainly we in England have, within the last few years, seen it passing through several rapidly alternating phases, both of practice and theory. But Mr. George Combe always went so profoundly into the subjects he handled, and connected them so strictly with the permanent constitution of man, that his observations and conclusions, so far as they were ever sound, will never be superseded. It is curious to notice that when speaking of women's education he is rather inclined to adopt the notion of the limited and dependent nature of woman in comparison with that of man, and to prescribe education for her accordingly: But he instantly becomes inconsistent when he has to

¹⁸ "Rambles in North-Western America." By John Mortimer Murphy. London: Chapman & Hall. 1879.

¹⁹ "Travels with a Donkey in the Cevennes." By Robert Louis Stevenson. Kegan Paul & Co. 1879.

²⁰ "On Foot in Spain." By J. S. Champion. Chapman & Hall. 1879.

²¹ "Our Native Land: its Scenery and Associations." Described by W. D. Adams. In *Monthly Parts*. Part I. With Woodcuts by R. T. Pritchett, F.S.A. Marcus Ward. 1879.

²² "Education: its Principles and Practice." As developed by George Combe. Collated and edited by William Jolly. Macmillan. 1879.

treat of the branch of knowledge with which he is most familiar. Here he insists on women having as thorough an education as can be given them. He repudiates the notion that rules for the preservation of health can be taught without the study of anatomy, and deplors the condition of an ill-informed mother who has not mastered the elements of chemistry, natural history, and natural philosophy.

Mr. Kenny²³ has added another useful leaf to the modest wreath of repute he has already deservedly won in treating on the law of Primogeniture, by an equally learned and comprehensive discussion of the "History of the Law of England as to the Effects of Marriage on Property, and on the Wife's Legal Capacity." The subject is known to be one of the most complex in the whole department of law, inasmuch as it has borrowed from Common Law, Equity, Custom, and Statute Law, while its implications with religious and ecclesiastical considerations, as well as with some of the strongest social feelings, have rendered at all times the systematic handling of it by the Legislature a task of insuperable difficulty. Mr. Kenny would deserve well of legal reformers and sociologists if he had done no more than publish his chronological chart, which traces every movement in the law affecting a wife's estate, from the time of the Saxon kings to the present reign. His analysis of contents, and what he calls his "logical analysis," are also highly commendable efforts in the art of arrangement, and point silently and surely to the incoming of a new era, when an impatience with the disorder and confusion of English law must bring about thorough and systematic codification of the whole law, civil as well as criminal.

Mr. J. Kerr,²⁴ who has already treated of some of the aspects of Indian life, has availed himself of his experience in that field to write on "Castism and Sectism" at home. He evidently regards—perhaps with philosophical truth—the system of caste in India as nothing more or less than a highly organised product, in a very favourable atmosphere, of the seeds of exclusiveness and social separatism, which penetrate English society in all directions. Mr. Kerr says that we "may see in Hindoo caste, as in a mirror, an exaggerated picture of our own manners, a fuller and more monstrous development of what, in a milder degree, lives and moves and has its being among ourselves. This modified caste we may, for want of a better name, call 'castism.'" The book is full of brief and lively illustrations of this position, and the instances from the commonplace religious and social life of ourselves and everybody else are generally searching, and often humorous.

Under the title "Free Trade in Land,"²⁵ the widow of the late Mr. Joseph Kay republishes a valuable series of letters on the Land Question, written by her husband for the *Manchester Examiner and*

²³ "The History of the Law of England as to the Effects of Marriage on Property, and on the Wife's Legal Capacity." By Courtney Stanhope Kenny, LL.M. London: Reeves and Turner, Chancery Lane. 1879.

²⁴ "Essays on Castism and Sectism; or, Some Aspects of Human Nature." By J. Kerr. Edinburgh: Edmonston & Co. 1879.

²⁵ "Free Trade in Land." By Joseph Kay, Q.C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1879.

Times. Mr. Kay had himself intended, when the series was complete, to re-arrange his material and produce it in a permanent form. Unhappily he did not live to carry through the work he had projected, even in its more fugitive shape. The vivid and popular manner in which he has presented the subject cannot but awaken a strong regret that a treatise which would have been likely to commend itself so widely should have been left incomplete; while his legal knowledge, and the acquaintance with social and economic facts which he gained during his journeys as Travelling Bachelor for the University of Cambridge, and in the course of subsequent inquiries both at home and on the Continent, give solidity and trustworthiness to his work. It is to be observed, however, that the book does not go beyond its title, and that Mr. Kay simply claims for land the freedom of transfer attaching to all other property, without touching at all on the problem peculiar to land, arising out of the facts of a limited national property and an unlimited population. Starting from the Returns produced in the House of Lords, as the result of Lord Derby's motion in February, 1872 (which Returns, by the way, he sharply criticises, on the ground of their omitting from the recorded acreage of the great estates all woods and plantations and waste and common lands, and of their reckoning as owners all leaseholders for terms exceeding ninety-nine years; and which he characterises as further misleading in regard to the number of small agricultural proprietors, inasmuch as they draw no distinction between "owners of one acre and upwards" of land for agricultural purposes and owners of small building plots), Mr. Kay, in a series of calculations, presents a striking view of the distribution of the total acreage of the United Kingdom and of Ireland; and proceeds to point out the contrast between our country, where the accumulation of land, with all its attendant evils, is still on the increase, and those Continental countries where the remedy has been applied, and the advantages of an opposite system are fully experienced. He complains of the wilful or careless misrepresentation of the views of those who wish for a reform of the Land Laws on the part of their opponents; of loose and vague talking on the part of the reformers themselves—instancing the use of the expression "free land," and asking where the free-trade question would be even now, if its advocates had gone about talking of "free corn;" and of misapprehension as to the relative force of this law or of that in maintaining the present state of things; remarking on the necessarily narrow reach of such a law as that of primogeniture, which, only applying in cases of intestacy, and leaving the heir free to alienate at pleasure, does little actual injury except in so far as it emphasizes traditional usage and directs the inclinations of the testator. Mr. Kay gives instances of the working of the various kinds of deeds, powers, covenants, leases, &c., by which a dead man may continue to hold the management of an estate for several generations; and passes on to consider the inconveniences and the discouragements to the transfer of land, arising not only from the complexity of the arrangements which may be made binding on the land, but from the extreme uncertainty with regard to them, consequent on the absence of any

system of registration; to contrast the simplification of all transactions relating to land, and the security of title, which result from the system existing in Scotland and on the Continent, under which any unregistered act affecting land becomes invalid; and the land-register of the district thus affords to the intending purchaser, without expense or the possibility of doubt, a complete view of every change or condition to which the land is liable; and to bewail the failure of Lord Selborne's measure for compulsory registration in England and Wales. The remainder of the letters contain the results of Mr. Kay's own observations of the working of non-restrictive land laws in France, Switzerland, and some parts of Germany, and corroborative evidence from authoritative quarters. On the much-disputed question of the French system he remarks, first, that he is not a supporter of that system as fit for imitation, but rather of that of Stein and Hardenburg, which allows the freest possible play of the right of disposal; and, secondly, that it must not be forgotten that, notwithstanding its grave faults, and the disadvantages which are seen to attach to it in France, where it is unaccompanied by any attempt whatever at agricultural education, it is the same system which, with the help of a system of scientific training, has produced such admirable results in Switzerland and in some parts of Germany. He makes an interesting allusion—it is hardly more—to visits paid by him to some Swiss agricultural schools, and to Vehrli's Training College for teachers of such schools at Constance. Mr. Kay did not live to write the letters in which he intended to discuss at length the Prussian system. The appendix reprints some parts of his volume on the social condition and education of the people of England and Europe, containing citations of well-known facts and authorities bearing on peasant-proprietorship on the Continent, on its tendency to promote prudence in marriage, respect for property, and a perhaps wholesome and not illiberal conservatism among the peasant class, and on the extreme need of such influences in a country like Ireland. The book is commended in a preface by Mr. Bright "to owners of estates, to tenant-farmers, to the labourers on their farms, and to the crowded populations of our large villages and towns."

M. Mosser, of Naples, sends us a small treatise,²⁶ apparently introductory to a larger work to come, in which, through the medium of a great array of logical terms and abstract definitions, he sets forth a philosophy of political economy evolved out of the inner consciousness. If at any point the facts are not in agreement, he proceeds gravely to inquire the cause of this "perturbation." Even this might be all very well, since it is admitted that many facts of human life and labour must honestly be regarded as "perturbations"—if his method conducted him into any practical soundness of thought. As a matter of fact, it does conduct him into definitions like the following:—"Utility (*la valeur*) and labour have thus the same result [that of acquisition]; they are therefore but two forms of the same substance—that is to say, identical in principle, different in their nature."

²⁶ "L'Esprit de l'Economie Politique." Par François Mosser. Naples. 1879.

The Publication Committee of the New York Free-trade Club is publishing, at the low price of 25 cents each, a series of "Economic Monographs," consisting of Essays on trade, banking, the currency question, and similar subjects. Four of these are now before us. A project has gained some hold of the popular mind, and has been adopted by the Democratic party in many State Conventions, for superseding the notes of the banks organised under the National Banking Act of 1863 by Treasury notes of the United States Government; these notes being either notes not redeemable on demand, available in liquidation of all claims of or against the State, but not forced upon the country as a legal tender for the payment of private debts; or notes not redeemable on demand, created a legal tender for all purposes whatever; or notes redeemable on demand. Mr. Scudder, in his pamphlet,²⁷ discusses the project under each of these three forms. To the first he objects that no note which is not made a legal tender can actually hold the place in commercial transactions now held by National Bank notes, convertible on demand into a legal tender; to the second, that it is a question whether the Supreme Court would allow the competency of Congress to authorise the issue of paper-money as a legal tender in time of peace; and also that it is impossible to ascertain with accuracy the quantity which will satisfy without surcharging the circulation, when the supply no longer fluctuates with the demand, but has to be arbitrarily determined; to the third, that, though Government notes redeemable on demand would not be open to the foregoing objections, the plan would be subject to the inconveniences attending the formation of a new Government department, and the creation of a redemption-fund which would be a perpetual temptation to politicians, while a single debate in Congress on the question of tampering with it might bring about a run on the Treasury; and that it is a wiser policy for a Government to intrench itself behind the responsibility of individual capitalists associated in a corporate capacity than to risk the remotest possibility of bankruptcy and public disgrace by banking on its own account.

"Honest Money and Labour"²⁸ is an address to the working-men of Boston shortly before the elections of last November, in which Mr. Schurz points out with great vigour and clearness what would be the consequences to the working-man of a re-issue of irredeemable paper currency, at the moment when the Government is able, and is bound, to resume payment in specie.

We almost fail to recognise some of our own institutions in the rose-coloured picture drawn by Mr. Sterne.²⁹ In a lively and slashing style he compares the condition of England, France, and Germany, at the beginning of the century, with that of the United States

²⁷ "National Banking." By M. L. Scudder, junior. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York; and Trübner, London. 1879.

²⁸ "Honest Money and Labour." By the Hon. Carl Schurz, Secretary of the Interior. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York; and Trübner, London. 1879.

²⁹ "Hindrances to Prosperity, or Causes which retard Financial and Political Reforms in the United States." By Simon Sterne. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York; and Trübner, London. 1879.

of America, unhampered by feudal customs, class interests, monopolies, and debt, and possessing a rich and virgin soil, and then asks—"Why are we no further ahead of them now? Why are we in some respects even behind them?" He then shows how, through the working of an excessive social differentiation, a political class has arisen in the United States which concerns itself with politics alone, while every other class abandons all interest in them; and illustrates the misgovernment arising from this state of things by describing the manner in which, recent legislation notwithstanding, private bills are still able to override Government business, contrasting with this a detailed account of the manner in which private bills are treated in England. He lays the blame of the neglect of important public business on the fact that "we have party government in all its evil forms, without that party responsibility which gives to the party in power the duty of governing well; and that because of the absence of Cabinet responsibility having direct reference to legislation."

Mr. Putnam³⁰ takes as nearly as possible the view of the Copyright Question taken by our own Copyright Commission of 1876. He complains of the want of unanimity amongst those Americans who wish for some measure of International Copyright, and gives some amusing instances of the irregularities arising from the absence of any such law. He believes that the "courtesy of the trade" which has hitherto restrained the better class of American publishers from entering the lists with any of their number who may be producing an English book in the United States "by arrangement with the author," is unhappily breaking down, and that it is becoming as difficult for American publishers to bear the risk of paying English authors, as it is for English publishers to bear the risk of paying an American author.

We have received the Report of the Volunteer Force Inquiry Committee (1879),³¹ and the Abstract of Annual Returns of Volunteer Corps, dated November, 1878;³² the Police Reports (Counties and Boroughs), for the year ending September 29th, 1878;³³ and the Report of the Poor-Law Union and Lunacy Inquiry Commission for Ireland.³⁴ In the last-named volume the Commissioners recommend a complete reorganisation of the lunacy administration: the existing district asylums to be classified into a small number of "lunatic hospitals" for curative treatment of incipient or hopeful cases, and a larger number of "lunatic asylums" for the chronic insane requiring special care; and the class of harmless lunatics not requiring special care to be provided for in "workhouse auxiliary asylums," for which purpose spare workhouse buildings may be utilised with advantage,

³⁰ "International Copyright, considered in some of its Relations to Ethics and Political Economy." By G. H. Putnam. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York; and Trübner, London. 1879.

³¹ "Reports on the Financial State and Internal Organisation of the Volunteer Force in Great Britain." 1879.

³² "Abstract of Annual Returns of Volunteer Corps." 1878.

³³ "Police (Counties and Boroughs)." Parliamentary Papers. 1879.

³⁴ "Poor-Law Union and Lunacy Inquiry Commission (Ireland). Reports and Evidence, with Appendices." Dublin. 1879.

or, in some cases, school accommodation may be appropriated, the guardians being compensated on a scale which would enable them to provide school accommodation elsewhere. The whole administration to be under the general control of the Local Government Board.

SCIENCE.

THE practical study of the physical sciences yields so much pleasure that it is matter for congratulation that text-books of geology no longer confine themselves to expounding the results which have been arrived at. On a former occasion we drew attention to the excellent lectures on Field Geology which Professor Geikie delivered at South Kensington.¹ The outline then published has now been expanded and improved, with illustrations, so as to form a compendious introduction to practical study. The materials are re-cast—divided primarily into out-door work, which occupies fourteen chapters of the book; and in-door work, which is less fully elaborated, and occupies the last three chapters. The volume is an admirable one, and cannot but be valued by field clubs, and all students who wish to obtain a mastery of the geological facts which now form a necessary part of the knowledge of educated persons. It might, perhaps, have been desired that the localities should have been given of all the sections and diagrams which add so much to the interest of the book, and we should even have liked to see some additional localities given in which students might learn from classical examples the true nature of the phenomena which are explained, and which the book will create a desire to study practically. For although the lecturer may easily supply this defect to his pupils, the volume will find its way into the hands of many who have no such opportunities of personal teaching, and who might easily enter into the pleasures of research with some little further assistance such as no one could better supply than Professor Geikie.

The great masters of geological science were content with observing the behaviour of rocks in great masses; but at the present day a new school has introduced an analytical study of rocks by examining their structure under the microscope. In this way the mineral composition is discovered of rocks which had no visible crystallisation; and the minerals themselves, identified by their optical properties, are often determined with an accuracy that was previously impossible. Thus a new branch of science is growing into existence, and as an aid to the student Mr. Rutley offers his handbook of the "Study of Rocks."²

¹ "Outlines of Field Geology." By Archibald Geikie, LL.D., F.R.S., Murchison Professor of Geology and Mineralogy in the University of Edinburgh. Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged, with numerous Illustrations. London: Macmillan & Co. 1879.

² "The Study of Rocks: an Elementary Text-book of Petrology." By Frank Rutley, F.G.S., H.M. Geological Survey. London: Longmans, Green, & Co. 1879.

This unpretending volume is a most excellent guide to the beginner who would study in a scientific way the modern mineralogical aspects of rock structure. The volume is divided into two parts; the first, called rudiments of petrology, consists of ten chapters, which treat of all that is necessary to know concerning rock-forming minerals, and their microscopic examination; while the second part, descriptive petrology, endeavours to give some results of study in the classifications of vitreous, crystalline, and sedimentary rocks. We cannot help suggesting that the artistic structure of the book would have been more perfect had its scope been restricted so as to exclude all discussion of sedimentary deposits; since the information given under those heads is meagre and mostly of a different character from that which imparts an unquestioned value to the larger portion of the book. We should not make this suggestion were it not that in grasp of his subject, and mode of treatment generally, the author rises far above the ambition usually limiting the work of a text-book. These remarks especially apply to the second part of the volume, in which the field is less trodden than in ordinary mineral knowledge. We would also venture to suggest to the author the desirability of a chapter in which he should point out the relation to each other of the several kinds of igneous rocks, not on microscopic evidence, but as these phenomena are actually observed in Nature; for, after all, the great value of the microscope is in imparting a new standard of accuracy for the conclusions of the field geologist, and it is most important that the evidence from both points of view should be presented together. We trust the author will not consider this as reaching beyond the elementary field which he undertakes to cover, for we cannot help believing that with such modification the book will be found not only an indispensable handbook for every school in the country in which geology is taught, but will contribute materially to train students to a higher standard of work than was possible for them before the book appeared.

Mr. Storer's volume on the Wild White Cattle³ is an elaborate study of the surviving herds, enriched with a large amount of tradition and historical information. The author believes the white cattle to be descended from the extinct colossal *Bos primigenius*, and states their distinctive features to be pure white colour with black hoofs and muzzle, black tips to the horns, and a black circle round the eye, with the ears blackish or brown inside and out, and with a tendency to produce small black spots on the neck. These cattle yield beef which in flavour and excellence is said to be more delicious than in any other breed, while when domesticated their milking qualities render them valuable. Formerly, these animals appear to have been preferred to all others; at the present day, a white bull is almost unsaleable. The fusion of the old white herds which had belonged to the monasteries with the ordinary cattle of the country became complete about three

³ "The Wild White Cattle of Great Britain. An Account of their Origin, History, and Present State." By the late Rev. John Storer, M.A. Edited by his Son, John Storer. Cassell, Petter & Galpin, London, Paris, and New York.

hundred years ago, so that few wild herds now survive. Twenty-eight English localities and eleven Scotch localities are enumerated in which the wild white cattle formerly existed, and in several of these they are still preserved. The volume is divided into eighteen chapters, the earlier of which deal with general questions relating to the importation of cattle into England in early times, and the characteristics of the several breeds which characterise the northern countries of Europe. The Chillingham herd is fully described, and treated with an evidently affectionate care, such as human biography does not always exhibit. In habit these animals show no signs of domestication, since they hide their young, feed in the night, sleep in the day, and retire for sanctuary to a wood in summer at the appearance of man. They move in single file, and in advancing are led by the bulls, and when in retreat the bulls bring up the rear. The cows breed slowly, and frequently suckle the calves till the second year. Few die from disease or in calving. Accounts follow of the Chartley herd, which is preserved in the central part of Staffordshire; and the Lyme Park herd, in Cheshire. The Somerford Park herd is domesticated, and polled. Accounts are given of all the other small remnants of wild cattle which have been preserved by the enclosure of forests and in other ways. In the last chapter the results are summarised, and the herds are classed into five sub-varieties, according to slight peculiarities of colouring which they present, and according to the presence or absence of horns. It would have been a great advantage to the book if the author's acquaintance with natural history had been equal to his enthusiasm for cattle; but as it is, the zoological part of the volume is rather weak, and no new contribution is made to the problem of the origin of domesticated cattle; but it is a work which will commend itself to all who take an interest in the historical questions with which it chiefly deals, and in the details of cattle life which are amply recorded.

The plant-life of Switzerland promises, in its first part, to be an important addition to the literature of botanical geography.⁴ The author divides the country into four principal regions. First, and occupying considerable space, is the Lowland region, which is treated of in five areas, called the Italian lake-district, the Rhone district, the Jura valley, the lake and Fohn area to the north of the Alps, and the valley of the Rhine. Secondly, the region of deciduous trees is described, and consists of the higher plains, alpine valleys, and valleys towards Italy. The third region is that of the pine-forests; while the fourth region comprises the higher Alps, in which the plants have an Arctic character. The present part only reaches as far in the lowland region as the Italian lake-district. There is a careful account of its climatic phenomena, and a description of the facies of the flora; followed by a detailed statement of the range and distribution of the plants which are met with. There is a map showing the distribution of a few plants, and especially of the vine; indicating that the red wine

⁴ "Das Pflanzenleben der Schweiz." Von H. Christ. Zurich: Friedrich Schulthess. London: Trübner & Co. 1879. Erste Lieferung, Erste Hälfte.

is chiefly produced in the east, while the white wine is grown in the west.

The possibilities of window-gardening are imperfectly known, notwithstanding the many efforts which have been made to spread an interest in the pleasures which may thus be brought home to those who have but slender opportunities for enjoying flowers. The happy idea occurred to Miss Buckton, of the Leeds School Board, to teach the children attending the Board schools in Leeds some of the elementary facts of plant-life after their school-work was over. Her Lectures⁵ appear to have borne excellent fruit, in the fact that on holding a School Board flower-show, after a sufficient interval for the knowledge gained to yield fruit, more than a thousand of the children became exhibitors. And as the School Board has now sanctioned another exhibition, and issued regulations for the guidance of the scholars, Miss Buckton has printed her little book of Lectures in the evident hope that they may be useful in other parts of the country. Being addressed to young children, and written by a lady, there is familiarity of style and a personality in the explanations which, though natural under the circumstances, necessarily make the lectures most suitable for such readers as the audience to whom they were delivered. Each Lecture treats, as a rule, of a single subject, such as the seed, stem, bud, leaf, &c. All the knowledge given is practical and clear. There are many useful woodcuts, and the volume is well calculated to create an interest in botanical knowledge of a more extended character than might be inferred from the title. Indeed the chief objection which might be taken to the book is that it is rather a series of botanical lectures than a treatise on town and window gardening; but although the bulk of each Lecture is given to matters of general interest, there is always sufficient told about the practical applications of the subject to insure the teaching accomplishing the task in which Miss Buckton has interested herself.

Mr. Heath's new volume on "Trees and Ferns"⁶ is a reprint of certain chapters from his former works, "Our Woodland Trees," "The Fern World," and "The Fern Paradise." As they are arranged, they form a welcome introduction to knowledge of ferns and trees, for those who have not yet learned the delight of recognising and studying the plant-life which is within their reach. Ferns occupy much the larger part of the little volume, which is illustrated with a few figures of plants and several charming views of woodland scenery; and we trust that it may lead many readers to seek the fuller pleasure which may be found in the larger works from which these extracts have been gleaned.

The plan of Mr. Blaikie's "Elements of Dynamics"⁷ is excellently suited

⁵ "Town and Window Gardening, including the Structure, Habits, and Uses of Plants." A Course of Sixteen Lectures. By Catherine M. Buckton. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1879.

⁶ "Trees and Ferns." By Francis G. Heath. London: Sampson Low, Marston & Co. 1879.

⁷ "The Elements of Dynamics (Mechanics), with numerous Examples and Examination Questions." By James Blaikie, M.A. Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged, with an Appendix. Edinburgh: James Thin. London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co. 1878.

to the wants of beginners, and especially of young students; and in the greater part of the book he has endeavoured to limit the knowledge required to simple equations and the first two books of Euclid. The chapters relate to kinematics, kinetics, statics, machines, and hydrostatics. The definitions and explanations are remarkable for clearness and brevity; every section is illustrated by examples, some of which are solved. A considerable section of the volume consists of examination papers, which have been set at Oxford, Cambridge, and Edinburgh. The answers to these questions are given, and, where necessary, the solution of the problem is fully worked out. The appendix contains demonstrations of propositions, which involve more mathematics than are required for the body of the work. So clear and useful an introduction to mechanics we do not remember to have met with, and it should do something towards making this subject compulsory in schools where it is not yet generally taught.

Mr. Clements's "Manual of Organic Chemistry"⁸ is a reprint from the *English Mechanic*, with the addition of the papers set in organic chemistry for the last ten years at South Kensington, with the answers worked out. It is obviously not intended to teach organic chemistry so much as to prepare students to pass an examination, which the author has carefully studied. The book possesses the merit of brevity, is elementary, and in general is clear and well stored with facts. The obvious objection to the volume is its effort to dispense as far as possible with practical work, and to substitute "cram" for education in chemistry.

The remarkable discoveries in the practical application of electricity during the last few years have called into existence several books which aim at making these discoveries generally intelligible. The Count du Moncel has written a popular book, well suited for the general reader, alike by its moderate size and by being well translated.⁹ It aims at giving, not merely a history, but an exposition of all that is best worth knowing about, the many forms of telephone and the phonograph. The chief divisions into which the many sections of the book are grouped, are musical telephones, speaking telephones, Bell's telephone and its modifications, experiments with the telephone, the microphone and its applications, call-bells and alarms, the practical uses of the telephone, the phonograph and its uses, and Faber's speaking-machine. It will be found a delightful volume by all who consult it, but, being originally written in French, the mode of thought and expression are sometimes a little more personal than is usually expected in works of a scientific character. It is, however, a matter for congratulation that one so distinguished as the author should have under-

⁸ "A Manual of Organic Chemistry, Practical and Theoretical, for Colleges and Schools, Medical and Civil Service Examinations, and especially for Elementary, Advanced, and Honour Students at the Classes of the Science and Art Department, South Kensington." By Hugh Clements. Blackie & Son, London, Glasgow, Edinburgh, & Dublin. 1879.

⁹ "The Telephone, the Microphone, and the Phonograph." By Count du Moncel, Membre de l'Institut. Authorized Translation, with Additions and Corrections by the Author. With 70 Illustrations on Wood. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1879.

taken the task of expounding some of the most remarkable inventions of recent years.

Mr. Prescott's work¹⁰ on recent electrical inventions, being American, is naturally largely occupied with the results of Mr. Edison's researches and the work of other distinguished Americans, though it is by no means limited to the results obtained on the other side of the Atlantic. It is a magnificently illustrated volume with about 320 well-drawn woodcuts, and is the most complete history and discussion of telephones and allied instruments and the electric light which has come under our notice. It will probably remain a standard work until the progress of discovery leaves it behind, for every instrument of which it treats is explained so fully and illustrated so well that there is but little room left for improvement. The general reader will find it somewhat too technical, but for the student, and all who have sufficient knowledge or interest in the subject, it will be a valuable magazine of information. It is divided into sixteen chapters, which treat of the speaking telephone, Bell's researches, telephone abroad, galvanic music, Edison's researches, electro-harmonic telegraphy, Dolbear's researches, improvements in telephones by Channing, Blake, and others; the talking phonograph, quadruplex telegraphy, call-bells, and the electric light, &c.

Under the editorial hand of Mr. Preece, the late Dr. Noad's "Text-book of Electricity"¹¹ has grown into an admirable handbook of this rapidly expanding science. As the editor observes, his difficulty has been, not to know what to insert but what to exclude. It is difficult always to see on what principle the exclusion has been made when it extends to several forms of electric light and the phonograph. Many of the explanations also seem to suffer from the difficulties of space, and it may now be questionable whether it is necessary to travel in such detail as formerly over discoveries, and instruments which have given place to others which seem likely to bear more abundant fruit; and by judicious abridgment, we think Mr. Preece might have not only somewhat reduced the size of the volume, but have gained space where space was needed for scientific explanations. It might also have been well to have divided the volume into sections corresponding with the main subjects to which it is devoted.

The "Locomotive Engine" is written to show the progress which has been made in improving engines for railways. The first third is an abridgment of Mr. Dempsey's historical account down to 1843.¹² The

¹⁰ "The Speaking Telephone, Electric Light, and other Recent Electrical Inventions." By George B. Prescott. New York: D. Appleton & Co.; London: E. & F. N. Spon. 1879.

¹¹ "The Student's Text-book of Electricity." By Henry M. Noad, Ph.D., F.R.S. A New Edition, carefully Revised, with an Introduction and Additional Chapters. By W. H. Preece, M.I.C.E. With 471 Illustrations. London: Crosby, Lockwood & Co. 1879.

¹² "A Rudimentary Treatise on the Locomotive Engine, comprising an Historical Sketch and Description of the Locomotive Engine." By G. D. Dempsey, C.E. With large Additions treating of the Modern Locomotive. By Kinneir Clark, C.E. London: Crosby, Lockwood & Co. 1879.

remainder of the volume consists of new matter, divided into four sections, which comprise a general description of the locomotive, ten English types of locomotives, special detailed description of the several parts of a modern locomotive, and a chapter on the resistance of trains as resulting from gradients, and from ordinary frictional resistance to traction. The book is clearly written, and well illustrated with numerous plans of engine structure, and forms a valuable handbook—not too elaborate for the general reader, and yet containing a large assemblage of facts which will make it useful to the student of engineering.

The two hundredth volume of "Weale's Elementary Series on Fuel and Combustion" consists of a condensation of two important previous works, with the addition of a large section on modern furnaces and fuels by Mr. Kinnear Clark.¹³ In its present form the work presents a comprehensive account of the practical questions which relate to fuel, and may be recommended to those who require this technical information. The editor commences his portion of the work by an account of the use of coal and the different results which may be obtained from it in various kinds of grates and furnaces, and passes on to mention the use of coke, lignite, asphalt, peat, tan, straw, and cotton-stalks. In certain boilers petroleum is used, and at the end of this part of the work the relative values of the different kinds of fuel are contrasted in tabular form. The remainder of the book gives a brief but admirable account of the many modern furnaces, such as puddling furnaces, blast furnaces, Siemen's regenerative gas furnace, the Ponsard gas furnace, and Mr. Gorman's gas furnace. The work concludes with some account of the use of powdered fuel in puddling furnaces and steam boilers. The explanations are clear and terse, and assisted by a number of well-drawn diagrams and views of machinery.

Monsieur de Quatrefages, Professor of Anthropology in the Museum of the Jardin des Plantes, presents us with a survey of the more general facts which concern the human species in a volume divided into ten books.¹⁴ It is a work, as might be expected, of great learning, admirably expounded; but it is unfortunately translated by some one whose knowledge of French is insufficient, and whose scientific qualifications do not appear to have been always so good as was to be desired. The subjects of the several divisions of the volume are the unity, origin, antiquity, and original localisation of the human species; the migrations which have peopled the globe, acclimatization, the formation of human races, the fossil races of man, and the physical and psychological characteristics of existing peoples. The volume does not open happily, since the first chapter is largely given to a

¹³ "Fuel, its Combustion and Economy; consisting of Abridgments of Treatises on The Combustion of Coal and the Prevention of Smoke," by C. W. Williams, A.I.C.E., and "The Economy of Fuel," by T. Symes Prideaux, with extensive Additions on "Recent Practice in the Combustion and Economy of Fuel, Coal, Coke, Wood, Peat, Petroleum," &c., by the Editor, D. Kinnear Clark, C.E. London: Crosby, Lockwood & Co. 1879.

¹⁴ "The Human Species." By A. de Quatrefages, Professor in the Museum of Natural History, Paris. London: Kegan Paul & Co., Paternoster Row. 1879.

vague discussion of the empires and kingdoms of Nature, leading the author to the conclusion that the human species forms a kingdom distinguished from the animal kingdom by the phenomena of morality and religion. And the second chapter, which treats of the origin of the human race from one or several stocks, is indefinite, and might have been dispensed with, especially as the conclusion to be adopted is left for later enunciation. The third chapter explains the senses in which the term species is used, while the fourth and fifth chapters treat of variations among certain species of plants and animals, and the nature of varieties among the races of men as shown in colour, hair, external form, and skeletal characters. Evidence is then adduced as to the fusion of characters in animal races by inter-crossing, for the purpose of showing that man is no exception to the general rule. But the phenomena resulting from the inter-breeding of the different branches of the human family are those which result from the crossing of races and not of species. The next section of the book is devoted to the views put forward by Darwin, Haeckel, Vogt, Wallace, and Naudin, in spite of which the author feels that he can say nothing in the name of science in answer to the problem of the origin of the human species. With regard to the antiquity of man, the evidence from caves in the South of France and the gravels of the North naturally receives notice; but the author is disposed to admit the claim of man to existence in the Miocene period, in virtue of the discoveries of the Abbé Bourgeois. Next succeeds an exposition of the views of Agassiz as to the division of the human race into natural regions or kingdoms, in illustration of which a few facts are drawn from the distribution of animals. The peopling of the globe by migrations is illustrated by various examples, such as the migration of the Kalmucks, first from China to the Volga, and afterwards back again to the land which they had previously occupied; while in the Polynesian nations the peopling of New Zealand is another example. The evidence concerning acclimatization is important in showing that in almost all cases man, like plants and animals, flourishes better on new than on native soil. The next book is somewhat more speculative, since it deals with the formation of races; but the case rests on such differences as separate the Yankee from the Englishman, which are stated to comprise loss of rosy colour, darkening of the hair, smaller size of the head, slenderer neck, prominence of cheek-bones, more massive lower jaw, elongation of the extremities; and in the woman an approximation of the pelvis to its shape in the man. There are also the well-known mixed races, produced by crossing. The fossil races have only been met with in Europe, and their characters are known from very insufficient material. The author recognises two Dolichocephalic races from Cannstatt and Cro-Magnon, and four Brachycephalic races, two from Furfooz, one from Grenelle, and the other from La Truchère. All these races are treated of fully, and conclusions are elaborated as to their stature and other characteristics. The last two books, treating of the various characteristics of existing races, will be found full of interest from the many osteological and

other well-ascertained facts which are given. The work naturally recalls Oscar Peschel's "Races of Man," but while covering the same ground as the earlier portion of that volume, it treats the subject in a more detailed manner, and entirely omits the discussion of the geographical distribution and characteristics of the human races, which was formerly designated under the name Ethnology, and constitutes the latter and larger part of Peschel's work. Although the author's workmanship is somewhat unequal, the volume constitutes a useful guide to the elements of anthropology.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

THE new volume of the "Annual Register" is quite equal to its old reputation. About one-third of the volume is devoted to English History, half as much again to that of foreign affairs, while the remainder is filled with a careful chronicle. Not the least important part of the work is that which is devoted to State Papers; and when we find among these, besides much correspondence on the Eastern Question, the text of the Berlin Treaty, the Salisbury-Schouvaloff Despatch, which surprised us in the *Globe*, and the despatch on the Vernacular Press of India, we cannot but praise the judicious character of the selection.

Mr. Guest has been giving some Lectures² to the students at the college for Men and Women in Queen Square, and has published them. We are not quite sure that he is right in doing so, for when he began the Lectures he intended, as he tells us, to treat of English Grammar, but was compelled by the barrenness of his subject to wander off into English History. If he had deliberated further, he would perhaps have made another change in his work. Thus, in a History of England of 570 pages, intended for the working classes, we should never have dreamed of devoting 530 to the period before William III. Mr. Guest belongs to the school of Mr. J. R. Green, and therefore his book is not dull; we cannot, however, welcome in it an important addition to our literature.

The Corporation of the City of London have caused to be published an index³ or calendar of certain archives, which are preserved in their Town-Clerk's Record room, covering the period from the middle of Elizabeth's reign to the early portion of that of Charles II. The documents, which are mainly letters between the Corporation and the Government of the day, are arranged in alphabetical order of subjects, which hardly strikes us as being the best system. It is, of course, impossible in our space to give a *resumé* of a book which is itself a *resumé*. We will, however, say simply that this volume, which is

¹ "The Annual Register for 1878." London: Rivingtons.

² "Lectures on the History of England." By M. J. Guest. London: Macmillan & Co.

³ "Analytical Index to the Remembrances, preserved among the Archives of the City of London, 1579-1664." London: Francis & Co.

brought out in a form worthy of the City, will be found a treasure-house for the student of the social history of the eighty-five years which it covers.

The work⁴ which next claims our attention is the fruit of the forced leisure of a statesman of European reputation. In the "King's Secret," however, by the Duc de Broglie, we note a certain diffuseness and thinness of which traces are to be found in the works which other statesmen nearer home have published in the intervals of official business. Among the least foolish of the follies of Louis XV. was that of keeping up a correspondence behind the backs of his Ministers with various agents of more or less disreputable character. A sensual, selfish, and irresolute ruler, like a stupid ruler, is rarely capable of giving his confidence to honest and able men. This distrustfulness sometimes induces him to choose knavish or narrow-minded Ministers. Sometimes, as in the case of Louis XV., it causes him to employ a double set of servants. No proofs are needed of the folly of either system; the ignoble scandal of the Chevalier D'Eon shows the depth into which it degraded the French Court in the last century. The Duc de Broglie's work is mainly filled with the relations of his grand-uncle, the Count de Broglie, with Louis XV. in the latter part of his reign, and treats almost entirely of the affairs of Poland, a portion being devoted to the miserable D'Eon intrigue in London. The book is not interesting, and does not add very much to our knowledge. No one would expect it to show anything to the credit of Louis XV.

Dr. Boulton's History of the Pre-Reformation period in the Church of England⁵ seems to us to be an exceptionally reasonable book among ecclesiastical histories. It is written in a spirit of impartiality which is rare in such books; and the author, although a Divinity Professor, claims to have written on the Church of England rather from a standpoint which regards a nationality, than from one from which a spiritual side is mainly visible. This is a distinct merit in one who is here, at least, a historian, and not a teacher of doctrine; and the author claims it with justice. His pages are not disfigured by that maudlin and unctuous passion for long-forgotten prelates, or by that feminine virulence towards opponents, with which we meet so often in ecclesiastical literature. He has carefully and judiciously studied the real authorities, Kemble, Stubbs, and the Public Records; and has produced a work convenient in size, and, as far as a brief examination enables us to judge, of real critical value.

Dr. Wittich has sent us a very interesting monograph⁶ on Struensee and the sad story of his relations with Queen Matilda of Denmark.

⁴ "The King's Secret: being the Secret Correspondence of Louis XV. with his Diplomatic Agents, 1752-1774." By the Duc de Broglie. 2 vols. London: Cassell, Petter & Galpin.

⁵ "A History of the Church of England, Pre-Reformation Period." By T. Boulton, LL.D., Principal of the London College of Divinity, St. John's Hall, Highbury, and late Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. London: Longmans & Co.

⁶ "Struensee." Von Professor Dr. K. Wittich. Leipzig: Veit & Co.

Of the many romances of history which have a right to be remembered, and yet are forgotten, none perhaps had a better right to be remembered in England than the tragic tale of Queen Matilda, the sister of our respectable George III. Thackeray's true story of the wife of George I., and his fictitious tale of the Princess Olivia in *Barry Lyndon* are both almost pale narratives in comparison with the incidents that happened, barely a century ago, to the grand-aunt of our present sovereign. Brought up by the narrow-minded mother of George III., married at fifteen to Christian VII. of Denmark, who was scarcely older, and who was already almost the impotent idiot that he presently showed himself, Caroline Matilda, a charming girl, of high bearing, noble impulse and large heart, was condemned by State craft to a fate as certain and as cruel as that which, in our old times, intrigue forced upon a generous princess who was born to still higher destinies, and who, after fulfilling them better than her cruel circumstances could allow us to expect, is still living. The miserable Christian VII. soon tired of the new toy, his wife, and presently plunged into the lowest excesses. The young Queen found occupation in the care of her children, to whom she was passionately devoted. In 1768 a German physician, Johann Friedrich Struensee, was recommended by Count Rantzau to the King; and accompanied the latter, as body physician, in a tour of debauch which he made in England and France. By the time of their return he had gained a complete ascendancy over the King, who had become feeble in mind and body. Christian insisted on presenting the physician to his wife, although she objected to Struensee's reputation as a pursuer of women. She was, however, obliged to consult him professionally, and the physician, who was fourteen years older than the girl-queen, and who had all the advantages which the practice of so-called gallantry undoubtedly gives a libertine in the beginning of an acquaintance with an honest woman, soon contrived, firstly, by successful treatment of herself and her children, then by dexterous talk of bringing her husband back to her, of deep sympathy, and presently of her husband's hopeless degradation, to make himself at first agreeable, and then necessary to his royal patient. A few months later, and the indifference of her husband, whose companions were dogs or monkeys, or a couple of negro children, the constant presence of the sympathising strange mind, idleness, youth, hopelessness, made her the physician's victim. Her new passion gave her new strength; she now controlled the willing King, and Struensee ruled both. Those were the days of enlightened despotism; and S. D. Struensee, who was not wanting in head nor altogether in heart, conceived the not ignoble ambition of being a great reformer. In 1770 he brought about the abolition of the Council of State, and was in the next year openly appointed Minister, and promotion was given to his friend Brandt. He made many wholesome reforms; he improved the finances, he abolished torture, and declared all men equal before the law. But he did all this with the same excessive haste which characterised his contemporary, the Emperor Joseph II.; and his reforms increased in the Danish Conservatives the hatred which all men feel for favourites, whilst his

abrupt abolition of sinecures and useless offices raised an army of disendowed pensioners against him. The bitterest amongst his foes was the same Count Rantzau, who had introduced him to the King, and whom the rapid rise of his *protégé* had made envious. The position was one that could not last. An imbecile King in the control of a young Queen to whom he was indifferent; a sympathetic young wife to whom a husband paid not a share of respect; a clever, ambitious, bold man, the absolute master of both; these were persons, these were relations, that could not endure in a State so rotten as Denmark then was. The populace, which is ever conservative at heart, first rose fitfully against the new order of things. As soon as the discontent became serious, Rantzau enlisted the Dowager-Queen Juliana, King Christian's stepmother, who saw with horror the downward path of the Court, and who, though a just woman, has been greatly maligned for her action in this delicate and terrible business. The King was so weak as to count absolutely for nothing; and Brandt, to whom Struensee had entrusted the royal person, had even flogged him. It may therefore well be believed that a little persuasion, or a few threats, were sufficient to make Christian sign anything. He was made to sign orders for the arrest of the Queen, Struensee, and Brandt. These were executed in the night of the 16th—17th January, 1772, Rantzau himself personally superintending the seizure of the Queen with circumstances of great indignity. The catastrophe was rapid enough. The prisoners were questioned separately; and Struensee was guilty of the incredible baseness of confessing his adultery with the Queen, before making what the clergyman who attended him described, in a sensational work which he shortly afterwards published, as a highly edifying end. The miserable man was executed, with his friend Brandt, in the following April. A like fate would probably have been suffered by the Queen, but that her brother's ambassador threatened the approach of the English fleet. She was formally divorced, and sent to Cello, where her ancestress, the guilty wife of George I., had spent the last of her life. There Caroline Matilda lived three years of sorrow, winning the sympathy and love of all around her, until her death, in May, 1775, while yet in her twenty-fourth year. The rapid severity of retribution produced a reaction. Rantzau had to quit Denmark in the same year, 1772. King Christian VII. was deposed, and the Dowager-Queen reigned in conjunction with her own son until 1784, when Christian's son, Frederick VI., seized power. Christian survived in confinement until 1808. It was for a long time endeavoured to deny Caroline Matilda's guilt, although the Queen herself had confessed it; and even the excellent *Conversations-Lexikon* of Brockhaus, published in 1865, doubts it. It was argued that Struensee, who not only owned his compromising crime like a coward, but even declared that he had been kept in it against his will by the Queen, had been forced into a false confession by the threat of torture. Of the Queen's confession, which was made only after she had been informed of that of Struensee, it was said that she too had signed a falsehood in the hope of lessening the punishment of that miserable

man. She was, indeed, noble and generous enough to have dared this; but if it could be demonstrated that such was her motive, this fact would go a great way to prove her guilt. Dr. Wittich has no doubt of her guilt; and he has seen documents which are still sealed to the world, and which even he may not publish. Painful as it is, this romance has its lessons for princes and peoples. None of our royal family, her collateral descendants, nor Prince Christian, her actual descendant, need blush at the name of Caroline Matilda of Denmark; and we will throw no stone at the neglected child-wife who was almost forced into crime. Dr. Wittich has told a story with the judgment of a critical historian, with the eloquence of a ready writer, and with the sympathy of a warm-hearted man.

Mr. Green publishes three small volumes⁷ of passages of English History, selected in chronological order from our leading historians. We confess that we see no great object in publishing these books, rather more than a fifth of which is taken from Mr. Green's own writings. The Editor tells us that he hopes by these extracts to persuade reluctant learners that history is not "dry," and to inspire them with a taste for it. With such an intention we should have made the books cheaper; and in place of some of the descriptions of battles which occupy a great part of the work, we should have given a few stories like that report of the wreck of the *Birkenhead*, which the late King of Prussia ordered to be read at the head of every regiment in his army.

Shoshee Chunder Dutt, Rái Bahádoor, of Calcutta, sends us two handsome volumes⁸ of historical writings, the greater part of which have been favourably noticed by us when published under the pseudonym of "J. A. G. Barton." The author, who writes in very good English, and gives evidence of a very wide and deep study, has made the whole cycle of ancient and modern history his province. One of his volumes is devoted entirely to Indian subjects, and here he is at his best. In the other, which treats of the history of Europe, he has naturally not very much that is new to us; but his generalizations are often striking and original. We note that he has no great dread of Russia in the future, and that he is extremely and unjustly severe on the American character. His books ought to have a great success among those for whom European history is a difficult and foreign subject; and may be studied with great advantage by such Europeans as wish to know how the best Indian minds think about us.

"The History of Travancore,"⁹ by P. Shungoony Menon, is another work which reaches us from India. Of this, however, we have to speak in another tone. Its style and spirit are very different to those of the book last noticed; and it contains a large number of the very

⁷ "Readings from English History." Selected and edited by John Richard Green, M.A., LL.D. 3 Parts. London: Macmillan & Co.

⁸ "Historical Studies and Recreations." By Shoshee Chunder Dutt, Rái Bahádoor. 2 vols. London: Trübner & Co.

⁹ "A History of Travancore from the Earliest Times." By P. Shungoony Menon, Dewan Peishcar of Travancore. Madras: Higginbotham & Co.

worst lithographs which it was ever our misfortune to see. The work appears to be merely a chronicle of public events in the State of Travancore during the last century and a half, written in the driest official style.

Mr. Richard Taylor, son of a former President of the United States, and himself formerly a Lieutenant-General in the Confederate Service, has written a book under the title of "Destruction and Reconstruction,"¹⁰ which describes his experiences during the war, and his opinions of subsequent events. His military narrative is bright and interesting, but is not historically valuable. In his views of what has happened since, he gives vent to a great deal of bitterness, as the following passage, which apparently refers to Simon Cameron, shows:—

"The War Secretary I did not meet. A spy under Buchanan, a tyrant under Lincoln, and a traitor to Johnson, this man was as cruel and crafty as Domitian. I never saw him. In the end, conscience, long dormant, came as Electro, and he was not; and the Temple of Justice, on whose threshold he stood, escaped profanation."

Who "Electro" may be we know not, unless the name refers to the power more commonly known as Alecto. Passing over such light blemishes, Mr. Taylor's book will be found pleasant reading.

In the "Rosicrucians"¹¹ we have come across perhaps the most absurd book that it has ever been our fortune to review. It is nicely got up; it contains some 300 illustrations, many of which, probably with a view to give them due emphasis, are repeated several times in the volume. It affords a great deal of disjointed information of greater or less soundness on very many subjects, including the "Insufficiency of Worldly Objects," the "Fire Theosophy of the Persians," the "Round Towers of Ireland," the "Origin of the Garter," the "Pre-Adamites," &c., but the one subject on which we have vainly sought information in its pages is the History of the Rosicrucians. The Phallos, and its worship, seem to be the most constant matters of the author's study, and we are surprised to find that Mr. Jennings has added some new forms to the very long list of objects in which amateurs of the subject find their favourite emblem. Thus, besides the Pyramids, the Round Towers, the Fleur-de-Lys, the Bonaparte Bee, the Prince of Wales's Feathers, and the Clock Tower of St. Paul's Cathedral in London, are all phallic monuments. A few quotations will best show the character of Mr. Jennings' erudition.

"The round-table of King Arthur (at Winchester), is a grand Mythological Synthesis. . . . Each knight is seated as at the base of an *obelisk*. The architectural "*obeliscar*" form (rayed, or spread, or bladed) is universal, all the world over, both in old and modern times. The Egyptian obelisks are sacred to the Sun. The Paladins of Charlemagne were Twelve in number. The Marshals of France should be twelve in number. The Judges of England, according to an old Constitutional *rationale*, should be twelve; as the number

¹⁰ "Destruction and Reconstruction: Personal Experiences of the late War in the United States." By Richard Taylor, Lieutenant-General in the Confederate Army. Edinburgh: Blackwood & Sons.

¹¹ "The Rosicrucians: their Rites and Mysteries." Second Edition. By Hargrave Jennings. London: Chatto & Windus.

of a Jury are twelve. All these are mythical of the Twelve Signs, or Divisions, of the Zodiac, the Twelve Jewish Tribes, the twelve oracular stones in the breastplate of the High Priest of the Jews, and in the Christian aspect of the mysticism, the Twelve Apostles; with the "Reprobate Condemned Central Sign" as Judas the Traitor. The whole is Cabalistic in the highest degree; and therefore ordinarily unintelligible.

The Order of the Garter, it appears, has quite a different origin to that to which it is usually assigned:—

"The glory of woman, and the punishment of woman after the fall, as indicated in Genesis, go hand in hand. It was in honour of woman and to raise into dignity the expression of the condemned "means," which is her mark and betrayal, but which produced the world, and producing man, &c. . . . It is to glorify typically and mystically this "fleshy vehicle" that the Order of the "Garter" or "Garder," that keeps it sacred, was instituted."

It might perhaps be said of the present passage, too, that it is "Cabalistic," and, therefore, "ordinarily unintelligible;" but there lies under it the insinuation of a filthy and ludicrous origin for the great Order. The whole book is an absurd jumble of passages and illustrations, for most of which no authority is, or could be, given. And through the whole runs a very unwholesome undercurrent.

Miss Yonge has written a "History of France"¹² for Mr. E. A. Freeman's Historical Course for Schools. It appears to be well and carefully written, although somewhat crowded with facts and names. It contains a capital map, showing the dimensions of France at twelve well-selected epochs. We believe this will be found an admirable school-book.

The "Literary Studies"¹³ of the late Walter Bagehot have been collected and edited by his friend Mr. R. H. Hutton, and they form one of the best books of the present quarter. Mr. Hutton's memoir of his friend is a model of what such a sketch should be: written in a tone of affection, but not of mere eulogy, being indeed a criticism. The two volumes contain seventeen Literary Essays, all on English writers, save one, which is devoted to Béranger. All are good, and if we like some (as those on Hartly Coleridge, Lady Mary Wortly Montagu, Cowper, Clough) better than others, it is chiefly because they treat of less familiar subjects. Besides these papers there are others on the *Coup d'Etat* of 1851, and its result in the Cæsarism of 1865, on metaphysical subjects, and on the late Rt. Hon. James Wilson, Bagehot's father-in-law. Every paper in both volumes deserves careful perusal.

We receive an admirable study of Robert Burns,¹⁴ which Professor Shairp has contributed to Mr. John Morley's series of English Men of Letters. The sad story of the poet's life is told with obvious justice and truth, yet with the lightest possible touch on its many painful details. The criticism of Burns' poetry is sound, indeed almost

¹² "History of France." By Charlotte M. Yonge. London: Macmillan & Co.

¹³ "Literary Studies." By the late Walter Bagehot, M.A., and Fellow of University College, London. With a Prefatory Memoir. Edited by Richard Holt Hutton. 2 vols. London: Longmans & Co.

¹⁴ "Robert Burns." By Principal Shairp, Professor of Poetry in the University of Oxford. London: Macmillan & Co.

severe, as being the work of a Scotchman. The following passage will be read with a smile:—

“She sat down at the piano and played several times the air of an old song beginning thus—

‘The robin cam to the wren’s nest,
And keekit in, and keekit in.’

“As soon as Burns had taken in the melody he set to, and in a few minutes composed these beautiful words, the second of the songs which he addressed to Jessy—

‘Oh! wert thou in the cauld blast,’ &c.

“Mendelssohn is said to have so much admired this song that he composed for it what Chambers pronounces an air of exquisite pathos.”

We can assure the Professor that the beautiful music which Mendelssohn composed to this beautiful poem is more certain and more familiar to us of the South than the air with the remarkable refrain which seems so much more real to him. We would, however, be understood as speaking only with the utmost respect and admiration of the Professor’s critical sketch, which for us, and for many others, will be a book of permanent value.

In the same excellent series appears a sketch of Thackeray,¹⁸ by Mr. Anthony Trollope. This is a book, one portion of which has interested us very much, while we are less satisfied with the other. The biographical portion is excellent, and is mainly new; for, as is well known, in deference to the great writer’s strongly-expressed wish, his family have refrained from publishing any picture of his private life. Mr. Trollope, who was his friend, has not violated his wish in this sketch; for he has written in a tone of manly appreciation, and he has recorded only such things as we have almost a right to know about a great public man. He has told us at how comparatively late a period of his too brief life Thackeray began to feel at ease in money matters. He has told us how much sadness there was in his character, and how much he had of that tendency, which Johnson so bitterly deplored in his own case, to put off work. And with these, and a few other lesser strokes, Mr. Trollope gives us a clear and comprehensible idea of the great novelist, whom he pronounces to be “one of the most soft-hearted of human beings, sweet as charity itself, who went about the world dropping pearls, doing good, and never wilfully inflicting a wound.” When, however, we turn to that portion of Mr. Trollope’s book which treats of Thackeray’s writings, we are less pleased; for the critic appears to us to be somewhat capricious, and—a sore fault in the biographer—niggardly in his praise. He attributes to Thackeray’s works that cynicism of which he acquits the man, and he fails to give their due meed even to the *Snob Papers*, to the larger works generally, and especially to *Denis Duval*. Nevertheless, the biographical sketch is sufficient to ensure for Mr. Trollope’s book an ample success.

Mr. J. R. Green is by no means content to rest upon the laurels which he has so well won with his English history; and he is now en-

¹⁸ “Thackeray.” By Anthony Trollope. London: Macmillan & Co.

gaged in editing a series of small volumes upon the chief Greek, Latin, and English classical writers. The first of the volumes on a Greek subject is by Professor Mahaffy,¹⁶ and treats of Euripides. The work is done in a thorough and judicious manner, and in a lively and agreeable style; and, though primarily intended for school use, Professor Mahaffy's little book will convey much solid information to the advanced student of Greek literature.

Mr. Yonge, Professor of Modern History in the Queen's College, Belfast, sends us a volume¹⁷ containing sketches of what he is pleased to term the seven heroines of Christendom, who are, it seems, Joan of Arc, Margaret wife of our Henry VI., Isabella of Castile, Charlotte de Tremouille Countess of Derby, the Empress-Queen Maria Theresa, her daughter Marie Antoinette, and Flora MacDonald. Selections are always invidious; and we need not, perhaps, find much fault with that which Mr. Yonge has made. His book can hardly be ranked among historical works, it being apparently written for the instruction or amusement of young people. For this purpose it seems well suited, as it is written in an easy and simple style, without any great depth of investigation. Mr. Yonge is certainly a most zealous knight of the ladies whom he has chosen.

In "Pillars of the Empire,"¹⁸ Mr. T. H. S. Escott has collected forty-seven short biographies of our chief Indian and Colonial statesmen, which originally appeared in the *Home News*. About half of these papers are by the editor himself, Major Arthur Griffiths being the contributor next in importance. These sketches are not very elaborate as criticisms; but they are remarkably good of their kind, as newspaper sketches.

Mr. Grundy is a gentleman, was born in the North of England, at such a date as to make him a schoolboy in 1830. He was brought up as a civil engineer, and emigrated soon after 1851 to Australia, where he has resided ever since. He has devoted some of his later years to writing a bright and interesting little volume of autobiography.¹⁹ In early life he had the good fortune to be acquainted with the Martineaus, George Stephenson, Leigh Hunt and his family, and the Brontë's. About Patrick, the unhappy brother of the three gifted sisters, he has some details that are very interesting; but scarcely go so far as the author thinks to clear his name from Mrs. Gaskell's severity. Mr. Grundy's early home-memories, then, are sufficiently pleasing; but the English reader will be probably still more interested with his subsequent experiences of the dawn of civilization in Australia. All is told in a bright, cheerful, and modest manner, which will please every reader.

The Arnold Prize at Oxford has been won this year by a namesake,

¹⁶ "Classical Writers." Edited by J. R. Green. "Euripides." By J. P. Mahaffy, A.M., Fellow of Trinity College, and Professor of Ancient History in the University of Dublin. London: Macmillan & Co.

¹⁷ "The Seven Heroines of Christendom." By C. D. Yonge, Regius Professor of Modern History, Queen's College, Belfast. London: Mullan & Son.

¹⁸ "Pillars of the Empire." Edited, with an Introduction, by T. H. S. Escott. London: Chapman & Hall.

¹⁹ "Pictures of the Past: Memories of Men I have Met and Places I have Seen." By F. H. Grundy, C.E. London: Griffith & Farran.

and (unless we are mistaken) grandson of the distinguished man in whose honour it was founded. The Roman System of Provincial Administration²⁰ is the subject of Mr. W. T. Arnold's Essay; and it has received careful and worthy treatment at his hand. A work on a learned subject by a young writer is apt to be very full indeed of learning; and Mr. Arnold's Essay absolutely bristles with names, and cases, and references. This is, however, a very good fault, and we think he may be fairly congratulated on having produced a work which will be of great utility to historical students of much longer standing than himself. He has made a beginning worthy of the great historian whose name he inherits.

Mr. Smiles made a most successful hit a year or two since with his "Life of a Scottish Naturalist," a book which benefited the man whose life it described as well as the author. He now sends us what may be called a companion volume,²¹ which is a biography of another Scottish naturalist in humble circumstances, Robert Dick, baker, of Thurso, who died in 1866. Mr. Dick was perhaps even a more remarkable man than Thomas Edward: and his life exhibits the same noble devotion to science, a devotion faithfully rendered in spite of all the difficulties caused by poverty and the necessary labour of bread-winning. It is, indeed, almost incredible to us matter-of-fact English that men exist who can cherish so constant a love for Nature in face of such discouragement. Happily for us they have existed, and it is by the varied forms of their passion that the world has been enriched with the works of a Burns, a Wordsworth, or a Robert Dick, whose labours in the fields of botany and geology won for him the admiration and friendship of Sir Roderick Murchison and Hugh Miller. He was, however, no mere naturalist. He was, as we have said, a thorough lover of Nature; and that, not only in the positive form of an observer of visible phenomena, but as one who by his letters, if not by his rhymes, proved that he had a by no means small share of the divine gift of expressing his thought. The biography of such a man is a valuable lesson and encouragement for us all, and particularly for those who are beginning life in narrow circumstances. For this reason we should be glad to see the lives of Thomas Edward and Robert Dick published in a cheap form; because the study of their lives would do more good to our poorer classes than hours of talk at Exeter Hall, or pages of watery twaddle in tracts or goody-goody magazines. We will finally express our opinion that Mr. Smiles' time is far better occupied in narrating these noble careers of energetic toil under difficulties than in lauding the accumulation of wealth by a trader of no exceptional gifts unless, perhaps, that of an unusually large feeling of benevolence, like the late Mr. Moore.

²⁰ "The Roman System of Provincial Administration to the Accession of Constantine the Great." Being the Arnold Prize Essay for 1879. By W. T. Arnold, B.A., formerly Scholar of University College, Oxford. London: Macmillan & Co.

²¹ "Robert Dick, Baker, of Thurso, Geologist and Botanist." By Samuel Smiles, LL.D., Author of "Lives of the Engineers," &c. &c. London: John Murray.

Mr. Augustus Hare has done good work in editing the Life and Correspondence of Frances,²² Baroness Von Bunsen, the founder and worthy sharer of the brilliant fortunes of her husband. This lady was the daughter of Mr. Waddington, a somewhat dull and methodical country gentleman, (grand-uncle of the present French Minister), who married, about 1789, Miss Port, the grand-niece and adopted daughter of the famous Mrs. Delany, the "little Portia" of that lady's letters. Not the least interesting part of Mr. Hare's book is the earlier portion, in which we have a pleasant sketch of the intimate relations of the venerable Mrs. Delany with her friends King George III. and his Queen and family. Those relations were not heroic or stately; one day the King brings the old lady "a gold knotting-shuttle," on another the Queen comes to dine with her "on veal cutlets and orange pudding;" but they are very friendly and pleasant, and confirm the best of our thoughts of the King. Indeed, the reputation of George III. is one that gains by familiarity; and that, not only for purity of private character, but (in spite of the narrow obstinacy of his conscience) for intelligence. Frances Waddington was born in 1791. She was well trained by an excellent mother; and she early gave signs of a remarkable mind. Mrs. Waddington brought up her children in their secluded home at Llanover on the wise principle of not forcing or overloading the mind; she encouraged a practice of self-examination or reflection after study; and above all she insisted that whatever was done was done thoroughly. In 1816 the family went to Italy, where they met Christian Carl Bunsen, then a young professor in very slender circumstances staying in Rome for purposes of study, and also in order to be near his idol Niebuhr, their Prussian Minister at the Roman Court. The next year Frances married Bunsen, who thus attained a position of comparative affluence. Their joint life, until the death of the husband in 1860, appears to have been one of rare happiness. Bunsen was soon after his marriage appointed Secretary of Legation under Niebuhr; and on the historian's retirement in 1823 became *Chargé d'Affaires*, and presently Minister. He had greatly impressed King Friedrich Wilhelm III. in a visit which the latter paid to Italy; and he became, as is well-known, a very intimate friend of his son and successor Friedrich Wilhelm IV. They had a certain dreamy idea of religion, Protestant, yet artistic, in common, which, however, led to nothing more definite than the foundation of that bishopric of Jerusalem which is troubling many ecclesiastical heads at the present moment. In 1838 Pope Gregory XVI. became dissatisfied with Bunsen, and procured his recall; and this circumstance gave Frau Bunsen the opportunity of visiting home for the first time after an absence of twenty-two years. Bunsen was employed for a short time as Minister to Switzerland; but the accession of his friend the Crown Prince gave him in 1841 the post of Minister at the Court of St. James', which he held until 1854. He then retired with his wife to

²² "The Life and Letters of Frances, Baroness Bunsen." By Augustus J. C. Hare, Author of "Memorials of a Quiet Life," &c. 2 vols. London: Daldy & Isbister.

Heidelberg, and afterwards to Bonn, where he died in 1860. His widow was then called upon to superintend the children of a deceased daughter, and for this purpose resided at Carlsruhe until her death in 1876. Mr. Hare has allowed her to write her own story with her own pen; for these volumes consist almost entirely of letters, or extracts from the baroness' diary; and this is, we think, the only method of treating properly a life which does not owe its interest to great public achievements. Frau von Bunsen's letters are most interesting; her own and her husband's position gave her the opportunity of meeting all the best people of her day, and she wrote with an easy and graphic pen. She has many pleasing passages about Queen Victoria's earlier Court; and these, like all the many side-lights that have lately been cast upon the Queen's life tend only to increase our respect for our Sovereign. In her family relations the baroness was most happy; a loving woman, she gained the warmest love of all around her. Her biography, treated with great delicacy and skill by Mr. Hare, will be widely read and admired.

Mr. Pinkerton has translated²⁸ Professor W. Müller's sketch of Count Moltke, and Captain H. M. Hozier "edits" the work, though what that accomplished soldier's exact share in the work has been there is little to show. We can hardly suppose that he is responsible for devoting the first chapter of the book to the Austrian campaign of 1866, and then beginning the second chapter with the hero's birth, and so continuing in chronological order to the end; yet thus is the remarkable system adopted. Moltke, like Blücher, is a Mecklenburger. He was born in 1800, was brought up at the Copenhagen Military School, and served for a short time in the Danish army, in which circumstance he again resembles Blücher. In 1822 he resigned, and entered the Prussian service. He did not attain his captaincy until he was thirty-five, which should be an encouragement to many men. In 1835 he visited Turkey on leave of absence; but circumstances detained him there for four years, and he shared the Turkish campaign of 1839 against Mehemet Ali. In 1841 he published his "Letters from the East," which are lively, and also of great scientific value. In 1842 he married Miss Burt, his sister's daughter by an English husband. This lady died in 1868. In 1845 he published a criticism of the Russo-Turkish war of 1829; and, in the same year, he visited Rome as aide-de-camp to the King's uncle, Prince Heinrich. Here he increased his reputation by the execution of a very excellent map of the city and its environs. He became a lieutenant-colonel in 1850, and five years later was appointed equerry to a person whom the editor or translator calls the "Crown Prince," but as there was no Crown Prince in Prussia between 1840 and 1861, it is not clear whether the Prince of Prussia (the present Emperor) or his son, who became Crown Prince in 1861, is referred to. This post gave Moltke an opportunity of visiting Russia (whence he wrote some excellent letters published recently), England, and France. Of Napoleon III.

²⁸ "Field-Marshal Count Moltke, 1800-1878." By Professor W. Müller, of Tübingen. Translated, with the Author's sanction, by Percy E. Pinkerton; and edited by Captain H. M. Hozier. London: Sonnenschem,

he wrote favourably, and of the Empress with great admiration. After a review the infant Prince Imperial, whose sad fate has just given Europe such a shock, "came back from a drive. We rode up to him with the Emperor, whose face was beaming with delight, and really he is a fine little fellow." When Prince Wilhelm became Regent of Prussia in 1857 he at once placed Moltke at the head of the General staff; and the career of the great strategist since that time has been a matter of European history. Moltke is by no means the saturnine man that he is often represented to be. His letters contain much fun and cheerfulness. Nor is he so silent as not to speak (and speak wisely) in all important military debates; and his speeches contain many passages that we could wish to hear in our own Parliament. Thus—

"I have only to quote statistics to show that officers are an important element in the conduct of a campaign. We have one to every fifty men, and in every *twenty men we lose* one officer"

"To leave a country defenceless would be the greatest crime a Government could commit. It must not be forgotten that the results of many years of economy in peace may be all lost in one year of war. . . ."

"Any shifting of figures (in number of the army) introduces an element of uncertainty which will hinder the vast and minute preparations which must long precede our attitude of quiet confidence in anticipating an attack. It must be borne in mind that any diminution in numbers reacts for twelve years, and who can venture to predict that in twelve years' time we shall have peace or war?"

Moltke's great successes, his loyalty, his modest but strong common sense, give him a position which may be compared with that of the great Duke of Wellington in his later years. His biography will be thoroughly worthy of study; but it will not be possible to write it worthily for years to come. The present work is good enough as a brief and temporary sketch.

BELLES LETTRES.

QUALIS ab incepto. As "Saul Weir"¹ began, so it ends. It commenced with fine writing, and it finishes with fine writing. It began with loud jokes, and it ends with loud jokes. The great defect of the work and of its predecessor has been the writer's want of sincerity. He is always writing for effect. Take, for instance, the twenty-first chapter of the eleventh part. When a writer calls a decoy pond "the Venice of the kingfisher," and compares the walled-up arch of a bridge to "the nethermost chamber of the Pyramids," and when in addition to all this he talks about bitterns as familiarly as if they were water-hens, and about oak trees being "clouded with mistletoe," we feel that he is laying on colour for mere colour's sake.

¹ "The Cheveley Novels. Saul Weir." Parts XI. and XII. London and Edinburgh: William Blackwood & Sons. 1879.

No doubt young ladies like to read about the bitterns, "who make graceful ascents at sunset," and "the clouding of the oaks with mistletoe." But whereabouts in Suffolk we should like to know are bitterns to be seen "making graceful ascents at sunset," and where, too, are oaks to be met with "clouded with mistletoe?" Did the writer of "Saul Weir" ever see the mistletoe on an oak? If he has he has been luckier than many botanists, who have spent their lives in looking for it on that tree. But the descriptions in "Saul Weir" are really good when compared with the attempts at humour. How any one could write the twenty-ninth chapter of the twelfth part and think that it was humorous is beyond us. The wit, if it can be called wit, is of that lowest and broadest order which mistakes one word for another. However, there must be people who relish it or else "Saul Weir" would not be published. "Saul Weir" is to us a convincing proof how low is the standard of literary taste among novel readers in England.

How is it Mr. Payn² does not hold a higher position as a novelist than he does? In many respects he is superior, as, for instance, in plot, and, what is more important than plot, in style and humour to Mr. Trollope. He is inferior in descriptive power and in poetical feeling to Mr. Black, Mr. Blackmore, and Mr. Hardy, but in nothing else. Perhaps the real reason is that cultivated readers were driven away from Mr. Payn's early novels by his sensation scenes. Only the subscribers to Mudie's know him. No novelist, however, has improved so much as Mr. Payn. He still for our taste deals far too much in sensation. In "Under One Roof" we have certainly a very liberal allowance. Still it is well managed, and, to use a hackneyed phrase, readers who begin the tale will certainly not leave off till the last page.

"Why is a watch-dog larger by night than by day?" is the riddle which Sir Mark Morton puts to the heroine of Mrs. Hunt's excellent story "Basildon."³ We shall no more think of giving the answer than of disclosing Mrs. Hunt's plot. We shall send our readers to the novel itself for both, and we think they will be grateful to us.

"Airy Fairy Lilian"⁴ is somewhat more airy than fairy. Of all characters such a one is the most difficult to draw. The slightest heaviness of touch, the least faltering in the outline, at once spoils the picture. She is, of course, very beautiful, and has golden hair. But she has also what we have never before met with in a novel, "great velvety eyes," such we suppose as Homer describes Juno as having. However, we cannot go on any further with the charms of the heroine, and must content ourselves with saying that the female characters are the best done, and that the book is pre-eminently readable.

² "Under One Roof. An Episode in a Family History." By James Payn, Author of "By Proxy," "Less Black than We're Painted." London: Chatto & Windus. 1879.

³ "Basildon." By Mrs. Alfred W. Hunt, Author of "Thornicroft's Model," "Under Seal of Confession," &c. London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1879.

⁴ "Airy Fairy Lilian." By the Author of "Phyllis," "Molly Bawn." London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1879.

But a still better novel—in fact, by far the best novel of the quarter—is General Hamley's "The House of Lys."⁵ Here the men are drawn with a firm, masterly hand, and the world is described by one who has studied it from many sides. As we have before said, General Hamley understands what drawing character really means. His men are not shadows, but such as may be met with in everyday life. Colonel Mackenzie, Major Warner, and Du Lys are all, in their different ways, admirable.

Of the remaining novels we must speak very briefly. To tell the truth, many of them do not even deserve the slightest notice. Miss or Mrs. Lumsden⁶ has, for instance, the whole art of novel-writing to learn. She has only a very faint conception of either plot, interest, or character-drawing. The "Mate of the Jessica"⁷ is, as its title indicates, a seafaring tale, and more adapted to the young and uncritical than to anybody else. Two love stories may be classed together—Miss Patrick's "Mr. Leslie of Underwood"⁸ and Miss Chapman's "The Gift of the Gods."⁹ The first is, perhaps, the best written, but both may be recommended to ladies who like such stories. Miss Jefferis's "Some of Life's Lessons"¹⁰ is somewhat more didactic, but is not ungracefully written. It has the advantage, too, of being compressed into one volume. "The Sherlocks"¹¹ is a book which should be spoken of with respect. The writer is an artist, and spares no pains over his work. Novel readers are unfortunately like dram-drinkers, and require every time a stronger stimulant. We are afraid that in these days of sensational writing that Mr. Saunders' story will hardly meet with that recognition which it deserves. To those, however, who do care for still life, and for scenes truthfully painted and carefully elaborated, we can strongly recommend "The Sherlocks."

There still remain one or two more novels which we must dismiss with a still briefer notice. Mrs. H. Martin's "For a Dream's Sake"¹² is readable; and the same may be said for "Patty's Dream."¹³ The most curious thing, however, is the number of translations of German novels which we have received. Curiously enough, too, not one of them is good for much. Perhaps one of the best is "The Hour Will

⁵ "The House of Lys: our Book of its History." By Major-General W. G. Hamley. London and Edinburgh: William Blackwood & Sons. 1879.

⁶ "Won, but Lost; or, The Mine Sprung at the Wizard's Point." By Marianne H. Lumsden. London: Kerby & Endean. 1879.

⁷ "Mate of the Jessica. A Story of the South Pacific." By F. F. Moore. London: Marcus Ward & Co. 1879.

⁸ "Mr. Leslie of Underwood. A Story with Two Heroes." By Mary Patrick. Author of "Marjory Bruce's Lovers." London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1879.

⁹ "The Gift of the Gods." By M. F. Chapman, Author of "A Scotch Wooing." London: Chapman & Hall. 1879.

¹⁰ "Some of Life's Lessons." By Mary Jefferis, Author of "Gertrude's Trial." London: Remington & Co.

¹¹ "The Sherlocks." By John Saunders, Author of "Abel Drake's Wife," "Hirrell," "Israel Mort Overman," &c. &c. London: Strahan & Co. 1879.

¹² "For a Dream's Sake." By Mrs. H. Martin. London: Griffith & Farran. 1879.

¹³ "Patty's Dream." By D'Aubigoe White. London: Remington & Co. 1879.

Come,"¹⁴ but we have found it dreadfully heavy. "The Book with Seven Seals,"¹⁵ too, is nearly equally dull. Why on earth should our publishers take the trouble to go to Germany for dull novels, when they have such an over-abundant supply at home? Not long ago two rival publishing firms were actually bringing out two different translations of the same novel—a novel which could not possibly interest English readers. Of the other translations of German novels, we can merely mention two—"The Marriage Tie"¹⁶ and "A Son of Sweden,"¹⁷ but we cannot recommend either of them.

Mr. Browning will no doubt have his admirers, and will be as popular as ever, even after the publication of his "Dramatic Idyls."¹⁸ It is useless to criticise him, and after his outrageous language three years since to one of his reviewers, few will care to undertake such a thankless task. We should be the last to deny Mr. Browning's great gifts, his command of language and rhythm, supreme in this amongst contemporary poets, his fertility of invention, his power of story-telling, his dramatic instinct, supreme again in this also, but all these precious gifts, so rarely united in one man, appear to us abused and distorted in "Dramatic Idyls." All of the stories are powerful, that is to say painful, for pain and power seem to be synonymous in Mr. Browning's later poems. They do not, however, show the fault of obscurity. The language is plain enough. It suits the characters with admirable propriety. Whether "Ned Bratts" is doggerel or poetry the world must decide. No man is ever written down but by himself. We should fancy that "Ned Bratts" will do Mr. Browning more harm than the most hostile critics could do.

Few literary offences are worse than one which is now so common, of publishing writings which their author wishes to destroy. Not long ago, as we have just been reminded by a certain trial, some of the early pieces of Mr. Browning were raked up out of obscurity. Mr. Tennyson has himself protested against such injustice. But he, too, has fallen a victim to the morbid curiosity of the public taste. From the short preface to "The Lover's Tale"¹⁹ we learn that it was written in his nineteenth year, and that two out of the three parts were printed. Mr. Tennyson, however, "feeling the imperfection of the poem, withdrew it from the press." Here the matter should have rested. Mr. Tennyson is by far the best judge of his own powers. But the world was stronger than Mr. Tennyson. The two parts, he adds, "have been mercilessly pirated, and what I deemed scarce worthy

¹⁴ "The Hour will Come." From the German of W. von Hillern. By Clara Bell. London: Sampson Low & Marston. 1879.

¹⁵ "The Book with Seven Seals." From the German of Carl Adalbert. London: Remington & Co. 1879.

¹⁶ "The Marriage Tie." From the German of Johannes von Dewell. By K. E. Stautel. London: Remington & Co. 1879.

¹⁷ "A Son of Sweden." From the German of C. F. Van der Velde. By Christina Tyrrell. London: Remington & Co. 1879.

¹⁸ "Dramatic Idyls." By Robert Browning. London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1879.

¹⁹ "The Lover's Tale." By Alfred Tennyson. London: C. Kegan Paul, 1879.

to live is not allowed to die." In self-defence, therefore, Mr. Tennyson has republished the two parts with various omissions and amendments, together with the third part, and the sequel already known to the world under the title of the "Golden Supper." We thoroughly sympathise with Mr. Tennyson. We hold that the poet is the only judge of his own works, and it rests with him only as to what shall be given and what shall not be given to the world. We do not for one moment pretend to know what were the reasons which led Mr. Tennyson to withdraw the first two parts of "The Lover's Tale" after they had been printed. We can, however, guess at the reason why in after years he should be reluctant to see them republished. One of the first things which must strike the most unobservant reader in reading these first two parts is that we see in them the germs of Tennyson's characteristics,—his own, for it is entirely his own, blank verse, its peculiar cadences and rhythm, his peculiar vein, too, of reflection, and his own characteristic landscapes set as only he can set them. All these things are here, but they are drawn with a certain unsteadiness. The hand has not yet obtained its full power. The most beautiful passage, and the most Tennysonian, may be found at page 25, beginning—

"Never yet
Before or after have I known the spring
Pour with such sudden deluges of light
Into the middle summer; for that day.
Love, rising, shook his wings and charged the winds
With spiced May-sweets from bound to bound."

This is indeed very beautiful, and would appear to us far more beautiful, were it not for the still finer passage in "The Gardener's Daughter." That passage until now stood unrivalled and unique in English poetry. As it now is, each passage does the other injury. The glories of the maturer piece dim the beauty of the earlier, whilst the earlier piece, if we may use such a term, discounts the later. We might pick out several more passages, which, as we read them, involuntarily suggest similar comparisons. These two parts are undoubtedly very beautiful; but when they are compared with Tennyson's best work, are undoubtedly crude. This, however, is the highest compliment we can pay him. The poet who in his nineteenth year wrote such lines as—

"Cries of the partridge, like a rusty key
Turned in a lock, owl-whoop and dorchawk-whir" (p. 61),

in after years rose to such felicities as "the garnet-headed yaffingale," and "the sea-blue bird of March." Of course as a means of illustrating the growth of Tennyson's mind these two parts will be invaluable, but Tennyson may think that this is not the exact end of poetry. We repeat that we thoroughly sympathise with him under the circumstances. With regard to the device of tagging on "The Golden Supper" at the end, we cannot regard it as very happy. It looks very much as if a man's head had been stuck on to a boy's figure.

Mr. Anderson²⁰ does not grow. He has undoubtedly a great flow of language, no small command of rhyme, and a certain rhythmical sweetness, and a deep love of Nature. But he deals too much with mere appearances. All is from the outside. Whether he is describing a steam-engine or a flower, he paints only the exterior. He does not yet appear to have learnt that the highest poetry is "the beauty of ideas as distinct from the beauty of things." Nor is he by any means always happy in his descriptions. There is a want of originality. His images and pictures suggest those of other poets. When we read of a lake "with golden lilies, double in their bloom," we naturally think of Wordsworth's swan that "floats double, swan and shadow." When we read immediately after how the heron

"Kept eager watch, nor stirred upon his post,
But stood a feathered patience waiting prey,"

we are reminded of Hood's "sentinel heron." When, too, again, on the next page, the primrose is called "yellow star of earth's green sky," Longfellow's "flowers, stars that in earth's firmament do shine," unconsciously recur to the mind. We are sorry to speak in what may seem so disparaging a strain, but we fear that Mr. Anderson runs the risk of being spoilt by too much flattery. Poetry must be judged as poetry. To say that "Ballads and Sonnets" is a very wonderful production for a person in Mr. Anderson's position is true enough, but it is not any criticism upon the real merits of the poetry. They are, we may most truly add, very extraordinary poems, considering the enormous difficulties under which they have been produced. But if Mr. Anderson wishes to do real justice to his undoubted powers he must devote very much more time and labour to his poems than he appears to have done, and must, above all things, be on his guard against that gift of fluency of language, which may, in the long run, turn out to be a fatal curse.

"Elflora of the Susquehanna"²¹ is heralded by a strange preface. The author appears to have published the poem lest, after his death, "it might fall into the hands of a literary pirate, or it might be brought out in a garbled edition, a disgrace to the author, and an insult to the heroine." We think that the most hardened literary pirate would scarcely publish such a rhyme as the opening verses of the poem give us,—

"Throughout all Nature hath a change begun,
The forest shades proclaim the spring hath come" (p. 1).

We doubt, too, if any literary pirate could disgrace the author much more than his own want of ear does, in—

"And this dark forest now in sombre gloom,
Which is to me more dear than grey saloon" (p. 8).

²⁰ "Ballads and Sonnets." By Alexander Anderson ("Surfaceman"), Author of "Songs of the Rail," "The Two Angels," "A Song of Labour," &c. &c. London: Macmillan & Co. 1879.

²¹ "Elflora of the Susquehanna." A Poem by C. Harlan, M.D. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co.; London: Trübner & Co. 1879.

Lastly, we think that the literary pirate could not insult the heroine much more than the author does himself, when he rhymes about her in this fashion—

“Keen be thy sorrow, pure and lovely one!
To parents’ will thy mind could not succumb” (p. 14).

In all these *Thymes* it would appear to be the writer’s object “to publish the bans of marriage between M. and N.”

“*The Death of Phidias*”²² is a difficult book to review. A critic would be perfectly safe if he contented himself with saying that the poem was far above the average. If he went on to add that the writer showed promise of future excellence, he might be raising hopes which would only be doomed to disappointment. It is very difficult to say what seeds will bear fruit and what will not. Most probably the poem will be totally unnoticed by the critics, and the writer, crushed by the disappointment, will turn aside from poetry to other pursuits. We cannot say whether this would be the wiser plan or no, for so much, in short everything, depends upon a writer’s own force of character, and his circumstances and surroundings. One thing, however, is certain, that the writer is in this case imbued with a deep sense of beauty, and has drunk in his inspiration, like Keats, from classic sources.

Very different are the sources which inspire Mr. Bevington,²³ from whose book also it is very difficult to form any judgment on the writer’s future. Here we encounter the problems and difficulties of modern thought. “What are we to do to help the world on its way?” is the question asked on the first page, and the answer is, “To live by the last-learned law is more than to praise and to pray,” and we seem to find the same answer in the third page—

“Free, and yet fast; fast and for ever free,
Led in the line of law to liberty.”

The great danger which we think Mr. Bevington runs is that of falling into the use of too scientific a terminology. His fine poem “*Unto This Present*” does not entirely escape from this mistake. “To sing of evolution” (p. 29) is indeed a worthy theme—perhaps the highest. Mr. Bevington has made the attempt. If he is a young man, he may succeed. The piece which we like the best is “*Temptation*.” Here, again, the problems of modern thought are touched upon, but touched upon so subtly and delicately that they do not obtrude themselves, and would not probably be even guessed at by the ordinary reader. There is more of the true human element, from which poetry can never be divorced, in this than in many other of Mr. Bevington’s pieces. The book certainly shows one of the rarest qualities in modern poetry—thought.

Little need be said of the “*Bride of Venice*.”²⁴ The author has got hold of a dramatic tale, but he does not possess one single poetic

²² “*Phidias, and Other Poems*.” By E. M. Thompson. London: Remington & Co. 1879.

²³ “*Key-Notes*.” By L. S. Bevington. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1879.

²⁴ “*The Bride of Venice*.” By J. S. Fletcher. London: W. Poole. 1879.

gift. Little, too, need be said of "Elnora."²⁵ The author has a fatal facility for rhyming, and could apparently have written another closely-printed volume on the same or any other subject. "A Lyric of the Fairy Land"²⁶ is, we suppose, a first production. It shows a certain sense of beauty, and no little imaginative power. But Fairy-land is a dangerous country to enter. Most young poets, however, venture there. It is not till later in life that they find out how difficult is the task which they have attempted.

We do not know whether the letters which introduce us to the play of "Martin Luther"²⁷ are genuine or not, but they certainly do not form a very good introduction. We should have imagined that the author of "Flowers of Passion" was not exactly the man to treat such a subject as Martin Luther. Our surmise proves to be only too correct. The blank verse is little else but prose, and the songs mere doggerel. Professor Blackie²⁸ would certainly have treated the subject far more sympathetically, but he has ventured into fields where we certainly do not think that he is so much at home. We cannot in this section possibly examine his views—how far he has read between the lines, and how far he has, rightly or wrongly, represented modern ideas—but must content ourselves with saying that it is a book which is sure to be read not only by his admirers but by all who are interested in ancient philosophy and thought.

Mr. Symonds's "Sketches and Studies in Italy"²⁹ show a great advance, as far as mere style is concerned, over many of his previous works. He does not allow his fancy to run riot quite so wildly. He has restrained the exuberance of his rhetoric, and pruned down his epithets. It is no small compliment to say that we have a distinct recollection of most of the essays in the present volume, and that we did not only enjoy them when they first appeared, but have still more enjoyed them on a second reading. Still there are passages even in the present volume which, we think, offend against perfect good taste. Thus, when Mr. Symonds is describing love as pictured by Lucretius, he adds, "Both the pleasures and pains of love are conceived on a gigantic scale, and described with an irony that has a growl of a roused lion mingled with its laughter." We are at a loss to conceive how this simile at all helps to explain the *hominum divomque voluptas*, *alma Venus* of Lucretius. Besides, it looks as if Mr. Symonds had confused a lion with a hyæna. Many more such passages might be picked out, but they are much fewer than in previous essays. We must, too, confess that this essay

²⁵ "Elnora. An Indian Mythological Tale in Six Cantos." By Frère Tolingsby. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1879.

²⁶ "A Lyric of the Fairy Land." By A. E. Waite. London: J. E. Catty. 1879.

²⁷ "Martin Luther. A Tragedy." By G. Moore and B. Lopez. London: Remington & Co. 1879.

²⁸ "The Wise Men of Greece. Dramatic Dialogues." By Professor Blackie. London: Macmillan & Co. 1877.

²⁹ "Sketches and Studies in Italy." By John Addington Symonds, Author of "The Renaissance in Italy," "Studies of the Greek Poets," &c. London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1879.

on Lucretius is one of the most tantalizing in the book. When Mr. Symonds writes, "it would be beyond the scope of this essay to discuss the particular form given by Lucretius to the Democritean philosophy," we feel that he is leaving undone precisely what he ought to do. We feel grateful to him, however, for pointing out in a passage, which is far too short, the principal points of resemblance, and also of difference between the Lucretian philosophy and the modern doctrine of evolution. This is the really valuable part of the essay, but it is not sufficiently worked out. Very much more might be said on the subject. We trust that in the next edition Mr. Symonds will expound this portion. When Sellar's well-known essay appeared the doctrine of evolution had not then assumed the gigantic proportions which it has since done, and an entirely new field of inquiry is consequently opened up to any writer upon Lucretius. We need not say that Mr. Symonds does full justice to the poetical beauties of the great philosophic poet which have been so unaccountably depreciated by a recent writer. Of the purely literary articles, the one on England's literary debt to Italy will probably be the most interesting to Englishmen. With it, however, should be read three admirable papers, one on blank verse, another on its history, and a third on the blank verse of Milton, which for some reason or another are relegated to an appendix at the end of the work. The criticism on Marlowe's versification is most interesting. It was he really, as Mr. Symonds rightly points out, who breathed a new spirit into the metre. He understood the harmonies of "long-resounding and full-vowelled" words, and the use, too, of monosyllables and the charms, generally so dangerous, of alliteration. Equally true are Mr. Symonds's criticisms on Shakespere's versification. The following passage, with one or two slight reservations, appears to us on the whole very just:—"Shakespere has more than Marlowe's voracity and power. . . . He restrains his own luxuriance, and does not allow himself to be seduced by pleasing sounds. His finest passages owe none of their beauty to alliteration, and yet he knew most exquisitely how to use that meretricious handmaiden of melody." Mr. Symonds goes on to observe, that in Shakespere the words seem always to adjust themselves to the thoughts—noble words ever answering to noble thoughts. Of course, great exceptions occur. Speaking, however, generally, we think that Mr. Symonds is in the main right. The fact was, as Mr. Symonds also notices, that a sense of rhythm seemed to be spontaneous in the Elizabethan age. Ben Jonson, Beaumont, and Fletcher, Webster, Decker, Massinger, Heywood, and Middleton, all possessed it in different degrees. Towards the end of the second essay, Mr. Symonds makes what we think is a most valuable suggestion, that the English language can be made "perfectly lyrical and musical without the need of stanzas or rhyme." This is an idea which we certainly think may some day bear fruit. Blank verse has often been called a "noble blunder," and a "splendid heresy," but we believe that there is still a glorious future reserved for it in new forms. Blank verse, as Mr. Symonds well says, is the "metro of genius, and is only successfully used by indubitable poets, and is no favourite in a mean, contracted, and unimaginative age."

We wish that we had space to say something on the last essay upon Milton's blank verse. All three essays, however, are worthy of the deepest attention. One or two slight inaccuracies occur. Here, for instance, is one in a quotation from Ben Jonson's "Sad Shepherd,"

"Her treading would not bend a blade of grass,
Or shake the downy blue bell from his stalk."

What is "a downy blue bell?" Ben Jonson wrote not blue bell, but "blow-ball," still a provincial name, we believe, in some parts of England, for the dandelion when seeding. The allusion is to children blowing away the winged seeds, so as to tell the hour of the day by the number of puffs which they are obliged to give. For this reason the plant is also provincially called "clock."

The change from Mr. Symonds to Mr. Bellamy³⁰ is indeed great. If Mr. Symonds does not always write with that restraint and severity which marks the highest art, we still feel everywhere the presence of culture and scholarship and liberal sympathies. On the other hand, Mr. Bellamy's style is loud and rampant. There is a want of culture and refinement in the general tone. It is not so much what he says, as his manner of saying it, which is offensive. We may agree with him, but we, at the same time, wish he would put his opinions in another form. His style is aggressive. Americans, whenever they write upon Shakespeare, fall into the same mistake. They copy Shakespeare's worst blunder—become spasmodic. Again, most writers upon Shakespeare fall into the mistake, which Socrates notices people make when they write about love; try not who can say the truest things, but who can say the finest and loudest things. Again, most writers upon Shakespeare fall into the blunder of attributing to Shakespeare the views which he puts into the mouths of his characters. Mr. Bellamy is not quite free from either of these errors. Here and there in the book are some sensible remarks, but they sometimes have nothing, as far as we can see, particularly to do with Shakespeare, and would have been far better in an essay upon social subjects. Mr. Bellamy has evidently thought for himself, but requires much training before he can do himself justice. He has, however, seized upon one or two points in Shakespeare's plays, which are characteristic of all great minds in all ages; his wide sympathy with every form of suffering, and his tolerance of opinion and creed, and his firm faith, if not in the actual and visible triumph of goodness over evil, in, at all events, its utility, and in the practice of virtue for virtue's sake alone. It is something to have done this. We can only regret that Mr. Bellamy should have adopted such a bombastic style, which will simply make his book intolerable to most cultivated minds. Again, he should have avoided such a gross blunder as calling the wife of Socrates "Zantope" (p. 75).

"Ah!" said Heine, "that Xanthippe's husband should have become so great a philosopher is remarkable. Amidst all the scolding to

³⁰ "Essays from Shakespeare." By G. Somers Bellamy, Author of "The New Shakespearean Dictionary of Quotations," "Two Wedding Rings," &c. Edinburgh: The Edinburgh Publishing Company; London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co. 1879.

be able to think. But he could not write; that was impossible. Socrates did not leave behind him a single book." To an innumerable number of good things like this will Mr. Snodgrass's book²¹ introduce the English reader. We have had plenty of translations of Heine's poems, most of them indifferent enough, but, as far as we are aware, no version of any of his prose works; which, of course, can be better rendered. Our thanks are therefore doubly due to the translator for his most welcome volume. To the translation there is prefixed a most interesting introduction, which gives the general reader a very good idea of Heine's character and the peculiarities of his style. How well and how sympathetically the work has been done may be seen by the following extracts, which illustrate different sides of Heine's character:—"If some day the sky were to shower down crown pieces I should get nothing but a broken head, whilst the children of Israel joyfully gathered the silver manna." Here, again, is another which brings to light the deeper side of his poetic nature: "Quite a strange elevation of soul takes possession of me when I walk alone at gloaming by the seashore, behind me nothing but flat dunes, before me the heaving immeasurable sea, over me the sky, like a great crystal dome. I seem then to myself so ant-like in my insignificance, and yet my soul takes such a world-wide flight." Our own Pugin used to say that there were only two things he cared for, the sea and Gothic architecture; but Heine continues in a loftier strain: "Never was cathedral vast enough for me. My spirit, with its old Titanic aspirations, cleaves upwards to heights beyond the gothic pillars, and would fain pierce the roof itself." Here is one more extract in a very different vein, but which will illustrate, some of Heine's views on women: "The music at a marriage procession always reminds me of the music of soldiers entering upon a battle." In conclusion, let us strongly recommend the book to all English readers if only for one reason, they will see Englishmen painted as they are seen by others, and we may hope will by this means learn to be ashamed of our narrow sectarianism, and our insular pride and superciliousness, which have, we fear, scarcely decreased since Heine's day.

Mr. Paton continues his "Hamnet Shakespere,"²² and gives us Cymbeline for the Third Part. As we have said, we must know a great deal more about the usage of capital letters in other Elizabethan works before we can decide upon the value of Mr Paton's theory. It is a subject which might be most profitably investigated by the New Shakespere Society. We should, for instance, like to know what was the proportion of capital letters in Beaumont and Fletcher and Ben Jonson. To his edition of Cymbeline Mr. Paton has prefixed a most interesting introduction. We are glad to say that he appears as a

²¹ "Wit, Wisdom, and Pathos of Heinrich Heine," with a few Pieces from the "Book of Songs." Selected and Translated by J. Snodgrass. London: Trübner & Co. 1879.

²² "The Hamnet Shakespere," Part III. The Tragedy of Cymbeline: According to the First Folio. With Lists of such of the Emphasis-Capitals of Shakespere as were omitted by each of the Second, Third, and Fourth Folios, &c. &c. By Allan Park Paton. Edinburgh: Edmondston & Co. 1879.

thorough Conservative with regard to the text, and abstains from all rash changes. He examines with great care that most difficult passage about the death of Falstaff, and comes to the conclusion that none of the proposed emendations for "a Table of green fields" are satisfactory. Again, he also minutely criticises that well-known passage in *Cymbeline*, "Some Jay of Italy (whose mother was her painting) hath betrayed him," and again decides against all the emendations. In both cases he would allow the text of the First Folio to stand. In *Cymbeline* we think that he is undoubtedly right, and that the true meaning of the passage is that which Johnson assigned to it, she is "the creature not of nature, but of painting," owes in fact all her beauty to art. The metaphor is in Shakespeare's bold, vigorous style, and those who know that style ought to find not the slightest difficulty in interpreting the meaning, or in recognising his hand. It would be most unjust to Mr. Paton if we did not mention the elaborate tables which he has prepared with regard to the capital letters in the different Folios. He has evidently spared no pains. Further, we must give a word of praise to the excellence of the typography and the paper.

"*Stories from Early English Literature*"³³ is meant for children, but will most certainly interest others. The writer has gone to sources which, although they may seem by no means recondite to scholars, are not to be met with in every library, especially in the country. She has made use of these stories with discretion. Here for the first time is a popular account of John Russell's "Bokes of Nurture," which was edited not long ago by Mr. Furnival for the Early English Text Society, of the Paston Letters, and of Juliana Berners and her works on *Hawking and Heraldry*. Then, too, we have a very good account of the Fairies and the Pixies and the Fairy Court. All our old poets are laid under contribution, and the criticisms upon some of them as that upon Chaucer are really poetical. Besides this we have the story of the Crusades vividly related, and the history of printing sympathetically told. It is just the book for the village library.

The English Dialect Society³⁴ still steadily pursues its course. If the publications for the past year were less in number, they were certainly more valuable in quality. The first part of the "Dictionary of Plant Names," by Messrs. Britten and Holland, was alone worth the subscription. And here let us express a hope that the English Dialect Society will make some arrangements with the English Folk Lore Society to publish Mr. Swainson's forthcoming Glossary of the Provincial Names of Birds. The society which has undertaken to give the provincialisms for flowers, and also for fish, should most certainly not omit those for birds. It is also to be hoped that amongst its members may be found some one who will give us a glossary of the provincial names for

³³ "Stories from Early English Literature," with some Account of the Origin of Fairy Tales, Legends, and Traditionary Lore. Adapted to the use of Young Students. By Sarah J. Venables Dodds. London: Griffith & Farran: 1879.

³⁴ "No. 24. English Dialect Society." Series C. Original Glossaries, X. Supplement to the Glossary of Words and Phrases pertaining to the Dialect of Cumberland. By William Dickinson, F.L.S. London: Trübner & Co. 1879.

insects. Could not Dr. Adams be persuaded to undertake such a task? No one certainly is more competent. At all events his contributions on the subject to the "Proceedings of the Philological Society" and elsewhere should not be lost sight of. Two of the publications of the English Dialect Society for the present year have already been issued, and both of them are equally valuable. The first is a Supplement to Mr. Dickinson's Cumberland Glossary, and supplies the best evidence of the truth which we have been trying for so long to enforce, that no one single collector can ever completely sweep a district clean. Mr. Dickinson has been for more than half a century a collector of Cumberland provincialisms. We forget now how many years it is since he first published his Glossary. Last year he brought out a second and enlarged edition, and now comes a supplement to it, chiefly supplied by the Rev. Robert Wood, who, by the way, is an octogenarian, giving us no less than four hundred new words, many of which are excessively valuable. Now we trust that this will be a lesson to the younger members of the English Dialect Society. We constantly hear members say, "Oh, our district has been done; it is no good doing it." The answer to this is, No district has been thoroughly done. There is always something to be gleaned by the intelligent collector, come after whom he may. The writer of this present notice once kept an old Cumberland beggar for a considerable time, on purpose to collect provincialisms from him. The glossary has unfortunately been lost; but we feel certain that it would have contained many words which neither Mr. Dickinson nor Mr. Wood have given, although they have given so many.

The next publication³⁵ of the English Dialect Society is equally valuable. Professor Skeat makes an apology for reprinting any more glossaries. But most certainly no apology is needed. Those members of the Society who know the value of the particular glossaries which Professor Skeat has edited, who know, too, the value of having such glossaries all bound together in a convenient and handy form, instead of having to search for them through a large library, who know the value, too, of having them carefully edited with all the old philological errors corrected; and, lastly, who know the value of a full index, will certainly have nothing else but thanks and gratitude for Professor Skeat. The first reprint is that of the glossary in Bishop Kennett's "Parochial Antiquities," and if any one wishes to see the advantage of such a glossary being competently edited, let them turn to such words as "bind-dags," "bun," "busk," "badger," "cop," and "bind of cels." In all these cases the old errors are corrected, and explanations are given as to the meaning of the terms, when the original glossary left the student in the dark. And here let us express a hope that since Professor Skeat has begun to deal with Bishop

³⁵ "English Dialect Society." Series B. Reprinted Glossaries, XVIII.-XXII., XVIII. Dialectal Words, XIX. Wiltshire Words, XX. East Anglian Words, XXI. Suffolk Words, XXII. East Yorkshire Words. Edited by the Rev. W. W. Skeat, M.A., Elrington and Bosworth Professor of Anglo-Saxon. London: Trübner & Co. 1879.

Kennett that he will not desert him, but will undertake the editorship of the Bishop's valuable MS. Glossary of Provincialisms in the British Museum. To do this as it should be done would indeed be the crowning glory of the English Dialect Society. It would certainly be a most laborious undertaking, but we trust that it may be done, and that Professor Skeat may be induced to do it. The second reprint is a Glossary of Wiltshire words from Britten's "Beauties of Wiltshire." The reader, however, gets a very great deal more than this, for Professor Skeat has incorporated Akerman's well-known Wiltshire glossary and another Wiltshire glossary from *The Monthly Magazine*. Here, at all events, is a large nucleus for the future glossarist of Wiltshire. No neighbouring county is perhaps so rich in well-marked and typical provincialisms as Wiltshire, and no county has had so little attention paid to it, except, perhaps, Oxfordshire and Berkshire. The third reprint is also equally valuable, still more so in one way, because it does justice to a collector whose name and whose labours had been by an accident forgotten. Authors, like their books, have their fates. And Mr. Spurdens, to whom Forby owed so much, through no fault of Forby's, ran a very narrow escape of having all his work put down to another. The glossary is most valuable, if only for the explanation of the one word "Sammodithee," over which so many philologists have puzzled in vain. The fourth reprint is from the Rev. Sir John Cullum's Glossary of Suffolk words, in his "History of Harsted and Hardwick." It is, though only short, particularly rich in poetical words, such as "woodsprite" for the green woodpecker, though the spotted may be meant; "to lie by the wall," that is to die, and in such Shakespearean words as "stover," "owe" to own, and "jauneing." The last reprint is a supplement to Marshall's East Yorkshire Words, taken from the second edition of his "Rural Economy of Yorkshire." It will be found particularly rich in terms of natural objects, such as "fox-fingers" for foxglove; "collier" for swift; "hagworm" for viper; "prood tailier" for goldfinch; "sheepcade" for sheeplouse; and "summercolt" for the exhalation which arises from the ground on a hot summer's day. Altogether this volume of reprints will be found to contain matter suited to every variety of taste. Lastly, we must not forget to thank Mr. Heritage for the excellent index which gives the volume double value.

Amongst other books we can only now briefly notice Mr. Gosse's "Studies in the Literature of Northern Europe,"³⁶ which requires to be dealt with by a specialist. Mr. Alfred Milnes's "Johnson"³⁷ shows careful editing. The notes somewhat remind us in their quality of the excellent notes to the Rector of Lincoln's edition of Pope's "Satires" and "Essay on Man;" and to say this is the highest praise which we can bestow. Amongst translations we must not pass over Mr. Lewis's "Letters of the Younger Pliny."³⁸ To "The Foreign Classics for

³⁶ "Studies in the Literature of Northern Europe." By Edmund W. Gosse, Author of "On Viol and Flute." London: C. Kegan Paul. 1879.

³⁷ "Clarendon Press Series. Johnson." Select Works. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by Alfred Milnes, B.A. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1879.

³⁸ "The Letters of the Younger Pliny." Literally Translated. By John Delaware Lewis. London: Trübner & Co. 1879.

English Readers" series, Mr. Collins adds a most readable account of Montaigne.³⁹ Mr. Cowper sends us some tales from Euripides,⁴⁰ done somewhat in the manner which Mr. Church has made so popular. Lastly, we have to acknowledge a "Handy Manual of German Literature,"⁴¹ which seems very well suited for its particular purpose.

MISCELLANEA.

THE latest work of the creator of "Alice" will delight a great many people, annoy a good many, puzzle a few, and hardly fail to amuse every one who takes it up. As a defence of Euclid's great manual against its modern rivals,¹ it will delight all those who believe that the mathematician of Alexandria has never yet met with a competitor of equal merit. As a series of exceedingly sharp and witty criticisms upon all the best known systems of "improvement" upon Euclid, it will annoy the various authors of these systems and their followers. As it is written in a style which for its fantastic mixture of science and nonsense might almost be considered a new development of the macaronic, it will puzzle not a little the ungeometric or the humourless into whose hands it may chance to fall; but it must amuse every one who has ever fought his way across the Bridge of Asses, to see the science, which is so often associated with gloom in the minds of youth, treated in so light-hearted a manner; and this by no scoffing outsider or angry tyro, but by a Professor of twenty years' standing. The Bishop of Peterborough, playing with his curate in the presence of that landscape he admires so much, would hardly be a more bewildering vision to the average intellect than the sight of an Oxford M.A. sporting with the shade of Euclid, and finding food for mirth in the tedious and imperfect text-books of modern geometricians. Let those, however, who refuse to believe that sense and nonsense can be happily wedded read Mr. Dodgson's volume, and if they do not admit that it is at once a very valuable scientific work, and an exceedingly amusing *jeu d'esprit*, we can only say that we are very sorry for them.

Mr. B. H. Kennedy's one volume edition of Virgil² contains so much in so comparatively small a space, that we have little hesitation in pronouncing it the best school edition of the poet we have ever met with. When we mention that, besides the complete Latin text—that of the doubtful poems excepted—the volume contains an account of the life

³⁹ "Foreign Classics for English Readers. Montaigne." By the Rev. W. Luca Collins, M.A. London and Edinburgh: William Blackwood & Sons. 1879.

⁴⁰ "Tales from Euripides." By Vincent King Cowper, M.A. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1879.

⁴¹ "A Handy Manual of German Literature." For Schools, Civil Service Competitions, and University Local Examinations. By M. F. Reid. London and Edinburgh: William Blackwood & Sons. 1879.

¹ "Euclid and his Modern Rivals." By Charles L. Dodgson, M.A. London: Macmillan & Co. 1879.

² "P. Vergili Maronis Opera." Edited by B. H. Kennedy. Longmans & Co 1879.

and writings of Virgil, an abundance of notes that reveal the profoundest scholarship and erudition, a series of appendices on Virgilian geography, mythology, prosody, text, and syntax, two maps, four exhaustive indices, and, to crown all, a metrical translation of the eclogues, we shall give some idea of the value of the volume. We have not space enough to enter upon the various critical questions which Professor Kennedy's "Vergilius" might arouse. We must, however, mention his interesting interpretation of the words "*manibus date lilia plenis*," &c., in the lament for Marcellus. Here he upholds the theory that *date* equals *sinite*. He thus translates the passage—

"Alas! lamented youth, if any way
Thou mayest defeat the cruel destinies,
Marcellus thou shalt be. Give me to strew
The purple lily flowers by handfuls, give
With these unstinted gifts at least to grace
The shade of my descendant and perform
An unavailing office."

This bit of translation, with some of the other fragments of verse scattered through the notes, give a better idea of Professor Kennedy's poetic powers than his metrical version of the eclogues. Here he has certainly succeeded in reproducing Virgil's words, but the lines to our mind lack the beauty of sound which in such a case is even more important than accurate translation. We would not go so far as to say with Hlofernes, "Here are only numbers ratified; but for the elegancy, facility, and golden cadence of poesy, *caret*." But we must consider that the English version of the eclogues has yet to be done for those who want something more exact than Dryden's high-sounding and florid verse, but more like poetry than Mr. Kennedy's version. We fancy a boy beginning Latin would get a better idea of Virgil's pastorals from the translation of the Restoration poet than he could from that of the modern scholar. Taken altogether, however, Professor Kennedy's volume is exceedingly attractive, and must prove a source of much delight to any thoughtful student.

The appearance of Mr. Froude's "Cæsar" has been the signal for a series of attacks, all levelled chiefly at the scholarship of the author. Mr. Tyrrell's first volume³ of his edition of the correspondence of Cicero was printed before the appearance of Mr. Froude's work, but he has managed to insert into his preface a few sharp and decidedly damaging lines of criticism on some of the reckless statements and assumptions with which Mr. Froude's brilliantly-written book abounds. These criticisms, with the lengthy sketch of Cicero's life which Mr. Tyrrell gives, will be read with great interest, as presenting a totally different estimate of the great orator's career and character to that offered by the latest historian of Cæsar. One passage in the criticisms on Mr. Froude we must quote, for we thoroughly agree with it, as pointing out the chief defect in Mr. Froude's eloquent piece of special pleading.

³ "The Correspondence of Cicero." Vol. I. By R. Y. Tyrrell, M.A. Longmans. 1879.

" Mommsen has finely remarked that in the soul of Cæsar there was room for much beside the statesman. If Mr. Froude had told how the soul of Cæsar was large enough to harbour a true appreciation of what was really good and great, even in an irreconcilable political opponent—large enough to hold an enthusiastic admiration for the unsurpassed literary powers of Cicero, he would have been able, without resorting to fiction, to place in a really beautiful light the nature of his hero, and might perhaps have dispensed with the futile attempt to wash the stains from the moral character of this extraordinary man. Yet we see how such an attempt was forced upon Mr. Froude when we arrive at the whimsical parallel with which he has thought it fitting to close his sketch."

Mr. Tyrrell's *Apology* of Cicero is an exceedingly able piece of writing, commendable alike for clearness of thought and of style. Mommsen called Cicero a journalist of the worst description and Mr. Froude holds him up to something very like derision; at Mr. Tyrrell's hands Cicero receives the highest honours. We confess to inclining to Mr. Tyrrell's view of the orator, for though probably the true man lies between the two extremes of praise and blame, yet the portrait as drawn by Mr. Tyrrell seems more like the man who made so great a mark upon all time than the vacillating petty "trimmer" of Mr. Froude or the journalist of the worst class of Herr Mommsen.

Mr. Tyrrell's estimate of the character of Catiline has the merit of novelty. He declines to recognise either the archplotter and fiend in human shape of Sallust or Cicero, or the whitewashed patriot whom Mr. Beesly portrays. He thus expresses his opinion:—

" In short, it seems to me that Catiline, whose atrocities are probably much exaggerated and whose chief defect was his stupidity, finds his political analogue not in Marat or Robespierre, but in Guy Fawkes or Smith O'Brien, who, had Fortune called upon him to die in battle would have known how to die as well as Catiline, and who did not know much better how to effect the purpose of his life. Of course, in private life, there was all the difference in the world between the high-minded and single-hearted Irish enthusiast and the 'stolid rake,' who, even after full allowance is made for the exaggerations of his delineator and destroyer, must be admitted to have earned as bad a character in a bad age as was consistent with his dullness and want of individuality. Indeed, I cannot help thinking that Cicero has done all he could to secure a place in history for Catiline. He has manufactured a somewhat imposing stage villain out of very scanty materials. It is a strong proof of the amazing literary power of the orator. Surely no one would have been more surprised than Catiline himself (who seems to have been but too conscious of his own mediocrity) had he known that the time would come when he should occupy a niche beside Cæsar Borgia; when his existence should be reconciled with the Divine supervision of the world only on the theory that

'Plagues and earthquakes break not heaven's design.'

I own I can look on Catiline as but a very mild eruption, and a sort of make-believe stage earthquake."

Mr. Tyrrell deserves great praise for contributing to critical literature what promises to be a most valuable and scholarly work. We have little doubt that Mr. Tyrrell's Letters of Cicero will take its place with the classical editions of the ancient classics.

The warmest admirers of Cicero cannot say that justice is not done him by the scholars of the day. After considering Mr. Tyrrell's volume of Cicero's Letters, we are now called upon to investigate Mr. Wilkins's handsome edition of the first book of the "De Oratore."⁴ The study of the volume will be a delight to students of the literature of the Augustan Age. The "De Oratore" should be familiar to all who desire to excel in what Piderit styles "the *one* art of eloquence;" and if Mr. Wilkins helps to make it more so, his hard and earnest labours will have been given in a good cause.

All lovers of Catullus will be glad to welcome Mr. Simpson's little volume of selections.⁵ The taste for the great Veronese poet seems to have considerably increased of late, so much so that an English gentleman's knowledge of Catullus will soon be as proverbially assumed as his ability to read Horace. There is, indeed, a tendency among some of the admirers of the unhappy lover of Lesbia, to pit him against his epicurean brother in song, and to exalt Catullus above Horace. Comparisons of this kind are needless. To some minds Horace, to others Catullus, will always appeal more nearly. But any attempts to gauge their relative merits by setting off one poet against the other seems to us mere vain and wearisome labour. In the present volume, all that is best of Catullus is preserved, and the valuable prefaces and notes of the Editor make of the "Lepidum Libellum" a veritable Catullus library. All the dross of the poems, all those passages that can only be of interest to a student in pornography, are removed, and the true metal remains in all its unalloyed purity. That fiery, passionate love which made Clodia into a goddess, and gave to the name of Lesbia an enduring immortality among that paradise of fair women whom great poets have worshipped, can hardly be too well known to the lover of all that is highest in lyrical poetry, and we therefore gladly greet a work so well calculated to widen the circle of students of Catullus.

In the same series, Mr. Mayor puts forth a new part of the school edition of his justly celebrated "Juvenal,"⁶ which for its critical acumen and scholarly culture deserves the highest praise. In the note on "Servatum victo caput abstulit," however, we should have liked Mr. Mayor in enumerating all the circumstances attendant upon the death of Pompey to include that incident which describes his freedman Philippus tracing upon the rude stone which covered his hastily consumed ashes the word "Magnus" with a blackened brand. It is, perhaps, the saddest sermon on a great career to be found in history.

⁴ "Cicero De Oratore," Liber I. Edited by A. S. Wilkins. Clarendon Press. 1879.

⁵ "Select Poems of Catullus." Edited by Francis P. Simpson. London: Macmillan & Co. 1879.

⁶ "Juvenal." Satires x. xi. Edited by J. E. B. Mayor. Macmillan & Co. 1879.

Mr. Pinckard contributes a useful edition of the "Persæ of Æschylus" to the same series.⁷

Mr. Parker's volume on the "Egyptian Obelisks in Rome," is one of the most interesting of his valuable series of archaeological works devoted to the *prima inter urbes*. The vague mystery which hangs over everything Egyptian, and lends an awe to its weird gods and weirder goddesses, such as even the strange Etruscan deities could never command, is especially exemplified in the obelisks. Their strange form and their strange symbols compel reverence and wonder. "You dare not mock at the Sphinx," says Kinglake, in his exquisite *Eothen*. Neither dare you mock at those melancholy everlasting emblems of a mighty empire passed away, and a mighty faith forgotten. Rome is rich in obelisks, and Paris has long been proud of its spoil from Luxor, but London is now not behindhand, and by the Thames as by the Tiber and the Seine, there stands a trophy from the Nile. This obelisk of ours might well use the words that Theophile Gautier gives to the Parisian obelisk:—

"Et ma vieille aiguille, rouge
Aux fournaises d'un ciel de feu
Prend des pâleurs de nostalgie
Dans cet air qui n'est jamais bleu."

But we are proud of our strange exotic, and the second edition of Mr. Parker's work will interest English students of Roman Archaeology none the less because it devotes a few pages to Cleopatra's Needle.

We have scarcely space at our disposal in which to consider duly the various important problems which "Philanthropus" presents to his readers.⁸ The institution of marriage is a social subject, respecting which it is difficult to arrive at any definite conclusion. Still more difficult is it to create any scheme which shall perfect the institution. It is impossible not to agree with "Philanthropus" that the laws of England in relation to marriage and all connected with it are exceedingly crude and imperfect. We also agree with him that in a far greater freedom of divorce than that which now prevails—some such freedom, for example, as exists in Prussia—the solution of many of the difficulties attendant upon the question of marriage is to be found. The volume will repay thoughtful perusal, for it brings important and unfortunately too often avoided exigencies of humanity boldly forward. There is, however, a good deal of the "catch-penny" about the volume which abounds in misprints.

People possessed with a passion for riddles, square words, acrostics, and similar other specimens of man's efforts to amuse himself, and to assert his existence as a laughing animal, will probably derive a great deal of pleasure from the "Excursions into Puzzledom" of the late Tom Hood and his Sister.¹⁰

⁷ "The Persæ of Æschylus." Edited by A. O. Pinckard. Macmillan & Co. 1879.

⁸ "The Twelve Egyptian Obelisks in Rome." (Second Edition.) By J. H. Parker. John Murray. 1879.

⁹ "The Institution of Marriage in the United Kingdom." By Philanthropus. Effingham Wilson. 1879.

¹⁰ "Excursions into Puzzledom." By the late Tom Hood and his Sister. Strahan & Co. 1879.

Now that it is the fashion to be acquainted with at least one of the Northern Languages, the "Icelandic Prose Reader" of Dr. Vigfusson and Mr. York Powell¹¹ will doubtless be eagerly welcomed by would-be students of the great Sagas. The volume is to all appearance admirably adapted for the purpose to which it is intended.

Those who, like Theophile Gautier, find pleasure as well as profit in the reading of dictionaries will follow with interest the serial publication of two dictionaries, the first parts of which lie before us. Mr. Skeat's dictionary¹² will commend itself especially to those who love to be learned in the peirage of words and should command a place on the shelves of all serious students of the history of our language. The labour and care which Mr. Skeat has expended in giving exact reference will win him the gratitude of everyone who uses the work.

Mr. Christy's work¹³ addresses itself especially to architects and builders, but it will be of great value to all artists, and to all indeed whose pursuits or tastes bring them into any association with architecture.

Dr. Hullah's paper on the great question of how a sound knowledge of music may be best disseminated will be carefully read not only by musical students, but by many who are not, but would gladly be, students of music.¹⁴ Dr. Hullah considers the best way of making musical skill common is by having it taught in the nursery and infant schools. Here we quite agree with him. Music, to some extent, should be made as much a part of primary education amongst us as it was among the Greeks. It should be added, however, that Dr. Hullah defines a musician to be one who knows, without even having heard it, the effect of what he sees written in musical characters or hear described, and, *vice versa*, to be able to write or describe that which he hears. We also agree with Dr. Hullah in considering the present system of musical notation as the best existing.

This is a scientific age, and Mr. Macfarlane's Algebra of Logic¹⁵ will, therefore, find eager and attentive readers, and his theory of the operation of the mind in reasoning about quality will meet with the careful consideration which so valuable a contribution to the science of mathematical analysis deserves.

Mr. Park's little treatise on "Method,"¹⁶ as viewed in relation to the Government-inspected schools of this country, will meet a very decided want. It is perfectly true that "no part of a teacher's work

¹¹ "Icelandic Prose Reader." By Dr. Gudbrand Vigfusson and F. York Powell. Clarendon Press. 1879.

¹² "An Etymological Dictionary of the English Language, Arranged on an Historical Basis." Part I. A. to Dor. By the Rev. Walter W. Skeat. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1879.

¹³ "A Universal Dictionary for Architects," &c. Part I. By W. I. Christy. London: Griffith & Farran. 1879.

¹⁴ "How Can a Sound Knowledge of Music be Best and Most Generally Disseminated?" By John Hullah. Longmans. 1878.

¹⁵ "Principles of the Algebra of Logic." By Alexander Macfarlane. Edinburgh. David Douglas. 1879.

¹⁶ "A Manual of Method." By Abr. Park. London. Blackie & Son. 1879.

is so difficult and so harassing, and at the same time so responsible, as the training of pupil teachers." Anything, therefore, that will lighten this labour—and "Method" always lightens labour—should be welcome. Mr. Park's system of methodizing deserves the careful attention of all who have anything to do with education.

Mr. Cruttwell's history of Roman Literature¹⁷ was not a conspicuously valuable work, either when tested by its literary or its critical merits. The new companion volume of Selections from Roman Authors will prove far more serviceable to the student of Latin literature. We should, however, have been glad to find among the excerpts from Apuleius the passage in which he describes the statuette of Mercury made for him by Saturninus, not only for its vivid style, but for its evidence of contemporary appreciation of art-workmanship.

We are glad to welcome a new edition of Roget's Thesaurus.¹⁸

¹⁷ "Specimens of Roman Literature." By C. T. Cruttwell and Peake Banton. London: Charles Griffin & Co. 1879.

¹⁸ "Roget's Thesaurus of English Words and Phrases." Longmans. 1879.



INDIA AND OUR COLONIAL EMPIRE.

INDIA.—From within and from without the voice of protest against the errors of our administration in India has never been silent. But hitherto the voice has been raised in a desert. It can hardly be said that officials as a class are blinded by the traditions of official life, but those who rise highest and whose influence in effecting change would therefore be greatest, are naturally the men to whom the system they work under is least distasteful. The Press, once a power in the land—while officials were still thinkers and writers, and plans had not hardened into systems—is now so partial and so personal, so shallow in tone and yet so violent, that it has little influence. The few natives and unofficial Englishmen who take an intelligent and unselfish interest in public affairs can hardly make their voice heard or drown each other's voices by discordant utterances. Popular representative institutions, even if they existed, would hardly give such men a chance in public life. The despotic system of nomination gives them some chance, and they become the bores of legislative councils. But against the preponderance of official and complaisant native sentiment they are powerless. For effective exhibitions of independent feeling we must look to Chambers of Commerce and to voluntary associations. Of these several have been formed for the assertion of native rights, but the crudity, the narrowness, too often the blind selfishness, of the views expressed, as well as the violence and extravagance of the language held, render their declarations on questions of public policy almost valueless, except as evidence of the feeling of the classes represented. The Municipal Councils have not yet ventured to assume the functions of political bodies. The mass of the people is passively resigned to the dispensations of Government—the only providence they know.

That the present system of rule impoverishes India in order to make England rich, and discourages native merit in order to provide a field for English talent, is a doctrine which has long been fanatically preached by some native gentlemen of undoubted honesty and loyalty. The rulers of the land were deaf to their rebuke. But now the voice

that was raised in the desert is heard in our streets. The most extravagant doctrines of Indian reformers have been welcomed, if not espoused, by English politicians.

The phenomenon is easily explained. The visit of the Prince of Wales and the discussions connected with the Queen's assumption of the Imperial title has given the English public a new sense of responsibility in regard to India. The Afghan war introduced into the consideration of Indian politics all the heat of party feeling and even of humanitarian sentiment which the Imperial policy of the Ministry had evoked. In a happy moment a Parsi enthusiast got hold of an English writer, who, by the favour of the editor of a popular monthly review, got hold of the English public. Once the train was laid the explosion was certain. The Ministry being responsible for the Afghan war was by an easy transition assumed to be responsible for everything in the existing state of India. Great as was its criminality in regard to that measure, it would be greater still if it appeared that the crime was to complete the ruin of the Indian exchequer. It was easy to believe that a Government which was unscrupulous in its diplomacy would be reckless in its finance, and so the "Bankruptcy of India" became a new catchword of debased Liberalism. It was one peculiarly effective. The ordinary Englishman could not be expected to master all the intricate conditions of Indian politics, but at least he could understand a balance-sheet. To Mr. Fawcett and others who have long honestly opposed the financial policy which, under Liberal as well as Conservative Administrations, our Indian Government has followed, the new agitation brought long looked-for help. For ourselves, while we regard Mr. Hyndman's—or rather Mr. Dada Bhai Naoroji's—views as, in themselves, false and mischievous, we can hardly regret that they have attracted attention. No one who is acquainted with the methods and details of Government can deny that there is in many departments urgent need of reform. Our duty to India—whether it be rich or poor—is with all possible thrift to administer its resources for its benefit alone. Wherever there is extravagance or inefficiency reform is needed. Reforms, it is true, are little likely to be judiciously introduced under the pressure of financial panic. Sudden retrenchments are, no doubt, economy of revenue, but they are waste of resources. Unhappily, however, the impulse to real economy comes only from these sudden blows of adversity. And however sensational and extravagant may be Mr. Hyndman's warnings, the bugbear of bankruptcy has frightened public opinion into a recognition of the possibility of economies, which otherwise would not have been carried into effect. Wealth, we suppose, involves waste.

It is impossible for us here fully to discuss the views we condemn. Mr. Hyndman has, we think, very much over-estimated both the proportion of the whole resources of the country which Government takes in the form of taxation, and its increase in recent years. The real point in such controversies is not what Government takes, but what it gives in return. And of this Mr. Hyndman—excusably, perhaps, since he professes to have no knowledge of administrative details—loses sight altogether. He forgets that Government expenditure is but a part, and a very small part, of the entire expenditure of the country, and that if Government forbore to spend the national resources for certain purposes, the people would have to spend much more than the Government would thus save. He forgets that efficiency is the soundest economy. The results of outlay—say on productive Public Works—are not to be measured by their direct returns in Revenue to Government. He repeats again and again that the people are poor, and suggests sometimes that their poverty is the result of Government taxation, sometimes that it is a reason why Government should tax no more. Every one, of course, must admit that the people are as a rule poor. While their notions of thrift remain as they now are, there will always be a large section of the people living on the very borders of subsistence. If Government could be conducted—say, at the expense of England—the only result would be that there would be a larger population, and a larger class of very poor to be the object of Mr. Hyndman's commiseration. In considering the economic effect of our administration, the increase of population which has resulted from the peace and order of our rule is an important factor. All Mr. Hyndman's conclusions, even if in other respects they were sound, would be vitiated by the fact that he assumes population to have been stationary.

To say that, because the people are poor and thriftless, Government is not to spend money on Schools and Public Works, is to say that, because they are poor and thriftless, Government is to do nothing to make them less poor and more thrifty. No one who knows India can fancy with Mr. Hyndman that the people would employ productively the money which Government now takes from them to spend on their behalf. If India had capital of its own to construct its Public Works—if it could supply for its own Government a class of administrators as able, as honest, and as cheap as those it now receives from England—we may readily admit that some of the appearances popularly regarded as indications of prosperity would be more generally found in the country than they now are. Retired civilians would probably spend their pensions in peaceful homes for their old age, and the owners of

the capital would probably maintain private establishments from the interest they received. But the only result would be that the population of the country would be greater than it now is by the annuitants and the persons they employed to minister to their wants. The number of persons otherwise employed in production would not be increased, nor would the reward of their labour. A Bath and a Cheltenham would be added to Indian cities, but Bombay would not grow more like Liverpool, and the lot of the Deccan ryot would remain as bad as that of a Dorsetshire labourer. It is needless to speculate, however, as to what might have been. India has *not* supplied the necessary capital or administrative material. It has in consequence to send every year an immense amount of its produce to pay for what in this and other respects it has got from England. To Mr. Hyndman this is an overwhelming evidence that our rule impoverishes India. To us the fact that from the vast increase of its produce due to English help—India can spare a portion to pay us for that help—is an evidence that our rule enriches India. India, says Mr. Hyndman, gets no direct commercial equivalent for its remittances. It does, we answer; it gets railways, canals, peace, and security—all essential and expensive conditions of industrial efficiency. Railways would not pay 5 per cent. on their capital if they did not confer on the people of India advantages worth more than 5 per cent. We do not deny or extenuate the mistakes we have made. The benefits we have conferred might have been conferred at a less cost. Peace and order may even now be maintained by too large an army, or by too highly-paid a civil service. But it does not follow that this is so, merely because the amount of the remittances shocks Mr. Hyndman's nerves.

We do not, of course, deny that the same considerations of prudence apply to the administration of a country, as to the management of an estate. The interests of the present should not be sacrificed to the interests of the future. The sons ought not to be starved that the grandsons may inherit more fertile acres. Improvements effected at the cost of heavy incumbrances are not benefits. The Indian Government, representing the Indian people, is lord of a rich, but undeveloped domain. If the process of development is to be healthy and constant, the first consideration must be to maintain the credit of the proprietors. Let us refer to the figures of the recent Budget statement to ascertain whether from this point of view there are even plausible grounds for speaking of "The Bankruptcy of India." Our readers will, we assume, bear in mind the explanations we gave in reviewing last July the Budgets for 1878-9 and previous years.

The general results can be best shown in a tabular abstract, thus—

| | Millions Sterling in Round Numbers. | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| | Completed Accounts of 1877-8. | Regular Estimates for 1878-9, based, of course, on the Actual Returns for nearly the whole Year. | Budget Estimates for 1879-80. |
| Revenue (in which are not included Receipts on account of Loans, Advances or Deposits) | 59 | 64½ | 64½ |
| Expenditure (in which are not included Repayments of Loans, Advances, or Deposits—nor the Capital Expenditure on Productive Public Works) | 62½ | 63½ | 66 |
| Capital Expenditure on Productive Public Works | 5 | 4½ | 3½ |
| Excess Expenditure | 8½ | 3½ | 5 |

We ought, perhaps, to explain that in these figures rupees are converted at the old conventional rate of exchange. The returns, both of revenue and expenditure, are swollen with many items which are not properly revenue nor expenditure from revenue, and thus they do not fairly represent either the resources or the burdens of the Exchequer. But their inclusion does not, of course, affect the general financial result. In the figures for all three years are included the *provincial* receipts and expenditure, while in those of 1878 and 1879-80 are incorporated also the *local* revenue and expenditure. We ought further, perhaps, to explain that while the interest on loans for productive Public Works (as on other loans), and the working expenses are included in expenditure, the returns direct or indirect form part of the revenue. Thus, if they were truly productive, the increase of the public debt for their construction would not involve a fresh charge on the general revenue.

An attempt has been made to separate the productive Public Works accounts from the general financial returns. Thus, under the heads irrigation and navigation, guaranteed railways, and State railways, we find the revenue and expenditure (including working expenses and interest) to be—

| | 1877-8. | 1878-9. | 1879-80. | |
|-------------|---------|---------|----------|--------------------|
| Revenue | 7½ | 6½ | 7 | Millions sterling. |
| Expenditure | 7½ | 8½ | 8½ | „ |

It is, however, evident that such distinction of account must be to a great extent arbitrary. Take three cases, for instance. What proportion of the general expenses of administrative supervision is to be included in Public Works charges? What proportion of the increased Land Revenue is to be assigned to irrigation? What

proportion of the returns of productive works is to be attributed to work done *not* from borrowed capital? or to advantages which the State has surrendered? We do not propose to discuss here the general question as to whether Public Works pay. We believe that, taken as a whole, they do. But we may point out what facilities for financial juggling the separate system of account affords.

If, for instance, Government wants to construct a railway, which will be chiefly useful for strategic purposes, there is an obvious temptation to construct it from borrowed capital as a productive work. Afterwards when Government is called on to justify the results of its productive Public Works policy it is easy to exclude such a work from consideration by saying that it was improperly treated as productive in the first instance. There is, we say, no fear of financial embarrassment from persisting in the policy of constructing productive works from borrowed capital, but there is grave risk that works will be treated as productive which are not really so—that the cost of repairs which ought properly to be treated as a working expense will be treated as capital outlay.

According to Sir John Strachey's calculation, had there been no famine and no outlay on public works in 1877-8, there would have been a surplus of over two millions. The actual excess of expenditure over revenue was, however (after necessary correction of account), nearly ten millions.

For 1878-9 the total net disbursements in excess of revenue amounted to over five millions. This included, however, money borrowed to lend again to Native States, and repayments of railway capital, &c., so that the net addition to the Public Debt was only about two and three-quarter millions—a sum much less than the capital expenditure on Public Works. The true surplus of the year was in fact 1,309,000*l.* The arrears of Land Revenue realized covered the expenditure on famine. But 670,000*l.* had been spent on the war, and the fall in exchanges had caused a loss of over half a million more than the estimated amount. (The actual average rate was 1*s.* 7½*d.*; the Budget rate was 1*s.* 8¼*d.*) As the net *new* taxation realized during the year was only 971,400*l.* (the total eventual new taxation will only be 1,104,900*l.* per annum), we think that by the provision of this virtual surplus Government fulfilled the pledges it gave, or, to speak more correctly, saw the verification of the forecasts it offered when in 1877 Sir John Strachey proposed the special famine taxation.

It is, however, unsafe to base an estimate of the condition of the finances on the figures of a single year. The deficits for the four years, 1876-80—estimated or actual—amount to nearly twenty-five millions. During this period the extraordinary expenditure would be—Famine,
[Vol. CXII. No. CCXXI.]—New SERIES, Vol. LVI. No. I. T

including loss of revenue, nine and a half millions; War, two and a half millions; productive Public Works capital expenditure, sixteen and a half millions. Famine we see has been provided for by special taxation. War is so exceptional an event as to justify the contraction of a loan. And the Public Works would, if really productive, impose no real burden on the Exchequer. But from the Budget Resolution itself it appears that much even of recent expenditure has not been on works strictly productive, or at any rate likely to prove so soon. Still it appears that towards these "extraordinary objects" *current revenue* had contributed nearly four millions. The rest was provided by addition to debt, twenty and a half millions; by reduction of public balances, five millions; by an increase in outstanding bills of the Secretary of State and of deposits, four millions. It should, however, be explained that of the nominal increase of debt over four millions, went in loans to Native States or in payment of Railway capital. The total debt of India, including the capital of railway and irrigation companies is 2,79,80,39,945 rupees (279 millions at the nominal exchange of 2s. per rupee), and on this the average rate of interest is 4.48 per cent. Hardly a symptom of bankruptcy!

It must be observed that in this estimate of the financial position no reference has been made to the increased cost of remittances for home charges. How serious and abnormal an element there has been may be judged from the fact that were provision made for remittances to cover all the home charges in 1879-80, the "loss by exchange" would be—at the existing rate of exchange—nearly three and a half millions more than would have been incurred seven years ago. The financial difficulties of the Indian Government may, therefore, be fairly attributed to the depreciation of silver—a phenomenon it could not have foreseen, but of which in its plans for the future it had to take cognizance. It was possible that exchanges might improve; but, on the other hand, it was possible that the value of silver might continue to sink. The uncertainty on this point—the uncertainty, too, as to the continuance of the war in Afghanistan—rendered accurate financial forecasts impossible.

In the estimates for 1879-80 two millions were provided for the Afghan War, but a deficit of nearly one and a half millions was anticipated. Had there been no war, and were the loss by exchange only what it was at the close of 1877, there would be a surplus of over two millions—*i.e.*, the surplus which the special taxation of 1877 was imposed to secure. The Government of India had matured a scheme which in its opinion would save it from the loss by the depreciation of silver. At the time its Budget proposals were submitted this scheme was under the consideration of the Home Govern-

ment. While so many conditions were uncertain, the Finance Minister properly abstained from proposing fresh taxation or enforcing retrenchments which, if unnecessary, would be certainly mischievous. He did what in February, 1878, he had distinctly stated it might in certain cases be necessary to do. He accepted temporarily the loss of the surplus of 1878-9, by which it was hoped that insurance against panic had been provided.

The worst feature of Anglo-Indian political life is the virulent denunciations of statesmen who have unpalatable measures to propose. All the passion excited by the imposition of the special taxation of 1877 and 1878 again blazed forth against the Minister who had to acknowledge that its produce had been swallowed up in the loss of exchange. The very men who demand more liberal outlay on public works, who would foam at the mouth if further taxation were proposed, now charged Sir John Strachey with wanton breach of faith because he applied the surplus of 1878-9 temporarily to the wants of 1879-80. Unfortunately some characteristically extravagant phrases of Lord Lytton's about the sacredness of the Famine Fund served the malcontents for an effective text.

We need not examine the details of the Budget proposals. Partly because much of the uncertainty which existed in March has been dispelled, and partly, no doubt, because public opinion in this country and in India has clearly pronounced in favour of a policy of retrenchment, Government has modified, or perhaps we ought to say developed, its policy.

The Home Government decided that no action should be taken to meet the currency difficulty. The loss by exchange was to be boldly faced. Steps should be taken to secure a *bond-fide* surplus of two millions in each financial year. This was to be done by retrenchments. Of the details of these the telegraphic summaries are too obscure to allow us to speak definitely. Productive works are the only optional and elastic department of Indian Administration. They are constantly being spasmodically expanded (when the cry from home is for development and prevention of famine at any cost), or spasmodically contracted (when the cry is for retrenchment). To Public Works, then, at this juncture the shears of retrenchment are being ruthlessly applied. We admit the necessity, but the need is deplorable. The relief to the Treasury is brought by a sacrifice of the resources of the people. Even the lasting interests of the Exchequer are injuriously affected. We have at a vast outlay constructed great lines of railways and canals. To make them fully remunerative smaller subsidiary works have to be multiplied. But now the process of extension is suddenly checked. Nor is the

immediate waste less obvious. Labourers may be dismissed, and contractors must bear their losses as they can. But the immense establishments of trained engineers and native subordinates cannot be summarily dismissed or allowed to eat the bread of idleness. We hear of great schemes for inducing superfluous officers to retire voluntarily. We may be sure, too, that the work already done on many works now left half finished will prove to have been wholly wasted. In estimating the results of Public Works policy it is necessary to take into account the loss by excessive establishments and spasmodic reductions. Henceforth the sum to be borrowed annually for productive works is reduced to two-and-a-half millions. This is to be borrowed *in India*. The reason given for limiting the loan is that any larger amount would unduly disturb the money market; but it may fairly be suspected that a doubt as to the expenditure proving *directly* remunerative, and a consequent wish to lessen the charge for interest, has affected the decision.

In ordinary Public Works expenditure, and indeed in every other branch, retrenchment and economy are prescribed. The full reductions cannot, of course, be effected this year, but a saving of a million is, we believe, anticipated.

The abolition as a separate department of the Department of Agriculture and Commerce is a step at the right end. The need of economy has, of course, revived the consideration of a thousand possible reforms. Two are seriously contemplated by Government. The first is the more general employment of natives in the public service. Instructions on this subject have been sent from the India Office, and when they are made public we shall have an opportunity of discussing the question fully. Here we shall only say that whether there is or is not a sense of grievance among the natives generally—whether it is or is not a reasonable sense of grievance—to satisfy their claims will not, as Mr. Gladstone and other friends of natives and economy seem to think, relieve the finances. What the Bengali Balu wants is not to reduce the emoluments of the Civil Service but to participate in them. Next, Government is considering the possibility of retrenchment in army charges. We have often spoken of this. A Commission is at present about to commence an inquiry in India, both as regards the cost and the efficiency of the present army organization, European as well as Native.

The decision of the English Government to lend two millions without interest to India for the expenses of the Afghan War, has of course given great relief to Indian finance. It is repayable in seven yearly instalments. India complains that the burden of an "Imperial"

war should be so unfairly distributed. Such discussions will always arise till some rigid principle is laid down. If the Afghan War was waged in the interests of the Empire, the expense of our armaments in the East was incurred on behalf of India. If England ought to share in the burden of the first, India ought to contribute to the latter. The rule applied, if arbitrary, has at least the merit of being clear and intelligible. India pays for wars on its frontier. England for wars beyond.

As to other ways and means for the year, five millions have been borrowed in India at 4 per cent. The terms of subscriptions have been satisfactory to Government. Of this sum half a million is devoted to the redemption of existing debt, so that the real addition to debt is only three and a half millions.

The Home Government has further taken power to borrow five millions, not to supply ordinary financial needs, but to enable Government to influence the silver market and avoid loss by exchange. We may remark that of late exchanges have shown a sustained improvement. There is, therefore, good reason to hope that at the close of the year the Indian Government will have the surplus which it is its declared policy to secure.

In the copious criticism which the Budget has provoked, we find little recognition of the undoubted Reforms which the Administration has introduced in the financial system. The policy of decentralization has been extended; and in the revision of the arrangements with Assam and Burma, the Government has made the "most complete provincial contracts yet existing." In Burma, for instance, only a few items have been reserved as Imperial or joint—all the rest of the revenue and expenditure has been made wholly provincial. The result is to give each province an important increase of revenue.

A system of local debenture loans has also been instituted. For works of local utility, local loans will be raised under an Imperial guarantee. The debenture holders—residents, of course, in the locality—will have besides interest a share in the profit and a voice in the management. To lessen the responsibilities of Government it has been decided that municipalities and other corporations which have hitherto borrowed from the Treasury, must in future borrow in the open market.

The measures for the Reform of the Salt Duties have been nearly completed. Treaties have been entered into with the native States of Rajputana, and on the first of October last, all the more important salt sources passed under the control of Government. On the first of April "the reproach of our Administration," the Inland Customs'

Line was with a trifling exception abolished. In July, the tax in Northern India, Bombay and Madras, was uniform at two rupees and eight annas per annum. In Bengal it was two rupees and fourteen annas, in happier Burma only three annas.

It is possible that Sir John Strachey's confession of inability to fulfil the pledges or forecasts of Government, regarding the Famine taxation, would have led to little hostile remark, had it not been accompanied by the announcement of a further step towards the abolition of the Cotton Duties. We need hardly add anything to what we have already said on the general aspects of this question. No reasonable person—who is not a Bombay cotton spinner—will deny that the Import Duties afford protection direct or indirect to the native manufacture. They do not, as is ridiculously alleged, increase the profits of the spinners—but they enable them to manufacture at an ordinary trade profit, goods which otherwise they would not manufacture at all. We believe that complete Free Trade is best for India as for England, and therefore we believe that except on the ground of absolute fiscal necessity no duty protective in its character ought to be allowed to exist. The revenue from Customs generally in India is so small, as compared with the cost of collection, that all Import Duties will before long be abolished. Believing all this we still hold that the sacrifice of revenue at a time of such financial pressure was so inopportune as to be gravely impolitic and unjust. The impolicy and the injustice seem all the greater because there is every reason to believe that the abolition of the duty was due, not to the doctrinaire enthusiasm of the Finance Minister, but to the urgency of the Ministry *at home*—anxious to conciliate the good will of the English Cotton interests. Yet we must in fairness say, that the gravity of the case against the Indian Government has been grossly exaggerated. The abolition had been decreed in principle before. But the principle had been enforced inadequately by a specific exemption of certain classes of cloths. A Commission (in which we believe the Indian Chambers of Commerce were well represented) reported to Government that to carry out efficiently the principle of the exemption, it would be necessary to define certain limits of fineness below which all cloths should be exempt. This was all that the Indian Government did. It is remarkable that while Bombay complains that 400,000*l.* of revenue has been sacrificed, Manchester feels or affects indignation because only 20,000*l.* of duty has been removed. It has been urged with some show of reason that if Government really wished to relieve Indian trade from burdensome duties the Export Duties on Rice, not the Import Duties on Cotton should have been

selected for abolition. An increased export of Rice would, of course, affect the balance of trade, and lessen the loss by exchange. To this the Indian Government has only been able to answer that it is not clear that the Rice Duty checks the export—that to abolish it would mean a loss of half a million instead of 200,000*l.*, and that a unanimous vote of the House of Commons declared that the Cotton Duties should be removed—(“when the state of the finances permitted”)—while there had been no such vote with reference to the Rice Duty.

Perhaps no act of the Indian Government has stirred every section of opinion in India more deeply than this concession to Manchester. We discern in the protests it has elicited the first evidence of a national movement destined to assume large proportions.

The purchase of the East India Railway is the last of the great financial measures to which we need refer. The whole stock (over twenty-six millions) has been bought for thirty-two and three-quarter millions, payable by an annuity terminating in 1953. Government, however, was unwilling to supersede the present system of management by the less efficient and more costly system of State direction. Accordingly a new working Company has been formed with a capital of over six and a half millions. Under the contract with this Company the State gets four-fifths of the surplus profits. The measure is undoubtedly profitable to Government, but the Parliamentary Committee appointed to consider it has reported that the terms of purchase were unduly favourable to the Company.

“Personal Rule,” “The Imperializing Policy of Government” have become catchwords of reproach among the opponents of the Conservative Administration. We shall not, we hope, be suspected of sympathy with those who use them if we say, that the neglect of the authority of Councils has become emphasized and conspicuous by recent events. On the plea that the Afghan Question involved matters of Imperial policy the Council of the Secretary of State was not consulted on Afghan affairs. On the plea that the abolition of the Cotton Duties was a matter vitally affecting the interests of India, the Viceroy overruled the almost unanimous opinion of his Council. The Viceroy, the Marquis of Salisbury is good enough to inform us, represented the views of the English Ministry. We do not say that there has been a technical infringement of the law, but there has been a defeat of the intentions of the framers. The Ministry has been able to show that their predecessors transacted important affairs, as they have done, by private correspondence between the Secretary of State and the Viceroy. It must, of course, be acknowledged that in the last resort, Parliament—*i.e.*, the Ministers in

whom Parliament has confidence—are supreme; and that it would often be unreasonable to expect them to subject their policy on matters of grave concern to the criticism and delay of Councillors who have no direct responsibility to Parliament, and personally no special knowledge of Imperial affairs. But the possibility of an ignorant and imperious Secretary of State, unrestrained by the advice of an experienced Council, or by the fear of the effect the publication of their protests might produce on public opinion, dictating policy to a Viceroy who, perhaps, owes his appointment to the favour of the Minister, and has been sent out as his tool, is one which no friend of India or England can contemplate with composure.

Africa.—The events of the South African War have been followed with such intense interest that we need not review them in detail. Of the causes of the disaster of Isandula we have spoken elsewhere. The excellent handbook compiled by Lord Chelmsford's orders before the war shows that we were, at all events, not ignorant of Zulu tactics, their silent celerity, their discipline, their desperate valour. But experience apparently is needed to dispel the false sense of security which confidence in their own pluck engenders in English soldiers. Even the saddest lessons of experience are soon forgotten. While the shock of Isandula was still recent, a detachment of our troops was surprised on the Itombi. And now a faction in France and a whole people in England mourn for the Prince Imperial. By a strange caprice of fortune a few Zulus, crouching in a mealie field, have removed from the political struggles of France the chief element of unrest.

In justice to the brave men who perished at Isandula, let us say that Colonel Durnford's advance to check the progress of the enemy, and Colonel Pulleine's attempt to give his men the shelter of the hollows, are now recognised as soldierly expedients, to make up for the want of proper defences round the camp.

The success of Col. Wood's bold raids shows that there is room for dash as well as caution in Zulu warfare—while the splendid defence of the improvised ramparts at Rorke's Drift and of the earthworks at Kambula and Gingihlovo show what might have been done at Isandula.

It is not difficult to conjecture what the reasons were which restrained Katsiwayo from invading Natal. Whether from considerations of military policy or from a desire to appear to be acting wholly in self-defence, he had apparently ordered his chiefs not to cross the Tugela. The repulse at Rorke's Drift and the frightful carnage by which the victory at Isandula was purchased, had dispirited his troops. The

very shock of success was demoralizing, but it may be doubted whether the Zulus did not on the whole regard themselves rather as vanquished than victors. With an army still in Natal, with Col. Pearson at Ekowe, and Col. Wood on the eastern border, Katsiwayo may well have feared to trust his army to desultory raids in Natal. Further, there were crops to be gathered, and the Tugela was flooded.

The employment of native levies was an experiment, the result of which was looked forward to in Natal with some anxiety. A long correspondence between the Lieut.-Governor and the Commander-in-Chief has been published, in which the merits of what are called the tribal and the regimental systems are discussed. The dispute seems to us to be wholly verbal. Lord Chelmsford respected tribal arrangements as far as possible. But without discipline, the men would have been a mere rabble, and their own chiefs were, of course, useless for purposes of military organisation. European officers had therefore to be employed to drill and lead them. Unfortunately, these being for the most part ignorant of the Zulu language and of Zulu customs, had little influence. Yet, on the whole, the native auxiliaries fought well, and at last dispersed only under the shock of a disaster which would have destroyed the *morale* even of disciplined troops. There was no indication of the predicted tendency to a treasonous revolt.

The attitude of the Home Government to Sir Bartle Frere and Lord Chelmsford has been just, and even chivalrous. Sir Bartle Frere had acted—if not against their instructions, at least without and beyond their instructions. He had been told that the troops sent out were to be used only for defence; and he had defended Natal by offensive measures in Zululand. Prominent members of the Government have practically admitted in the debates, that his action was judicious; but it was impossible wholly to condone so grave a breach of official discipline. Sir Bartle Frere had been headstrong and wise. He was censured lest his example should lead other Governors to be headstrong and foolish. The Opposition naturally sought to discredit the Government by attacking Sir Bartle Frere—whose influence in determining Government policy in the Afghan Question they could not forget. But the votes of censure were rejected—in the House of Lords by an overwhelming majority—in the House of Commons by a majority less than that which Government generally commands.

While public indignation was still seeking to fix the responsibility for the disaster to our arms, a letter of Lord Chelmsford's was published, which was generally regarded as a confession of incapacity.

Since then he has been the object of persistent and malignant attack. But Government, with wise generosity, refused to withdraw its confidence from a commander who had done such excellent service elsewhere; and by accomplishing successfully the relief of Ekowe he has vindicated his reputation. But though the Government yielded nothing to the clamour of a noisy faction, there were reasons which ultimately rendered a transfer of the conduct of affairs necessary. Sir Bartle Frere's presence at Cape Town was urgently necessary to settle the important questions of colonial defence, taxation, and confederation, awaiting solution there. It was impossible that he could thence effectively control affairs in Natal. Angry dissensions had broken out between the Lieutenant-Governor and Lord Chelmsford regarding the policy of raiding into Zululand, and the command of the native levies raised for the defence of Natal. Transvaal affairs were intimately connected with those of Natal, yet they were under the distinct management of an administrator. Obviously, if the war was to be brought soon to a successful close, it was desirable to concentrate authority of every kind in the hands of one able administrator. Such an administrator was found in Sir Garnet Wolseley, who had had ample experience of Civil Government, as well as of the conduct of campaigns with savage foes. Public opinion had long designated him for the duties he was now to discharge. He had before administered Natal affairs, but at a time sufficiently remote to save him from any responsibility in regard to recent matters of controversy. Perhaps, too, the Government wished, by appointing a new commander, to "change the luck" of a campaign which, in its incidents, must be admitted to have been singularly unfortunate, whatever may be the opinion as to its policy.

Yet, while we approve of the nomination of Sir Garnet Wolseley, it must not be forgotten that he has gone to reap what others with infinite labour and under every circumstance of discouragement have sown. All the difficulties of transport and commissariat have at length been overcome. An army magnificent in numbers and equipment has already commenced its advance. The spirit of the Zulus has been broken by repeated defeats. Umbelini—the Swazi chief whose raids were one of the immediate occasions of the war, and whose fertile genius planned the attack on the Itombi and the Hlobani Mountains—is dead. Dabulamanzi—the victorious leader at Isandula, and the vanquished leader at Gingihlovo—is either dead or anxious to submit.

The future may have as many surprises in store for us as the past. Many who are hopelessly committed to gloomy condemnation of the war predict that there will be no objective point to strike at, that the

Zulus, if defeated in the field, will take refuge in their natural fastnesses. Our troops will be exhausted in an ever-baffled pursuit, and will be harassed by constant attacks.

In forecasts such as this, allowance is not made for the strong common sense of the Zulus. We have given them what they wanted, an opportunity of "washing their spears." They are, perhaps, satisfied with the result, and will not long resist the coercion by starvation and constant pursuit which has proved effectual with other tribes. Katshwayo may, perhaps, retire to Swaziland. In that case the Zulu people will be glad enough to have peace.

It is even possible that Katshwayo may submit. Everything will depend on the terms offered. Till the instructions given to Sir G. Wolseley are published we cannot say what terms he is authorised to offer. Government and Sir Bartle Frere are quite as anxious as the Aborigines' Protection Society to bring the war to a close on "reasonable" terms. But no terms can be regarded as reasonable which do not break down once and for ever the military organization of the Zulus, and establish amongst them a peaceful and merciful Government.

A few of the Transvaal Boers have fought with splendid courage against the Zulus. But the Boers, as a whole, have maintained an attitude of angry indifference. If we have anything to regret regarding the annexation, it is that the measure was not deferred till the nearer approach of danger would have satisfied the Dutch farmers that our intervention alone saved them from ruin and even extermination. The old controversy regarding the annexation has been revived to embitter and obscure the controversy regarding the policy of the war. We can only say that annexation was unavoidable, and that, far from having led to the Zulu War, it postponed the outbreak.

Many of the Boers appreciate the advantages our intervention brought, but the pseudo patriotic clamour of a few has kept the agitation alive. A great meeting of farmers at Wonderfontein protested against the extinction of their independence. Later, several thousands encamped near Pretoria, and for some time open violence was feared. But Sir Bartle Frere with characteristic courage, as soon as affairs in Natal permitted, proceeded to the camp. He heard the farmers patiently, and argued with them moderately. He made an accurate record of their views for submission to the Home Government, but he held out no hope of a reversal of annexation. The fullest measure of good government and even of self-government would be accorded—but no more. His firmness and good humour prevailed. The angry assembly dissolved, and though the Boers still protest, they protest peacefully. It is no doubt untrue that they entered

into relations with Katshwayo with a view to common action, but it is to be noted that their change of attitude occurred soon after the news of the victory of Gingihlovo arrived.

The Government of the Orange Free State, though it has decided to remain neutral, has expressed its sympathy with Natal, and has given facilities for the enrolment of volunteers.

Moirosi, one of the chiefs of the Basutos, has for some time been in revolt. A colonial force beleaguers his stronghold, and trifling encounters, with varying fortune, have taken place.

The rebels on the island in the Orange River have at last been dispersed.

At intervals, since the war commenced, Zulu messengers have come declaring vaguely that Katshwayo wished for peace, and more recently, that he despaired of successful resistance. The messengers, however, were by their own confession not authorised to treat, and were not of such rank as those whom the King generally selected as his representatives. Though there is every reason to believe that the King was acquainted with the terms of the ultimatum, and knew that the war was waged to enforce them, there was no reference to them in his messages. It therefore seemed probable that his overtures were mere attempts to gain time, or to tempt our commanders to relax their precautions. The King's warlike preparations meanwhile continued. The attacks at Isandula, at Gingihlovo and at Kambula, were each preceded by these "peaceful" messages. As it seemed probable that the messengers were mere spies, they were subjected to some restraint in our camp, and, in one case, were, by an unfortunate mistake, unnecessarily detained.

It now appears that till lately Katshwayo himself made no attempt to avert war. Certain of his indunas, without his knowledge, sent messengers to General Crealock, commanding the Lower Tugela column. On their return, Katshwayo, who meanwhile had discovered that his people were weary of fighting, gave his sanction to their enterprise. They have since had an interview with Lord Chelmsford and have been told by him that if Katshwayo proves the sincerity of his intentions by sending ambassadors with part of the plunder of Isandula which is known to be in his possession, by promising to restore the rest, and by causing his own regiment to lay down their arms, an armistice would be granted. It is clear that to suspend operations without exacting effective guarantees would be mere folly. Delay would be valuable to the Zulus who have their crops to look after, but would be fatal to us. If the King is really willing to make peace on our terms he will not hesitate to comply with these preliminary requirements. If he is unwilling to concede them,

it is worse than waste of time to enter into negotiations. The general opinion at the seat of war seems to be, that not till he has discovered our superiority in the open field will he consent to that extinction of his power which our safety renders imperative.

Meanwhile all is ready for the advance on Ulundi. The first division under Lord Chelmsford was near Ibabanango, where almost midway between the frontier and Ulundi, a fortified depot is to be maintained. Subsidiary posts will connect the base with the head of the advancing column. Gen. Crealock's column has also advanced from its base in the Lower Tugela, and already has drawn close to the northern column in the heart of Zululand. The plan of the campaign seems to be to drive the enemy to the north-east.

Victoria.—All who understand the important Colony of Victoria, all who are familiar with the constitutional, political, social, industrial, or economical prospects of Victoria, one and all join, with the emphasis of knowledge, in the perennial cry for Reform. And this cry has at last been brought to the august ears of the Imperial authorities. But this desired reform is no result of any grand impulse of progress: it springs not from "advanced notions;" it has nothing in common with the "onward march of peoples;" it originates not in high-flown theories. On the contrary, as becomes a community of practical colonists, this cry takes its rise in commonplace facts. The Constitution of Victoria has pronounced itself in effect unworkable. As it at present stands on paper, it has proved inadequate to its allotted task. And the keen politicians of Victoria, unable to agree amongst themselves as to the true remedy, or, indeed, as to the actual application of any remedy at all, have shown some vestige of business-like common sense by appealing to the experienced statesmanship of the Home authorities for a remedy which they rightly regard as the best procurable in the present condition of political experience.

Did the English public see more of the newspapers written by and for distant communities of Englishmen, they would awake to the fact that English public opinion is eagerly sought for and religiously venerated to the limits of the earth. And this is above all the case when opinion is needed in respect to the more thoughtful and learned branches of human endeavour. Constitutional policies are influenced more than any others by the valued opinions of Home statesmen. Nor is this condition of things other than natural if we are to believe in the proverbial common sense of Englishmen. Victoria covers an area just equal to that of England, Wales, and Scotland; and her revenue equals that of such States as Portugal or Chili; while her

trade with England is double that of those States. At the same time, her population does not exceed that of Kent. Consequently, we have a small band of men saddled with very important responsibilities and duties—for Victorians manage their own affairs by the means of Parliamentary Government. Such a state of things drives a large percentage of the population to hold prominent positions in the actual government of the community. Need it be wondered, then, that among the leading engineers of the State machinery there appear ever and anon workmen inspired by crude notions, or even actually incapable? Need it be wondered if the State machinery, whether in build, management, or repair, suffers from this well-intentioned care of the incompetent?

But as, on the one side, we have this peculiarly circumstanced community of Victorians, so, on the other, we have the fact that this community still remains part and parcel of a larger whole. The pioneer band of 800,000 can fall back for aid or support on a veteran army of 30,000,000. We may not be surprised, then, that the Victorian public pay reverent heed to Home opinions, whether these be elaborated with the concentration of skill at the command of the Colonial Office, or ably detailed in the publications of men who have won for their abilities public recognition in a community which is forty times the size of that of Victoria. This is the basis of one of those ties of mutual interest which Lord Hartington has recently told us hold the Empire together.

The Constitution of Victoria is embodied in an Act of Parliament, not lengthy, and easily to be understood for the reading thereof. And there is one sole point in which the Constitution halts. That point in itself is simple in the extreme. The Parliamentary Government of the Victorian Constitution is bicameral on the English system. It has failed to work with the success of its model; and the visible sign of this failure has been the frequent recurrence of deadlocks between the two Houses of Parliament. All parties agree that the prevention of such deadlocks is all that need be sought. But though these actual evils of the ailment are undisputed, in its diagnosis, and consequently in its treatment, doctors vehemently differ.

It is well to remember that the local doctors, from whom we might expect the most intimate knowledge, unfortunately belong to local parties: their party theories colour their vision; and party theories in Victoria are of the most opposite and rival types. As with the body national, so with the body natural; the homœopathist of the present day will diagnose and describe in exact opposition to the allopathist; and each will have lengthy theoretic reasons for his course; his mind

has been coloured with them in his bringing up. The next generation may have an entirely new system in store for those of us that survive. Change time to space, and the analogy is presently profitable. The Berry party of Victoria are imbued by their "party bringing up" with definite views: so, too, the Opposition hold other theories and remedies to be correct for the ailment in question. It is well that there exists a third party, removed from either influence, yet knowing both, and so capable of developing some new diagnosis and new treatment. Thus, while the hot antagonism of the local doctors prevent absolutely the initiation of all curative treatment, the independent advice of outsiders may be looked to, to introduce some really workable compromise.

The only need is that these otherwise skilful and learned outsiders should be possessed of the true facts of the particular case in hand. Those who enjoy unprejudiced knowledge, know well that the real point of issue in Victoria lies in the proprietary of the soil of the colony. History shows that the first human occupants of any soil are the owners of flocks and herds; and the history of the occupation of the virgin soil of Australia is no exception to this rule. Men with their flocks and herds pushed into the untenanted wilds in search of pasture. The business was eminently profitable. The owners of the flocks and herds, under the title of squatters, increased in numbers, and as they increased so they jostled one another. No sooner do tribes, and after them communities, become contiguous than compromise gives rise to political institutions; or, in what some modern authors would call the absurd picture of the older theorists, "a stage of warfare is succeeded by a stage of contract." In plain words, a State is created; and forthwith the interests of the squatter fall to the care of a Government. In Victoria, the action of Government proceeded in this wise—each squatter was allowed to feed his flocks within certain limits, and others were prevented encroaching on these limits by the strong arm of the united community; the muscle and sinew of this strong arm being signified by a portion of the squatters profits. In other words, the squatter rented from the Government large districts or runs. These squatters, by the natural increase of their flocks, and with the aid of great advantages in climate and vegetation, became possessed of wool both in quality and quantity far surpassing that of any other country in the world. The consequent increase of their wealth was great.

During these halcyon days of Victoria came the discovery of gold. This at once flooded the country with a large immigrant class who speedily dug wealth from the earth. There is a permanent law

of the human heart, that no sooner is its owner possessed of wealth than it must needs contemplate the ownership of land. So this large class of men who had gathered together wealth by the agency of the pick or the grog-shop, looked round them for homes of their own. Manhood suffrage had been introduced. Consequently, the Government that would stand firm on its legs at once sought to gratify this plausible desire of the manhood majority. It was argued that a numerically large class of small landowners is undoubtedly a great element of stability in a community. It was also most truly foreseen that the ready and cheap purchase of land would prove a powerful immigration magnet; its success as such was hardly inferior to that of the report of squatting and mining good fortune; and there came about a very great influx of population.

The squatters, however, very soon discovered that these immigrants bought up small portions of land as soon as they could scrape together a small sum of money. The pastoral runs were vast, but they had their more valuable and their less valuable portions. In most districts flocks were only to be watered at some one or two lagoons or "water-holes." And when the squatter discovered one fine day that the land around this water hole had all become the property of some three or four "selectors," he knew at once that a large tract of his run became useless to him, and so to the State, unless such indiscriminate intrusion could be prevented. But the prime principles of these early land-laws was that the land was sold at a low price. And the squatter was wealthy, and the selector poor. Land was rapidly bought up; but selectors were bought out; and the "Shepherd Kings," from being what Nature intended them mere *tenants* of uncultivated lands, became, in self-defence, *owners*. And the land in law passed from the care of the State to that of the individual.

The theory of cheap land purchase was most plausible. It succeeded with a grand success in its two main objects, the introduction of population and the sale of numerous small holdings. But it brought about an unintended, but no less influential, result in the changing the squatter from his historical position of tenant to his forced condition of extensive landowner. But the squatter, whose primary product was wool—for there is no sale for mutton in the Australian bush—found that wool, grown with the sole aid of the natural bush fertility, though it yielded most handsome profits on low-rented lands, yet failed to yield any profit at all when such lands were each acre of them purchased. Thus, for instance, it by no means followed that it was highly profitable to grow wool on the old system of trusting all to Nature in a run of 30,000 acres when that run had been just purchased for 30,000*l.*, while its former rent reached only 500*l.* per

annum. Accordingly, squatters turned more to the breeding of stock of excellent quality for the stocking of new runs in the unoccupied interior of Australia; they availed themselves of the indirect effect of enhancing the value of the fleeces that fell to them in the process; and they set themselves vigorously to work to improve by irrigation, planting, and sowing, the feeding capabilities of their large tracts of wild bush land which they fondly imagined had now become their own.

The cheap alienation of land, the policy of the party supported by the class of owners of little wealth—a class, in a colony where manhood suffrage prevails, of very great political power—proved in the long run of greater benefit to its opposers than to its proposers. Yet in the hands of the latter still remained some preponderance of political power. What was to be done in the interests of this party?

The most important step taken was that culminating in the Land Law of 1877; a measure on which Mr. Berry, the present Premier, rests his chief claim to power. This is a Property tax confined expressly and entirely to one kind of property. It taxes alone the industry of Squatting—an industry which is the natural backbone of the prosperity of every Australian colony. The title "Land Tax" is altogether a misnomer. The cardinal principle is seen in the standard of valuation adopted—viz., the number of sheep the land will carry per acre. It is, indeed, nominally a Land tax, and has the excellent theoretic proviso, borrowed from the English Income tax, that land, assessed for the purposes of this Act below a certain value shall pay no tax. This is a proviso palpably in favour of that small landowner class whose benefit was originally sought. But curiously enough it extends its shield over a very large proportion of most wealthy landowners. There are many who enjoy enormous incomes from their potato farms in the Warnanibool district, or their stock-breeding "estates," or their valuable sites in Collins Street, or the suburbs of Melbourne. These owners pay no Land tax; for their land, which yields them all this revenue, does not carry the requisite number of sheep to place them within the proud but taxed ranks of the squatters. These facts are clearly seen by the more intelligent Victorians, a class which will soon, in all probability, resume the reins of affairs. All owners of property cannot but feel that their *confrères*, the squatters, are now having played off upon them what may be termed political spite for the unforeseen issue of the previous popular policy—the cheap alienation of the public land.

Such are what may be termed the social or economical elements of the question at issue. Side by side with these must be ranged those which are rather constitutional or political. The two Houses of the

Victorian Parliament are elective. The electors to the Upper House must be possessed of a certain qualification either of wealth or education. They are, in fact, those who chiefly support the State, or those who are best capable of understanding the principles of government. For the Lower House, on the other hand, manhood suffrage prevails. There are few educated persons, few shopkeepers, or even provident artisans who are not qualified electors to the Council; nevertheless, these qualified electors only number some 30,000, as against the remaining 150,000 electors to the Lower House. It will then be readily inferred that in the Council there is usually to be found a majority representing the wealth, the learning, and the higher industrial elements of the colony; while in the Lower House there rules more frequently a majority that seeks the support of the masses. These masses are, of course, not so accessible to reason; which would, indeed, lead them from the temptations of the present to the unseen benefits of the future; they come to be less regardful of consequences than the electors to the Council. And it may be said that, however much the one party are the champions of their own selfishness, they are outdone in any harm they may cause to the community by the heedless recklessness of the other.

By way of instance, there is the fact that the masses just now vehemently support a strict Protectionist policy, and they do so on the specious plea that it provides labour for the labourer. But they utterly scorn to notice the fact that not only are the most common articles manufactured in the colony far higher in price than if imported, but that since the inauguration of strict Protection, farmers and many other employers of labour have actually taken their capital with them to the neighbouring colonies. They find their profits far greater where they can buy their reaping machines and other requisites at the low prices induced by American and English competition—with no need to pay over a share of their own profits to the lucky manufacturer who has the monopoly of the manufacture of agricultural implements in Melbourne. The labourer gives his electoral support to the man who vaguely promises him increase of wages; but he looks not far enough ahead to see that he pays away this increase and more, if, indeed, he can get any work at all, in the enhanced prices of what he buys; while, at the same moment, he is scaring capital from the colony, or, in other words, killing the goose that lays him his golden eggs.

Such, then, is the open secret of the principles to the two essential parties in Victoria; and we have seen it is an important political accident that those principles become the principles of the two Houses of Parliament respectively. Can it be wondered, then, that at all events

the opportunities for deadlocks occur? And there are subsidiary causes which aggravate this condition of things. Among these none is more prominent than the fact that the personnel of the Assembly as a body differs no less from that of the House of Commons than does that of the Council from that of the House of Lords.

The main recruiting ground of the House of Commons is among the scions of families that have, at all events for some generations, enjoyed the advantages of competence, and so of careful education. They have tasted of and become familiar with the best that man has yet devised in point of self-improvement. There is, too, within the House of Commons a large majority of the best men of this educated class—whether of those who in the large arena of public competition throughout the English Empire have proved themselves of more than average ability, or of those whose fathers have done so, leaving to their sons the heirship of a fair name, and probably the heritage of talents or, at all events, of honest ambitions. The sole utilitarian advantage of entering Parliament—viz., the social prestige of membership—is the motive but in exceptional cases. It is the early ambition of serving one's country well, mingled even if this be with the alluring prospect of a Minister's fame; but worldly advancement, pecuniary reward, the making out of it a living, this class of inducements are entirely foreign to the very possibilities of membership. Yet this is not so with the Victorian Assembly. Men have no doubt sought seats in it from precisely similar motives to the Home candidate; but the community is small, and there are fewer than necessary of this highly desirable class. No doubt this state of things must and will alter with age, but in the meantime there reigns, in addition, a scheme, temporary, it is true, in nature, yet nevertheless sufficing greatly to maintain these anomalous conditions of Parliamentary life. Each member receives 300*l.* a year and a free railway pass. The motives and the prospects involved were well condensed in the confessions to the writer of this of a once well-known Member of this Assembly:—"I came to Victoria to dig gold; I prospered but little. I had no capital; found the shepherd's life too rough; and of clerkships there were none vacant. By a happy inspiration I addressed myself to the electors; made vague promises of what I would do for them did I ever get into power. Since then I have been a respectable Member, living on my 300*l.* a year and my free railway pass; and ever looking forward to turning up some day as a Minister with my 1500*l.* or 2000*l.* a year, or, at all events, in the end falling into some such snug berth as one of those Land Commissionerships at 1000*l.* per annum. After all, I could not have done much better in

life, certainly not considering the liberty I enjoy in regard to the when, the where, and the how much of my work."

Payment of Members is no doubt a debatable point. Concerning it, however, one fact is undeniable. It opens the doors of Parliament to a large class of men who have practically no stake in the prosperity of the community; to others, who lack the necessary education; to others, who lack the highly useful business shrewdness of the self-made man. In short, as was once said of it, "it looks much like an open invitation by the community to place their corporate affairs in the hands of those who have failed in the ordinary affairs of life." The proportion of these undesirable classes who accept this invitation, who enter through these doors, depends intimately on the competition of the more eligible and useful candidates. In Victoria these better men have not come forward as they should. It is notorious that many able young sons of the wealthy, enjoying the advantages of European training or world-wide travel, have not taken to Parliamentary life with the hereditary zest of their compeers in England. The atmosphere of salaried membership may be uncongenial. At all events there is but much reason to see that at present there is unrestricted opportunity for a very large leavening of a most undesirable element in the Victorian Assembly, which at times renders it incapable of that spirit of sagacious compromise and of dignified forbearance which has been the lubricating oil of the British Parliamentary machine.

And when we turn to regard the personnel of the Victorian Upper House we do not meet with any closer resemblance to the House of Lords. The majority of the Members are a very useful and able type of men. Their talents are proven; their own abilities have for the most part raised them in life to be leaders in their community. They would form a most useful element in any House of Commons. But they are men who owe their good fortune to themselves, and to their trades and industries at which they have bravely toiled. They are thus indubitably the "Representatives" of certain interests; they are often termed the "Representatives" of wealth; and they have not always shown themselves untrammelled by the influence of their personal surroundings. They are not above and beyond the actual industrial life of the community. They are personally interested in and mixed up with the leading concerns of the colony. As a body they represent capital. And as a body they do not appear in the Assembly: stragglers from their ranks may be found in the Lower House. But the main body of these "Representatives of wealth and education" seek the sure seats of the Council. They thus feel to the quick many policies or proposals of the Assembly which deal with

matters with which the Members of the Assembly have little or no connection. Thus, the Lower House is no longer the arena where Representatives of *all* the interests of the community meet on common ground; it becomes, as we have seen, the stronghold of the Representatives of labour, of small capitalists, of the less prosperous members of the community.

The main result is that in Victoria the two Houses of Parliament are co-ordinate, not alone in theoretic powers, but in their asserted practice of them. This state of things, it need hardly be said, is not Parliamentary Government on the English system. The House of Commons, making use of the best technical knowledge of the community, initiates schemes and generally supervises all the legislative, administrative, and executive functions of the State. The House of Lords, like some Council of Elders, aids the Lower House with its matured wisdom, its advice, or, if need be, its remonstrance. But it attempts not to set itself forward as a counter authority, or a rival in the same arena; it regards itself as the "Governor" of the State Engine, regulating all eccentricities of motion; or as the break to stay too rapid a speed. In Victoria, on the contrary, each of the two Houses has shown itself most jealous of all interference on the part of the other. Leading Members of the Upper House claim for it the Constitutional position of a "second House of Commons." The state of things has been summed up in the conclusion that "a measure has but to be proposed in one House to be opposed in the other." And this is a strange phrase to apply to a Parliament on "the English model."

The most glaring instance of the truth of this conclusion is to be seen in the recent local attempts at reform. With the proposals that emanated from the Assembly, the Council would have little to do. And the same treatment befell the suggestions of the Council once they appeared in the Assembly. Both classes of proposals proceed on the assumption that the Upper House needs reforming. This coincidence is remarkable. But the one scheme reforms by subtracting from, the other, by adding to the powers of the Council. The schemes that have the support of the majority in the Assembly practically do away with the Council. Thus, it was proposed to enact that if the Council reject Bills passed by the Assembly in two consecutive Sessions, these Bills are to be taken as passed, subject only to the Council having a right to appeal directly to the electors of the Assembly. The Council, in other words, is asked to waive its own claim to power, and subordinate that of the Assembly to rule by Plebiscite. Other yet more stringent measures were proposed in regard to Money Bills. When we bear in mind that property finds due representation, at the present, in the

Upper House alone, we shall understand how it is that the Council does not approve of this class of proposals.

The schemes that have the support of the majority in the Council seek to reform the Council into more power. By lowering the franchise and the qualifications for membership, by inaugurating a something equivalent to Dissolution, it is sought to make the Council a partner of acknowledged equality in the Government of the country. It is urged that as mercy is the attribute of the great, so is forbearance that of the strong; and that on occasion the Council would yield to the Assembly, conscious of its own increased strength. But these apothegms are rather applicable to the dealings between superiors and inferiors, between weak and strong, than between equals. To many minds such a reform would only seem to intensify the conditions of the past, and so to equalise the powers of the opposing forces, that a contest could but conclude with the exhaustion of both forces; or, in other words, the ruin of the community.

There is a silver lining to the cloud. This very rivalry of the two Houses will prevent either of these two classes of destructive schemes becoming law. The remedy to be provided must be something altogether different, if it is to be adopted with the concurrence of the community itself; and there are two distinct types of reform possible.

The one class specially regards the present. Acknowledging that universal suffrage prevails in Victoria and that the Upper House is elective, we turn for hints to countries where such a state of things prevail. In these we find a legal means to compromise between the two Houses. The principle adopted is that when the two Houses differ, they sit together as one House and decide finally by a two-thirds majority.

The other class specially regard the future. The colony is at present in the transition state of youthful development. The materials are not at the present moulded into the stage requisite for the support of a true English Parliament, but signs that they are capable of, and rapidly tending to, this are distinctly apparent. The question then is, how to turn the Assembly into a House of Commons, and the Council into a House of Lords. At the present, wealth, intellect, and property, find voice in the Council. Again, at the present, the Council alone keeps prominently in legislative life that upper stratum of society, which all ages and countries have shown to be a necessary element towards insuring a lasting and equitable form of Representative Government. It is not the rule of the masses or of the few that can give prosperity to a community, but it is the securing to each man his proper opportunities; and this can alone be done when a Government reigns which has truly at heart the interest of each and every class. An Assembly,

for instance, which is violently antagonistic to one of the most wealthy and important industries of the community is not likely to conduct the affairs of that community to the satisfaction of all its component parts. This is the lesson Victoria has been learning.

To turn the Assembly into a House of Commons there must be some modification of the existing franchise, and there must be some alteration in the personnel of the Members. To do away with manhood suffrage, once it has been introduced, is impossible, but its effect may be qualified. In the Victorian community there is ample scope for the introduction of some scheme which shall bring about the better representation of the learned and teaching professions, and of property. Additional taxes to rate-payers is a type of suggestions that might be attempted with advantage. Very great things are to be expected of the rescinding of the present temporary arrangement of payment of Members. The abolition of this, an abolition warmly advocated by an increasing class in the colony, would go a long way towards improving the tone and dignity of the House, and attracting to it a better and more independent class of Members.

To turn the Council into a House of Lords, it is a first necessity that the Assembly become a House of Commons. So soon as all interests find due representation in the Lower House, the Upper House can at once become a true Senate. Such a change will be inaugurated by the adoption of nomination for election; and a seat in the Council become the honoured prize for success in any walk of life. The wealthy, the learned, the skilful, the successful, may there congregate to watch disinterestedly over and tend the prosperous development of the community.

The means to these ends are the honoured suggestions of Home opinion, and the more direct inspirations of that Home opinion speaking through the Colonial Office and the Governor. To the good sense of Victorians must be left the rest.

The main result of the late visit of the Victorian Premier to England has been a despatch to the Governor of Victoria, in which Sir Michael Hicks-Beach has embodied much sound advice. He presses Victorians to accept the onus of self-government in a right and intelligent spirit. He deprecates direct interference by the Imperial Parliament, for it would "involve an admission that the great Colony of Victoria was compelled to ask the Imperial Parliament to resume a power which, desiring to promote her welfare, and believing in her capacity for self-government, the Imperial Parliament had voluntarily surrendered, and that this request was made because the leaders of political parties, from a general want of the moderation and sagacity essential to the

success of Constitutional Government, had failed to agree upon any compromise for enabling the business of the Colonial Parliament to be carried on." The question remains, have the present political leaders in Victoria the sagacity and moderation to propose and to accept such further definition or even modification of their present Constitution as shall develop to the full its latent powers of true Parliamentary Government. Englishmen will watch with interest the next political moves in Victoria; for these will confirm or deny the ability of Victorians to manage their own affairs. The Victorian Constitutional difficulties are thus of pregnant interest to those who watch the automatic development of Parliamentary Government in the dissociated communities of Englishmen now rising to power and strength in so many quarters of the globe.

THE
WESTMINSTER
AND
FOREIGN QUARTERLY
REVIEW.

OCTOBER 1, 1879.

ART. I.—THE FEDERATION OF THE ENGLISH EMPIRE.

IN this Article* we have to consider the practical working of an Imperial Federal system. It will, perhaps, be best to deal first with the question of representation.

As briefly stated before, the governing principles in carrying out a Federation of the Empire are the separation of Imperial from local affairs in Parliamentary Government, and the representation by popular election of all parts of the empire in the Imperial Parliament.

These are the main principles as broadly stated, though they are subject to limitations. Thus, in the matter of representation, it would not be either desirable or necessary that *every* colonial possession should be directly represented, as many of the very small colonies would not be of sufficient importance to be accorded representation in the Imperial House; but as each colony grew and developed it would ultimately be accorded this representation. The precise stage in the life of a colony at which it would arrive at this representation would be a matter to be decided as circumstances required. That is to say, it would not be advisable to create any definite and fixed standard—based either upon population, wealth, or extent—by which to regulate the admission to the Imperial Parliament, and to grant this admission only when that standard had been attained. No doubt the population, wealth, and extent would always form the chief and important elements in the question of admission

* For the preceding Articles on the Federation of the English Empire, see the WESTMINSTER REVIEW for April and July, respectively, of this year.

to the Imperial House ; still it would be injudicious to assign any definite quantitative value to these elements, as this value might, and probably would, vary with different colonies. The main point, however, to be insisted upon is the adoption of the principle that ultimately each colony should arrive at this representation, and that the fully-developed state in the political life of each colony is that of being merged in the political life of the empire at large. Every step should be taken with this final goal in view.

It will no doubt be objected to this, as has already been objected by Lord Blatchford, that the interests of the various colonies are so diverse, that the physical conditions of each are so different, as to render any community of interest, such as would be necessary for the working of an Imperial House, impossible of being attained. To this it may be answered that, in spite of these apparent diversities and differences, this community of interest *does* exist, and exists even now, in spite of the want of any central point in which these interests may be focussed and practically utilized. There would be at least this one grand purpose, which would be common to every part of the empire—the maintenance of the empire. There is undoubtedly throughout the colonies a strong love for the mother country, a strong desire to remain connected with the mother country, and evidence of the practical outcome from these feelings is afforded in the offers of military assistance which have been tendered to England by the colonies, when the colonies have nothing to gain and everything to lose by such assistance. Would not these feelings be immensely strengthened by having a definite object afforded to them in the maintenance of one compact empire under a supreme Parliamentary Chamber? The argument drawn from the physical and geographical view of the case is captious and unsound. As well might it be said that the people of the Orkney Islands have no interests in common with the people of the West of Ireland, and that, therefore, it would be unwise to form a Parliamentary Chamber affording representation to such disconnected places. And no doubt two hundred years ago, and even less, this would have been true ; no such community of feeling could have existed between the Orkney Islands and the West of Ireland as to have rendered representation in one Parliament at Westminster, under any circumstances, possible ; the separation, geographically and intellectually, was too complete. But just as during the last two hundred years the increase of population, the extension of knowledge, the development of means of communication, the integration and differentiation of the people of the United Kingdom, have rendered this representation not only possible

but imperatively necessary ; so the same causes at work throughout the whole empire during more recent years have now resulted in a similar effect. The empire of the future, if maintained at all, must be maintained under a system of Parliamentary representation of all parts of the empire. If sectional feelings are to have weight, then the arguments adduced against affording representation in the Imperial Parliament to the colonies might be adduced with equal force as between England, Scotland, and Ireland. The argument drawn from the geographical separation is of little force. As a writer in the WESTMINSTER REVIEW* says on this subject: "As to the geographical argument, it is each year becoming more obsolete ; we laugh at distance ! Australia is not so far off now as John o' Groat's was a century ago. Swift steamers and ocean cables make Melbourne as near to us as Dublin. It is too late, when we can transmit men by steam and messages by electricity, to urge that distance is a bar to government." And each year this bar that once existed becomes less and less ; until, by the perfection of the means of travelling and communication, it will be as little personal inconvenience to a man of business to represent a constituency at Westminster as at Ottawa.

Another matter on which there would be a strong community of interest would be emigration. Under a Federal system it would be the duty and care of the Imperial Government to see that emigration from the mother country to those parts of the empire, where there were great latent resources to be developed, was properly stimulated and encouraged. It would be necessary to spend considerable sums of money every year in assisting emigrants to go out to Canada, Australia, or the Cape. The effect of this would be to reduce the pressure in the labour market at home, while those who went away would be placed in positions of comparative ease and comfort. It has been shown in a previous Article that it is only under the Federal system that Government assistance can be given to emigrants ; and that it is only under a system of assistance that the poorer classes—the true surplus—can ever afford to emigrate. It was shown also that under the Federal system not only did it become possible to give this assistance, but that it became a prime duty to afford it, and that it would be an extremely self-injurious policy on the part of the nation to refuse it. See, then, the result to which we are driven. Federation of the Empire means, for the unemployed and the poor, assisted passages to various parts of the empire, where their labour would command a remunerative

* "Our Colonial Empire," WESTMINSTER REVIEW, April, 1876.

price. It means transplanting them from squalor, destitution, and misery to comparative ease, plenty, and comfort. To the colonies, on the other hand, Federation of the Empire would mean a plentiful supply of labourers; it would mean a rapid and complete opening up and peopling of the country; an amazing renewing of the national vigour. From a purely national standpoint this would seem to imply sufficient community of interests to make a Federation workable. But what shall we say when we consider the individual interests of those benefited by this national emigration? Take the case of a labouring man in England. Even by the utmost prudence and economy it is impossible for him to support himself and his family, and at the same time lay by any money worth the naming to guard against less prosperous times. When dull times come, as they do periodically, his little savings are swallowed up in a few weeks, or at most months. He has to rely on charity and poor-rates for subsistence, while his misery is increased tenfold, and a fresh bitterness added to his degradation by the sight of his starving little ones. Tell such a man (and there are thousands such in England at the present day) of a land beyond the seas where he can get plenty of work, where he can place his family beyond the horrors of starvation; tell him that the Government will pay his passage out to this new country, will assist him to start in the new life, and would not his heart be moved with new hope, would not his whole being be moved to new action? If the working men of England, the unemployed of the mother country, understood the Federation of the Empire in this sense, every other political question would sink into insignificance before it. Federation of the Empire would be *the* question of the day. It would be discussed in every working-man's club; it would be advocated at every meeting; it would be made the test question at every polling-booth. For the philanthropist there could be no work the consummation of which would confer such immeasurable benefits on his fellow-men as the Federation of the Empire. Not only for the present would the condition of the poor be immensely improved, but for an indefinitely long time their descendants would be placed in positions where, by their own industry and perseverance, they could live in comfort and plenty.

Again, on viewing the trade aspect of the case, we shall discover a sufficient community of interest to render a Federation of the Empire desirable. Within the last fifty years the wonderful development of the means of communication has almost revolutionized the older systems of trading. Raw material from remote corners of the earth is poured into England, there to be worked into useful articles, and again exported in its finished state to far distant countries. Distance is no bar to trade. The flannel

shirt worn by the Canadian farmer, and which he has bought at the little country "store," is probably made from wool clipped from an Australian sheep, has been manufactured in some English factory, and again carried some thousands of miles by sea and rail before it reaches its final purchaser. And all this has been done at a less cost, and a better garment is obtained, than if the farmer had clipped the wool from one of his own flock. The cost of carrying the material this immense distance is probably less than was the cost in former times of conveying it from London to Birmingham. Again, the cheese made on the Canadian farm is perhaps purchased on account of its superiority and cheapness by some London artisan. To a far greater extent than ever before is England now dependent upon countries outside of herself for the prime necessities of her physical and commercial existence.* Like a great tree, her roots have struck into far distant countries, while her branches overshadow the most remote lands. As it is impossible for the English people to live unless supplied with food from other countries, so it is impossible for English trade to live unless it has access to other countries. Recognising this, we may ask what precautions has England taken, what political safeguards has she adopted in order to secure and maintain her colonial trade? It is with amazement that we have to answer, "None at all." While she has spent millions of money, and poured out her blood in opening up the markets of the world, in acquiring and peopling vast possessions, in forming new markets for herself, in her colonies she has adopted a policy towards these colonies which puts it in the power of colonial politicians, in order to gratify some personal ambition, or gain some party triumph, to adopt a fiscal policy that excludes English manufactures, that shuts out English trade. No sooner is a colony sufficiently developed to become of value to England as a purchaser of English manufactures, than England lets slip from her hands the power that could direct or control the movements of English trade.† In our immediately preceding Number we discussed the question of Free Trade and Protection, and only need now to point out to the British manufacturer and the British taxpayer how the volume and direction of British trade is immediately and directly affected by the fiscal policy adopted by the various British colonies. Under a system of "Protection," with the object of fostering colonial manufactures, British trade is injured and British merchants suffer. In order to maintain a fiscal system throughout the empire that would ensure the colonial markets for British manufactures, it is

* In the last forty years the value of the export trade in English manufactured goods has increased about four times.

† This not in the Protectionist sense, but in the sense of preventing inimical legislation.

apparent that the fiscal policy of the empire must be under the control of the empire—that is, of one chief Parliamentary Chamber of the Empire; and this implies Federation. Under the present colonial system it is impossible for England to exert any restraint over the fiscal policy of her colonies; if they choose to adopt Protection, England cannot choose but agree to it. But it must be apparent to every British manufacturer upon rightly viewing the trade question, that there is sufficient community of interest between himself and his fellow-subjects in the colonies to render a Federation of the Empire desirable.

Granting, then, that this Parliamentary representation is a necessary element in the maintenance of the unity of the empire, let us now inquire how this representation may be best effected. To this question there seems to be but one answer. The representation must be effected by the election of members to serve in the Imperial House. All parts of the empire (that are fully admitted to the Federation) must be represented in a similar manner. It has been proposed, however, by Sir Julius Vogel and others, that a Council should be formed of colonial representatives, which should officially advise the Colonial Secretary or the House of Commons on colonial matters, and that the representation of the colonies should be effected in this manner. This might, perhaps, be a judicious manner in which gradually to introduce the Federal system, but it is impossible that this could be the ultimate and final form that the colonial representation would assume. If the Federation of the Empire is an accomplished fact, why should Canada or Australia be represented in a more imperfect manner in the Imperial House than is Scotland? Is it reasonable to suppose that as Canada or Australia grow in wealth and population they would be satisfied to be represented in the Imperial Chamber only in a second-hand manner? If the empire is one, all parts should have equal rights, and all parts should have a proportionate share in the governing of the empire. Representation by a Council, as proposed, would be simply a continuance of the present system; it would not afford representation in the Imperial House to all parts of the empire.

The objection that seems to be always supreme in the minds of most Englishmen in dealing with this question of colonial representation in the Imperial House is, that already the House of Commons is too large and unwieldy to do its work, and that to admit colonial members and bring in colonial questions to the House would so increase the business and enlarge the talking capacity of the House as to bring all business to a standstill. Already it is found impossible to get through the business of a Session during the sittings of the House, and every year numerous measures are shelved without, from lack of time, having been considered at all; while upon some popular question

the time of the House is utterly wasted in listening to the repetition *ad nauseam* of the same ideas and opinions by members who feel it to be their duty to make speeches in order to have them read by their constituents. So pronounced has this evil become of late, and so great are the difficulties of carrying through the necessary business of the House, that we have at the conclusion of every Session a long list of Bills that have been thrown aside from sheer inability of the House to take up their consideration, while the press teems with suggestions for the expediting of public business. From an Article published in the *Times* of 6th May, 1878, it appears that the total number of Measures before the House during the then current Session was 147 public Bills, and 275 private Bills. How many of the 147 Bills became law at the termination of the Session might be hard to say, but after three months' work only fifteen had been consummated, while four others had gone up to the House of Lords, and of the remainder only thirty-nine passed a second reading. Of the 275 private Bills, besides those of a purely personal nature, there were ninety-six railway Bills, thirty-one tramway Bills, thirty-one water Bills, twenty-four gas Bills, eighteen docks and harbours Bills, and forty-nine local improvements Bills. These private Bills would appear, all of them, to be of a purely local nature, and not such as should require the deliberations of the highest Chamber of the Empire. As the writer of the Article says, "Why the Imperial Legislature should have to ratify arrangements for empowering a landlord to grant leases for ninety-nine years instead of twenty-one when he and all persons interested in the property have already decided the change to be for their common benefit, it might be hard to explain to a German or French Deputy." No doubt it would, and the same might be said of most, if not all, of the private Bills. Again, the same Article says, "The conclusion is obvious, and has been recognised for years past, that Parliament undertakes more work than it can ever accomplish." Here in these two sentences there is a recognition of the fact that Parliament is not only overburdened with work, but also undertakes work that is somewhat derogatory to the high functions of an Imperial Chamber.

To cure these defects in the Parliamentary system in a thorough and complete manner, there would seem to be but one course to be adopted—viz., to separate the Local from the Imperial Measures, and by forming a Local House of Parliament for the consideration of the former, thus leave the Imperial House so much the more untrammelled to deal with Imperial matters. The gain to Parliamentary legislation by this course would be immediate and direct. The Local House would be of manageable and compact proportions; its members would be able to devote

their time and energies to the proper treatment and consideration of various local questions; the dissatisfaction caused at present throughout the country by the constant burking of local measures would be allayed; and we might even hope that the Irish difficulty would be set at rest, perhaps by the formation of an Irish Local Parliament, but in any case, by reason of the House being able to devote proper time and attention to the consideration of Irish grievances. In a similar manner, the Imperial House would be much reduced in bulk and proportionately increased in activity and vitality. Its time would be occupied in the consideration of Imperial questions; its energy would not then be frittered away upon petty local matters; nor would the business of the House be obstructed by members anxious to force the consideration of some local grievance.

Such a rearrangement of the Parliamentary system would expedite public business to a degree that could not be attained by any other system; and considering the constant and steady growth of Parliamentary business, it would seem that recourse must be had to some such system in order to carry on the ordinary business of the country. Nor would this rearrangement require that any violence should be done to the English Parliamentary system; it would not introduce any new principle such as would be the case if a large part of the empire were to be represented by an Advisory Board, as has been suggested; it would simply be to adopt the Confederation system that has been found to work so smoothly in Germany and the United States. A scheme of this nature to facilitate the despatch of Parliamentary business was put forward some years ago by Earl Russell, and the fact that so experienced a Parliamentarian as he favoured the idea is somewhat of a guarantee that it is not impracticable.

But we see at once how easily and naturally, by the adoption of this system, the representation of the colonies would be effected. There would no longer be any objection to the admission of colonial representatives to the Imperial House; the matters submitted to the House would be matters of Imperial interest, matters upon which representatives of any or every part of the empire would have a right to express an opinion, and upon which they would be in a position to form sound judgments, or offer valuable advice. In the Imperial House every part of the empire would, as a matter of right, be represented. The Imperial House would stand in the same relation to Australia or Canada as to England or Ireland.

We now venture to submit a general scheme for the Imperial and Local Houses, chiefly with the hope of evoking discussion on, and developing public interest in, the subject.

The Imperial House might be composed of 300 members, distributed in the following manner :—

| | |
|--------------------|-------|
| England | 185 |
| Scotland | 25 |
| Ireland | 40 |
| Colonies | 50 |
| | <hr/> |
| | 300 |

This would retain pretty nearly the proportions in which the members are allotted at present. This, while granting the principle of colonial representation, and admitting the representatives in a sufficient number to give proper weight to colonial views and sentiments, would yet leave a proper preponderance of power on the side of England. Of course it is to be expected that with the growth and increase of the distant parts of the empire, there would go an increase in the representation.

The colonial representation might be distributed in the first instance as follows :—

| | |
|---|-------|
| Dominion of Canada and Newfoundland | 20 |
| Australia | 15 |
| New Zealand. | 5 |
| Cape Settlements | 5 |
| West Indies | 5 |
| | <hr/> |
| | 50 |

These members would be chosen by popular election, and the requisite electoral districts would be marked off in the various countries.

The Ministry of the day would be drawn from members of the Imperial House and the House of Lords, and these Ministers would be the immediate and responsible advisers of Her Majesty.

The sittings of the House would take place annually in London, and would be of five years' duration, unless terminated by a dissolution.

The matters falling within the province of the Imperial House to deal with would be chiefly comprised under the following heads :—

- Maintenance of the Royal Family.
- Control of the Army and Navy.
- Relations with Foreign Powers.
- Inter-Provincial relations with various parts of the Empire.
- Marine and Shipping Affairs.
- Customs and Finance.
- Postal Affairs.
- Justice.

These would probably represent the chief heads of business. The "Postal Affairs" would probably include the entire management and control of the Post Office business throughout the United Kingdom, but throughout the various colonies the internal management of the Post Office would, perhaps, be better left to the Local Houses. Under "Justice," would be included the establishment of Supreme Courts of Appeal in various parts of the empire. The power to appoint Judges to these Courts would be retained in the hands of the Imperial Government. Each of these Courts would be a final Court for its respective locality. The matters of Customs and Finance will be more fully treated of further on.

The following is a sketch of the Local House for England or Ireland.

The country would be under a Viceroy or Governor, appointed by the Queen in Council. The advisers of the Viceroy would be drawn from the members of the Local House, and the relations of the Viceroy to his Ministers would be precisely analogous to those of the Queen to her Ministers. The size of the Local House would, perhaps, be as follows :—

| | |
|--------------------|--------------|
| England | 250 members. |
| Scotland | 35 " |
| Ireland | 65 " |
| | <hr/> |
| Total | 350 |

This is assuming that the United Kingdom would be represented in one Local House.

All measures passed by the Local House would require the assent of the Viceroy before they could become law. But any measure of doubtful constitutionality could be "reserved" by the Viceroy, in which case the Bill would be remitted for the consideration of the Queen in Council, and either passed or vetoed. Also any measure passed by the Local House, and assented to by the Viceroy, could be annulled if vetoed by the Queen in Council within two years from the time of assent. These provisions have been adopted in Canada as between the Governor-General and the Lieutenant-Governors, and as between the Queen and the Governor-General, so as to preserve a proper control over provincial or local legislation. Copies of all Bills assented to by the Viceroy would be immediately forwarded to the Secretary of State for Her Majesty's consideration.

The local Colonial Legislatures would remain much as at present. The appointment of Colonial Governors would rest with

the Queen in Council. With respect to Canada, where confederation has already been adopted, it would probably be found that the Dominion House could assume some of the work now performed by the Provincial Legislatures, as some of the work done by the Dominion House would be transferred to the Imperial Parliament. The effect of this would be to render possible a further concentration of the Provincial Legislatures (such as Legislative union of the Maritime Provinces) with a proportionate gain in Legislative wisdom. No doubt, in time, with the development and perfecting of the municipal system of governing, the ultimate result would be to do away with all the Provincial Legislatures, and leave the present Dominion House as the one Local Legislative Assembly for Canada.

In the foregoing sketch nothing has been said about a second Chamber. For the local Legislatures a second Chamber would not be required. The veto power vested in Her Majesty in Council would hold a complete check on any unconstitutional measures, and after all it is only against such measures as these that it is possible or even desirable to guard. Under our Constitution, which may be called a "limited democracy," the will of the bulk of the people must ultimately become law. In Canada, where we have an example of Federation at work, each province (except Ontario) began its political life under the new régime, with two Chambers, a Legislative Assembly and a Legislative Council, corresponding to a House of Commons and a House of Lords. But each province has awoken, or is awaking, to the fact that the Upper Chamber is only an encumbrance and useless expense, and every province is following the example of Ontario in abolishing the Upper Chamber. So it would be with the Local Houses of England or Ireland. The Upper Chamber, if instituted at first, would soon be found to be unnecessary.

The House of Lords would be, as now, the Upper Chamber of the Imperial Parliament. It would be necessary to add a few Life Peers (perhaps 20) to represent the colonies. The position of the Bishops in the House of Lords would undoubtedly raise a very delicate question, and a question over which much bitterness would probably be displayed. There can be no question, from a perfectly unprejudiced and dispassionate standpoint, but that the Church of England is a local matter, and that as such the Bishops would no longer, *ex officio*, be entitled to a seat in the Upper Imperial Chamber.

This, then, is the scheme which is suggested for the representation of all parts of the empire in one Imperial Chamber. Even apart from the question of a Federation of the Empire, it is apparent that the Parliamentary system of England would be

strengthened and renewed in vigour by the formation of Local Houses and the separation of Local from Imperial matters. The heterogeneous mass of legislation which the House of Commons annually attempts to digest is in marked contrast to the more carefully selected food that is supplied to the chief Chambers of such countries as the United States or Germany, where the more highly-developed Parliamentary system obtains. From a separation of the measures to be considered, there would result a more careful consideration of the measures, with more carefully amended statutes. These, however, are collateral advantages, the chief result to be striven for is the formation of one great empire; an empire founded on so broad a base that no storms could move her; an empire that would be mighty in war, and yet mightier in peace, whose voice would sway the councils of every nation, and whose voice would be always on the side of right, truth, and progress.

We come now to the consideration of the income and expenditure of the Empire under Federation. This subject is very large and difficult, and though the scheme about to be submitted is probably far from perfect, still it will show that the plan in the main is workable, and all that is required is only more precise information and more exact knowledge in order to perfect the details.

In order to present a comprehensive view of the financial aspect of the case, there is inserted here a statement showing the condition of the various countries forming the colonial portion of the empire in 1875:—

| | Population. | Revenue. | Imports. | Total Trade. | Debt. |
|---------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| Canada and Newfoundland . . . | 3,832,077 | 5,249,960 | 26,791,040 | 44,556,579 | 31,481,461 |
| Australia and New Zealand . . . | 2,287,500 | 14,000,802 | 47,272,839 | 91,079,841 | 54,759,347 |
| Cape and South Africa | 251,973 | 2,506,350 | 6,940,167 | 11,983,394 | 2,757,059 |
| West Indies | 1,277,920 | 1,666,268 | 7,369,474 | 15,475,745 | 1,225,559 |
| | <u>7,651,570</u> | <u>£23,363,280</u> | <u>£89,376,510</u> | <u>£163,705,569</u> | <u>£90,223,424</u> |

While during the same year the corresponding statistics for the United Kingdom were as follows:—

| | Population. | Revenue. | Imports. | Total Trade. | Debt. |
|--------------------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| United Kingdom | 32,750,000 | £74,921,873 | £373,939,577 | £655,551,900 | £775,348,896 |

Thus, it will be seen that the colonies comprised under the four preceding headings represent no insignificant domain either in population or trade. The value of the imports into these colonies was greater than the value of the imports into the United States,* and the revenue and trade per head of the population was greater than that of the United Kingdom. The following is a tabular

Value of imports into United States in 1878 was 86,706,136 $\frac{1}{2}$.

statement of the foregoing figures worked out upon the basis of the population :—

| | Revenue. | | | Imports. | | | Total Trade. | | | Debt. | | |
|---|----------|----|----|----------|----|----|--------------|----|----|-------|----|----|
| | £ | s. | d. | £ | s. | d. | £ | s. | d. | £ | s. | d. |
| Colonies, per head of Population . . . } | 3 | 1 | 0½ | 11 | 11 | 3½ | 21 | 10 | 7½ | 13 | 7 | 2 |
| United Kingdom . . . } | 2 | 5 | 9 | 11 | 8 | 4½ | 20 | 0 | 4 | 23 | 19 | 7 |

Considering how rapid is the growth of the colonies, both in population and trade, it is apparent that in comparatively few years the above items will equal those of the United Kingdom absolutely as well as relatively.

Under a Federation of the Empire, the position to be aimed at is, that all the public debts of the empire, together with other Imperial burdens, should be assumed by the Imperial Government, and that to meet this the Imperial Government should collect Customs in every part of the empire. This is the broad principle, but it would be subject to limitations. Thus, in the first instance, it would be impossible for the Imperial Government to assume the whole burden of the National Debt, without also assuming the collection of some Local tax. Indeed, in order to meet four-fifths of the charges on the National Debt, it would be necessary that the Imperial Government should assume the greater part of the British excise duties as an Imperial revenue; the remaining one-fifth of the National Debt charges would have to be borne by the Local Government of England, until, at any rate, the Imperial Customs receipts had sufficiently increased. The collection of Customs would necessarily be carried on everywhere by Imperial officers. And the fiscal policy in all parts of the empire would be uniform, at least so far as British goods were concerned. Perhaps it would be best to introduce here a comprehensive view of this matter.

Estimated Expenditure of Empire under Federation.

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Cost of National Debt, £28,411,751; 4-5ths, or this | £22,729,400 |
| Royal Family | 550,000 |
| Army (include Colonies and India) | 17,000,000 |
| Navy | 11,000,000 |
| Customs throughout empire | 2,000,000 |
| Inland revenue (Excise, United Kingdom) | 1,000,000 |
| Salaries of Departments and Expenses | 2,500,000 |
| Law and Justice (include Supreme Courts of Appeal) | 1,000,000 |
| Post-office (include Packet Service throughout empire) | 4,000,000 |
| Consular and Foreign Service | 500,000 |
| Subsidies to Provinces | 2,000,000 |
| Interest on Colonial Debt, £100,000,000, at 3 per cent. | 3,000,000 |
| Miscellaneous, Emigration, &c. | 1,500,000 |

£68,779,400

To balance this the receipts would be somewhat as follows :—

Estimated Revenue of the Empire under Federation.

| | | |
|--|------------|------------------------|
| British Customs—7 per cent. on £380,000,000* | | £26,600,000 |
| Colonial „ —12 per cent. on 90,000,000† | | 10,800,000 |
| British Excise, Malt | 7,800,000 | } 23,300,000 |
| „ Spirits | 15,000,000 | |
| Sugar used in brewing | 500,000 | |
| Post Office | | 6,000,000 |
| Crown Lands | | 500,000 |
| Suez Canal | | 200,000 |
| Miscellaneous | | 1,500,000 |
| | | <hr/> |
| Total | | £68,900,000 |

It will be noticed that only four-fifths of the total charges on account of the National Debt are borne by the Imperial exchequer; the remaining one-fifth, amounting to 5,682,351*l.*, would have to be borne by the Local Government of England—at least until the Imperial receipts had sufficiently grown to assume the whole burden of the debt. Probably the best plan would be for the Local Government to pay the above sum annually to the Imperial Government, allowing the whole management of the debt to rest with the Imperial authorities. This would be the simplest way of arranging. It would be better, too, that it should be done in this way rather than that the Imperial Government should assume the collection of any other taxes—such as for instance, the income tax. The receipts from the income tax (5,841,265*l.* for 1877-8) would more than balance this one-fifth of the National Debt charges, still it would be better that the levying of this tax should be left to the Local Government and the necessary amount paid over as a subsidy to the Imperial exchequer rather than that the Imperial Government should assume the control of so purely local a tax. With the increase of trade the increase in the Imperial receipts from Customs would be sufficient to bear the whole burden of the National Debt. The increase required represents only about 50 per cent. on the

* The value of British imports in 1875 was 373,939,577*l.*; in 1876 it was 375,154,703*l.* The amount raised by Customs amounted in 1874 to 5·5 per cent., in 1875 to 5·3 per cent., and in 1876 to 5·15 per cent. on the gross value of the imports.

† The exact value of the imports into the Colonies for 1875 was 88,376,510*l.* The amount raised by Customs in Canada in 1875 amounted to 12·48 per cent. on the gross value of the imports. In 1876 it was 12·63 per cent. The sum raised by Customs in the United States in 1878 amounted to 30 per cent. upon the gross value of the imports, being 26,134,036*l.* upon a gross value of 86,706,136*l.*

colonial trade, and this would probably be effected in a very few years,* and then it would not be necessary that the Local Government should pay the subsidy above spoken of.

The amount set down for Customs throughout the empire is for the collection of Customs in all parts of the empire. The Customs officials would be appointed by the Imperial Government.

Supreme Courts of Appeal would be established in various parts of the empire; probably one for England, one for North America, one for the West Indies, one for Australia, and one for South Africa. The judges of these Courts would be appointed by the Imperial Government. Each one of these Courts would be a final Court. The administration of justice generally would be left in the hands of the Local Government; these Appeal Courts being the only Courts to which the Imperial Government would appoint judges.

The item of 2,000,000*l.* for subsidies to provinces is to supplement the revenues of those provinces or colonies where the source of revenue has been taken away by the absorption of the Customs dues in an Imperial revenue. Thus, in the Dominion of Canada at the present time the Dominion Government pays subsidies to the various provinces forming the Confederation amounting to a total of 801,615*l.* (\$3,655,850·58 in 1876-77). These subsidies are fixed charges, and are paid in lieu of the Customs receipts which these provinces resigned to the Dominion on entering Confederation. But if the Dominion were to join the Federation of the Empire and give up to the Imperial exchequer the Customs receipts, the Imperial Government would be required to assume the burden of these provincial subsidies. As with Canada so it probably would be with some of the other colonies, and there is therefore set down the sum of two millions sterling as being somewhat near the amount required to meet this expense.

The colonial debt is placed at 100,000,000*l.* This is greater than it is at present by some six or eight millions. It would probably be advisable to allow for a substantial increase to the colonial debt upon the eve of entering the Federation.

In estimating the probable revenue the British Custom receipts are calculated at 7 per cent. on the gross value of the imports. This is an increase of about $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on the present rate. The additional amount raised, as compared with the present Customs receipts, would be about 6,000,000*l.* On the

* The value of imports into the various colonies under consideration was about 61,500,000*l.* in 1865 as against 88,376,510*l.* in 1875, showing an increase of 43·6 per cent. in ten years.

other hand, however, there would be almost a similar remission of taxation under the Local Government of England (see page 329) which would counterbalance this increase of Customs. On the colonial imports the average Customs receipts are estimated at 12 per cent. *ad valorem* on the imports. This is probably less than it actually would be. As a very large proportion of the British imports (about 100,000,000*l.* out of 380,000,000*l.*) consists of staple articles of food, it would not be advisable to collect heavy duties on these, and, therefore, the British Customs rate would probably average less than the colonial on the total value of the imports, as the latter consist mainly of manufactured articles.

No doubt this question of Customs is one that presents considerable difficulties; and the difficulties are much increased by the fact of some of the colonies having adopted a system of Protection. For the Imperial Government in London suddenly to revert to a revenue tariff throughout the empire would in Protectionist countries create great trouble, and probably dissatisfaction. In these countries it would, perhaps, be best to maintain the Protectionist duties, so long as this was desired by a majority of the representatives of the particular country in the Imperial House. At the same time, however, it should be pointed out that Customs dues levied between parts of the empire are more of the nature of excise or octroi duties rather than Customs duties, in an international sense; and that in these Protectionist countries an octroi duty, and merely for revenue purposes, might be charged on goods entering from various parts of the empire, while a high Customs duty might be maintained in deference to the Protectionist doctrines against foreign countries. This is the plan proposed by Mr. Labilliere in his Paper read before the Colonial Institute, in January, 1875, and by some such compromise as this the Customs difficulty might, perhaps, be overcome; but, of course, the condition ultimately to be attained is that of Free Trade between all parts of the empire, while the revenue should be raised by levying Customs on foreign goods. The idea has been suggested that the Imperial exchequer might be supplied by subsidies paid by the Local Governments, leaving the Customs in the hands of the Local Parliaments to be dealt with. But it is not possible that this system could ever be the final and complete system under an Imperial Federation. It would be necessary that the control of the finances of the empire should be in the hands of the Imperial Chamber, and this could not be the case if the revenue depended on subsidies from the Local Parliaments. In the event of an increased supply being at any time asked for for Imperial purposes, it would be competent for the Local Parliament to refuse it; and the granting of supplies would be seized upon by the Local Parliaments as an

occasion to review and criticise the policy of the Imperial House, and possibly to dictate as to the future course to be pursued. Such a relation between the two houses would be quite untenable, and would certainly ere long lead to strife and disagreement. The only perfect financial system under a Federation of the Empire would be that under which the entire control of the Customs and Revenue was in the hands of the Imperial Parliament.

In the foregoing sketch of the financial condition of the Empire under Federation, enough has been brought forward to show that the scheme is practically workable. Of course, there are many points that have only been lightly touched upon, and the working out in detail of which would require much thought and skilful handling. Still the main features have been dealt with, and the result may fairly be claimed to be satisfactory. To complete the sketch, however, and even at the risk of becoming tedious, it will be necessary to show the financial condition of the Local Governments under the Federal system.

We will take the United Kingdom, using the statistics of the year 1877-8.

Estimated Revenue of British Local Government (Ireland included) under Federation.

| | |
|---|-------------|
| Stamps | £11,000,000 |
| Land and House Tax | 2,700,000 |
| Income Tax | 5,800,000 |
| Excise : Licenses, £3,000,000; Railways, £750,000 | 4,350,000 |
| Telegraphs | 1,350,000 |
| Miscellaneous | 2,000,000 |
| | <hr/> |
| | £27,200,000 |

Estimated Expenditure.

| | |
|--|-------------|
| One-fifth charge of National Debt | £5,682,351 |
| Courts of Justice | 650,000 |
| Public Works and Buildings | 1,500,000 |
| Salaries and Expenses of Departments | 1,500,000 |
| Law and Justice | 5,000,000 |
| Inland Revenue | 800,000 |
| Telegraphs | 1,200,000 |
| Education, Art, and Science | 4,000,000 |
| Miscellaneous | 1,000,000 |
| | <hr/> |
| | £21,332,351 |

From this it will be seen that the Local revenue, as pointed out previously, shows a surplus of nearly 6,000,000*l.* over the Local expenditure, and that, therefore, a reduction of taxation to this

extent would be possible. This reduction just counterbalances the increase of revenue that would be exacted by the Imperial Parliament from the increased Customs duties levied on British imports. At the same time, however, it must be pointed out that, while the reduction is favourable chiefly to the richer classes of the community, the increase is obtained from all classes of the community.

To show how Federation would affect the Colonial finances, we may give here the condition of Canada under the Imperial Federation. The statistics are taken from the Canadian Financial Blue Book for 1876-7.

| | | | |
|--|------------|------------|------------|
| Total revenue under present system | | £4,538,945 | |
| Less revenue transferred to Imperial Government under Federation :— | | | |
| Customs | £2,581,683 | | |
| Militia | 2,598 | ... | 2,584,281 |
| | | | <hr/> |
| Total Canadian revenue under Federation | | | £1,954,664 |
| | | | |
| Total expenditure under present system | | £4,839,363 | |
| Less expenditure borne by Imperial Government under Federation :— | | | |
| Debt charges | £1,611,826 | | |
| Militia and Defence | 119,408 | | |
| Customs | 148,478 | | |
| P. O. Transatlantic Packet Service | 34,000 | | |
| Appeal Court | 10,000 | | |
| Subsidies to Provinces | 752,232 | ... | 2,675,944 |
| | | | <hr/> |
| Total Canadian expenditure under Federation | | | £2,164,419 |

It will be noticed there was a deficit in the Canadian revenue amounting to 300,418*l.*, and in the new scheme submitted there is still a deficit amounting to 109,755*l.* It would be necessary to provide against this deficit by a re-arrangement of taxation ; and as a further help towards this would be the possibility, as pointed out before, of the Dominion Government assuming duties and revenues at present performed and applied by the Provincial Legislatures. This would, doubtless, more than wipe out the deficit, but it is unnecessary here to go further into details on this point. The revenue and expenditure of the various other colonies entering the Federation would be treated in a similar manner.

It may be thought painful to have gone so far into this question of revenue and expenditure, while as yet there is but little (if any) practical movement in the direction of an Imperial

Federation, but it is apparent that the whole scheme ultimately hangs upon this. If Federation cannot be shown to be workable financially, then, no matter how grand and lofty the idea may be, no matter how vividly the picture may be painted, it can never be more than an idea, it can never be more than a picture. If, on the other hand, it can be shown to be practically workable from a Governmental point of view, then it merely remains for the people, or rather, to speak more practically, the leaders in political thought throughout the empire, to weigh calmly and dispassionately the advantages against the disadvantages of Imperial Federation, and to decide which has the preponderance. Unfortunately, however, it is difficult under our system of party Government to set a new idea such as this in such a form as to be practically manageable. The question is so large, so broad and comprehensive, that it is impossible so to present it as to appeal to the ordinary intelligence and feelings of the great body of the electors. Considerable time must be required before such a general knowledge of the question is attained as to make it popular with the bulk of the people.

No political leader would care in the present unformed condition of public opinion to adopt "Federation of the Empire" as a party cry. The risk to his party would be too great. Even to identify himself prominently with the question would be dangerous, as, until the matter is more thoroughly understood, it is much more easy to stir the small and narrow feelings of a multitude against Federation, than it is to convince the higher and noble reason in favour of it. We can imagine how the popular demagogue on the eve of an election would inveigh against the candidate who was favourable to Federation of the Empire. Trembling with patriotic zeal, he would denounce the man who would "destroy the grand old historic Parliament of England," who would "suck the life-blood of the country," by a system of national emigration, who would "rob the taxpayer" of England by making him pay the interest on the colonial debt, together with much else of the same sort, calculated to rouse the venom of an unthinking crowd. And yet the Federation of the Empire is a question of the highest and most supreme importance to the nation. If the reasonings and deductions of the foregoing pages have any truth in them at all, the most vital processes of the national life are ultimately dependent on the answer to be given to this question. Neither is it a matter that can be very long delayed. The rapidity with which the empire is developing will soon place the matter beyond the realm of discussion, and the form the question will soon assume will be, not how to retain the colonies, but how to

regain them. It has been shown in these Articles that the natural development of the colonies can only result in separation from the mother country, there would seem to be no escape from this; under the present colonial policy the position to which every colony is moving is that of complete separation from the mother country, and it is only a matter of time when the political organism of the colony shall have sufficiently developed itself to bring about this result. But apart from the separation that must ultimately and certainly be thus effected, there is the probability of the separation being brought about earlier through secondary causes. A glance at the course of recent Canadian politics will show this.

As most readers of the WESTMINSTER REVIEW probably know, Canada has lately adopted a Protective tariff. At the general election for the Dominion Parliament, which took place in the autumn of 1878, the Conservative party, led by Sir John A. McDonald (then in opposition), adopted the Protection cry in order to carry the election. Canada, like every other country, suffered from the recent depression in commercial circles. Protection was prescribed by the Conservative party as the nostrum that was to cure all commercial ills. Adopt a "national policy" that will exclude the manufactures of other countries; foster and encourage Canadian manufactures by the imposition of a prohibitory tariff; keep "Canada for the Canadians," and, said the Conservative party, all will be well. Under these doctrines the people were taught to believe that the importation of cheap manufactures from England was an injury rather than a benefit. The fact that a man could purchase cloth imported from England more cheaply and of a better quality than he could make it in Canada was, instead of a matter for congratulation, a matter full of danger to the well-being of the people. Exclude the English cloth by a high tariff, and force all to use the worse and the dearer, and one step towards commercial prosperity will have been gained. No matter how subversive of reason and common sense these arguments may seem when thus nakedly stated, yet when dressed in election garb by the skill of the demagogue they had the effect of winning over the great body of the electors to the Conservative side. As the result, there is now established in Canada a strongly Protective tariff. Let us trace the consequences of this.

The British manufacturer finds that under the new tariff he is unable to trade with Canada as formerly. While, on the one hand, as a British taxpayer, he is required to assist Canada by guaranteeing the payment of the interest on Canadian loans, on the other hand, he is by the Canadian Government denied the privilege of trading with Canada. Naturally this results in a

feeling of irritation, and representations of the injustice committed are made through the press and otherwise; while it is pertinently asked, "If the colonies turn against us in this manner, why continue a connection so humiliating?" To the Canadian the matter presents itself differently. He has been taught to believe, and no doubt does believe, that the admission of British manufactures is an injury to his country. He feels that it is of the utmost importance to him to "secure the home market." He feels that his material interests are bound up in this Protective tariff; that with this tariff his commercial prosperity must stand or fall; and if the result of this should be to endanger British connection, then "so much the worse for British connection."* Thus, we see on either side of the Atlantic a feeling is produced which is antagonistic to the maintenance of the connection between the mother country and the colonies, and which might possibly, at any moment, cause a disruption of the Union. Clearly the only way to obviate such difficulties in the future is by the adoption of an uniform fiscal policy throughout the empire, and by the adoption of such a system of Imperial governing as will render it impossible for any one part of the empire to legislate against another part.

It must be borne in mind, in dealing with this question of Federation, that it is not so much the present that should be considered as the future. Though, as the foregoing pages have shown, the colonial part of the empire is by no means unimportant either in population or wealth, yet this is but the germ of the future empire. In attempting to forecast what will be the growth within the next fifty years, one cannot but be amazed at the vastness of the figures. The population will probably be not less than 70,000,000, and may be very much more. Is England content to let this vast empire slip from her grasp? Is she content to contemplate herself in the future as confined to the narrow limits of the British Isles? When she has been able, by the power of her arms, by the heroism of her soldiers, by the energy and endurance of her sons to acquire and develop these vast countries, is she not also capable of the still grander effort, and by widening her political system, hold them all under one supreme sceptre? Upon the answers given to these questions depends the future of the English empire. If the present policy be persisted in the result is easily foreseen—the English empire will be broken up, and England, burdened with immense debt and vast responsibilities, will be left only with those colonies

* As stated recently in the *Toronto Mail*, the leading Conservative newspaper of Canada.

that are too small and unimportant to be able to separate from her. On the other hand, if the political system of England be expanded and broadened so as to embrace all the colonial possessions there will be established an empire that must in the future rule the destinies of the world. Which shall it be?

ART. II.—THE LAW OF REAL PROPERTY.

1. *Das Anglonormannische Erbfolgesystem.* By HEINRICH BRUNNER. Leipzig. 1869.
2. *The Succession Laws of Christian Countries, with special reference to the Law of Primogeniture as it exists in England.* By EYRE LLOYD, B.A. London. 1877.
3. *The Seisin of the Freehold.* Being Twelve Lectures delivered in Gray's Inn Hall in the months of January and February, 1876, by JOSHUA WILLIAMS, Q.C. London. 1878.
4. *The Settlement of Real Estates.* Being Twenty-four Lectures delivered in Gray's Inn Hall in the year 1876, by JOSHUA WILLIAMS, Q.C. London. 1879.
5. *Principles of the Law of Real Property.* By JOSHUA WILLIAMS, Q.C. Twelfth Edition. London. 1877.
6. *Report from the Select Committee on Land Titles and Transfer, together with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, and Appendix.* Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 16th July, 1878.
7. *Report from the Select Committee on Land Titles and Transfer, together with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, and Appendix.* Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 24th June, 1879.

IT may be hoped that the reform of our land laws will at some not distant day come within the sphere of practical politics. Already most Liberals acknowledge that there is, or may be, a "Land Question," though they would freely admit that at present they are not prepared with an answer to, or even with a very precise statement of, that question. Nor is there necessarily anything unreasonable in this somewhat vague dissatisfaction. Many an invalid knows that he is unwell without being able to give a name to his ailment, and it certainly is not surprising that those whom lawyers call laymen should have no very defi-

nite opinions about real property law. With all their love for politics and public affairs, Englishmen are easily content with knowing nothing of the ordinary civil law under which they live. So long as it is not scandalously unjust they are satisfied, and for the rest will trust to Providence and the family solicitor. And if this be the case with the more modern and intelligible portions of the law, still truer is it of the inscrutable mysteries of real property. How could it be otherwise? How is the ordinary man to become acquainted with them? If he consult his "Blackstone" he straightway finds himself in the Middle Ages, or, what is far worse, in a theory of the Middle Ages, concocted by the lawyers of the last century. He has to learn a new language, and to acquire wholly new habits of thinking about the most ordinary transactions. He is perplexed by ancient statutes, and troubled with "the learning of feuds." All is to him unreal and unreasonable, and in all probability he decides not to waste his time over matters which, after all, do not concern him very greatly. As to his own affairs, there is the family solicitor, while as to the affairs of other people, they are, by supposition, no affair of his.

Natural as all this is, it is none the less to be regretted. For we move in a vicious circle. The people cares not to understand its own laws, because these laws are obscure and antiquated; the laws are obscure and antiquated because those who would be advantaged by their reform know nothing about them. And as our Constitution grows more democratic it becomes ever more important that our civil law should be widely known. Little will now be done by Parliament to which it is not urged from without, and in these days, when there are always many excellent and exciting electioneering cries, many questions about which it is easy to make a stir, no Minister could afford to devote Session after Session to measures, however indisputably useful, for which there was no popular demand. It concerns Liberals in particular to see that nothing is lost by those successive extensions of the suffrage which they have advocated. But something will assuredly be lost unless the electoral body can be persuaded to interest itself in our everyday civil law. Something will be lost if the spirit of law reform which was fairly awakened in Parliament some half century ago be allowed to languish before one tithe of its appointed work is accomplished.

It is hard to believe that there can be any reform more necessary than a reform of our land laws, and yet it is a reform which might easily be accomplished were popular attention once fixed on the work. It is really to no one's interest that the law should remain what it is. Opposition, of course, there would be, for there are some whose honour demands that they should resist

every change; but their honour would be easily satisfied, their resistance official and half-hearted. There have been times when a vigorous and virulent opposition to law reform was to be expected from lawyers. But lawyers have apparently grown wiser. It has become plain, from many proofs, that they have no real interest in maintaining a cumbersome and clumsy system. Here, for instance, is Mr. Joshua Williams, the professor appointed to instruct law students in the hidden wisdom of real property law, the writer of books from which hundreds of lawyers have learnt all the real property law they know. He lectures on the Seisin of the Freehold. Now, when a very learned professor of the laws undertakes to lecture on so dark and mysterious a theme, we are wont to expect from him some of those bravura passages about ancestral wisdom, and the perfection of reason which Blackstone so brilliantly executed before crowded and admiring audiences. But Mr. Williams disappoints us. In his first paragraph* he states his belief that some of the most remarkable of our laws are "absolutely worthless," while "others are worse than worthless; they are absurd and injurious;" and in his last paragraph† he modestly opines that he has made good this his first thesis. Now, when those who are set to teach the youth hold such language as this, there are but two courses open to us—to silence the professors, or to reform the laws.

But while it is impossible to defend the law as it at present stands, it is only too possible for reformers to differ among themselves as to what changes should be made. There are many who would look on no improvement of the law as final which did not do something towards securing a more equal distribution of landed property, towards lessening the power and influence of the land-owning aristocracy. There are others who would move in this direction with reluctance, or at least with much hesitation. Now it is to be feared lest a difference of opinion about the end of the journey may prevent our taking steps which all must allow tend in the right direction. For it seems to us that before any further advance can profitably be made, it is quite necessary that the law should be much simplified. Here is something on which we might agree at the present moment, and a measure which can in no way prejudice the cause of any further reforms. Unless this work be done we shall have more of that tinkering of antiquated law of which the disastrous results are daily seen,—fresh gins and pitfalls for the unwary. The new patch will be put upon the old garment with the result which we have been taught to expect.

But though the reforms at present most necessary are chiefly reforms tending to simplification; though they imply no alteration in the habits of English society, no interference with the manners and customs of landlords, farmers, and labourers; though they might leave the agricultural system which Lord Hartington has lately attacked, and Lord Beaconsfield defended, much as it was before, it should be well understood that they must be real reforms, real changes, not mere additions to our law. Of mere additions to our law we have seen enough. We have now before us two Blue Books containing the results of an inquiry conducted by a Committee of the House of Commons as to the steps which ought to be taken "to simplify the Title to Land and facilitate the Transfer thereof, and to prevent Frauds on Purchasers and Mortgagees of Land." The point to which the attention of the Committee was chiefly directed was the complete failure of two modern statutes, the one due to Lord Westbury, the other to Lord Cairns, intended to provide means for the registration of titles to land. On these two statutes, or at least on the latter of them, many reformers had pinned their hopes, but the witnesses examined, and the members of the Committee, however they might differ on other points, could not but agree that the failure has hitherto been complete. This is, indeed, so painfully obvious as to be beyond dispute. The Acts have been ignored by landlords and their advisers. Many different causes were assigned for this failure. The more hopeful considered that the scheme had not been sufficiently advertised; that solicitors had not been properly conciliated; that Lord Cairns' Act had been prejudiced by the collapse of Lord Westbury's inferior and less practicable measure. The less hopeful referred to the great complexities of English titles, so different from the simple and registrable titles of Australia and New Zealand, to the fact that a land owner has no inducement to incur the expense of putting his land on the register, to the English love of secrecy, the English hatred of offices and officials. These differences of opinion spread from the witnesses to the members of the Committee, and produced two draft reports, the one submitted by Mr. Osborne Morgan, and finally adopted, the other proceeding from Mr. Shaw Lefevre. The chief issue between the two reports was the expediency of requiring the registration of *deeds*. Now the registration of deeds is a very different matter from the registration of title. The report puts the distinction clearly and well. The registration of title "aims at presenting the intending purchaser or mortgagee with the net result of former dealings with the property," while the registration of deeds "places the dealings themselves before him, and leaves him to investigate them for himself." It was generally admitted that the registration of title aimed at by Lord

Cairns' Act is the more desirable system, and that the Act itself is very cleverly constructed. The great question was whether, this Act being for the present a dead letter, we ought not at least, as a temporary protection against fraud, to compel the registration of deeds. It was allowed that such registration is an efficient protection against frauds of a particular kind, a kind which has lately been brought to the notice of the public by the ingenuity of Messrs. Dimsdale and Downes. These gentlemen, it was acknowledged, could hardly have succeeded in giving ten or twenty "first mortgages" on the same piece of land, had that land been situate in Middlesex or Yorkshire, in a county, that is, in which the registration of deeds is required. But desirable as it is to secure ourselves against a repetition of these scandalous frauds, it is thought by Mr. Lefevre and those who followed him that this security would be bought at too dear a price were we to abandon our ideal, a registration of title, and adopt and consecrate an inferior though more immediately practicable system. The question is doubtless difficult, and we hesitate to decide between many high authorities and many sound arguments; but, on the whole, we think that the minority of the Committee were in the right. We shrink with Mr. Lowe from that "mausoleum of parchment," a registry of deeds. Of two schemes, both of which will protect us against Mr. Dimsdale, but only one of which will render the sale and mortgage of land a simpler and less costly undertaking than it now is, the choice seems easy, and we will not believe that the better plan is impracticable until efforts much more vigorous than any hitherto made have failed to secure its adoption. For the present compulsory registration of title is out of the question, and we may be heartily glad that it has not been tried. It would, indeed, be impossible to force all land owners to do what not one land owner in a thousand has chosen to do of his own accord. The suggestion has been made that it is so much for the benefit of society at large that a habit of registering should be formed, as to make it sound policy for the State to undertake for some few years to register titles for a very small fee, or even gratuitously. This suggestion seems to us worthy of all attention. It may shock stern economists that public tax-raised money should be spent to confer a benefit on individuals already lucky enough to possess land; but it may well be doubted whether we could lay out money in a manner more advantageous to posterity than by inducing the present generation of land owners to set their titles in order, and have them publicly registered.

But all this by the way; whether the State should insist on the registration of titles as a matter of national concern; whether, even if it were willing to incur expense, it could in the present

state of English law get the work done successfully, are questions which we may raise, but will not discuss. One fact, however, is obvious, namely, that among the chief obstacles to any efficient system of registration is the perverse complexity of real property law.

This was brought to the notice of the Committee by many most competent witnesses. Indeed, it was so constantly brought to their notice that they could not but recommend in their report certain changes in the law. Perhaps they felt that in proposing these changes they were trespassing beyond their proper sphere. To this we readily ascribe the timid and desultory nature of their proposals. They propose that a certain statute, called the Statute of Uses, should be repealed; that the land of a dead owner should pass, not straight to his heir, but to a "real representative" comparable to the personal representative who takes his goods and chattels; that the machinery of a mortgage should be less clumsy than it at present is. Now all these may be changes in the right direction; but if it was the Committee's business to consider them it was also their business to consider many other things also. Apparently they were content to catch at a few valuable hints thrown out by Mr. Joshua Williams, Mr. William Barber, and other witnesses, without asking themselves whether the particular absurdities which they condemn are not logical parts of a system the whole of which is equally worthy of condemnation. We should be glad to learn that the Committee (a more able and industrious it would be hard to find) had been reappointed with power to consider the whole of our land laws. We are convinced that such reappointment would result in proposals very different from those now made, proposals not limited to the trimming and pruning of essentially bad law, but extended to the rooting up of the cause of all those evils which are noticed in the present report and countless others no wit less grave.

For though we would begin with changes which might be called formal rather than material, these changes should be bold and thorough. The simplification of our land laws which is needed is nothing less than a total abolition of all that is distinctive in real property law. The distinction between real and personal property might be done away, without any disturbance of substantial rights or interests. There would be a saving of money, of time, of temper, of trouble; a saving of vexatious lawsuits and of those worst of quarrels—family quarrels; vast masses of antique and unintelligible law might be for ever forgotten; but beyond this, there would be little change, and certainly no change which the veriest Tory could call revolutionary.

It is really high time that the question should be asked, whether we gain anything whatever by keeping two systems of property law. Two systems we have, as many know to their cost, each with its own peculiar history, each with its own peculiar doctrines. Of course, it is plain enough that for certain purposes law must distinguish between the various subject matters of proprietary rights, and must place land in one class, moveable goods in another. It is chiefly with regard to the remedies for wrongs, breaches of contract, trespasses, and the like, that the distinction is important, and the distinction is well enough marked in English law, but marked, it should be noticed, by a line which does not coincide with that which divides real from personal property. And yet it is to this distinction that the words *real* and *personal* apparently point; for real property, so the phrase would lead us to think, there are real remedies, for personal property none but personal remedies. But these words are of late introduction, and were always inapt. The old word *hereditaments*, things descending to the heir, is the real key to the situation. Our distinction between the two kinds of property is not to be explained by any jural necessity, it is the outcome of a long chapter of accidents. What is really at the bottom of the distinction is the fact that we have two systems of inheritance, or, if that phrase be incorrect, one law of descent and another law for the distribution of an intestate's goods and chattels. This is the one central, all-important fact from which the two systems diverge.

What, then, do we want with two systems of inheritance? We might, however, be thought visionary and unpractical were we at once to address ourselves to this abstract question. To any arguments drawn from the complexities which arise from this dualism, or from the comparative simplicity of foreign law, it might be replied that having a good, or at least tolerable, law of descent, we ought not rashly to abandon it for the sake of technical symmetry. For, of course, it is the law of descent, the law applicable to real property, that is threatened, no one being so enamoured of the heir-at-law as to desire that he should take, not only all the land, but also all the goods. Of the law of descent we are therefore obliged to speak, though it is certainly difficult to criticise it without insulting the intelligence of our readers. What need be said may be said in few words. The law makes a will for intestates which no sane testator would make for himself. However often this may have been said, it remains unanswered; it is unanswerable. Its truth may be easily tested. There are hundreds of wills set forth in the law reports, and any one who will look at them, or who will even look at the *Illustrated London News*, may see that it is not the rule, but the rare exception, for any man to leave his land to

his eldest son without making provision thereout for his widow and younger children. Besides, what class of persons is it that the law of inheritance should regard? Surely those who are most likely to die intestate, the men of small means, not the owners of vast estates; and in popular estimation a man of small means would be guilty of more than folly and little less than crime were he to make the will which the law, in the fulness of its wisdom, makes for him. We are glad to hear Mr. Williams speak his mind on this matter. He, we should imagine, had no prejudice against the law of real property, but "I confess," he says, "that, saving estates tail, the descent of which should, I think, be permitted to remain, I should be glad to see the whole law of inheritance swept away."*

The Essay by Mr. Eyre Lloyd, with the title of which we head this Article, is instructive. We cannot, indeed, praise the work very highly, but it serves to bring into strong relief the fact that the whole civilised world is against us. It was not always so; primogeniture has been known in many parts of Europe, the postponement of women in most, perhaps in all. But it is so now. Mr. Lloyd arranges the countries of Christendom in alphabetical order, and as we pass from Austria to Wurtemberg the same phrases constantly meet our eyes; "all property, real and personal, is divided equally between the children," "without distinction of sex," "no distinction between males and females," and so forth, continually. And the exceptions are noteworthy. The only exceptions of any importance are Great Britain, Russia, and Servia. Have we not lately learned (if not, we cannot plead a lack of instructors) that of all countries Russia is the most barbarous and backward, save, perhaps, Servia? And yet it is to the despised Russia, and the contemptible Servia, not to France, Germany, or Italy, that we must look for a law at all resembling our own. But let us not be downhearted. Mr. Lloyd has concerned himself only with Christian countries; should he at some future time turn to the heathen he may obtain valuable and gratifying results.

But, better still, he should turn to the Dark Ages. To Herr Brunner the English law of inheritance is vastly interesting. There has, it seems, been a notable dispute among German antiquaries, who have divided themselves into two Schools, *Gradualisten* and *Parentelisten*, over the question, What was the pure Teutonic law of inheritance before it was corrupted by Romanism and reason? Some aid towards solving this nice problem, may, Herr Brunner thinks, be found in the Anglo-Norman law

* See also, p. 97, and Evidence before the Committee, First Report, p. 10

and so in praiseworthy fashion he has set himself to examine Glanvill, Bracton, and the old Norman customs. His short Tract is a valuable contribution to the history of English law, one of those contributions which we obtain but too seldom from English lawyers. But we must leave *Gradualisten* and *Parentelisten* to fight their own battles. We are, unfortunately, not at present in a position to examine our law from the archæologist's standpoint. Let us, however, notice, with pardonable pride, that a learned historian in search of the primitive finds it in law which is still in force among us. For should our readers desire to know what law it is that Herr Brunner reveals as a curiosity for admiring antiquaries, they have no need to trouble themselves with mediæval Latin or Norman French; let them but turn to Mr. Williams's well-known text-book, and there, explained in the clearest English, they will find substantially the self-same law. A few little changes have been made—for accidents will happen in the best regulated museums—but, on the whole, this interesting specimen of antiquity has been most carefully preserved.

Englishmen, no doubt, are proud of this priceless curiosity, but apparently their pride is somewhat uncritical; they are hardly aware of the facts whence it derives its vast value in the eyes of connoisseurs. Such, at least, is the conclusion to which we are brought by a perusal of "Hansard." It seems to be thought that a vague reference to "feudalism" is a sufficient account of the origin of primogeniture. Perhaps familiarity with this law has blunted our power of discrimination. We are so accustomed to see all the ages jumbled together in our nineteenth century law that nothing surprises us, and any semblance of explanation which may be offered for existing institutions is accepted as satisfactory. "Feudalism" is a good word, and will cover a multitude of ignorances. To ask what was the real connection between feudalism and primogeniture would argue a reprehensible discontent with beliefs sanctioned by Blackstone and orthodox. Thus we miss the really noticeable points in the history of our law, and our attention must be drawn to them by learned foreigners, by whom they can be contemplated with the single eye of scientific interest. We are used to an unreasonable law of real property, and we find no difficulty in believing that what is unreasonable now was unreasonable always, "feudalism" of course, being a particular form of unreasonableness not to be easily defined.

And so with the postponement of women, this also is sometimes called feudal, but with much injustice; it is better than feudal, it looks primitive, it is grandly barbarous; nay, it is prehistoric. Indeed, the rule, the line of the old law of inheritance had begun long before

anything that could be called feudalism made its appearance. Already in the seventh century a king of the Visigoths ordained in the plainest terms that females should share equally with males, and supported his decree by sophistical reasoning about nature and justice. But there is no accounting for the caprices of foreign monarchs; and in this country no rationalizing Prince, Potentate, or Parliament has hitherto laid unholy hands on the sacred principle. Englishmen, we say, are not sufficiently aware of the high pedigree which may be claimed for their law. It may be (we do not say it is, for we would not excite hopes destined to be blighted, but it may be) that our law of inheritance has some connection with that pure and primitive record of barbarism, the Salic law, *ce texte si fameux, dont tant de gens ont parlé, et que si peu de gens ont lu*.* We must not be too eager to adopt a conclusion so gratifying to our national vanity, but the fact remains, that the author of our *Leges Henrici Primi*, when he came to speak of the law of inheritance, thought fit to abandon his English authorities, and to transcribe, with slight modification, a passage from the Ripuarian law. This passage was itself but a slightly modified transcript of the world-famous words in the *Lex Salyca*. Why the English compiler did this we cannot say, nor can we shut our eyes to the fact that his work is bad and untrustworthy, but still there is some ground for hope, and national boastings have been based on worse evidence. But what a cause for congratulation is here! The *Lex Salyca*, so high authorities tell us, was in its earliest form the production of a still heathen nation uncorrupted by Christianity or civilization. Really, when we think of the many destructive forces which at one time, of course long ago, threatened to deprive the male sex of its just prerogative, it seems little more than an accident, little less than a miracle, that our law of inheritance came safely through those revolutionary Dark Ages. There was the Church arrayed on the side of women, and of the meddlesome canon law, all diligent readers of "Blackstone" know what to think. There was the civil law, including those improper Novels which even English judges are suspected of having perused in private. Nor are the names of individual revolutionists wholly forgotten. In the seventh century, and the neighbourhood of Paris, there lived a monk and conveyancer, one Marculf by name, the father of all those who publish collections of precedents. This bad man, not respecting ancestral wisdom, settled a form of conveyance from a father to his daughter, with intent to circumvent the salutary Salic law which he scrupled not to call "*diuturna sed impia consuetudo*" *Diuturna*, indeed, what would he have said now? We ar-

* Montesquieu, "L'Esprit des Loix," liv. 18, ch. 22.

afraid that he would have said *diuturnissima Impia* indeed, but let us remember, in his favour, that the law was not in his days so old and mellow as it now is. And yet there are those even in this nineteenth century who, unconvinced by the annual eloquence of Her Majesty's law officers, and glorying in their invincible ignorance, still mutter to themselves the words of Marculf, "*diuturna sed impia consuetudo*," or, changing the phrase but not the meaning, adopt Mr. Williams's plain English, "worse than worthless," "absurd and injurious."

But, in all seriousness, why should women be postponed? It must be out of respect for some one's memory. But whose? Is it Ethelbert or Cnut, is it Salagast, Bodogast and Widogast, or Choke, Croke, and Coke, is it Howel Dda or Dynwal Moel Mud? The Conservative party is a historical party, let it explain to the uninitiated the exact form which its ancestor-worship takes. And it really should be more consistent. It would, perhaps, be imprudent to re-enact the whole of the *Lex Salica*, because there are so many words in it which no one understands. A modern judge, not inexpert in the construction of obscure documents, might reasonably shrink from the title "*De Chrene Cruda*." And so with the Welsh Triads, and the *Senchus Mor*, and even with the *Dooms of Hlothar and Eadric*. But were we really in earnest something might, with the help of philologists, be done for the great principles of archaic law. Foreigners have stated as a fact, that it is still common in England for a man to sell his wife;* that they mistake *Punch* for the Statute Book is plain, though pardonable. The statement is unfortunately not quite accurate, but it might be made so *ex post facto* by the next Metropolitan Markets Act. We are in difficulties with our bankruptcy law; might not a short and easy way with insolvent debtors be found in, let us say, the Twelve Tables? But we really must have the blood feud; no criminal code will be complete so long as this antique and excellent institution is neglected. As matters at present stand, our law of inheritance does look a little foolish, and from time to time the words of Marculf recur to our minds. But make our law all of one piece, and all will be well, the wisdom of our ancestors will be respected, and the price of woad will rise.

We would fain be serious, but we can only regard the arguments in favour of postponing women to men as some sort of fantasia or capriccio on the *Leges Barbarorum*. But the subject is as a side which cannot be so airily treated. We again repeat that it is not our purpose to deal with the more obvious effects of the law.

look. "Es ist bekannt, dass in England unter den gemeinen Volk der Gebrauch
rent zu tag gilt, die Frau auf dem Markt zu bringen und zu verkaufen."
rule, "m, "Deutsche Rechtsalterthümer," p. 431.

of our law of inheritance; about these readers of this Review have probably made up their minds. But it seems doubtful whether the full strength of the case for reform is widely known, and we turn to some of the less obvious effects of the law, believing that were these well understood there could be but one opinion as to the necessity of a radical change. For absurdity can go no further than to represent the badness of this law as a sentimental grievance. It may seem a small thing to introduce a reasonable system of succession on intestacy, for few who have aught to leave allow our absurd law to distribute their property; but even though the direct and immediate reform may be small, it must bring in its train certain other reforms which would effect a simplification—a time-saving, money-saving simplification throughout the whole body of the law.

But, in the first place, let it be noted that our canons of inheritance, besides being guilty of the two capital follies with which they are commonly charged—primogeniture and the postponement of women—are in other respects thoroughly bad. What shall we say of a law which ordains that if a man purchase land and die without issue, his most distant relative on his father's side shall inherit before his nearest maternal kinsman, before his mother herself? A "parentelic" system of descent may interest foreign professors, but its convenience and justice are not readily seen. Surely there is nowadays no presumption that a man's paternal kinsfolk are, or ought to be, nearer or dearer to him than his mother and his mother's kin. Our Statutes of Distribution, which, being but two centuries old, we may call modern, may not be very perfect; but at least they start from the sound cognatic and "gradualistic" principle, which is, as a matter of fact, the principle of the modern family.

In the second place, we can now well spare the local customs of descent—gavelkind, borough English, and those still more anomalous customs which lie dormant for centuries, and never awake save to do a mischief. The only reason for retaining the gavelkind custom has been, that it was one degree less ridiculous than the common law; it postpones females to males, but knows not primogeniture. The borough English rule, which gives all a man's land to his youngest son, has also fulfilled its only purpose, that of preserving for modern historians a relic of an almost prehistoric family system. But the time has come when all these local rules should perish; they are merely snares for laymen or traps for costs. However, all this is, or should be, obvious enough, and we pass to some remoter consequences which follow from the adoption of one law of succession for all kinds of property.

Foremost among these we reckon the abolition of "equal shares" [Vol. CKII. No. CCXXII.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. LVI. No. II. Z true

conversion," and all its attendant subtleties. The doctrine of conversion (let not our readers think that we here desert law for theology) arises in this way. A man owns land; by his will he directs trustees to sell that land, and to divide the proceeds between A and B. The trustees do not sell at once, and while they delay A dies; who is to take his share of the money, his real or his personal representatives? It would be unfair that the trustees' delay should benefit the heir at the expense of the next-of-kin, and the rule has been established that the trust to sell converts the land into money for the purpose of succession. And so with the converse case in which a testator directs money to be laid out in buying land for one who dies before the purchase is made. A person, it is said, may make land money, or money land. Hence an infinity of perplexing questions, hence a vast mass of law, much of it very equitable and very elegant, but all of it quite unnecessary. Many thousand law-suits has this transubstantiation, or rather consubstantiation (for land may be land for some purposes and money for others), cost the country; and yet this doctrine is the unavoidable consequence of having two systems of succession where one would suffice. Once get rid of the heir-at-law, and there will be no more need for conversion; all property will be for ever personal property.

It should be remembered that English law is by no means unprepared to deal with personal property in land. In the first place, this device of conversion is often resorted to for the very purpose of placing land beyond the reach of our inheritance law, and rendering it divisible among the next-of-kin. In the second place, there are leaseholds, and leaseholds are personal property. It is certainly very ludicrous that when a man dies intestate the field that he holds in fee should go one way, the field that he holds for a thousand years another; but clearly all property in land might be made personal without our being driven to invent a wholly new system of land laws. Leaseholds may be regarded as providentially preserved for our guidance. If we must have a theory of tenure, let it be that all land is in the last resort held of the Crown for a million years.* Those who argue that to render land divisible among the next-of-kin would necessitate frequent actual subdivision, show their complete ignorance of English law and English habits. They may fairly be challenged to prove that a minute subdivision of long leaseholds is any commoner than a minute subdivision of freeholds.

When we reflect on the English impatience of taxation, it is
 * Esq. Lowe, we observe, ascribes this proposal to Mr. Senior. (*Second*
 Q. 2938.)

surprising that we should allow ourselves to be heavily taxed by means of lawyers' bills for the maintenance of the "worse than worthless." What an outcry would there be were the Chancellor of the Exchequer to propose a vote of money to be spent on a decent edition of "Bracton"—something better than that with which Sir Travers Twiss has favoured the world—and yet we are willing to pay for a cabinet of legal antiquities, if only we can have the annoyance of causeless litigation thrown in for nothing. We are willing to maintain even a "doctrine of conversion," a most expensive property, provided that we are suffered to keep our *diuturna sed impia consuetudo* of postponing females to males.

Another reform would follow. After a long struggle we have succeeded in establishing the principle that a dead land owner's debts should, if possible, be paid. But owing to our double property law, the principle is carried into effect by very imperfect machinery. Clearly the creditors should have some one person or body of persons to whom they could look as representing the dead man for all purposes, and bound to pay the dead man's debts so long as there are assets. As it is there is one man with the land, another with the goods. So convinced is Mr. Williams of the necessity for some measure establishing a real "real representative," that he would secure this object even though the law of inheritance remained in other respects unaltered. Mr. Williams has on this point convinced the Committee, but we hope for better things. Let all property be personal property, and this, as well as many other reforms, will follow as a matter of course. A will of realty will be proved as a will of personalty is proved, and a man's executor or administrator will represent him for all purposes whatsoever.

Take, again, the law concerning the effect of marriage on property. No one can pretend that it is in a satisfactory condition, and clearly the whole subject must one day be reconsidered. But an abolition of the distinction between real and personal property would go far towards making it more intelligible, and a better subject for further consideration. For, leaving out all question as to property settled, whether by statute or contract for the wife's separate use, and all consideration of the very capricious "equity to a settlement," we have this state of things—A man marries a woman who has both freeholds and leaseholds, his rights in the two are utterly different. During the marriage he cannot sell the freeholds without his wife's consent solemnly given; he can sell the leaseholds against her will. If he survive his wife he is absolutely entitled to the leaseholds; he gets at most a life estate in the freeholds. For all this there is no reason, though there may be a historical explanation. It is true

that the law of real property is rather more favourable to married women than the law of personal property, and the abolition of the distinction would afford a good opportunity for making our one system of property law better than either of the existing systems. But it surely is of some importance that the law of husband and wife should be intelligible to the people, and this it never will be until we have determined that two systems of property law are one system too many.

You cannot create an estate tail in personal property. This is a blessed truth and full of promise. Establish, therefore, that freeholds are only extremely long leaseholds, and estates tail disappear. Here it may be thought that we pass from matters of mere law reform to questions of great social and political interest. But not so, for any lawyer will tell us that it is perfectly possible, and very common, so to settle leaseholds and other personal chattels that they shall go along with an entailed freehold estate. There is no need to investigate the mechanism employed by our modern Marculfs for this purpose; but the fact is, that, if it were impossible to create an estate tail, settlements of land might still be made, and would most certainly be made, which for most practical purposes, and in the ordinary course of events, would have the same effect as those which are now in use. The result would not be quite the same, but so far as all matters of real importance are concerned the result would, we believe, be the same. Not a great reform, then, some Liberals may be tempted to say; but we cannot agree with them. Once effected, it would be easy, if thought advisable, to set narrower limits to the power a proprietor has of settling his property, whether land or goods; but until some such simplification has been introduced, any attempt to shorten settlements will, in all probability, but darken the darkness of real property law. Let us first do that which all men who think about the matter must see to be good, then will come the time for deciding questions about which men may reasonably differ.

The position of a tenant in tail of full age is amusing. Something between a life tenant and an absolute owner, he can make himself an absolute owner by executing a deed and having it enrolled—that is, by paying certain costs to his solicitor. Very instructive is all this to learned Germans, but to tenant in tail, and all who have to do with him, a nuisance. Besides; these estates tail form one of the worst stumbling-blocks in the way of an unlearned testator. By some phrase thrown out at random he may succeed in creating one of these anachronisms, or still more probably render a law-suit inevitable by leaving it doubtful whether he meant to give an estate tail or an estate in fee simple. All such doubts should once for all be answered; estates tai

should vanish; one pitfall would be safely filled in, one "possible construction" of obscure wills be rendered for ever impossible.

Can anything be more absurd than what happens on the death of a mortgagee in fee? The only substantive right, the right to be repaid the money, passes to his personal representatives. But his heir takes something; he takes "a legal estate" in the land. Really he has no rights, he must deal with his precious possession as others bid him, he can make no penny thereout for himself. But the legal estate, the ghost of a departed right, goes wandering from heir to heir, and devisee to devisee, until it is hunted down, and safely exorcised, and "got in," not without costs. Otherwise there will be a law-suit and more costs. These legal estates, mere abstractions of nothingness, are a plague to vendors and purchasers, they are one of the chief hindrances to the registration of titles. To some extent, but to what extent our authorities tell us is not very clear, an improvement has been introduced by a recent Statute; but how? By grafting an anomaly on an absurdity, by timid tinkering and caulking. There is but one way to meet the evil. Render it impossible that the heir of a mortgagee, or the heir of any one else, should take anything whatever. For as with mortgagees, so with trustees. We are not pleading for elegance or technical refinement, but for real solid reforms, which would benefit the nation at large. Should any reader think that we overstate our case, we can only send him to the text-writers, but we send him with confidence as to the result. Let him reckon up the reported cases due to these outstanding legal estates, let him multiply their number by the average cost of a law-suit, let him consider how few are the cases reported out of those decided, let him consider how many are never pressed to a decision, let him think of these things and of the obvious remedy.

But throughout our law, look where we will, the distinction between the real and the personal is found a permanent cause of mischief. It is an all-pervading distinction, similar to that which some metaphysicians make between the objective and the subjective. Indeed, were it still, as once it was, the fashion for our lawyers to adorn their works with scraps of second-hand and third-rate philosophy, there would doubtless not be wanting those who would convince us that the real is the objective and the personal the subjective. However, lawyers have been in some respects more fortunate than those with whom we have made bold to compare them; for between the two great opposites they have found what metaphysicians are still to seek, a *tertium quid*, the mixed fund. The part played by the mixed fund is well illus-

trated by an extract from Mr. Pollock's "Principles of Contract," given below. First, however, let us notice that the law of England is good enough to encourage marriage, and with this object in view has established certain rules respecting the invalidity of a condition avoiding a gift on the marriage of the donee. Of course, however, it cannot deal with the two kinds of property by one set of rules, for it is, or must be deemed to be, a maxim of our law, that distinctions are to be multiplied. The extract is as follows:—

"Conditions in Restraint of Marriage:—

"If *precedent*, are with trifling exceptions (if any) valid as both real and personal estate

"If *subsequent*,—

"*General* restraint. Good, it seems, as to real estate. Bad as to personal estate or mixed fund (or a fund arising only from the sale of realty, *semble*), and this whether there is a gift over or not.

"*Particular* restraint. Good as to real estate; and good as to personal estate if there is a gift over, otherwise not."*

This is a very fair specimen of English law, and the reader will see that we have not been romancing. We have one rule for personalty, another for realty, and then arises the question which rule is applicable to the mixed fund. But why two rules? Either sound policy demands that a condition defeating a gift on the marriage of the donee should be void, or it does not, but it cannot possibly draw any distinction between land and goods. It is, of course, very interesting to know that the ecclesiastical and temporal courts could not agree about the validity of these conditions, but a history, however interesting, is not a reason. This is, we repeat, a fair specimen, and we have chosen it, not because it is more strikingly irrational than many others, but because Mr. Pollock's statement is so concise, that it may easily be quoted. In truth, "it is curious to notice," as Mr. Williams observes, "the strange differences that exist in our law, without any particular reason whatever, so far as one can see, between real estate and personal estate."† This remark serves as an introduction to an account of a very strange difference indeed, and one due to the unprincipled meddling of a modern Parliament. We say *unprincipled*, for an opportunity was offered for establishing on a particular point the same rule for real and personal property, but our legislators preferred to introduce a new complication for which we will defy any one to find "any particular reason," or, indeed, any reason particular or not particular. The matter is too elaborate

* F. Pollock, "Principles of Contract," 1st ed. pp. 282, 283.

† "Settlements," p. 159.

to be here explained, but we refer our readers to Mr. Williams's book on "Settlements." If they do not agree with the learned author that "it is curious," their taste for legal curiosities must need cultivation.

Now, it seems to us plain that, even if both our two systems were reasonable and convenient, there would still be good cause for ridding ourselves of one of them. Much more, therefore, ought we to abolish so inconvenient and unreasonable a system as that of which we read in "The Seisin of the Freehold." The general reader would hardly thank us for any observations on the abstruser doctrines of the law so lucidly expounded, we had almost said exposed, by Mr. Williams. And yet it is only by considering the minuter details of the law that we can appreciate its worthlessness at its true value. This is one of the worst impediments in the way of improvement. When told that the law is bad, and might easily be bettered, we are sceptical, we desire, and rightly desire, a proof, and when the proof is offered, we say, and truly say, that it is dull. For who shall interest us in contingent remainders, or the Statute of Uses, while Chinese metaphysics remain unexplored? If we want barbarism at its best, we can turn to the *Lex Salica*. If we want scholasticism at its best, we prefer Thomas Aquinas to Lord Coke. Were it a matter of wrong or wicked lewdness reason would that we should lend an ear (the reports of the police and divorce courts are found by some to have a certain human interest), but as to words and names and our law, our ordinary civil law, let lawyers look to it, for we will be no judge of such matters. And yet the subtle learning of contingent remainders is suffered to interfere with actual life. It is mere innocent ingenuity amusing itself with frivolous distinctions. On it may depend the rights of the widow, the orphan, the purchaser who has paid for land and bought a law-suit. And it is all unnecessary. There can be no contingent remainders of leaseholds. Make freeholds personal property, and one mass of obscure and difficult doctrines may be for ever forgotten. Who would lose by such a reform? No one. Must we hint that this is the very reason why no one cares to alter the law? Who would gain? Every one who, whether as vendor or purchaser, donor or donee, had anything to do with freehold land.

Then there is that marvellous monument of legislative futility, the Statute of Uses, the statute through which not mere coaches and four, but whole judicial processions with javelin-men and trumpeters have passed and re-passed in triumph. It has been said of this ambitious statute that its sole effect has been to "add three words to a conveyance." This may pass as a contemptuous epigram, but it is far from the whole truth. It has caused innumerable unnecessary law-suits. This is not an epigram but a

fact. It is not a mere Statute of Uselessness but a Statute of Abuses. And it will be readily understood that if there is a flaw or a stupidity in our property law, the whole body of the civil law is the worse for it, for property law must be the very core of the *Corpus Juris*. Thus, it is not only those who make and profit by elaborate settlements of land who suffer by our misplaced antiquarianism. Whenever title to freeholds comes in question, directly or indirectly, the power of this statute is felt, and the real merits of the case but too often disappear beneath the accumulated rubbish of ages. It might have been supposed that one part at least of our law would be plain, the law relating to the Parliamentary franchise. But it never will be plain so long as it depends on real property law essentially nonsensical. It is a "fancy franchise," more fanciful than any conceived by our most fantastic Minister, when the right to vote is given or denied by the fact that a certain deed took effect not under the common law but under this statute. It is a powerful sarcasm on our boasted liberalism that the cases which of recent years have turned on the most absurdly frivolous distinctions have been cases on the right to vote under the Reform Act.

Space may fail us but matter does not, for in truth it is only when we turn to "questions of construction" that the badness of our dual system is seen at its best. To take but one instance, centuries have not sufficed to convince the people of England that the word "heir" is quite inapplicable to personal property; they cannot or will not believe that we have two distinct schemes of succession. The consequence is that in their innocence testators make use of inappropriate phrases, and then follows the inevitable administration suit, the family quarrel, the costs. We do not hesitate to say that ten per cent. of the "questions of construction" which are raised are due to our having, and having long had, two bodies of law where one would suffice. Doubtless, the simplification of our property law would work but slowly and gradually on the minds of testators, but it would work surely, and some day an educated Englishman may be trusted to make a simple will for himself.

Perhaps there is not sufficient work for our Courts, that wrongs being unknown, and all contracts kept, we are obliged to invent problems for our judges. Can there be any other explanation than this for the care with which we preserve a system or want of system ingeniously framed to lead testators astray? And yet we are constantly told of large arrears of cases waiting to be tried, we constantly hear demands for more and more judges. We are not so very successful in suppressing fraud and breach of faith that we can afford to encourage by artificial means that worst kind of litigation, litigation between parties all

equally innocent, equally unfortunate. The promoter of bubble companies, the swindling director, the fraudulent bankrupt, are allowed a respite, which may be ruinous to those whom they have cheated, while the Courts are deciding what shall be done with the property of a man whose sole crime is that he has shown a not unnatural ignorance of the distinction between real and personal estate.

Now, were it seriously contended by the friends of the heir-at-law that his existence is necessary for the maintenance of our present social order, that he is a prop of the State, or the Church, or of anything else, we might have to consider whether the system of law of which he is the centre might not be made more tolerable by amendment. But no such contention is raised. On the contrary, the advocates of primogeniture are fond of laying stress on the fact that few land owners die intestate. Is it not a little one?—this is their favourite plea. No, we reply, the abuse is not a little one. It is for the sake of the heir-at-law that we disorder the whole of our jurisprudence. In order to postpone women to men, in order to make a will which no one wants made, we render our law unknowable by any save experts. If after all our efforts we fail in attaining our worthless object, if daughters and younger sons are not disinherited, this is but an additional argument for reform. We undergo all the evils of having two systems of property law, and have nothing to show for it. You cannot prove that a law is good by showing that all sensible men contrive to evade it.

It is quite unnecessary for us to say harsh words of our ancestors. There is no need to seek a scapegoat among the feudalists, the canonists, the civilians. We have no quarrel with the Parliament which passed the Statute *De donis* or with that which passed the Statute of Uses. For all our legislators and judges from Ethelbert to Eldon we profess profound respect. It is we who are guilty of our own law, for as Hobbes rightly says, "The legislator is he not by whose authority the laws were first made, but by whose authority they now continue to be laws." It is therefore our present law-givers, and we who have elected them, that are to blame, if the right to land, and the right to vote, may still depend upon nonsense which it would be unjust to the schoolmen to call scholastic, nonsense which can only be explained by long stories about the quarrels between Courts which we have abolished. If these quarrels ended in an illogical compromise, this may have been our ancestors' wisdom, but that the terms of this compromise are still retained as law for all time is no better than our own folly.

To any reader trained in the historical school now fashionable our arguments may savour of a narrow and frigid Utilitarianism

long since abandoned by all enlightened persons. The law of real property is, we shall be told, an historical institution—the product of social evolution, of national life—and as such it must be criticised; nor must it be rashly condemned if it fail to conform to our notions of practical convenience. Now, it is but too probable that we are sadly deficient in the historic sense which it is the pride of this generation to have discovered in itself. It is not unlikely that we are behind an age whose chief ambition is to be behind itself. We must even confess to a belief that the law reformers of fifty years ago were often on the right track, though it is but too plain that they were ignorant persons who knew nothing of the primitive Aryan, and believed that all the Middle Ages were contemporaries. Were it necessary we should not fear to maintain the heresy that no practical convenience, however small, is to be sacrificed on the altar of historic continuity. But in the present case there is no need for the assertion of this very old-fashioned doctrine. Were it expedient, we might easily show that for centuries past there has been one steady tendency running through the whole movement of our property law; a tendency towards the assimilation of real to personal property. Indeed, we know not where to date the beginning of this tendency, for, as far as our records reach, we see it at work. We have been gradually, very gradually, moving towards the idea of absolute property in land. The theory of feudal tenure marks a particular stage in the movement; but the movement had begun long before the feudal theory was conceived, and has continued long after that theory has been capable of producing any consequences save confusion and inconvenience. What is now desirable is that we should bring the work which has been so long in hand to its logical conclusion. We know that there are those who would hesitate to sanction the doctrine that there may be and is absolute property in land. They have a certain affection for the old theory of tenure, not because they are Conservatives, but because they are Radicals; because in their eyes that theory serves to indicate, however imperfectly, the principle that property in land ought not to be placed on the same footing as property in other things. How far their economical reasonings justify this distinction we may not here inquire; but let them ask themselves whether they can seriously hope to make use of the theory of tenure in aid of their schemes. To us it seems that they do but prejudice their cause by seeking an alliance with worn out and discredited principles. If there be any special reason for taxing landlords more heavily than other people, if there be just cause for appropriating to the State “the unearned increment” of rent, all this is compatible with a simple system of property

law, unencumbered by theories of tenure. We do not believe that any sense of the claims of the community on the land is kept alive by the doctrine still to be found in our law books, that of land no subject can be the absolute owner. Every one knows that this doctrine, however indispensable as an explanation for some of the subtleties of real property law, is, in fact, untrue. "The first thing the student has to do is to get rid of the idea of absolute ownership."* So says Mr. Williams; but we may add, with equal truth, that the second thing he has to do is to learn how, by slow degrees, the statement that there is no absolute ownership of land has been deprived of most of its important consequences. The question, therefore, for those who would limit the rights of property in land is, whether they would rather work in the dark or in the light; whether they would rather deal with a modern and reasonable system, capable of further improvement, or with a mass of old theories—once, perhaps, an organized whole, but long since fallen into decay.

For our own part, we can imagine no sounder advice than that given by Mr. Williams:—"For the future, perhaps, the wisest course to be followed would be to aim as far as possible at a uniformity of system in the laws of both kinds of property; and, for this purpose, rather to take the laws of personal estate as the model to which the laws of real estate should be made to conform, than, on the one hand, to preserve untouched all the ancient rules, because they once were useful, or, on the other, to be annually plucking off, by parliamentary enactments, the fruit which such rules must, until eradicated, necessarily produce."† Thus has Mr. Williams preached through twelve editions of his book, but we grow no wiser; and now we have Mr. Morgan's Committee marking out for us the annual crop of weeds for the year 1880: a statute to be repealed, a real administrator appointed, verbiage curtailed, but no attack on the root of all evil—the heir-at-law. Perhaps when Mr. Williams has published twelve more editions we may be converted to his bold and sensible policy, and regret that we have spent so much well-meant labour in trying to patch up a hopelessly rotten system. When that time comes we shall think of Mr. Williams not only as of a very learned lawyer, but also as of a law reformer who knew what he was about: a law reformer of the good old school, which knew that a reform to be effectual must be logical and thorough.

Such, briefly stated, is the case for reform. We have chosen to take what may seem to some a narrow and a low view of the subject, but our object has been to lay stress on the practical

* "Real Property," p. 17.

† *Ibid.*, p. 468.

inconveniences of our present law. We are quite willing to adopt Mr. Matthew Arnold's argument, that to our law of inheritance is in part due that very unequal distribution of wealth of which he complains, and we are decidedly of opinion that "materialize," "vulgarize," and "brutalize" are brave words and not inapt. We are quite willing to leave open the question whether our law does not give to settlers too vast a power of tying up property. We would gladly see land a merchantable commodity. But we have purposely avoided all great social and political questions, and even all questions which are likely to be warmly contested. We have taken our stand on low ground, the saving of quarrels and costs, but our position is, we verily believe, impregnable.

There was a time, some fifty years ago, when it might have been plausibly said that to meddle with so old a structure as our land laws was dangerous. For centuries they had been almost untouched by statute, and there was some reason for thinking that to improve them was beyond the power of mortal man. But there were reformers in those days. The work that they did was done skilfully and well; and yet it was a daring work. Old abuses fell like leaves in autumn. Fines were not saved by their antiquity, nor recoveries by their absurdity, nor real actions by their costliness. The writ of entry sur disseisin in the quibus perished along with writs of aiel, bosaiel, tresaiel, and cosinage. Our sense of historical continuity was not keen enough to save "the casual ejector," or "the common vouchee." A decent oblivion was provided for John Doe and Richard Roe. The law of inheritance itself did not altogether escape the touch of the innovator. The deluge did not follow. The House of Lords exists. The Church flourishes. Had these measures failed, had they even produced great though temporary inconvenience, were we inconsolable for the loss of the solemn mummerly of fictitious actions, we might hesitate to make another perilous experiment. But these measures were splendidly successful. There probably has never been a statute which has won higher praise for its technical perfection, and that too from critics not wont to praise highly, than the Act which abolished fines and recoveries. It did its work with little friction. It was skilful and it was bold. Are we to believe that similar skill and boldness are not now at the command of law reformers? This surely is not the case. The work might be done, and done well, were there a demand for it. But such a demand must nowadays be a popular demand. We trust it may soon be made. It did not seem unreasonable to hope that a Conservative Ministry might have given us this reform; for it is a Conservative reform, one, that is, which has no tendency to benefit one class at the expense of others. But now, it seems, we must wait for the Liberals; may

they soon come and deliver us from this heir-at-law. The war against him and his works, let it be well understood, must be a war of extermination. There should be no compromise, for this simple reason, that any compromise must leave us with two systems of property law instead of one. The details of the campaign it may be impossible to foresee, but of the general plan there should be no doubt; it must leave us with one system of property law, and one only. This is what a civilized jurisprudence requires, and here, as always, scientific jurisprudence is on the side of convenience and common sense. What is inconvenient in fact is anomalous in law. A system of law logical but inconvenient may perhaps be imagined, but it cannot be realised; it must fall into confusion so soon as it is applied in practice. First one exception is admitted, then another, then chaos. The converse is true; make law convenient and you make it scientific. Contemplate, therefore, this reform from what point of view you will, from that of the jurist, from that of the farmer, from that of the landowner, from that of the plain man of sense, it is seen a necessary indispensable reform.

This heir-at-law must know that the time of his departure is at hand. His doom was long ago pronounced. It was foreseen by the dramatist who determined that the epilogue to *The Heir-at-Law* should be spoken by Dr. Pangloss, LL.D. and A.S.S. It was foreseen even more clearly by Bentham, when he said in the pages of this Review that the heir-at-law must be "abandoned to the Society of Antiquaries."* This is his doom, "abandoned to the Society of Antiquaries;" yes, with all his rights, privileges, and appurtenances. Or if our antiquaries will not have him as a gift, if there is in England no Pangloss who will receive him with an apt quotation, we will hand him over to the tender mercies of *Gradualisten* and *Parentelisten*, who shall write monographs upon him until the end of time.

* "Commentary on Mr. Humphrey's Real Property Code," WESTMINSTER REVIEW, No. XII. Reprinted in Bentham's Works, vol. v. p. 387. See p. 405, comment on the word "heirs."

ART. III.—THE INDIAN MUTINY.

1. *History of the Sepoy War.* By JOHN WILLIAM KAYE, F.R.S., author of the "History of the War in Afghanistan." Vol. I., eighth edition. 1877. Vol. II., fourth edition. 1878. Vol. III., third edition. 1877.
2. *History of the Indian Mutiny* (contemporaneous with Vol. III. of the "Sepoy War.") By COLONEL G. B. MALLESON, C.S.I., author of "History of the French in India," &c. &c. Vol. I. 1878. Vol. II. 1879. William H. Allen and Co., Publishers to the India Office, 13, Waterloo Place, S.W.

ONCE, and sometimes twice, in the history of a great conquering people, of a race born to empire, there occurs a crisis which calls forth all their innate qualities, whether they be those which commend themselves to the admiration of mankind or the reverse. The crisis may have been brought to pass by the indifference, or the folly, or the over-confidence, not the least criminal of the three, of the imperial people; and very often such has been the case. It was so in the great drama which we are about to consider by the aid of two historians, the one dead, the other living, who, regarding events from a different standpoint, and often widely opposed to each other in their estimate of various characters, are yet at one in their earnest appreciation of the great events which they have portrayed for the lasting gratification and profit of their countrymen. The Indian Mutiny was as clear a condemnation as could be afforded of the policy adopted by several of our leading politicians. It proclaimed to the world the inherent weakness of a system which its advocates had so loudly lauded that it was held to be without a flaw. It showed beyond all question the over-confidence which is the predominant weakness in the English character. It was produced by a series of blunders, and it was permitted to acquire greater consistency and strength by the weakness, and almost unparalleled obtuseness of several of our generals and civilians, and by the blind and too-trusting faith reposed in the Sepoys by the officers who had lived amongst them for years. That the Bengal army should have risen against the Government, and that it should have been joined by the vast mass of the people north of the Nerbudda, must always remain a blot upon our Indian administration. It was essentially an event that should never have taken place. On the other hand, the national mind

may be consoled with the reflection that its repression was among the most brilliant deeds the world has ever witnessed. It was a re-conquest, practically, of India, and it was not a less striking achievement than the gradual conquest had been during the previous century.

The causes of that mutiny and rebellion were numerous. The whole of Sir John Kaye's first volume is occupied in specifying them. It would suit neither the purpose we have in view, nor the space we have at our command to detail them by condensing the historian's discursive retrospect. Yet we cannot pass on to the consideration of events without saying that that retrospect is most necessary, and that Sir John Kaye, in reviewing the administrations of Lords Hardinge and Dalhousie, has done much towards a right understanding of that rising against the Feringhees, which makes the year 1857 a memorable epoch in the world's history. The same historian's remarks on the Sepoy army are particularly valuable and instructive. Its rise, progress, and decline are sketched out for us with the hand of a master; and due importance is given to those minor outbreaks on the part of the native soldier which should have taught our authorities that a change was coming over the spirit of the Sepoy. Sir John Kaye sums up the deteriorating influences as follows:—"A series of adverse circumstances, culminating in the annexation of Oude, some influencing him from without, and some from within, had weakened the attachment of the Sepoy to his colours. We see that whilst the bonds of internal discipline were being relaxed, external events, directly or indirectly affecting his position, were exciting within him animosities and discontent. We see that as he grew less faithful and obedient, we grew also more presuming; that whilst he was less under the control of his officers and the dominion of the State, he was more sensible of the extent to which we were dependent upon his fidelity, and therefore more capricious and exacting. He had been neglected on the one hand, and pampered on the other. As a soldier, he had in many ways deteriorated, but he was not to be regarded only as a soldier. He was a representative man, the embodiment of feelings and opinions shared by large classes of his countrymen, and circumstances might one day render him their exponent. He had many opportunities of becoming acquainted with passing events and public opinion. He mixed in cantonments, or on the line of march, with men of different classes and different countries; he corresponded with friends at a distance; he heard all the gossip of the bazaars, and he read, or heard others read, the strange mixture of truth and falsehood contained in the native newspapers. He knew what were the measures of the British

Government, sometimes even what were its intentions, and he interpreted these meanings, as men are wont to do, who, credulous and suspicious, see insidious designs and covert dangers in the most beneficent acts. He had not the faculty to conceive that the English were continually originating great changes for the good of the people; our theories of government were beyond his understanding, and as he had ceased to take counsel with his English officer, he was given over to strange delusions, and believed the most dangerous lies. But in taking account of the effect produced upon the Sepoy's mind by the political and social measures of the British Government, we must not think only of the direct action of these measures—of the soldier's own reading of distant events, which might have had no bearing upon his daily happiness, and which, therefore, in his selfishness he might have been content to disregard. For he often read these things with other men's eyes, and discussed them with other men's understanding. If the political and social revolutions did affect him they affected others, wiser in their generation, more astute, more designing, who put upon everything that we did the gloss best calculated to debauch the Sepoy's mind, and to prepare him, at a given signal, for an outburst of sudden madness. Childish as he was in his faith, there was nothing easier than to make him believe all kinds and conditions of fictions, not only wild and grotesque in themselves, but in violent contradiction of each other. He was as ready to believe that the extension of our territory would throw him out of employment as that it would inflict upon him double work. He did not choose between these two extremes; he accepted both, and took the one or the other, as the humour pleased him. There were never wanting men to feed his imagination with the kind of aliment which pleased it best, and reason never came to his aid to purge him of the results of this gross feeding. Many were the strange glosses which were given to the acts of the British Government, various were the ingenious fictions woven into the purpose of unsettling the minds and uprooting the fidelity of the Sepoy. But diverse as they were in many respects, there was a certain unity about them, for they all tended to persuade him that our measures were directed to one common end—the destruction of caste, and the general introduction of Christianity into the land. If we annexed a province it was to facilitate our proselytising operations and to increase the number of our converts. Our resumption operations were instituted for the purpose of destroying all the religious endowments of the country. Our legislative enactments were all tending to the same result—the subversion of Hindooism and Mahomedanism. Our educational measures were so many direct assaults upon the religions of the country. Our

penal system, according to their showing, disguised a monstrous attempt to annihilate caste by compelling men of all denominations to feed together in the gaols. In the lines of every regiment there were men eager to tell lies of this kind to the Sepoy, mingled with assurances that the time was coming when the Feringhees would be destroyed to a man; when a new empire would be established and a new military system inaugurated, under which the high rank and the higher pay monopolised by the English would be transferred to the people of the country. We know so little of what is stirring in the depths of Indian society; we dwell so much apart from the people; we see so little of them, except in full dress and on their best behaviour, that perilous intrigues and desperate plots might be woven under the very shadow of our bungalows without our perceiving any symptoms of danger. But still less can we discern that quiet undercurrent of hostility which is continually flowing on without any immediate or definite object, and which, if we could discern it, would baffle all our efforts to trace it to its source. But it does not the less exist because we are ignorant of the form which it assumes, or the fount from which it springs. The men, whose business it was to corrupt the minds of our Sepoys, were, perhaps, the agents of some of the old princely houses which we had destroyed, or members of old baronial families which we had brought to poverty and disgrace. They were, perhaps, the emissaries of Brahminical Societies, whose precepts we were turning into folly, and whose power we were setting at naught. They were, perhaps, mere visionaries and enthusiasts, moved only by their own disordered imaginations to proclaim the coming of some new prophet or some fresh avatar of the Deity, and the consequent downfall of Christian supremacy in the East. But whatsoever the nature of their mission, and whatsoever the guise they assumed, whether they appeared in the lines as passing travellers, as journeying hawkers, as religious mendicants, or as wandering puppet showmen, the seed of sedition which they scattered struck root in a soil well prepared to receive it, and waited only for the ripening sun of circumstances to develop a harvest of revolt." This lengthy quotation defines the causes of the mutiny, and it is given here in full, because it is the progress of that rising which will receive most of our attention.

The advent of the year 1857 had been looked forward to by the natives with feelings of expectation. It was the centenary anniversary of the victory of Plassey—the triumph which placed Bengal at the feet of the English. The popular fancy, acted upon by the influence of designing men, had fabricated a prophecy said to have been current hundreds of years before the first English trader had planted his foot in Asia, that after a century

of unchecked success our domination would perish before a great national uprising. As that year drew nearer the popular excitement increased. Originating in the credulity of an ignorant and superstitious people, it was made to serve the purpose of the intriguer, the fanatic, and the discontented. The Indian Mutiny was not produced by the sayings of some half-witted prophet, but none the less is it clear that the common superstition afforded a rallying-cry for creeds and races never before united in a common cause. With the dawn of that eventful year the signs of the coming struggle revealed themselves, although to very few English eyes was it given to perceive the full and dread significance of what was so near at hand. The great contest for supremacy between the peoples of Hindostan and their English rulers found the former prepared, but anxious and perhaps un-nerved at the prospect of closing in a death-struggle with the invincible "pale-face"; and the latter wholly unprepared, but steeled by the teachings of an historic past to bear the extremities of either fortune.

The exigencies of modern warfare caused a change at this time in the habits of the Sepoy which added fuel to the flame that had long been smouldering. The Sepoy for a hundred years had fought our wars and won our battles with that gun which, known as Brown Bess, had helped in deciding the fate of Europe in the Peninsula and at Waterloo. But the age had advanced beyond the weapon, and it was resolved to place in the hands of the Sepoy a good rifle, similar* to that carried by the European soldier. The cartridges, which were to be used were soon reported to be greased with the fat of the ox and the pig, and this was equally abhorrent, both to the Hindoo and the Mussulman. The rumour spread like wild-fire throughout the country that the contaminated object had to be bitten in the act of loading, and this, which to Hindoos meant a loss of caste, and to the Mussulmans a deed of the most offensive kind, raised the popular sentiment to a pitch of frenzy not easily to be allayed. At Dum-Dum, near Calcutta, at Barrackpore, at Berhampore, either agitation or open mutiny proclaimed the state of the soldier's mind. But on these occasions the disturbance was only of local importance and of a temporary character. They indeed afforded some token of the seething of indignation that there was among the Sepoys below the surface. Regarded by the light of history their significance is unmistakable. They were so many warnings afforded us of the forthcoming tempest. That they were neglected is clear proof of the blindness and over-confidence of our officers; and it is very probable that, if later events had not assumed so sombre a hue, these minor and pre-montory outbreaks would have been forgotten. The folly of having neglected them must be patent to all.

It is true that the cumbersome machinery of our administration was not the one most fitted to cope promptly and completely with a danger that was rapidly attaining wide proportions. But still it appears that something more stringent, and more adequate to the occasion might and would have been done, had there only been a due perception of the magnitude of the crisis. In the meanwhile, the disaffection was becoming more clearly manifested. Two native regiments at Barrackpore were notoriously infected with a dangerous spirit. It was a matter of great good fortune that the soldier who was called upon to deal with this danger was one peculiarly suited to the task in hand. General Hearsey, the commander of the division, saw very clearly that it was a "great fear" which was driving the Sepoys towards the verge of mutiny; and he did not blind himself or those around him to the fact that under the circumstances that panic was intelligible, if not excusable. It was by "kindly treatment and delicate management" that he hoped to avert all danger to ourselves, and to appease all discontent among the natives. With that idea uppermost in his brain General Hearsey addressed the Sepoys, and it seemed that his words of wisdom and moderation had had their due effect. It was said that "a heaviness had passed away from their minds;" but it was only for a moment. The Calcutta authorities saw with other eyes than those of the General on the spot; and they resolved that, as soon as a sufficient number of European troops could be assembled, the regiments at Berhampore and Barrackpore should be disarmed and disbanded. The rumour of the summoning of troops from Burmah, and other preparations reached the native soldiers, and gave rise to wild rumours of the intention of the Feringhees to annihilate their native army. Already was there talk of blowing from guns, although the air was still quiet as a summer afternoon. The "great fear" became greater than ever. The panic of a wholesale destruction was banishing common sense and all reasoning power from amongst the native regiments. The Indian mind, so easily inflamed and acted upon by outside influence, was afire; and what might have been repressed at an earlier stage had now attained such dimensions that it was not possible for the conflagration to be quenched without its occasioning serious damage.

Yet Hearsey did not wholly despair. His plain manly words had once had a soothing effect. He would try them a second time to see if by them he could not allay the excitement that the military preparations at Calcutta were raising in his district. But Hearsey's words, fine, noble, and magnanimous as they were, could not arrest the decree of fate. A native regiment was on the march from Berhampore to Barrackpore to be disbanded for

mutinous conduct. The laurels which it had obtained in many a previous campaign were to fade away in the past, when the ignominious fate was allotted to it of disbandment. Its approach to Barrackpore was marked by an occurrence which showed to what a pass the excitement had attained. This was the incident of Mungul Pandy. On the afternoon of the 29th of March this soldier, inflamed with *bang*, made an attack on parade upon the adjutant of his regiment, and for a short time absolutely bade defiance to all authority. It required all General Harsey's personal influence to restore order. The regiments committed a breach of discipline in remaining inactive; but they were not yet ripe for open revolt. On the following day, too, the great event was to take place—the disbandment of the 19th regiment; and in that more important event the incident of Mungul Pandy was forgotten. That, too, passed off without a collision; and, although the situation was of the most critical, there was no manifestation of sedition. The condemned regiment piled arms and marched off to their homes, cursing not so much the Feriughees as the brother regiment which had instigated them to mutiny. The conclusion of the ceremony was rendered the more affecting by the touching words which General Harsey addressed to them, and by the manner in which the Sepoys received them. As they moved off they cheered the fine old soldier, and it is impossible to conceive a more sincere tribute of admiration to the qualities of this gallant officer and gentleman, than the cheers of those men who but the moment before had ceased to be soldiers. A few days afterwards Mungul Pandy was hanged, and the conduct of the other regiment at Barrackpore—the 34th—was made the subject of a searching and protracted investigation. The investigation was imperative, and it was well that it should be searching; but its effect was greatly lessened by the tedious delays and formalities that obstructed the inquiry.

In the meanwhile, the storm was rising up on all hands. Lord Canning's attention was soon required elsewhere than in the vicinity of Calcutta. General Anson, the Commander-in-chief, was on the point of leaving Umballa for Simla, when the unquiet spirit in the native regiments forced itself upon his attention. At Umballa itself, one of the depôts for rifle instruction, and, consequently, one of the pulses of the sentiment of the native army, this spirit revealed itself very clearly. General Anson attempted to meet the difficulty by reading an address to the native officers on parade, in which he explained how absurd and irrational were the fears which had been spread as to the intentions of the English Government: but the impression made upon the minds of the men was very slight. "For one man who disbelieved the stories" that were current, "there were ten thousand

who believed them." At this point it became absolutely necessary to decide if any, and what, concession should be made to the prejudices and fears of the native soldier, or if military discipline should be permitted to take its usual and undeviating course. The latter was the course that was adopted, and perhaps it could not have been otherwise. It was a matter of such difficulty to reach the mind of the private soldier, that it may have appeared to be impossible to the military authorities, after addresses and public proclamations had been found to be of no avail. The Commander-in-chief proceeded on his way to the hills, while the selected officers and men of the Bengal regiments were completing their instruction at Umballa. "It was not," as Sir John Kaye says, "a time for the enjoyment of Himalayan delights." For that sure token of coming rebellion, incendiarism, was breaking out in all quarters. Nor was it confined to the defenceless bungalow of the English officer. Barracks, huts, store-houses, and hospitals were the principal victims of this outbreak; and none of the culprits could be discovered. But up to this point, however charged the air had been, there was no sign that the very existence of our empire in India was in jeopardy. Wise and far-seeing men recognised that the native army was in an unsatisfactory state, and that there would be local disturbances before things could be restored to their normal condition of tranquillity. But no one was so wise or so foreseeing as to perceive that we were at the crisis of our career in India. Before the blow was struck it was nowhere supposed that we were on the brink of a mutiny of the native army, backed up by a great rising on the part of the people of Bengal. The disturbances hitherto described, though not without importance, were regarded as matters of minor moment. They had also been confined to the infantry, and it was generally supposed that they had been produced by one cause alone, the introduction of a new weapon with its greased cartridges. It was also believed that the disaffection was mainly, if not exclusively, confined to the Hindoos, and that the Mahomedans were free from the contamination. These suppositions were proved, by the events we have now to describe, to be quite erroneous. The ulcer had spread on all sides. Not a Sepoy from the plains could be said to have escaped from its influence; fatal to his character as a soldier and as a dutiful subject.

If there was one spot in Northern India where it could be said that we were most prepared to encounter any accumulation of difficulties, that spot was certainly the station of Meerut. To this place came all the rumours that were agitating the rest of India; and close upon the heels of the vague stories that were in the air, arrived emissaries of evil in the shape of wandering

fakeers and the like. In no place were these tales discussed with greater eagerness than at Meerut; and certainly nowhere else did the Sepoys manifest greater determination or a more dogged temper. The third regiment of cavalry was the first to break out into open mutiny; and when ammunition was being served out to one squadron, eighty-five out of the ninety present refused to receive it. It was all in vain that their colonel strove to point out the folly and wickedness of their conduct; they were deaf to all advice, and to every remonstrance. The delinquents were ordered for court-martial. The flame of disaffection was gradually spreading over the country, and the most absurd rumours were current of plots on the part of the English for the wholesale conversion of the Indian races to Christianity. The Raj that had been remarkable above all things for its impartiality in religious matters, was suddenly, in the eyes of the popular superstition, vested with an insatiable desire to proselytise on all hands. Neither Brahmin nor Hindoo, Sikh nor Mussulman, was to be safe from the fervour which had suddenly seized the Feringhees.

And behind all this popular ignorance stood the dark schemers, the discontented Princes, and their astute and unscrupulous advisers, eager to do something, and not over nice as to how it should be done. Long before the question of the Enfield rifle had arisen, and when India was to all appearance lapped in a full sense of tranquillity, the prospect of a decline and fall in the British power had occurred to social intriguers who had met with various disappointments in their dealings with our Government. Of these, perhaps the most dangerous, and certainly the best known, was Nana Sahib. As this man played such a prominent part in the mutiny it will be well to say something at this point briefly of his career.

On the 28th of January, 1851, Badjee Rao, the last of the Peishwas, died. He left no descendant, but by a will executed twelve years before his death he had declared as his heir a youth known as Doondoo Punt, the Nana Sahib. At that time Doondoo Punt was considered to be a most exemplary young man, with "a ready disposition to attend to the advice of the British Commissioner." But the Indian Government refused to continue to the adopted heir any portion of the stipend that had been paid to the Peishwa. The Nana was to have only the money saved by Badjee Rao, and as a special favour, the Jagheer, or rent-free estate of Bithoor. Those were the days when it was first beginning to be perceived that there was an independent and an all-powerful public opinion in England, differing in many ways from that which was prevalent amongst the English in India. But neither the Nana's memorial nor

his agent, Azimollah, of whom much more is heard during the progress of the mutiny, could move the heart of the directors. Badjee Rao's pension could not be continued to Badjee Rao's adopted heir, and the "well-disposed" young man known as the Nana Sahib, who in Mahratta eyes was nothing more nor less than the Peishwa, had to remain content with his private possessions. From 1853 until 1857 the Nana lived in retirement at his castle at Bithoor. He was brooding over his wrongs during those years, with the wily Azimollah ever at his elbow; but to all appearance his friendship had never been more ostentatious or more sincere towards the English than it was in the beginning of 1857. Two men alone suspected him, and they were master minds, Outram and Henry Lawrence.

About this time the annexation of Oude spread the discontent throughout a large section of the nation before uncontaminated. It was still more important as accentuating the hostility of those who were already disaffected. Of Lord Dalhousie's wisdom in sanctioning that step there would appear to be little doubt. It was only taken when Sir James Outram, our Resident in Oude, declared that "the duty imposed on the British Government by the treaty of 1801 cannot any longer admit of our honestly indulging the reluctance which the Government of India has felt heretofore to have recourse to those extreme measures which alone can be of any real efficiency in remedying the evils from which the state of Oude has suffered so long;" and after General Low, now Sir John Low, who may at the venerable age to which he has attained be styled the Nestor of the Anglo-Indian world, had in the shape of a weighty minute exhausted all the arguments in favour of intervention. General Low's great name decided the question. Every one felt that the case was hopelessly bad when he said that it was "the paramount duty of the British Government to interfere at once for the protection of the people of Oude." Once decreed, the task of annexation was easy. There were no popular risings. Not a blow was struck in defence of the native dynasty of Oude. The annexation of Oude was unavoidable, but it could not have been otherwise than that its effect should have been to create an unfavourable impression throughout India. Who was safe, it was said, if not the ruling family of Oude, which had been our allies for a century? Coming at such a moment too, when the atmosphere was overcharged with dangerous elements, its effect was rendered the more mischievous. Yet not for that reason can the annexation of Oude be sweepingly condemned. The Indian Mutiny originated neither in that nor in any other single cause; but it is probable that it was the deposition of the Oude family which produced a wider impression than any other individual

act. We can now return to Meerut, the place where the disaffection in the army was reaching a head at a faster rate than elsewhere, although the storm-cloud was growing daily darker and darker in Oude, where Henry Lawrence was striving his utmost to repress disorder at the same time that he endeavoured to restore confidence. But the fate of the early scenes of the approaching struggle lay with the British soldiers at Meerut.

After the incident already described of the Third Cavalry, the mind of the native soldier at Meerut became more and more disturbed. The feeling half of fear and half of hatred grew intensified, more especially during the weeks which were taken up with the trial of the guilty eighty-five. After unnecessary and tedious delays the Court sentenced them to ten years of imprisonment, with hard labour, but recommended them to mercy on account of their previous good character. The sentence was confirmed by the General commanding the Division, and the recommendation to favourable consideration disregarded. On the 9th of May it was arranged that the sentence should be carried into effect, and with military precision the arrangement was adhered to. The scene was a most affecting one, but the day passed quietly off. Military discipline had been vindicated, and "as far as English brains could understand" at that time there was an end of the disagreeable episode. But in the Sepoy lines, separated from the European by a nullah, and in the town that had sprung up near the cantonment, there was the greatest excitement, and the wildest rumours were prevalent. It was said that the English were about to disarm the whole of the native troops, and that a large quantity of fetters had arrived for the purpose of placing them in confinement. Placards were posted throughout the town, inciting the people to revolt against the English; but these were not believed in by our people. Elsewhere the spirit of resistance might seize the mind of the native soldier, but it would not at Meerut, where a gallant force of Horse, Foot, and Artillery lay encamped, ready to exact the most complete vengeance for any deed of overt rebellion. So closed that eventful day. Among the natives a great fear and a bitter hate rising higher and higher in their bosoms, and nerving them to face the white man, even though the penalty should be death; and among the Europeans that trust in themselves and their good fortune, that over-confidence in their own superiority to mere Asiatics, which has often brought them into peril, never so great, perhaps, as on that bright May day in 1857, but which has never as yet failed to carry them out of the greatest of difficulties in triumph. The next day—Sunday, May 10th—the sun rose without a cloud, and the English residents and officers, eager to forget the painful events of the preceding day, made their preparations for the observance

of the Sabbath in indifference to the events that were passing round them. During the whole of that day the natives had been hard at work arming themselves and bracing themselves up to strike the blow on which they had resolved; and when evening came all the preparations had been completed. It was time to strike if the blow was to be struck at all.

Nor did the Sepoys hold back. As evening church parade was being held the Third Cavalry rode off to release their comrades from incarceration in the gaol, and as the guard was composed only of Sepoys this was speedily accomplished. The cavalry returned to their quarters, and for the moment they had nothing further to do. But the signal had been given, and it was too late at that stage to arrest the further progress of the rising. Two Infantry regiments broke into open revolt. The colonel of one of them was shot by the men of the other; and then they all broke loose into the town, murdering every European, man, woman, or child, whom they came across. In this work they were aided by the prisoners from the gaols, and by the refuse of the bazaars. But even in the midst of the massacre the hearts of the Europeans never misgave them, for was there not a large and irresistible force of Englishmen in their close neighbourhood? The reign of the mutineers could not last many hours, and it might cease at any moment, before the volleys of the Rifles, or the charge of the Carbineers. But the confidence was quite misplaced. The troops were there, and the means at hand to vanquish any organised resistance on the part of the mutineers. But under such conditions that is not sufficient. There must be the man as well, and at Meerut the man was wanting. Instead of proceeding to crush the mutineers without delay, neither General Hewitt nor Brigadier Archdale Wilson did anything. The little that they did at all was done with an apathy that, under the circumstances, was not less disgraceful than it must now appear to us to be surprising. The historian has devoted pages to this incident; but in one sentence the whole situation can be explained. Those in command lost their heads.

The troops were, of course, called out, and a few harmless rounds of grape fired into the obscurity of the night. But it became clear at once that the mutineers had departed. It was not to be supposed that the jackals would remain in the neighbourhood of the scene of slaughter when there was a lion—even though it might be a sleeping one—close by. The pressing question then became, where had the three mutinous regiments, with their following of the scum of Meerut, gone? It was thought that they might have marched by a flank route on the European portion of the Cantonment while the troops were absent; and accordingly the force returned to quarters. The mutineers had

not done so. The English bivouacked on the parade ground, and nothing more was done. Anxiously that night did the men and officers ask themselves, whither had the mutinous regiments gone? and although the tongue refused to express the thought, there was one dread oppressing the mind of those Englishmen: and that was that the mutineers had started for the great goal of all—Delhi, the Imperial City. And what the general mind conjured up was only the natural conclusion, after all; for Delhi, without any European troops, and with its disaffected Sepoy garrison, was the one point which offered the Meerut mutineers a prospect of safety. So it was that, during that eventful night of the 10th-11th of May, while General Hewitt's mind was in a whirl of doubt and uncertainty as to what was to be done, and his troops were bivouacking on the parade-ground, the mutineers were speeding along the road to Delhi, 30 miles away, impelled forward by a great fear. In every sound of the night they heard the clanking of the avenging sabres, or the rolling of the Galloper guns. It never occurred to them to suppose that the dreaded European would remain supine under the challenge that had been thrown at his feet. But as they approached Delhi without any sign of pursuit, and when they saw the waters of the Jumna at their feet, they knew that they were safe, and that they had reached the City of Refuge.

The morning sun saw the Meerut mutineers outside the walls of Delhi, clamouring under the windows of the King's Palace; but it brought neither vigour nor wisdom to the councils of General Hewitt. "The Meerut Brigade did nothing more in the clear morning light than it had done in the shadow of the darkness." The whereabouts of the mutineers was no longer a mystery. They had gone off along the Delhi road, and what did the General in command do? He conducted a reconnoissance "on the right of the Delhi road." He did not even exact a terrible retribution upon the remaining scum of the populace in the Bazaar for the murders of the day before. While Delhi was being won by the mutineers, while red-handed rapine was rampant in the Imperial City, while the Chandni Chowk ran with the best of English blood, and while Willoughby and his gallant band were vindicating the honour of their race, General Hewitt was going through the manoeuvres which are prescribed by military text-books in face of an enemy of equal strength and resources. It was well-known—a subject of daily conversation—that the Court of the Mogul was one of the centres of political intrigue and treasonous designs, and that the followers of the last representative of the House of Baber were eager, and hopeful of being able, to found an independent administration of their own. None of these was a Foreign Department secret. They

were known to everybody, patent to all eyes. Yet General Hewitt was indifferent to these considerations—blind to these facts. His conduct was but a modern exemplification of one side of the story of the Roman Emperor fiddling when his capital was in flames.

It was the successful rising at Meerut which applied the match to the powder magazine. Far and wide throughout Bengal went the story that the Meerut brigade had successfully defied the English; and, as the story passed on, rumour, true to her character, magnified the shock to the English reputation. Eagerly was the question discussed in the lines of every Sepoy regiment, and the view was general that if the native soldier could resist the European at Meerut, there was not a spot in India where he could not do so with greater impunity and surer prospect of success. The argument was logical, and had all our generals been like Hewitt at Meerut, the result would have justified their expectations. And but a few hours after, and in some cases, before, the intelligence of the events at Meerut, there came the more terrible and appalling news of the fall of Delhi. One of the historic capitals was in the hands of victorious rebels, and the Great Mogul, whose name had not wholly lost its significance, had either set himself up, or been set up by his adherents, as a ruler in the land. The crisis of our empire in India had been reached. It was no longer possible to regard the position of affairs as unsatisfactory. It was critical. The storm had gathered to a head, and the great contest had to be fought out over again between the European few and the Indian many.

With the tidings of their achievement a flying all over India, it is necessary to describe briefly what the Meerut mutineers had done at Delhi. With the Third Cavalry in advance they had entered the city, and pushed on for the King's Palace. In a short time they were masters of the town. The Sepoy regiments of the garrison fraternised with the heroes of Meerut. Words and authority became nothing. And as the rebels advanced, carrying everything before them, so did the remnant of the European residents flee for safety to the palace of the king. But there was no safety in the place towards which the whole volume of the mutiny was surging, as towards a common centre. The doors of the palace were broken in; the gallant commissioner, Simon Fraser, was slain at the foot of the staircase, and the rest of the Europeans were massacred, "with exultant ferocity." These scenes were repeated at the bank, the press office, and wherever else Europeans or Christian natives were to be met with. Within the walls there remained only the Magazine where the English flag still flew, and where English-

men still bade defiance to the enemy; and of all places it, on account of its vast stores, was the most important, both to us and to the rebels. The guard consisted of three English officers, Lieutenants George Willoughby, Forrest, and Raynor, and six European subordinates. When the news came of the advance of the mutineers, these gallant men at once set about the task of defending the magazine to the last gasp. But this sense of duty did not stop with the formation of the resolve to die at their post; at all costs the contents of the magazine should not fall into the hands of the mutineers. So all the guns were double charged with grape, and posted within the gates; and Willoughby, ever daring, and always bearing the brunt of the labour, laid the train to the powder magazine; and when all hope should be abandoned, the match was to be applied, at a signal to be given by him. In a short time the mutineers streamed out of the palace, and from all the purlieus of the great city, to do battle with the dauntless nine. The reception they met with showed the stuff of which that garrison was made; but the numbers were overwhelming. The ammunition was soon exhausted, and none could leave the guns to get more. The enemy had won; but, if the "cold" courage of Englishmen had not become a mere tradition, they should yet be cheated of their prey. And they were. When the enemy was most exultant over his fancied triumph, when hundreds of them were on the point of grasping their great prize, Willoughby gave the signal. There was a tremendous report, and the Delhi Magazine had been exploded into the air. Of the nine heroes who performed that deed four escaped, the three officers and one sergeant, by some miraculous chance. In the whole records of war, during the progress of the Indian Mutiny itself, there is nothing to excel the act of George Willoughby and his eight comrades. It is impossible to measure the effect it had at the time in India. But this much may be said, that for Englishmen it struck the key-note of the intrepidity and daring to which, in the coming crisis, they would have to rise; and that for the natives, it told them that Englishmen had not forgotten the first penalty of being conquerors—indifference to death. All honour to George Willoughby, the man who struck the first blow at the hopes of rebels and intriguers!

Without the walls the danger was scarcely less serious; the confusion not less great than within. The British cantonments on the ridge were as much the scene of mutinous conduct as the city had been of open rebellion. For the better part of two days the officers managed to restrain the men of one regiment out of the three present—the other two had deserted at once—under the threat of the approaching succour from Meerut; but these, too,

mutinied, when it was found that time passed, and no aid came. Our officers, deserted by their men, and with no means of offering a defence, were compelled to flee. So on the ridge, as in the city, was mutiny the victor. The 12th of May found no English left in Delhi or its vicinity, save prisoners, and these in a few days were all massacred. "The British had no longer any footing in the capital of the Mogul." So confident did these events make the rebels, that they declared that the English had become *luhar*, helpless!

The Meerut rising and the fall of Delhi were the beginning of the Mutiny. The tidings were flashed from one end of India to the other. What had been matter of speculation had become certainty. The inexorable facts stared every man in the face. It is necessary to consider now briefly, for space is becoming smaller, what Lord Canning did in the way of coping with the great danger which now beset the Government of which he was the responsible chief. The pressing need was for more English troops, and these must be obtained at all cost and as speedily as possible. Two regiments were recalled from British Burmah, two more were summoned from Madras, and all the troops which could be spared were requested from the Governor of Ceylon. The Persian War had also closed with the Treaty of Paris, and Outram's force was thus ready for service. But still more important, the expedition at that moment proceeding to China was only half-way on its journey, and it could be stopped and diverted to meet the pressing need in India. Lord Canning did not hesitate to accept the responsibility of calling upon Elgin and Ashburnham to turn aside in their course to India, for the chastisement of China could wait, while the salvation of India could not. In matters of detail Lord Canning was equally energetic, and once the gravity of the situation was recognised, nothing could exceed either the vigour or the sagacity of his preparations. The events already described produced a sort of panic in Calcutta, which was not finally allayed until some time after; but so far as any outbreak took place Lord Canning was justified in styling it a "groundless panic." Every day found the British position more and more assured from the arrival of reinforcements and the formation of volunteer corps. The question then became, where was the first blow of retribution to be struck? And the only answer came back unhesitatingly, that it could and must be against Delhi. So the progress of the Mutiny resolves itself for the moment into the first advance of English troops for the recovery of Delhi.

While Lord Canning had been diligent in his efforts at Calcutta, John Lawrence, Commissioner of the Punjab, had not been less so on the other hand. On the 26th of May the

nucleus of an army had been assembled near Paniput, under the immediate command of General Anson, when that officer died. He was succeeded as Commander-in-Chief by Sir H. Barnard, who at once began his march on Delhi. The Meerut Brigade, under General Wilson, was to effect a junction with him *en route*. It fell to the fortune of the latter to bear the first fighting. Two battles were fought on the Hindun river, in both of which the rebels were defeated with heavy loss in men and guns, and General Wilson's brigade was further strengthened by the arrival of a Ghoorka regiment. One week after the latter of these victories the whole force was concentrated near Delhi, under the command of Sir H. Barnard. The mutineers had taken up a strong entrenched position at a place known as Budlee-ka-serai, about six miles from Delhi, and it was known that they had thirty guns in position. Early dawn found the English army advancing against the rebels, and the historian tells us they were filled with a fierce determination to obtain victory and to exact revenge: It is almost unnecessary to say that our arms were victorious. The Sepoys fought well, but their valour availed them little. They were driven from the field in confusion. Sir H. Barnard at once determined on following his success up, and before evening he was in possession of the ridge which looks down upon the city, and where our cantonment had formerly been. The first blow had been struck for the recovery of Delhi and it had been crowned with success. But the full reward was yet far off. Delhi, lost in a day, was not to be regained so speedily.

During this period troubles were rising up on all hands. The great line of the Gauges to Allahabad, and thence through the Doab to Agra, was exposed throughout its whole length to innumerable dangers, and as the summer went on these were multiplied. At Azimgurh, Benares, Allahabad, and other places, there were mutinies which might have been serious but for the intrepidity of Brigadier-General Neill, who with his Madras Fusiliers had arrived upon the scene at a most opportune moment. At this stage of the rising it is impossible to do adequate justice to the services of Neill. He saved Benares and Allahabad, and while at that particular moment there was no man to the front in whom it was possible to place perfect confidence, Lord Canning and the army recognised that he was one "to scorn the consequence, and to do the thing." And superior as Neill was to all his colleagues in energy and daring, he was still more superior to them all in his grasp of the situation. He was no "Sepoy officer," and he had no faith in black soldiers at all. The skill and daring which he showed at the disarmament at Benares, and in the manner in which with a very small force he

cleared the villages near Allahabad of the rebels, are among the brightest deeds of the Mutiny. With the country safe up to Allahabad, the great question remained what was the condition of Cawnpore and Oude; and Neill's task then resolved itself into sending forward a force as speedily as possible to Cawnpore. But delays were inevitable, as he had to improvise his transport, and to await reinforcements. It was not until the last day of June that an advanced force of 800 men and two guns, under the command of Major Renaud, left Allahabad *en route* for Cawnpore. At this point Neill was superseded by Henry Havelock in the command of the brigade to be assembled for the relief of Cawnpore.

But before this, a great disaster had occurred. Cawnpore, the station of four Sepoy regiments, and at this time held by about 300 Europeans as well, had been the scene of an event which, however terrible in itself, was not without its redeeming features. The general in command was Sir Hugh Wheeler, an officer who had performed fifty years of brilliant service for his country; but although bowed down to some degree with the weight of more than seventy years, he was neither blind to the signs of the times nor indifferent to the sentiment of his native regiments. The responsibilities of his position were very great. He had hardly any English troops, and yet he had to protect the women, children, and invalids of a regiment stationed at Lucknow. There was also a large number of European residents; and the temper of his Sepoys was more than ambiguous from the very commencement. There was in Cawnpore also a great fear settling down over the Sepoys. They believed that the Feringhees had a settled plan for their extermination, and in the frame of mind into which they had worked themselves, to explain had only the effect of magnifying their alarm. In the month of May General Wheeler recognised that it would be well to take measures for placing his charges in a place of security, and he accordingly began to intrench a spot, with the intention of making it a place of refuge when the need came. But here he made a fatal mistake, for in sheer fatuousness, he refused to make that place the magazine. Whereas the magazine admitted of being easily converted into a strong position, the intrenchments raised by General Wheeler near the Sepoy lines were weak and insignificant. Sir John Kaye endeavours to palliate the blunder, but the defence appears to be extremely lame. At this point the Cawnpore garrison was reinforced by a small detachment sent from Lucknow by Henry Lawrence, who, ill as he could spare them, could not turn a deaf ear to the request of his comrades in arms for help. Sir Hugh Wheeler in his anxiety appealed also to his near neighbour, the Rajah of Bithoor, Nana Sahib. At Cawn-

poré it was forgotten that the man to whom this appeal was about to be made had been a thwarted suppliant in our courts. His protestations of friendship were alone remembered, and Sir Hugh Wheeler requested the Nana to help us so far as to place a guard of his retainers over the treasury, and thus overawe the Sepoy garrison, of the trustworthiness of which Sir Hugh felt so dubious. The Nana felt that he hated the English, and seeing that his time had come, willingly complied. The treasury and the magazine passed into the hands of the man who was more to be feared by us than any one else in India. That act sealed the fate of Cawnpore the instant the moment should arrive for the rising to take place. During the last weeks of the month of May an understanding had been come to between the Rajah of Bithoor and the refractory Sepoys, by which they pledged themselves to make common cause against the hated Feringhees. On the 4th of June the auspicious moment had come. The Sepoys of Cawnpore, emulating the conduct of the Meerut mutineers three weeks before, cast off their obedience, and, with the assistance of Nana Sahib, made themselves masters of Cawnpore, with the exception of the small intrenched spot within which the General and the Europeans had taken refuge. At first the mutineers intended to march on Delhi, and join their countrymen there; and, indeed, they marched one day's journey towards the imperial city. But that design formed no part of the Nana's plans. His sphere lay in Cawnpore. To go to Delhi would be only to invite eclipse amongst the followers of the Mogul. So he strove to induce them to turn back to the city they were leaving behind; and he succeeded.

He at once laid close siege to the British position, and the heavy artillery, which had been captured with the magazine, was soon pouring a fierce and destructive fire into the weak defences of our intrenchment. During three weeks Sir Hugh Wheeler held out against the assaults of the enemy, and the sufferings caused by want of food and water, imperfect medical attention for the wounded, the dangers of fire, and an accumulation of deprivations and perils which would have blanched the heart of the boldest man, but which had to be endured by women and children. The misery which our countrymen underwent during those three weeks has never been surpassed, yet the thought that they were Englishmen inspired them to rise above all their troubles, and to boldly face the Asiatic horde which was encompassing them round about, and thirsting for their blood. At this point, two days after the garrison had repulsed a desperate assault, delivered to commemorate the centenary of Plassey, there came in the handwriting of Azimollah, the arch-fiend at the Nana's elbow, a document promising to

all those "not connected with the acts of Lord Dalhousie" a safe passage to Allahabad, if the garrison would lay down its arms; and after some hesitation, and with some doubts upon their minds, the terms were accepted. The English garrison would surrender their position; and, for the sake of the weaklings, brave soldiers to whom capitulation was dishonour consented to accept the offer which had been made to them for their destruction. On the 27th of June the garrison left their intrenchment for the boats which were to convey them down the Ganges to Allahabad; but as soon as they had reached the waterside the signal was given for their massacre. It is unnecessary to repeat the dreadful and never-to-be-forgotten tale. It lives in the memory as fresh as if it had but occurred yesterday. Of the garrison of the English intrenchment at Cawnpore but one boat-load escaped the massacre at the Ghaut. It might be styled the Hero Boat, for in it were, by some strange freak of fortune, the heroes of that defence. During its passage down the river it met with many an adventure, and with each fresh encounter its occupants became fewer and fewer; and in the end but four, Mowbray-Thomson and Delafosse, with privates Murphy and Sullivan, survived to tell the story of Cawnpore. But, despite the terrible activity and the ruthless blood-thirstiness of the Nana's agents at the Ghaut and on the waters of the Ganges, there were still some survivors, chiefly women and children. They numbered, with the captives of Futtehghur, more than two hundred souls. When the news came of the advance of Havelock's legions, the Nana resolved to have one more triumph. He might not be able to fight the hardened soldiers of the great captain marching against him, but he could at least wreak his vengeance on the defenceless women and children in the Beebeeghur. On the 15th of July, when, worsted in the field, the Nana saw his hold on Cawnpore slipping away from him, he therefore ordered that the prisoners should be massacred, and his behests were carried out to the letter. With that act ended the tragedy of Cawnpore, which had begun on the 4th of June, when the regiments had mutinied. Here, as elsewhere, the cause of the disaster was plainly a too confiding trust in the honour of the natives. Our officers forgot that they were aliens, and that as such they never could, and never can, be anything save the object of the legitimate hostility of the natives.

While these events were occurring at Cawnpore, others not less important were taking place at Lucknow, the capital of Oude, the latest of British acquisitions. The Chief Commissioner was Sir Henry Lawrence, the greatest of a band of brothers who have done more than any other family to make India British, and to

keep it so. If there was blindness at Calcutta, if lethargy was supreme at Meerut, if at every station there was over-confidence, it is certain that at Lucknow there was the very reverse of those political mistakes. In the counsels of Sir Henry Lawrence want of clearness of vision and of promptitude in action had as little place as a too-confiding trust in the fidelity of his soldiery. He knew well that when the crisis came—and he saw it approaching with gigantic strides—he would have only the few white faces to depend upon in his effort to stem it, and that the Empire once placed within the threat of jeopardy could be saved by Englishmen alone. Many weeks before the Meerut rising Henry Lawrence had taken in the whole situation. He was in the heart of that province of Oude, which still pined for the misrule of its own king. He had under him eight native regiments and two batteries, on not one of which he felt he could rely. But, on the other hand, he had one English regiment, and with that he was sure he could defend, if he could not act on the offensive. And so it was that this great man counted up the chances of the future, and knowing what his means were adapted them to the end in view, which was the maintenance of British authority in the capital of Oude. Therefore he fortified the Residency—a strong building, with offices and out-houses attached—provisioned it, garrisoned it with English troops, and made all the preparations for a siege which suggested themselves to a skilful and cautious commander. He had completed his preparations before the 30th of April. When he received tidings of the Meerut rising he concentrated his small force. Colonel Malleon gives, in his first volume, a singularly able and clear account of the preparations made by Sir Henry Lawrence, which have been briefly summarized. On the 30th of May, when the Sepoy regiments revolted, all was ready for the defence of the Residency. On that day it became evident, too, that the whole province had risen. In Oude, faster than elsewhere, the mutiny had become a rebellion.

During the month of June, Lawrence perfected his preparations, and maintained authority in Lucknow. There were many striking incidents, which cannot here be alluded to, that marked that period as one of pre-eminent historical interest. Sir Henry showed that he appreciated to the full that lesson of warfare which tells us that the best defence is to assume the offensive; and for that reason it is impossible to condemn his resolve to go out and encounter the mutineers in the open, although it resulted in the defeat at Chinhat. That reverse served the useful purpose, too, of compelling Lawrence to confine his defence to the Residency, and to abandon the Mutchee Bewan, which he had intended to defend as well. The Mutchee Bewan was accordingly blown up. After that event, the rebels bombarded the Residency without

ceasing. The siege of Lucknow had fairly commenced only a few days after the great atrocity at Cawnpore had been perpetrated. It is unnecessary to dwell on the incidents of that siege further than to say, that almost at the very commencement the garrison suffered an irreparable loss in the death of its gallant commander. One of the eye-witnesses of the scene—there were only four persons present in all—Captain Wilson, has given a graphic description of the death of Sir Henry Lawrence by a round-shot fired into his room when lying in bed, and Colonel Malleson, who excels in his portrait-painting, has provided us with a remarkable analysis of the character of this "noble" man.

During these same weeks, too, a crisis had occurred at Patna, the great Mahomedan city of the country east of Benares, and the centre of the Wahabees. But although weakness was shown in dealing with the native regiments at Dinapore, Patna itself and the surrounding district were preserved by the vigilance and resolution of the Commissiour, Mr. William Tayler. Mr. Tayler rendered the Government and his country most valuable service at this crisis, and it is a matter to be deplored that, instead of receiving the rewards which he might justly have expected, he had meted out to him twenty years of official neglect as his recompense for patriotic and well-timed labour. The Patna crisis and the position of affairs in Behar undoubtedly received additional lustre from the splendid defence of Arrah by a few civilians and Sikhs, and from Vincent Eyre's remarkable and gallant relief of that place. With 220 men and three guns Eyre not only relieved the besieged residents of Arrah, but he followed up that blow by attacking the rebel Zemindar, Kunwar Singh, in his stronghold, which he captured. For resolution in the initiative, and for promptitude and vigour in execution, there is nothing in the whole annals of the mutiny to compare with Eyre's march on and relief of Arrah. There is no doubt that this blow shattered the hopes of the rebels in Behar, and the credit for it must be apportioned between the present Sir Vincent Eyre and Mr. William Tayler.

As these events were in progress in the Lower Provinces of India, all eyes were turned towards the Punjab, where John Lawrence was ruling with an almost absolute sway. Natives and Englishmen alike agreed that the fate of India depended upon the fate of the Punjab. Well was it for England that John Lawrence was the ruler of that province, which better than any other man he understood; and well was it, perhaps, for Lawrence that he had such a band of noble men under him, John Nicholson and Herbert Edwardes, Neville Chamberlain, and many another gallant man nursed in the Punjab school, to play thereafter a fore-

most part in the administration of India. The first object was to save Lahore, which was done. The next, to disarm the doubtful regiments, which was also accomplished in a manner completely satisfactory. The way was thus paved for the formation of that movable column of retribution which decided the fate of Delhi, and eventually did so much towards effecting the reconquest of Bengal. The outbreak of the mutiny has now been described at all the chief points. In Central India and in Rajpootana similar scenes had been enacted, but these scarcely require to be particularised. So far we have seen the English cause waning under an accumulation of difficulties and before a multitude of enemies. But, although the fighting had been severe and the situation was full of peril, the battle had not yet been lost. The indomitable courage of the paramount race still rose serene over the storm, and although rebels might here and there obtain a success through their superior numbers, the English showed their confident belief that such were only exceptions and not to be repeated. We have now to describe briefly the repression of the mutiny, the description of the greater portion of which it has fallen to the lot of Colonel Malleon to depict for us. Colonel Malleon has performed his task in a manner in every sense worthy of his high reputation as a historical writer, and we do not know of any work in the language in which we could find a more perfect account of military operations. His volumes on the Indian Mutiny should stamp him as the greatest English military writer of the day.

We have already seen how Lord Canning had hoped that Delhi would speedily be won back, and the victories have been described which enabled an English army to encamp once more on the ridge over that city. Several councils of war were held, and various propositions were made for an assault on the positions of the mutineers, but they all ended in the resolve to do nothing until reinforcements came. So Lord Canning's sanguine expectations of an early capture of Delhi were doomed to disappointment, and in the meanwhile the chief command before Delhi had been passing through several hands. Sir H. Barnard died. His successor, General Reed, after a short stay departed, and Archdale Wilson next obtained the command. For several weeks, then, inaction marked the progress of events round Delhi, and it was only when the movable column arrived under the command of General Nicholson, who had been raised to the chief command over many of his superiors, that the operations became more vigorous. On the 7th of August, Nicholson was on the ridge looking down upon Delhi. On the 12th the mutineers were driven out of Ludlow Castle, and two days afterwards the movable column arrived in camp. The siege train was making

its way slowly up from Ferozepore, when the rebels conceived the idea of stopping it. Nicholson heard of this intention, and resolved to anticipate them. These manœuvres gave rise to the battle of Nujufgurh, which was fought on the 25th of August, and which, owing to Nicholson's skilful dispositions, was a complete victory. Thenceforth the siege was pressed with greater determination, and the long weeks that had been passed in inglorious inaction were now changed for days and nights of constant activity. On the 7th of September the batteries began to play on the Delhi fortifications, and on the 13th Baird Smith, the Engineer-in-Chief, reported that the breaches were practicable for assault on the next day. On the 14th the assault was made in five columns. As Colonel Mallison says, it was not so much the fate of Delhi as it was the fate of India, which hung in the balance on the result. All the columns met with more or less success, but when that under Nicholson had worked its way round to the rear of the Lahore gate, an unexpected obstacle opposed its further advance. The enemy were strongly entrenched in a block of houses, the only approach to which was by a narrow lane, swept by the fire of two guns. Despite the remonstrances of many of his officers, Nicholson resolved to attack this while yet the rebels might be under the influence of their defeat at other points. But all the valour of his men, and the splendid obstinacy of their leaders, were in vain. They were falling back a second time when Nicholson rushed to the front. "His voice never rang more nobly, his presence was never more inspiring, than when he summoned his men to follow where their general led." At this point he was struck down by a bullet, and after lingering for a week he died, leaving behind him the reputation of being "the most successful administrator, the greatest soldier, the most perfect master of war, in India." All this he had accomplished before the age of thirty-seven. Severe fighting went on in the streets of Delhi, at the Lahore gate in particular, during the three following days, and it was not until the 18th of the month that any slackening was visible in the vigour of the defence, and even that day saw an attack on the Lahore gate repulsed with loss. On the following day, however, this check was retrieved. The Burn bastion which commanded that gate was taken, and on the following day the gate itself shared the same fate. On the 20th, the Palace and the Selimgurh also fell into our hands. The rebel army at once began to abandon the city, and Delhi was again all our own. The king, Bahadur Khan, was also taken from his place of refuge in the Tomb of Humayoun, and his sons and grandson shared the same fate. The latter were, however, slain by the officer to whom they had surrendered, the celebrated Hodson, of Hodson's Horse. Of

that act both historians speak in terms of undisguised disapproval and condemnation. Colonel Malleon stigmatises it as brutal and unnecessary, as much a blunder as a crime. The successful termination of the siege of Delhi, and the capture of the king, struck a great blow at the cause of the rebels, both directly and indirectly. The effect was felt in every part of India, and the fall of the Mogul proved to the natives that where he had failed no lesser adventurer could hope to succeed.

We left Havelock on the point of superseding Neill in the command of the brigade at Allahabad, destined to effect the relief of Cawnpore. It is time to return to him. Before he left Allahabad the news of the capture of Cawnpore had arrived. He was coming too late to save, but not to retrieve and to avenge. On the night of the 7th of July he quitted Allahabad; on the 12th he gave battle to the Nana's army at Futtehpore, routing it with severe loss; on the 15th he defeated it again at Aong; and finally, on the 16th, he won his culminating triumph in the battle of Cawnpore. In the last of these conflicts Havelock's son, the present Sir Henry Havelock, performed a deed, the first of a long series of gallant deeds, which will be best described in the words of the historian: "At this moment the general's aide-de-camp—the boy Harry—wheeled his horse round to the centre of the leading regiment and rode straight upon the muzzle of the twenty-four pounder, whose round-shot had now been supplanted by grape, which was making deadly gaps in our advancing column. It was a moment of rapture to the white-haired veteran . . . when he saw that battery carried and knew his son was safe." The recapture of Cawnpore was only the preliminary to the relief of the Residency of Lucknow, now hard pressed by the mutineers. On the 25th of July, Havelock was on the Oude side of the Ganges, which had been bridged, with a force of 1500 men and ten guns, ready to march on Lucknow. Neill was left behind at Cawnpore, to hold the base from which this relieving force was to operate. On the 29th of July he defeated the enemy at Onao, and again on the same day at Bashiratganj. But his losses were severe. On the morrow of his first day's fighting he could only count on placing 850 infantry in line of battle. Havelock saw the futility of pressing on at that moment. He must await reinforcements. On the 4th of August, being slightly reinforced, he began his second advance. The enemy made a stand at Bashiratganj, only to be driven from the field. A third fight took place at this village, with the same result; but Havelock was still too weak numerically to effect anything. On the 13th of the month he had withdrawn his force across the river into Cawnpore; but on the 16th he led out his troops against the

rebels at Nana Sahib's castle of Bithoor, where he inflicted a severe defeat upon them. At this point, just as Havelock had superseded Neill, so was he himself superseded by Sir James Outram. But when Outram reached Cawnpore, on the 16th of September, he, with that unparalleled self-abnegation which won for him the title of the *Bayard* of the Indian army, announced that he left to Havelock the task of effecting the relief of Lucknow, and that he would only take over the chief command after that event had occurred. No act of purer chivalry is to be found in the military annals of this or any other country. The force with which Havelock had to effect the relief of Lucknow consisted of about 3200 men, and the 20th of September found it all on the Oude side of the Ganges. Less resistance was experienced on this occasion than on the previous ones, and Havelock pressed on steadily and irresistibly towards Lucknow. On the 23rd he was close to the Alambagh, and here the first severe fighting took place. Having captured this position, Havelock continued his advance for a short distance farther, and then halted. He rested his men during the following day in preparation for the final movement. Carrying every obstacle before them, and turning the main streets, the three generals—Havelock, Outram, and Neill—bore down all opposition; but the last of these was killed in the Khas Bazaar. Shortly after that fatal occurrence the relieving force had reached the Residency, and the men who had fought so well in defence of that building were receiving the congratulations of those who had come to their aid through fire and sword. It soon became clear to Outram and to Havelock that they had not so much relieved as reinforced the garrison. Havelock's march on Lucknow is one of the most memorable achievements in Indian warfare, and gives him just claims to a high place on the roll of English generals.

There is only sufficient space left to describe very briefly the operations of Sir Colin Campbell, and to make a few closing remarks upon the Indian Mutiny in its political aspect. Sir Colin reached Calcutta on the 13th of August. His first task was to "organize victory." The pressing danger was in Oude. Outram's force had been swallowed up in Lucknow. It was besieged, and for the moment its utility had disappeared. A great gap had thereby been caused, and it was imperative that it should be filled up. A steady and a constant stream of troops was pushed up to Allahabad, and thence on to Cawnpore. On the 1st November Sir Colin was at the former of these places; and he reached the latter two days afterwards. He at once resolved to conquer Lucknow effectually. "At all costs the heart of Oude must be pierced." Hope Grant's column had been pushed across the Ganges, so that when the Commander-in-Chief

arrived much had been done towards effecting the main object. Cawnpore was left in the charge of General Windham, with 500 men. Sir Colin then set out in person to raise the blockade of Lucknow. During the previous six weeks the garrison had been engaged in a never-ceasing struggle with the rebels. Sorties, mining and counter-mining, were the daily events. Personal communication was established between Sir Colin and Outram by means of Mr. Thomas Henry Kavanagh, who at the greatest risk penetrated the lines of the enemy in disguise. On the 12th November the advance on the Alambagh commenced, and before the close of the day the garrison of that place was relieved. Fighting continued more or less every day, until on the 20th Sir Colin resolved to "retire" the garrison—a task which had been accomplished on the 23rd. The death of Havelock on that day was the "one mournful event which tinged the joy of the relief." Colonel Malleon gives a most eloquent sketch of the noble soldier. "The life of Havelock had been a life devoted to his profession. He had made the strict performance of duty his polar star. To the smallest office he gave his best abilities. He studied all his life for the future. He had fought a good fight: he had died, as he had lived, in the performance of duty." Sir Colin left a force of 4000 men and twenty-five guns at the Alambagh, under the command of Sir James Outram, to hold the enemy in check while he assembled a larger army. But while a triumph was being secured at Lucknow, a reverse was nearly happening at Cawnpore through the incompetence of Windham.

When Sir Colin left Cawnpore, Tantia Topi, the one general produced by the mutiny amongst the rebels, at the head of the revolted Gwalior troops, saw that the moment had come to strike a blow at a vulnerable point in our armour. His conception was not less clear than his action was prompt and energetic; and, thanks to the bungling of General Windham, his scheme was on the point of being crowned with success when Sir Colin arrived at the critical moment. This opportune arrival was the saving of Cawnpore. Tantia Topi was not prepared to give up the struggle without striking one blow; but on the 6th of December Sir Colin attacked him in his strong position and routed him. It was "a great victory." Sir Colin Campbell's "crowning victory" of Lucknow is told by Colonel Malleon in so masterly a way, and with such detail, that it is the less necessary to take it up here. With the capture of Lucknow in March, and the overthrow of the rebel army there, the mutiny was almost repressed. All real danger had been removed. Of the manner in which the two historians have performed their task it is only possible to speak in terms of praise. Indeed, it would almost seem as if to each had been allotted the part most suited for his genius

—to Sir John Kaye the description of the earlier stages of the mutiny; and to Colonel Malleon that of the later, including the campaigns of Sir Colin Campbell, Havelock, and the siege of Delhi. Each historian has risen to the height of his great argument, and the series of volumes at the head of this paper provides us with an account, adequate in its scope, and in its language worthy of the theme, of one of the great dramas of history. Over and above this praise Colonel Malleon's second volume is remarkable for its skill in bringing military combinations in a clear light before the reader.

The lessons that the Mutiny should teach Englishmen are as valid to-day as they were twenty-two years ago. The besetting sin in the national character is still over-confidence. If all appears to be serene, it is rank heresy to question whether that serenity be justifiable or not. Among all sections of the community a sentiment has spread that the natives of India are quite loyal and implicitly to be trusted. A large body of persons have even gone so far as to question the morality of our Indian Empire. They may be said to be the political descendants of the detractors of Clive and the calumniators of Hastings. But they have influence, and on this point have gained to some extent the ear of their countrymen. There is a growing tendency to depreciate ourselves and to exalt "the gentle Hindoo," probably the most self-csteeming personage in the world. So long as these generous impressions confined themselves to words, so long was there not much harm done. It was really but sorry charity to give so much lip-sympathy; but otherwise it was not objectionable. But they have now proceeded to acts. A larger field has been opened up for the native in the administration of the country, and that for the European has become proportionally more restricted. Yet there are apparently no misgivings. The first step has been taken towards the accomplishment of the cry of India for the Indians; and just as in 1857, so now, is the verdict of Englishmen, to use Kaye's words, "all serene." The danger is probably not close at hand; but one of the chief reasons for believing so is that neither Sepoys nor the mass of the people are likely to undertake, a second time, what the natives to this day very correctly describe that of 1857 as "the sheeps' mutiny." It is an absurd test to apply to make the good conduct of certain chosen regiments, such as those sent into Afghanistan, the criterion of the disposition of the whole army; to take the loyalty of a few native officers as representing the sentiment of that class which is most to be distrusted; or to assume that because the natives crouch before the English sahib, they love him. Disguise the facts how we may, delude ourselves on all points, take flattery for sincerity, and fear for love, it is as certain as blood is thicker than water that the

English rule is not and perhaps never can be popular in Hindostan. The Hindoo and the Mussulman will always secretly dislike us, and, as a natural consequence, there may be mutinies, and there must be rebellions against our authority in the coming years. All we can reasonably expect is that we shall be able to localise them, and prevent them coming to a head at the same moment. But if we are to accomplish even that much we must take a clearer view of our situation, and not permit common sense to be banished by a spurious, because quite misplaced, sentimentalism. That the Indian Mutiny of 1857 should ever have occurred must be held to be one of the most serious blots on the English administration; for had we only acted with common prudence it should never have assumed the proportions that it did. On the other hand, the patriot may become justly proud with the knowledge that its repression forms one of the noblest pages in the history of this or any other country.

ART. IV.—CAVOUR AND LAMARMORA.

1. *The Life of Count Cavour.* From the French of M. CHARLES DE MAZADE. London. 1877.
2. *Un po' più di Luce sugli eventi politici e militari dell'anno 1866.* Per ALFONSO LAMARMORA. Firenze. 1873. 4^{ta} Edizione.
3. *Alfonso Lamarmora.* Per PIETRO FEA. Rivista Europea 16 marzo, e 16 febbraio, 1878. Firenze.

ON an autumn evening, in 1850, three men sat talking on the terrace of the Villa Bolongaro at Stresa, overlooking that loveliest of lakes, whose bosom reflects the sky of Italy, and whose shores are clothed with the soft luxuriance of southern vegetation, while its horizon is embattled by the silver summits of the Alps of Tessin.

They saw the Austrian guns frown at them from the opposite shore, and they spoke sadly of the fortunes of their country, then seemingly at their lowest ebb. Manzoni the poet, and Rosmini the philosopher, had small hope in the future, but the third of the little group, a younger man just about entering on public life as Piedmontese Minister of Commerce, said, rubbing his hands with an audacious smile that was habitual to him, "We will do something."* The world knows how well those bold words have been made good; for the speaker was Camillo, Count Cavour.

* "Life of Count Cavour," by Chevalier de Mazade.

In little more than ten years that "something" had taken a very tangible form, growing with a rapidity that took Europe not a little by surprise; and in 1861 the aged Manzoni insisted on making the journey to Turin to see the impossible dream of his youth realized, and be present at what he called the "coronation of Italy," the meeting of the first National Parliament in the Palazzo Madama. When the patriarch of Italian letters appeared, leaning on the father of Italian independence, the excited crowd in the Piazza di Castello burst into enthusiastic "vivas," and Cavour said to Manzoni, "It is for you!" But the poet withdrawing his hand from his companion's arm, and pointing him to the crowd with a significant gesture, began to clap his hands, on which the acclamations were redoubled, and he playfully said to him, "Now, Signor Conte, do you see whom it is for!"

How little Manzoni could have dreamt that day that he was destined to survive by many years the vigorous statesman in the prime of his maturity, whose frame seemed full of inexhaustible vitality, whose elastic fibre promised an indefinite power of resistance, and whose splendid career had just touched its meridian of success. Later students of history cannot fail to wonder at the singular fatality, by which as the great drama of Italian unity was played out, the actors on both sides were swept away, like the pieces on a chess-board when the game is done. Cavour was the first victim of this species of Nemesis, but within the last few years we have seen Louis Napoleon and Mazzini, Victor Emmanuel and Pio Nono, Rattazzi, Antonelli, and Lamarmora, follow each other with startling rapidity. One indeed survives, as though overlooked by Fate, already an anachronism in the new order of things he has helped to create, but which has no longer a sphere for his erratic genius; and Garibaldi's admirers must often be tempted to wish that he too had vanished from the scene as soon as his work was accomplished, instead of remaining that most embarrassing of supernumeraries, a hero out of place.

The liberator of the Two Sicilies has survived his part in history—the victor of the Tchernaja lived to tarnish his laurels in the grievous reverse of Custoza; but we may safely say that if Cavour had been spared to his country his genius would have always been true to itself, and would be to-day, what it ever was, the unwavering pole-star of Italian liberty. For he was not one of those who have drifted into fame on chance currents of propitious fortune, but shaped his own course, and bent circumstances to his will. While others are satisfied to rule the present, he looked far ahead, and prepared the future; while ordinary statesmen limit themselves to dealing with established facts, he aimed at giving shape to seemingly impossible ideas; and history will

relate with astonishment how he made a despot the champion of liberty—the revolution the slave of order—and educated a province to be the liberator of a nation.

It has been the fashion to compare him to the German Chancellor, but while it is no easy matter to find a common standard for men, both so great, yet so different in their manner of greatness, it must at least be granted that the difficulties in the path of Bismark were incomparably less than the difficulties surmounted by Cavour ; and that while the former had only to work with materials ready made to his policy, the latter had to form and organise—to remodel and readjust the small means at his disposal for carrying out his great design. He was forced to seek the elements of stability in chaos—of social order in the wreck of tyranny—of national cohesion in the dregs of foreign oppression—of new vitality in the corruption of centuries of political decay. He had to establish the solid fabric of regular Government on the yet seething crater of the Italian Revolution—to unleash the wolves of anarchy that they might pull down, yet check them before they had mangled the prey—to break the seal of order, and enlarge the expansive energies of society ; yet, like the fisherman in the Arabian Nights, to trick the liberated genius of democracy into again compressing his vast bulk within the straight limits of a Constitutional Monarchy. The *force majeure*, which is the favourite argument and instrument of the great Northern statesman, was never at the disposal of the Piedmontese patriot, and he had to supply its place by sheer weight of intellectual calibre. There is no more difficult problem in gauging the intricate machinery of human society than that of assigning to all its multiplicity of parts, their respective shares in the movement of the whole ; of determining how far individuals are moulded by circumstances, or circumstances by individuals, and to what extent the great luminaries of history have their predestined orbits perturbed by the lesser influences amid which they move. In the ordinary government of the world we see will and destiny act and react on each other in what seems a rude equilibrium of force ; but at certain great crises of human affairs, first one and then the other appears to become the protagonist, giving to history, while it predominates, all the interest of drama. In the French Revolution, we seem to see a great engine broken loose from all human control, progressing with an irresistible momentum as though impelled by a monstrous volition, while individual figures only emerge for a moment from its chaos of ungoverned activity, to disappear the next, crushed or annihilated by the forces they are impotent to direct. This great triumph of an impersonal and superhuman fate is again followed by the counterbalancing cycle in which the unit is everything, and the rampant energies of society,

wearied of their own mad courses, are bestridden like a horse broken to the curb, by a single dominant will.

Yet even Napoleon did not create the circumstances from which he sprang, but was himself the creature of the reaction he personified, a nightmare evolved by the exhausted sleep of the French Revolution. He was but a mighty accident, the apotheosis of the unforeseen, Fortune's minion of a moment, whose greatness represented no great idea, whose exaltation upheld no general principle, whose power symbolized no common aspiration. Therefore his empire was transient, and his barren glory, centred solely in himself, passed away with his individual existence, and bore no fruit for posterity.

The Italian national deliverance, on the other hand, more than any great movement of our times, can be shown to have been due to no fortuitous combination, to no happy series of accidents—nor even to that irresistible force of destiny which sometimes seems to propel humanity to an unknown future, but to have been prepared and foreseen, in its general outline and approximate scheme, by the sublime intuition of a single human intelligence. A great political miracle, it was worked in the strong faith of a passionate conviction, a full and unalterable confidence in the magnetic force of free institutions, and in the regenerating influence of a Constitutional Government. Conspiracy and intrigue, secret association and revolutionary propaganda, had only resulted in bringing on Italy discredit abroad and the miseries of repression at home. Cavour saw this as clearly as many of his contemporaries, but did not, like them, despair of the future. He saw also that there was another way as yet untried, which he was determined to attempt, that of showing the world that Italians could be trusted to govern themselves in freedom and order, and would be strong enough to defend their own soil if it were once abandoned to them without the incubus of foreign occupation. To appeal, first, to the political good sense which he recognised in his countrymen, and then to the public opinion of Europe—this was the great idea of Cavour's life—first publicly expressed in his speech in the Chamber in support of the Ministerial Reforms in 1850, when he said, speaking of a liberal policy in Piedmont, that “should revolution spring up around us, not only will it have power to dominate revolution, but *it will gather to itself all the live forces in Italy, and conduct the nation to the destinies awaiting it.*”

A nucleus of freedom south of the Alps—a pledge to Europe of the reasonableness and practicability of Italian aspirations—such was the “something” looming up on the horizon of the future, of which he spoke to Manzoni and Rosmini at Stresa,

on the eve of taking office in the autumn of 1850, and which he thenceforward bent all the energies of his mind to realise. He brought to the task a singular combination of qualities—a genius tenacious yet supple, and fertile in expedient as unwavering in resolve; a high and enduring courage, a joyous elasticity of spirit, and a vigorous health of mind and body that seemed to shake off weariness and defy disease. When he first took office he had just completed his fortieth year, and was thus in the full prime of mature manhood.

He was born at Turin, on the 1st of August, 1810, of an old Piedmontese family, Lords of Santena since their ancestor had come from Saxony with Barbarossa, and married the heiress of the Bensi, but Marquises of Cavour (only from the last century, when Charles Emmanuel III. had conferred the title for military services. Camillo was but a younger son, and at ten years old entered the Military Academy, to prepare for the career generally adopted by cadets of noble houses. Placed in the household of the Prince of Carignano, the future Charles Albert, he did not remain there long, as his impetuous and lively temperament did not adapt itself to the restraints of Court etiquette. His military career was equally unsuccessful, for, after a couple of years' service as sub-lieutenant of engineers, at Ventimiglia, Turin, and Genoa, he got into disgrace for some incautious expression of sympathy with the French Republic of 1830, and was sent to a sort of penal station, the hill fort of Bard in the Alps. The life of the solitary mountain outpost soon became intolerable to the young lieutenant of engineers, whose superabundant energies required a less restricted field, and at twenty-two he resigned his commission in order to devote himself to farming, purchasing the property of Leri in the district of Vercelli.* Here we find him for the next fifteen or sixteen years leading the life of a provincial landowner, throwing his heart and soul into the improvement of his property, busy early and late among his maize-fields, and doing business on such a scale that he was able to carry out a contract for supplying eight hundred merino sheep to the Viceroy of Egypt. Syndic of his village, he was till the end of his life ready to enter into the affairs of his commune with as much zest as if he had never had a thought or an interest beyond its boundaries; and became so firmly rooted to the soil that a week at Leri was ever his panacea, when political anxieties pressed too heavily on his over-taxed brain.

He found time, however, for two visits to France and England, in 1835 and in 1843, studying both countries deeply even while entering fully into the amusements of their capitals. Though admiring English institutions he always had a decided preference

for France, and this personal predilection was probably not without its effects in shaping the future destinies of Italy. His military schooling had shut him out from general cultivation in either literary or classical subjects, and he used to say that he found it easier to make Italy than to write a sonnet. Mathematics, however, he had studied thoroughly under a first-rate master, Giovanni Plana, and to this form of mental training he attributed his wonderful clearness of judgment in after-years. He learned English from Lord Mahon's history, and was so completely master of the language that its whole literature was at his command. With a mind like his, indeed, education only ceases with life itself, and the mere technical amount of schooling which limits the entire stock of knowledge of ordinary men is but a comparatively small item in the store acquired with maturer years by those who are born to rule.

Cavour did not spend the whole year in his rustic retirement, but always passed some months in the family town-house in Turin, in the society of such men as Gioberti, d'Azeglio, Lamarmora, and other fervid young patriots of the same stamp. With Marquis Alfieri and Count Pralormo, he founded the semi-political association which, under the name of the Whist Club, gave the Piedmontese nobility a pretext for meeting and interchanging ideas on those subjects of public interest which were fast ripening into all-engrossing importance. Other institutions he was also active in starting or promoting, such as the Piedmontese Agrarian Society, of which he was one of the founders; and infant schools, naturalized in Piedmont by his efforts in combination with those of Count Salmour and other friends. He adventured also into the field of letters, writing sundry treatises in French on economical or agricultural subjects, such as the "Voyages agronomiques" of M. de Chateauxvieux, the state of Ireland, model farms, railways in Italy, communistic doctrines, and the influence of English commercial reforms.

A stirring country gentleman, as the reader sees, was this cadet of the house of Santena, half aristocrat, half farmer; a notable figure truly in a small community this village mayor, who will at no distant day develop unexpectedly from the obscure representative of a petty State into a great Power in the councils of Europe, and who will dexterously wedge the first small hint of the Italian question into the widening rift between France and Austria. He is now much occupied with the affairs of his commune, with new methods of irrigation, and modern improvements in agriculture, but is all the while among his mulberry-trees and long level tracts of hemp and maize, receiving an education for another sort of sowing and harvesting; and is

never without an eye on the great movements gathering and growing in the world without.

Most public men can be shown to have had their opinions considerably modified by experience and formed by circumstances, but Cavour's earliest political utterances breathe the same spirit that actuated him throughout his career. Though a Liberal to his heart's core, he dreaded and disliked nothing so much as the excesses which discredited Liberalism with others; and the fiery ardour of his temper was counterbalanced, even in his youth, by that strong practical sense which he was the first to recognise and appeal to among his countrymen, and which he may be said to have evoked from the turbid waters of revolution, as the guiding spirit of the national regeneration. "An honest middle-course man," this was what he tells us in one of his early letters he had elected to be; desiring and hoping for social progress with all his might, but determined not to purchase it at the cost of a universal overthrow. He was, however, too shrewd to shut his eyes to existing circumstances, and his mind busied itself much with the best manner of dealing with the inevitable preponderance of the masses, the great problem, as it already seemed to him, of the statesmanship of the future.

Born, as we have seen, in 1810, he was five years old at the date of the Peace of Vienna; and the gradual education of his mind for his future part in history was thus coincident with that period of incubation when the seeds sown by the French Revolution were slowly germinating in men's minds to a harvest that is ripening still. The general explosion of 1848 inaugurated that new era of social ferment, and political fusion and redistribution, whose end no one can foresee; an epoch since which society become suddenly self-conscious, seeks to analyse, shift, and reconstruct the most hidden springs of its elaborate mechanism, trampling on prescriptive right and immemorial use, and abandoning for ever the old worn grooves of habit and tradition. Of this new phase of thought Cavour was, for the brief remainder of his life, the leading mind, the intensified personification, and from 1848 we may date his active political career. To follow in detail the manifold phases of that career, does not come within the scope of this Article, whose main purpose is rather to dwell upon its initial stage and show how for years he bent his mind to educating Piedmont for the part he had assigned to her, gradually raising her from a condition of utter prostration to renewed prosperity and increased moral dignity; and how in the military reforms, which were an integral part of his policy, he was seconded by the administrative ability of his faithful ally, Alfonso Lamarmora.

That prudent "middle course," along which he aspired to

guide the fortunes of his country, did not immediately commend itself to the hotter spirits of his party, and, "my Lord Camillo," as they nicknamed the future Minister, was accused of English leanings and reactionary tendencies. At this time he founded the *Risorgimento*, as the exponent of his views and the organ of the moderate Liberals of Turin—the party which wrung a reformed Constitution from the reluctant sovereign. On the 8th February, 1848, in the midst of the European convulsion, when thrones and empires seemed rocking to their fall, Charles Albert swore to the *Statuto*, which is still the palladium of Italian liberty, and almost simultaneously declared war against Austria in league with revolted Lombardy. The issue of the campaign, though favourable to the Imperial arms, was not decisive, and it ended in a suspension of hostilities. Piedmont was convulsed by party-spirit during the winter, and Cavour, who was opposed to the renewal of the war, found himself the object of popular dislike in Turin, and heard the name *Colino* shouted after him in the streets. He bore this phase of public feeling with amused philosophy, and continued to wage fierce war against the views of the party of action, then uppermost in popular estimation. On the 8th November, 1848, he wrote the following eloquent invective against the extreme measures they would have advocated:—

"What is it that has always wrecked the most righteous and justifiable revolutions? The mania for *revolutionary means*, the men who have attempted to emancipate themselves from ordinary laws. The French Constituent Assembly creating the *assignats* in contempt of natural and economic laws—*revolutionary means* productive of discredit and of ruin! The Convention attempting to smother in blood the resistance to its ambitious projects—*revolutionary means* producing the Directory, the Consulate, and the Empire; Napoleon bending all to his caprice, imagining that he could wipe out a law of Nature as easily as conquer at the bridge of Lodi—*revolutionary means* leading to Waterloo and St. Helena! The sectarians of June striving to impose the Democratic and Socialist Republic by fire and sword—*revolutionary means* leading to the siege of Paris and reaction everywhere. Wait but a little longer, and you will see the last consequence of your *revolutionary means*—Louis Napoleon on the throne."

But the wave of democratic feeling which surged over Piedmont triumphed for the moment—the elections of the spring swept Gioberti's Ministry from office, and ousted Cavour from his seat for Turin. The crushing disaster of Novara followed quickly, where the national cause seemed lost for ever, but was really saved by the courage and spirit of the young prince, who, called to the throne in the darkest hour of his country's fortunes, did not despair of her future. With the strong tenacity of

purpose inherent in his sub-alpine race, Victor Emmanuel, in accepting the terms of the conqueror, held fast to two points—the national flag and the reformed Constitution. Here he would not yield an inch to the victorious Austrian, and his dogged loyalty—the instinct and tradition of his House—saved the future of Italy. The rule of Austria was doomed from that hour of her apparent triumph, when, in the wreck of all material strength, the moral victory lay with her foe.

The Piedmontese were imbued with the same spirit that actuated their king, and Massimo d'Azeglio, called to form a Ministry in that hour of difficulty and danger, said, "It is a long work to recommence, but we will recommence it;" while Cavour wrote about the same time to Salvagnoli, "As long as liberty exists in one corner of the peninsula, we must not despair of the future." As long as Piedmont can protect its institutions from despotism or anarchy, there will be a means of working successfully at the regeneration of the country."

Faith and courage were, indeed, needed to see a possibility of that future regeneration, amid present circumstances, that seemed all but desperate, with an army utterly disorganized, a refractory Parliament, one great city in open revolt, and the whole population inflamed to violent opposition to the terms of peace. Two Parliaments were dissolved before their sanction could be obtained, and it was only the personal appeal of the king, in the famous proclamation of Moncalieri, that procured the election of a more manageable set of deputies. Cavour, who had previously been unseated, was now returned by Turin at the head of the poll, and was one of the most strenuous supporters of the new Ministry in their work of reform and reorganization.

Their first task was the suppression of the revolt which the followers of Mazzini had excited in Genoa, and which Lamarmora was selected to put down. This officer had already been Minister of War in two short-lived administrations, and had begun, even before Novara, that organic military reform to which he now devoted himself with such ardour as to be in danger of losing his sight from overwork. His family, one of the oldest of the Piedmontese aristocracy, had always been distinguished for their military services, and he had made himself conspicuous when only a lieutenant, by reports on foreign matters connected with his profession, so valuable that they were studied by the king himself. Even then, as early as 1831, he had been allowed to carry out some of his proposed reforms in the organization of the artillery, and the instruction of the men in that branch of the service; measures to which its superiority over the other arms in 1848-49 was attributed. The disastrous result of those two campaigns had left the Piedmontese army in a state of pro-

found disorganization, while the party feeling which divided the country ran high in its ranks. Its defeats had rendered it unpopular, and it was accused by the advanced party of disaffection and hostility to the existing Constitution. The officers were wanting in efficiency, the rank and file in proper discipline and instruction, and the whole service in that sense of duty and responsibility without which the best drilled army is but a lifeless machine. To raise the *morale* of the men under his control was the object of Lamarmora's unceasing exertions, and the great means used by him to effect his purpose was the diffusion of instruction among the rank and file. The reforms introduced by him in this respect still subsist, while the other portions of his system of organization have been modified or altogether abrogated by other War Ministers. He had long before advocated the introduction of regimental schools, in which the non-commissioned officers should receive instruction from the subalterns in the rudiments of a general education, and was now able to carry into execution this system of military schooling, which still works with admirable effect. To give the necessary uniformity to the method of teaching, he created the normal schools of cavalry and infantry to prepare the officers for this branch of their duties, and lessened at the same time some of the more vexatious burdens of the soldiers in order to afford them a little leisure for study. The technical part of their education was provided for by camps of instruction, by schools of swimming, fencing, and marksmanship; while for the officers were instituted courses of staff duty, of topography, of horsemanship (for the subalterns of infantry preparatory to becoming field officers), and even the monotony of penal confinement was diversified by study and work. He also established regimental libraries, made some changes in the discipline of the Military Academy, and founded a college of preparation for it.

By some of these changes, he aimed at linking the various grades of the army together by the ties of fellow-feeling and mutual dependence, for as he declared amid the applause of the Chamber on the 7th December, 1848: "Until the regiment has become a family there will be no *esprit de corps*; as long as there is no *esprit de corps*, there can be no *esprit d'armée*; and as long as there is no *esprit d'armée*, national military spirit is impossible."

Lamarmora was inexorable in enforcing discipline among the officers by dismissing those who were either incapable or neglectful of their duties, and naturally drew on himself a storm of clamorous opposition in consequence. The vice of gaming, with all its fatal results, was prevalent amongst them, and the measures he took to extirpate it had sometimes to be directed against

his private friends; but he never allowed personal feeling to interfere with the strict execution of his reforms.

The law of military service in force when he came into office, while it rendered the conscripts liable to its claims for sixteen years, only retained those of the infantry regiments actually under arms for twelve or fourteen months, a term of training quite inadequate to give steadiness or cohesion to their ranks. It was only on the 20th March, 1854, that the Chamber, after much deliberation, passed a new law, rendering the conscript liable to eleven years' service, five to be passed under arms and the remaining six on unlimited leave; while the reserve was supplied by the men of the second category, who, after forty days of training, remained liable to be called on to fill the gaps in the regimental ranks. At the same time, the law permitting personal substitution in lieu of service was altered into one requiring a money payment for exemption, to be applied to premiums to induce time-expired men to remain in the ranks. Various alterations were also made in the details of military organization, and the old companies, two hundred and fifty strong, were reduced to a hundred and eighty, a number which, after still further reduction, has in the present Italian army been again raised to the original figure.

All these reforms, together with considerable outlay on fortifications, Lamarmora contrived to combine with the strictest regard for economy, so necessary in the circumstances of the country, and the limit of thirty-two millions imposed on the Military Budget was not exceeded. The efficacy of his measures was best shown by their results, when in the Crimea, six years after Novara, the Sardinian troops were able to take their place not unworthily beside the flower of the soldiery of Europe, and won from Marshal Bosquet the laudatory epithet of a *bijou d'armée*.

Lamarmora preceded Cavour in office, and it was only in October, 1850, on the death of Santa Rosa, Minister of Commerce, that the future Prime Minister accepted the vacant portfolio, which he shortly after combined with that of Finance. Victor Emmanuel showed a shrewd estimate of his ability when, on Massimo d'Azeglio requesting his consent to the nomination, he drily said, "I accept him for my part, but this man will unseat you all." This prophecy was fulfilled in two years time, when, in September, 1852, Cavour, after a short withdrawal from office, came into power as chief of a Ministry constituted on a broader basis than that of his predecessor, and became from that hour to his death the absolute ruler of the destinies of his country. At a later date, when he returned from the Congress of Paris, he is said to have controlled the most restive deputies with a glance or a gesture, and the Turinese used to say, as M. de Mazade tells us,

"We have a Government, we have Chambers of Representatives, we have a Constitution, and the name for it all is Cavour."

Massimo d'Azeglio's final resignation in his favour in 1852 was to a great extent voluntary, and he gave a somewhat curious reason for it to his friend Rendu, quoted in the biographical note by Matteo Ricci, appended to his personal recollections. "Je quitte mon banc de quart ; à un autre ! Cet autre que vous connaissez, est d'une activité diabolique, et fort dispos de corps comme d'esprit, et puis cela lui fait tant de plaisir"*

The terms of peace of 1849 had left Piedmont charged with an indemnity, nearly as great, relatively to her resources, as that of France after the late war. The financial question was therefore the most urgent when Cavour assumed the guidance of affairs, and was the first on which he expended a portion of his "diabolical activity." He had, as Manzoni said of him, not only the prudence, but also the imprudence of a statesman, and his economic measures were characterised by the same bold spirit as the rest of his policy. The future was ever before his mind, and instead of adopting a narrow system of retrenchment, which might indeed have met the exigency of the moment, but would have checked the development of further resources, he did not shrink, while restricting unprofitable expenditure, from contracting new loans, in order to stimulate the productiveness of the country, and enable it better to bear the burden of additional taxation. He opened up its communications by the construction of railways to Genoa, Susa, Savoy, and the Lago Maggiore, and emancipated its foreign trade by commercial treaties with France, England, Belgium, and Switzerland. The Austrian Prime Minister, Count Schwarzenberg, attributed to him the ulterior design of purchasing the support of England by his commercial policy ; but there was another country in which his prophetic genius already discerned the future ally of Piedmont, and which he openly declared his desire to propitiate.

"Something may occur," he said in the Chamber, "to make us desire at least the moral support of France ;" and ever pliable where a timely concession might purchase future friendship, he sacrificed a part of his economic system to the Protectionist policy prevailing under the Empire.

In regard to ecclesiastical affairs, Cavour's measures, though they excited great hostility at the time among the clerical party, were moderate compared with those of his followers at the present day. While suppressing some of the mendicant orders, he stoutly

* "Correspondance politique," &c., par Eugène Rendu, p. 78. Massimo d'Azeglio's resigning office to Cavour to "give him pleasure," recalls the incident of his childhood, when he gave his only toy to a playfellow who was loughing for it.

defended the Sisters of Charity, and declared that nothing would induce him to consent to a Bill abolishing the charitable orders. "I would quit the Ministry ten times over," he declared, "rather than sanction an act which would, in my opinion, be immensely prejudicial to our country in the eyes of civilized Europe." As regarded ecclesiastical property, he was averse to its expropriation on grounds of policy; both because he dreaded the effects of over-centralization and excessive Government patronage as dangerous to the liberty of the State, and because he believed that the clergy, when poor and dependent, are always less patriotic and more fanatical than when prosperous and assured of their position. He also wished that education should remain under their control, and that ecclesiastical students should be exempt from military service; two points on which modern Italian Liberals have abandoned his traditions.

Fortune did not at first favour his administration, and a series of bad harvests, with diseases of the vines and silkworms, drew down a storm of unpopularity on the reforming Minister. His house at Turin was attacked by an infuriated mob, who broke his windows, crying, "Death to Cavour!" and attempted to effect a forcible entrance. His expansive policy had not then had time to bear fruit, but it was soon justified by the increasing prosperity of the country. Early in 1854 the railway to Genoa was opened, and he made his journey thither on the first locomotive that traversed the line. Even the material advancement of Piedmont, however, was with him but means to an end, kept steadily in view and influencing his whole policy, as we can gather from such speeches as the following:—"It is impossible for the Government to have a national or Italian policy abroad without being reforming and liberal at home; just as it would be impossible to have a liberal domestic policy, without being national and Italian in our external relations." And: "Piedmont must begin by raising herself, by re-establishing in Europe, as well as in Italy, a position and a credit equal to her ambition. Hence there must be a policy unswerving in its aim, but flexible and varying as to the means employed, embracing the exchequer, military reorganization, diplomacy, and religious affairs."

Here was a programme requiring, indeed, that "diabolical activity" which his late colleague had ascribed to him, and in which, judging by its fruits, we may trace the inspiring force of a great idea. For while it would be claiming for him a super-human amount of foresight to say that he divined what the future actually brought forth, we can at least maintain that he consciously devoted the earlier years of his administration to preparing for some such contingency as occurred; and that the task he had set himself was that of fitting Piedmont to do her

part worthily, whenever circumstances should give her the opportunity. Three years of his administration sufficed for this, for in 1855 came the chance for which he was in readiness, of making a bold stroke for the sympathy of Europe, and winning for the Italian question a hearing from the Great Powers. Few, indeed, fathomed at the time the full bearing of the measure which he and Lamarmora, with the support of the king, almost forced upon the Chamber, and which seemed, on the part of a State situated like Piedmont, a piece of hard-brained quixotism. Yet time has shown the alliance of Sardinia with the Western Powers to have been one of the greatest strokes of policy which this generation has seen, strange as was the combination by which the freedom of Lombardy was won on the heights of the Tchernaya.

It was Lamarmora who, in negotiating the treaty with France and England, which Count von Usedom called "a pistol-shot fired in the ear of Austria," declined to accept the secondary position which England, with the offer of a subsidy of twenty-five million francs, wished to assign to the Sardinian contingent. Cavour, whose subsequent policy rather divided him from some of his earlier friends, was at this time so cordially unanimous with his War Minister, that he used to say, "Without Lamarmora I could not be Minister;" and on the General pointing out that the sending of a mere mercenary corps would only place Piedmont in a humiliating position, and rob her of all the moral *prestige* she hoped to gain, he declined to enter into the alliance save on an independent footing. Even then Lamarmora's relation to the French and English generals was not very accurately defined, and Cavour, in his final instructions, could only tell him to do the best he could for himself, trusting to his personal tact and dignity to enable him to assert his position.

Lamarmora, in his book,* complains warmly of the false position in which he was placed by Cavour's instructions, sent after he had landed, to act in preference with the English, and attributes this concession, on the part of the Minister, to his idea at that time that England rather than France would have been the instrument of his designs. The General also narrates how, after having pressed for detailed instructions on several occasions, when Cavour always turned off the subject with a jest, he made a last appeal at the moment of embarking at Genoa. "*Ma insomma, mi volete dare queste benedette istruzioni?*" "*Ingegnati!*" (use your wits!) said Cavour, embracing him.

The little Sardinian army was sorely tried on its first landing by the severe outbreak of cholera, which thinned its ranks, and

* "Un po' più di Luce," &c., p. 135.

deprived it of some of its best officers, General Alessandro Lamarmora, brother of the Commander-in-Chief, among others. Cavour, who had staked the whole future of his country on the success of the expedition, underwent a racking crisis of anxiety; he felt, he said, the terrible responsibility he had taken on himself, but was conscious also of having fulfilled a sacred duty. Lamarmora's telegram, announcing the victory of the Tchernaya, put an end to his suspense, and showed that the Sardinian troops were worthy of the part he had assigned them in the liberation of Italy. That they were penetrated with a sense of all that depended on their conduct, was proved by the saying of an officer to cheer on a soldier in the trenches: "Never mind; it is with this mud that Italy is to be made!"

Massimo d'Azeglio, though not in the Ministry, was at this time one of the most ardent supporters of its policy, and when the alliance was being arranged, Cavour offered either to resign in his favour or accept subordinate office under him, with the idea that it might facilitate the negotiations. Azeglio refused, but consented to accompany the king and Cavour on their visit to Paris and London, where, as the latter said, "his presence would be considered to purge them from the taint of the revolutionary leprosy."

With the Crimean War, Cavour's policy may be said to have entered on its active stage, and the Congress of Paris was not more remarkable for the peace concluded between Russia and the Allies, than for the first introduction of the Italian question to the assembled Powers of Europe. Thrown into close personal contact with the Emperor Napoleon, the great Piedmontese statesman succeeded in gaining an amount of influence over him that had an appreciable effect on the future policy of France. The singular character who so long swayed the destinies of nations had some of the inspirations of genius, without its patient power of waiting on events; and a strain of mystical enthusiasm was in him strangely combined with unscrupulous ambition and selfish views. He was liable to sudden fits of action, succeeded by long intervals of mental lethargy, and Cavour's genius had at times the power of stimulating and rousing him, forcing him to a resolve, and overcoming his native inertia. At times only, for there were powerful counter-influences at work, and his moments of impulse were quickly followed by reaction, in which his constitutional indolence and timidity asserted themselves. The history of the next three years is the history of the vacillations of his mind between the desire to lead a great army to fight for the liberation of Italy, and the desire of domestic peace; between the dreams of his youth and the prudence of his riper years; the struggle, in short, between the

visionary and the selfish sides of his character. Cavour meantime, ardent, passionate, devoured by the sublime impatience of a great purpose, had to wait on his moods, turning them when possible to his own account, and watching for the favourable moment which he believed would surely come.

He was not, however, idle at home; for it was in this interval that the fortifications of Alessandria were completed; none too soon, for these works, forming with those of Casale and Valenza the defensive system of the Po, stayed the Austrians in 1869, until the French came up and saved Turin from capture. This undertaking had been so much in Lamarmora's mind that his last words on starting for the Crimea had been to look well to the fortifications of Alessandria, which he and Cavour had begun on their own responsibility, incurring considerable expense for them before they were inscribed on the budget. The great arsenal of La Spezzia was at the same time completed and strengthened with defensive works, another favourite project of Lamarmora's, as we learn from Cavour's playful speech in excusing these costly undertakings: "When peace was made, my colleague, Lamarmora, who is at heart as tenacious as myself, said to me as he turned into the War Office, 'Alessandria and La Spezzia;' to which I replied, 'La Spezzia and Alessandria!'"

Another great work undertaken at this time—the boring of the Mont Cenis tunnel—shows what an enterprising spirit the leaven of Cavour's genius had infused into his countrymen. It was planned and executed by Sommeiller, a Savoyard engineer, and contributed to the moral *prestige* as well as to the material prosperity of Piedmont. Cavour watched its progress with the deepest interest, and used to say in reference to it, "The Alps must come down."

Meantime, the hostility between Austria and Piedmont was growing and deepening. The first serious estrangement had begun in 1853, when, after a seditious movement in Milan, the property of the Lombard *émigrés* in Piedmont—the Casati, Arese, Arconati, Torelli, and others—was sequestered by the Government. The subscription throughout Italy for a hundred guns to arm the fortifications of Alessandria was another note of discord. But the one act of the Austrian Government which caused real uneasiness to Cavour, and which, had the traditions of the Empire allowed it to be followed up, might have thwarted all his plans, was the sending of the ill-fated Maximilian, in 1858, as Viceroy to Lombardy, on a mission of clemency and conciliation. The plan was, however, quickly abandoned, the Archduke recalled, and the old military *régime* restored with added rigour.

It is not our purpose here to follow out all the working of Cavour's policy, from the time it became part of the general

history of Europe, however fascinating such a study might be ; but rather to show in its earlier stages, how it turned on developing the resources of his own country. It is, however, interesting to note in his later career three great crises of supreme personal emotion ; when a sudden and unforeseen turn of events seemed first to threaten all his plans with annihilation, and then, by a still more unexpected combination of circumstances to bring about their more complete realization ; as though Fate made believe to snatch from his grasp the object of his desires, in order to crown them with a fuller fruition. Though ordinarily the most genial and *debonair* of men, he was liable in the first moments of disappointment to outbursts of stormy passion, like the rage of a baffled lion, causing from the very effort required to control them an amount of nerve and brain excitement that was positively dangerous, and probably shortened his life.

Such a political thunderbolt seemed to shatter all his combinations, and blow to the winds the fast ripening Franco-Piedmontese alliance, when the Orsini bomb exploded in front of the Emperor's carriage on the 14th January, 1858. Cavour's first thought on receiving the incomplete telegraphic account of the incident was expressed in the fervid ejaculation, "Provided only the assassins be not Italians!" But Italians they were, and the first to bear the brunt of Louis Napoleon's anger was his sub-alpine neighbour. He demanded from Piedmont stringent measures against the Republican press, and a momentous crisis ensued, during which he threatened not only the withdrawal of his support in the future, but immediate measures of hostility if his desires were not complied with. The Cabinet of Turin was firm in refusing to adopt unconstitutional measures at the bidding of a foreign Power, and Victor Emmanuel wrote a spirited letter to Louis Napoleon, expressing his attachment and devotion, but saying that rather than make concessions compromising his royal dignity, he would, like his ancestors of Savoy, fight on the Alps to defend his crown. The Emperor proved placable as soon as the first ebullition of anger subsided, and wrote a conciliatory reply, though his Ministers, uninstructed as to his change of mood, continued to bully the Piedmontese diplomatists.

Then came the singular and touching episode of Felice Orsini's last letters to the Emperor, which seemed to have the effect of finally overcoming his vacillations, and hurrying him point-blank into the Italian war. This voice from the scaffold, assuring him that the peace of Europe and his own was a mere chimera as long as Italy was not free, evidently made a great impression on his imagination ; and Cavour rightly saw, in the forwarding of the letters to him, a most reassuring sign as to the future. Although he received no instructions with them, he interpreted

the Emperor's intention in sending them to be their publication, and they appeared in the Turin Official Gazette next day.

Events had begun to move, and now hurried on rapidly; to the interview at Plombières, where the Emperor, driving out Cavour in a small chaise, secured a three hours' *tête-à-tête* with him, and arranged the outline of the Sardo-French alliance; to the celebrated speech of Victor Emmanuel in opening the Chamber on the 10th January, 1859, called by Sir James Hudson "a flash of lightning striking the Treaties of 1815;" and, finally, to Napoleon's landing at Genoa, at the head of his army, when he said to Cavour, "You ought to be satisfied; your designs are being realized." Modern history has no page like that which follows, but its events are too fresh in our readers' minds to need recapitulating here. They may not, however, be so familiar with the position in which Cavour once found himself placed, when he had, at a few hours' notice, to provide rations for the whole French army. When the term for which the Piedmontese Government had undertaken to supply them expired, their own commissariat was not prepared with provisions, and they were threatened with a very unpleasant hiatus. Cavour, on being applied to, telegraphed to the syndics of all the communes within reach of the lines of rail, desiring them to requisition whatever meal was available, heat the ovens, bake and send the bread as fast as they could to the stations. Next morning there was more than enough of bread in Alessandria. Cavour's energy at this moment was positively superhuman, for in addition to exercising the functions of President of the Council, of Minister of Foreign Affairs, of the Interior, War, and Marine, he had to hold in hand the threads of the various movements going on in Central Italy, and provide governments for the States of that part of the peninsula, which had cast off their foreign dynasties on the breaking out of the war.

In the midst of all this hopeful activity came that second great check to his designs, notified to him by a telegram from Lamarmora on the 8th July, announcing the suspension of hostilities; on receipt of which he hastened immediately to the Royal head-quarters at Pozzolengo. For the only time in his life, his biographer* tells us, he totally lost his self-control, when the king, returning on the 11th from the Imperial camp at Valeggio, threw on the table the paper he had just signed, with that curious reservation, "As far as I am concerned." In the excitement of the moment the baffled statesman almost forgot the respect due to royalty, wanted to insist that Victor

* Massari, "Ricordi biografici di Camillo Cavour," p. 341.

Emmanuel should continue the war by himself, and after Lamarmora had vainly endeavoured to calm him, left the camp in a whirlwind of passion and disappointment.

As the train in which he was travelling passed through Milan, Vigliani, the governor, and others, were waiting at the station to see him. They did not, however, disturb him, for he was in a profound sleep. He had not closed his eyes during his agitated visit to the camp, but now the very exhaustion of passion had brought its own remedy, which probably saved his life; for nature could not long have borne such excessive tension in an organization so susceptible and highly strung as his. He resigned office, and went to travel in Switzerland, where the sanguine elasticity of his temperament soon asserted itself after the first shock of disappointment. "It is useless to look back," he said, at this time; "now let us look ahead. We have been following one trail—it is cut; now let us follow another. It will cost us twenty years to do what might have been done in as many months."

But more had been done than even Cavour knew, and with "*l'Italia farà da sè*," as its watchword, the national movement defeated the calculations of statesmen. Ere three months had passed, the retired Minister was loudly blessing the Peace of Villafranca in its unexpected working—ere six, he was uncontrollably impatient to have the guidance of affairs once more in his own hands. Indeed, his eagerness in this respect was somewhat hurtful to his old friend Lamarmora, who, with Rattazzi, had formed a Ministry in his absence. Did Cavour know what was coming—was he in the secret of the extraordinary crisis through which the country was about to pass, in which the lofty inflexibility and rigid political conscience of his former colleague would scarcely have been adapted to the extreme difficulty of the situation? It would seem that it was so; for on signing the treaty for the cession of Nice and Savoy on the 24th March, 1860, he said significantly to the French diplomatists, "Now, gentlemen, we have you for our accomplices!"

Be that as it may, he had now to face the most critical moment in his whole career—the third and most momentous of those sudden developments of the Italian movement, when a single false step on his part, or a single act of imprudence on the part of others, would have endangered the whole work of his life, and leagued all Europe in hostility against him. It is probable that he did not originate Garibaldi's expedition to Sicily on the 5th May, and would not have desired the immediate incorporation of the southern provinces with the scarcely solidified kingdom in the north; but the suddenness with which events rushed on to the completion of Italian unity left him no choice but to

adopt the result, and seek to avert the dangers that accompanied it. Had he not dominated, by accepting, the revolution in the south, Italy would have slipped through his fingers in a paroxysm of Democratic excitement, and brought on herself the fatal remedy of foreign intervention in the cause of order. It was the last phase of the long duel between Cavour and his old enemies the Reds, when he ordered the Italian troops to enter the Marches, and meet Garibaldi from the north before he had time to cross the Neapolitan frontier. For the Dictator of the Two Sicilies, intoxicated with success, and reckless of consequences, was about to defy France and march on Rome, when the check given to his advance by the resistance of Francis the Second's troops on the Volturno gave the Piedmontese soldiers time to come up, and win the race on which the future of Italy depended. It was a breathless moment, leaving no time for scruple or hesitation, and the hint which it is now said Louis Napoleon did *not* give Cavour, "Fate presto," might well have been the motto of the hour.

The storm of European indignation at this new aggression was, indeed, but beginning to gather and grow, when it found itself in the presence of a *fait accompli*, to which Cavour's diplomacy was sufficiently skilful to give the best colour. Against Austrian attack his precautions had not been purely diplomatic, for he was in communication with Louis Kossuth, and ready to spring the mine of the Hungarian revolution on her, should she attempt to move from the Quadrilateral. His position was so perilous and uncertain that many counsellors urged on him the advisability of having himself proclaimed Dictator, but he persistently refused. "I do not believe in Dictatorships," he said, "particularly civil ones. An honest Constitutional Minister, who has nothing to fear from the revelations of the tribune, is far stronger with a parliamentary majority than any Dictator. I, for my part, never feel so weak as when the Chamber is not sitting." And to another friend: "It will be not the least glory of Italy in the eyes of posterity to have achieved her independence without passing through the straits of a Dictatorship."

Meantime Cavour, in the midst of such involved and multiform political complications, was exposed to a series of violent personal attacks on the part of Garibaldi, then in the zenith of his power and popularity. He never forgave the man who, as he said, "had made him a stranger in his country" by the cession of Nice, his birthplace; and now, in round terms, demanded his dismissal from the king. The Chamber, summoned by Cavour to decide between them, affirmed its confidence in him by a large majority, while expressing its sense of the General's services by a vote of thanks. But the dispute did not end here. On the

18th April, 1861, Garibaldi broke forth in the Chamber of Deputies into an unmeasured invective against the Minister, accusing him of "having provoked a fratricidal war." Cavour, in a paroxysm of indignation, started up to answer him, but rapidly controlled his passion by a strong effort of the will. The dispute, however, became general, and the sitting ended in a scene of stormy clamour. A reconciliation was subsequently effected, and an amicable interview took place some days after between the two patriots, who had served their country in such different ways.

These painful passages were the last scenes of Cavour's life; and probably, coming after the mental wear and tear of the preceding months, helped to hurry it to its close from the very physical reaction caused by such tumults of nerve and brain as he was liable to. His illness set in on the 29th May, and, like almost all maladies in Italy, was called fever. To the last his mind was busy with the state of the southern provinces, and the desire to reclaim them by just and liberal government. "Above all," he said, "no state of siege; any one can govern, with a state of siege." And: "It is not by abusing the Neapolitans that they can be brought to reason." When his illness seemed likely to prove fatal he sent for Fra Giacomo, parish priest of the Madonna degli Angeli, with whom he had arranged seven years previously that he was to come to him on his death-bed, and whom he desired to tell the good people of Turin that he died as he had lived, a Christian and a Catholic. Within a few minutes of his end, on the 6th June, he repeated to this priest, with his hand in his, the famous words, "*Libera chiesa in libero stato.*"*

His career has all the interest attaching to the story of a supreme passion. A great soul greatly stirred, he threw into politics a fervour of vivid emotion that electrified all he came in contact with, and Europe was moved, and history made, by the impassioned throbbings of that fiery heart. Patriotism enkindled in him all the ardours of a singularly ardent temperament, and his death in the hour of fruition gave the crowning touch of dramatic completeness to the romance of his life. It thrilled

* "*La Revue du Monde Catholique*," of the 25th February, 1878, has an interesting article by M. d'Ideville, who was present at Cavour's death-bed, and describes the interview in which he narrated all the particulars of it to the late Pope. Pio Nono, after asking whether he was perfectly conscious when he received the last sacraments, and being assured that he was, said meditatively, shaking his head, "*Ah questo Cavour! questo Cavour! quanto male ci ha fatto! Dio gli perdonerà spero, ma meno che a quel povero Vittorio Emanuele, che non sa punto quel che si vuole da lui.*" Then, after another pause, walking up and down: "*Ah come ha amato il suo paese questo Cavour! questo Cavour! Quell'uomo era davvero un'Italiano!*" Pio Nono had to the end of his life, despite all political hostilities, a lurking tenderness for the great Italian Liberals.

Europe like an electric shock, and came on Italy (where it was ascribed to poison) with all the stunning effect of a national disaster. Yet in reality it was less so than it appeared, for his work, though not perfected, was so far matured that its ultimate completion was but a question of time, and the momentum he had given to the Italian national development sufficed to carry it through all the further stages of its progress. The future of the nation was assured in the moral dignity it had gained from his teaching, and public opinion in Europe was won to its side, by the wisdom of a policy which had known how to reconcile freedom with order. The restraining influence he exercised even over the most turbulent among his countrymen, was shown in the extraordinary circumstance that in all the Central States of Italy the existing Governments were overthrown, and popular rule established, without injury to life or property, and that the one crime which stained the movement, during months of provisional government—the murder of Colonel Anviti in Parma—was met with universal reprobation. Indeed, a good Irish priest who happened to be in Florence during the revolution, was much disgusted at its tranquil character; and after looking from the window in the vain expectation of some enlivening demonstration in the street, exclaimed indignantly to his friends: "Do you call this a revolution! We make more noise in Ireland about washing a score of sheep!"

Yet this silent and bloodless insurrection expelled a foreign dynasty for ever, and the attitude of the people during the following months rendered its restoration impossible, despite Imperial pledges to that effect.* Truly, though an Irish sheep-washing might have been more noisy, an Irish rebellion has never been so efficacious as this tame Tuscan revolution with its fangs drawn by Cavour.

The annexation of the southern provinces and the policy of the Government in countenancing the movement, had seriously estranged Cavour from many of his early friends, amongst others Azeglio and Lamarmora. The truth was, that minor differences of opinion, merged by Italian patriots in the common aim of liberating their country, began again to assert themselves, as soon as that great object was attained. Lamarmora did not, however, refuse to take the command in Lombardy in 1860, when the danger of an Austrian invasion, and the smallness of the force available to meet it, rendered it a particularly onerous charge. The next mission on which he was employed was one

* The Treaty of Zurich, of which the preliminaries were signed at Villafranca, provided for the restoration of the deposed Italian princes, but the clause could never be put into execution.

whose results, though remote, were of incalculable importance to the future of Italy and of Europe.

The alliance with Prussia, which only came to pass five years later, was already in Cavour's mind before his death, and probably from a period as far back as the Peace of Villafranca. He did not, indeed, find its immediate realization practicable, and said: "What cannot be done now shall be done hereafter; Prussia cannot fail to be carried away by the current of a national idea. The alliance of Prussia with an enlarged Piedmont is written in the book of the history of the future."

In carrying out this project, Lamarmora may be said to have been Cavour's political legatee, as it was reserved for him to negotiate and conclude in 1866, the alliance for which, in January, 1861, he was sent to Berlin to prepare the ground. He went ostensibly on a formal mission of congratulation to the king on his accession, but with instructions also to try and remove the prejudice entertained by him against the kingdom of Italy in consequence of its revolutionary origin, and to disavow, on the part of his Government, the claims which certain Italian politicians had been advancing to the port of Trieste as part of the national soil.* Cavour dwells particularly in his letter of instructions on the similarity in circumstances and destiny between Piedmont and Prussia, which he was always fond of pointing out to the statesmen of Berlin as giving him a special claim on their sympathy. Lamarmora in his report gives a very circumstantial account of the state of public opinion in the Prussian capital, which led him to believe an eventual war with France inevitable. He also states his opinion that the success of the latter, even against Prussia alone, would be very problematical.

His low estimate of the French army induced him, on his return from Berlin, to offer the most active opposition to the military reforms of General Fanti, in his opinion too closely approximating to the Gallic system, then so much in vogue; and on this question he became finally alienated from Cavour, who,

* *Apropos of the present agitation for the annexation of Trieste it is not uninteresting to note Lamarmora's opinions on the subject. "As to Trieste," he says ("Un po' più di Luce," &c., p. 52), "I never thought of it either then or now; for even admitting that Trieste is in language and manners more Italian than German, its interests, eminently commercial, are all bound up with Germany. In addition, it is surrounded by Slav and German populations, which neither have, nor wish to have anything in common with the Italians, save in regard to their commercial intercourse, which it is the convenience of both sides to render as active as possible, but without involving them with other interests, which are, and must remain, distinct. Did Trieste happen to belong to Italy, its possession would be a source of difficulties and grave dangers to our kingdom."*

though he showed himself anxious to conciliate his old friend, was yet compelled, when the latter rejected his overtures, to support his actual colleague.

On the death of Cavour, Lamarmora was charged by the Ricasoli with the civil and military administration of Naples, where he went in the double capacity of prefect and general in command. He remained three years, during which he says he was involved in difficulties as great as any he had encountered during his long career: but he was at least as successful as any other governor of Naples has been before or since. He repressed, if he did not extirpate, brigandage in the provinces, destroying the formidable bands of Coppa and Crocco, and succeeded in enforcing a measure his predecessors had shrunk from, the levying of the conscription for the army, and enrolment of thirty-six thousand men under the Italian colours.

The rest of Italy, meantime, had not been free from trouble, and in September, 1864, Lamarmora was called on by the king to form a Ministry, when the transference of the capital to Florence, and the consequent disastrous riots in Turin, seemed to threaten serious complications. The Roman question was also beginning to agitate the country, and thus the Lamarmora Ministry was confronted by grave difficulties—political as well as administrative. Foreign affairs, however, soon began to engross the attention of its chief, who, with a change of colleagues in January, 1866, remained in office till the end of the war in that year, and had thus the glory of annexing to Italy, Venice and the Quadrilateral. True, the remembrance of this triumph was embittered to him, as it still is to every Italian soldier, by that of the humiliation to the national arms with which it is associated, but it must ever remain a solid monument to his memory.

Our readers will doubtless remember the profound sensation created by the publication, in 1873, of a minute and detailed history of the negotiations connected with the Prusso-Italian alliance, in Lamarmora's famous book, "*Un po' più di luce sugli eventi politici e militari dell' anno 1866*;" probably the most singular revelation ever made of the hidden springs which control the destinies of nations. Signor Fea, who has recently written a sketch of Lamarmora's life,* believes his motive in giving these facts to the world to have been his fear that the Italian Government of the day was about to bind itself hand and foot by another treaty with Prussia, whom he certainly shows to have been a perilous and uncertain ally. A more obvious reason for its publication is that which he himself alleges—the desire to clear himself from the insinuation conveyed in the Prussian official report of the campaign, that he

* "*Alfonso Lamarmora. Rivista Europea, 16 Febbraio e 16 Marzo, 1878.*"
[Vol. CXII. No. CCXXII.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. LVI. No. II. D D

had not co-operated in it with the energy and activity that he might have displayed. Nor did he escape in Italy the invariable penalty of the unsuccessful general—the murmured charge of treason; brought against him, not indeed by the army, with whom his honour and loyalty were a proverb, but by those not so well acquainted with his character. The betrayal with which he was charged was not that, however, of having sacrificed the material interests of his country, but of having secured them by a dishonourable compact with the enemy; in virtue of which Austria was to cede Venetia, but to be allowed a victory in the field, as a satisfaction to her military self-love.

It appears from Lamarmora's book, that there was, in point of fact, an understanding between Austria and France previous to the breaking out of the war, that if the Imperial arms were victorious in Germany, Italy should receive Venetia, in consideration of the victor being allowed to indemnify herself on Prussian territory; and it was even represented to Lamarmora, from Paris, that he might either prosecute the war languidly to save appearances, or negotiate separately during its course, thus violating all his engagements with Prussia. He, however, declined to be a party to the bargain, which would have been damaging alike to the moral and military reputation of his country. One thing, at least, is abundantly clear from his pages—that the Emperor of the French was animated throughout by a generous and sincere sympathy for Italy, and that her statesmen had perfect confidence in his loyalty and goodwill. He seems, indeed, to have been a very dove of innocence and simplicity in comparison with the Prussian Chancellor; who, on one occasion, suggested that Italy should furnish herself with a pretext for commencing hostilities, contrary to her engagements with the other Powers, by bribing a corps of Croats to give her the provocation of a feigned attack.* He showed a strange blindness to character in making such a proposal to Lamarmora; but it is one of the weak points of excessive astuteness that it cannot allow for the possibility of good faith in others.

One of the most curious facts mentioned by Lamarmora is, that while England was straining every nerve to prevent the war, its actual outbreak was precipitated, after the disarmament of Prussia and Austria had been arranged, by a false alarm given by the English Minister that Italy was hurrying up troops to the north. The sole foundation for the report was the return to the northern garrisons of two regiments of cavalry which had been sent to Naples to act against the brigands, and which, moving up in scattered squadrons between Ancona and Bologna, led to

* Letter of General Govone. "Un po più di luce," &c., p. 27.

the statement in the papers that the whole Adriatic coast was covered with troops in motion.

The result of the campaign of 1866 embittered Lamarmora's mind, and made him querulous and acrimonious in all public matters. The defeat of Custoza, whose memory ever rankles in the hearts of the Italian army, was due, not so much to any inherent deficiency of soldierly qualities in its ranks, nor even to imperfections doubtless existing in its organization, as to a total want of combination or unanimity among those in command. A reserve of eleven thousand men was never even brought under fire, while some of the divisions engaged were almost annihilated. As for the retreat, it was a scene of confusion that baffles description, in which every semblance of organization was lost, and the splendid army—the pride and flower of Italy, but a few hours before so full of hope and courage—melted into a fugitive and disorderly rabble. No wonder that the indignant nation should have raised the cry of treason, and that every man who wears the Italian uniform should feel his heart filled with grief and bitterness at the memory of that day.

For the defeat, however occasioned, Lamarmora, as Commander-in-Chief, was responsible, and whatever may have been his administrative or political ability, the campaign of 1866 must be considered to have shown him incapable of regulating and combining the movements of large masses of men in the field. The humiliating consciousness of failure in his own profession blighted the remaining years of his life; and though he accepted a special mission to Paris in 1867, to conciliate the Emperor, irritated by the violation of the Roman territory, and again in 1870, consented to take a command in Rome as lieutenant-general of the king, he gradually withdrew from public affairs, and latterly lived in complete retirement in Florence. In the discussion of military questions, however, he always took a most active part; and in 1871 was a vigorous opponent of Ricotti's measures for Prussianizing, as he had been ten years before of Fanti's for Frenchifying, the entire organization of the army. His "Quattro discorsi sulle condizioni dell' Esercito Italiano," which made a great sensation in Italy, were directed against the reforms of the War Minister, bent on remodelling everything on the Prussian system. The principal changes made by these laws were the reduction of the term of active service for the conscripts from five to three years, the absolute enforcement of personal service without exemption, and the institution of the volunteers of one year, a corps in which men of independent means have the option of serving, provided they are willing to compute their chance of escaping the conscription for the certainty of being soldiers for twelve months, paying all their own expenses during

the time. In addition, the whole regimental organization was revolutionized, companies raised again to a strength of two hundred and fifty, system of drill and words of command altered, regimental distinctions of uniform abolished, the distribution of the territorial commands and military districts revised, and a whole host of minute and arbitrary changes introduced into uniforms, equipments, discipline, and tactics.

To these innovations, many of which have since been abandoned, Lamarmora opposed all the weight of his name and influence, raising a discussion which lasted for months, but ended in General Ricotti's carrying his measure.

Since the publication of "*Un po' più di luce*," in 1873, brought the name and career of Lamarmora again prominently before the public, he has been little heard of. Visitors to Florence may remember the tall figure, with its rigid military bearing, conspicuous on fine evenings among the loungers on the Lung Arno, and may have turned to look after it with curiosity, as some resident pointed out to them the famous Piedmontese general and statesman. His latter years were devoted to serious reading and meditation—the Scriptures and works of ancient philosophy, especially the writings of Marcus Aurelius, forming, Signor Fea tells us, his favourite subjects of study. He was, all through life, a man of strong religious convictions, and remarkable for his charity and benevolence to the poor, even when his own means were comparatively restricted. The emotion which the news of his dangerous illness caused among all classes of his countrymen proved to him, on his death-bed, that his long and faithful services were not forgotten; and the honours that have been paid his memory since, show that Italy holds them as far outweighing the unfortunate result of a lost battle.

His death, on the 5th January, 1878, preceded that of the king by but four days; and Victor Emmanuel, already stricken with his last illness, seemed to give way utterly from the moment that the telegram reached him announcing that his old companion-in-arms was no more. By his death was broken one of the few remaining links with the past, as he was one of the last survivors of that old stock of Piedmontese nobility who brought to the service of the Italian cause the uncompromising virtues of their subalpine race. The tenacity of the little State, impelled by what seemed a blind fury to hurl itself headlong against the unbroken strength of the Austrian Empire, was represented in the lives of such men as Balbo, Azeglio, Cavour, and Lamarmora, devoted unceasingly and ungrudgingly to forwarding the interests of their country. Charles Albert expressed the heroic feeling of his people as well as his own, in the solemn words in which he assured Massimo d'Azeglio, in 1845, "that should the occasion

rise, his own life, the lives of his sons, his arms, his treasures, his soldiery, should be all devoted to the Italian cause."

Lamarmora's biographer, in the "*Rivista Europea*,"* says that while he had no spark of genius, he was able to comprehend and master any subject on which he concentrated his attention; but it was rather by moral weight of character than by pure intellectual force that he gained so much authority among his countrymen, and so much respectful consideration abroad. With Englishmen he was especially popular for his frank address and social gifts of manner and conversation, while at foreign Courts he knew how to conciliate without subservience, and mark his sense of the dignity of others, without compromising his own.

In politics he never swerved from his principle of straight forward loyalty, and resisted many temptations to sacrifice the public faith of his country to its material advantages. In this, no doubt, he was wise as well as honest, and the success of his plain direct course points a safer moral than that of the deeper game played by his great colleague; for while the audacious genius of Cavour is given scarce to one man in a generation, the uncompromising rectitude of Lamarmora is within reach of the imitation of all.

ART. V.—THE BOHEMIANS AND SLOVAKS.

1. *Anthologie e Litterary Ceske Sestviril Josef Jirecek* (Anthology of Bohemian Literature, compiled by JOSEPH JIRECEK). 3 vols. Prague. 1876.
2. *La Bohême, Historique, Pittoresque, et Littéraire.* Par JOSEPH FRICZ et LOUIS ILGER. Paris. 1867.
3. *The Native Literature of Bohemia in the Fourteenth Century.* By A. H. WRATISLAW, M.A. London. 1878.
4. *Odpor Stavov Ceskych proti Ferdinandovi I.* L. 1547. KARLA TIEFTRUNKA. (Resistance of the Bohemian States to Ferdinand I. in the year 1547. By KARL TIEFTRUNKA.) Prague. 1872.

THE little kingdom of Bohemia, which has for upwards of three centuries formed a portion of the ill compacted Austrian Empire is, historically speaking, one of the most interesting parts of Europe. In the fourteenth and fifteenth

* "*I miei Ricordi* : Massimo d'Azeglio," p. 462.

centuries it ranked high from the celebrity of the University of Prague, the culture spread throughout the land, and the elegance of its Court. It was the scene of one of the noblest religious struggles on record, and no student of constitutional history can be apathetic to its brave efforts to maintain its national privileges against the force and fraud of the House of Hapsburg. In our present Article, however, we propose to touch upon the history of the country only incidentally; our chief business is with the language and literature, concerning which hardly anything has been published in this country. Indeed, to the majority of Englishmen the Bohemians are simply Germans, and nothing more. The resuscitation of this language and literature must be looked upon as one of the most remarkable phenomena of our own days. Speaking roughly, from 1620 to 1820, there was no such thing as a Bohemian nationality. At the beginning of the present century, Dobrovsky had looked upon the total extinction of the Cech language as proximate. Pelzel, in 1798, compared the condition of Bohemian with that of the Lusatian-Wendish or Sorbish, at Leipzig in the fourteenth century, which was occasionally heard from peasants in the market-place, but was rapidly receding. In German, Pelzel wrote his history; and in the same language nearly all Dobrovsky's works were composed, except those which he wrote in Latin.

The French Revolution, which stirred so many nationalities, was probably not without its influence upon the Bohemians. The labours of Dobrovsky, a patriot as well as scholar, created a band of enthusiastic students, who applied themselves to the history and antiquities of their country. In 1817 was discovered the fragment called "The Judgment of Libusa" (*Libusin Soud*) which was sent to the newly-founded Bohemian Museum anonymously, but the sender was afterwards ascertained to have been one Kovar, the steward (*Rentmeister*) of Count Colloredo. From its first appearance, the genuineness of this poem was stoutly contested; the curious reader will find all that he cares to know, and perhaps a great deal more, in Jirecek's "Genuineness of the *Königinhof Manuscript*" (*Die Echtheit der Königinhofer Handschrift*). It must be confessed that the question is surrounded with difficulties, and the argument insisted upon so pertinaciously by the brothers Jirecek, that at the time when these productions came to light there was no one sufficiently acquainted with the old Bohemian language to fabricate them, seems to be partially met by the fact that two poems for a long time deceived experts, which have since been ascertained to be spurious—viz., the Love-Song of King Wenceslaus, and the Song on the Vysehrad. Both of these were unfortunately included in the valuable "Selections from Bohemian Literature," of

which two volumes have already appeared. Their existence shows that a forger was busy somewhere. These questions seem as little likely to be settled now as they ever were, and Professor Sembera, of Vienna, has recently thrown down the gauntlet again, asserting that "The Judgment of Libusa" was fabricated by Linda, a Bohemian poet of third-rate merit, whose works are now almost forgotten; and Hanka, the custodian of the Museum Library, and discoverer of the manuscript of Königshof. Dobrovsky himself did not hesitate to brand this poem as a forgery. He thus wrote to Bowring:—"Alterum nimirum Libussæ judicium, ex phrasibus poematis Russici de Igore, et antiquis formulis poematum Msti Kralodworskani compilatum circa ann. 1818, non nisi in Krokio expositum reperies, qui tibi fortasse transmissus est. *Impostoris hujus*, auctorem sic appello, fraudem detexi primo quasi intuitu."

The story of the Princess Libusa will be found in the old chronicle, Cosmas of Prague, who teems with wonderful legends, probably belonging to the common stock of the Aryan mythologies. It reappears subsequently in the so-called chronicle of Dalimil, of which we shall have occasion to speak at some length, and forms an amusing chapter in the mendacious history of Wenceslaus Hajek. However mythical this lady may be, the Bohemians have accepted her as their tutelary Athena, as we are reminded by her statue erected in the Museum Buildings at Prague. The poem represents how Libusa, the daughter of Krok, was a princess and judge among her people, like the Veleda of Tacitus; but when called on one occasion to settle a question of inheritance between two rival claimants, one of them, Chrudos, refuses to abide by it. He says that the land is but ill-governed which is ruled by a woman, and Libusa, disgusted at her want of influence over her savage subjects, recommends them to choose a man capable of wielding a sword. The difficulty was solved, as all readers of Bohemian history know, by her marriage with the good peasant Premysl, from whom sprang the old line of Bohemian Princes. According to Cosmas, the buskins of the worthy rustic were to be seen in his time suspended in the citadel of Prague,* something as (we take it) Coryat, author of the "Cruities," suspended his shoes in the church of Odcombe, in Somersetshire. The manuscript of the "Judgment of Libusa" will be found in the National Library at Prague; we must confess ourselves but half-satisfied with its genuineness. Sembera quotes the opinions of many excellent

* "Tollit secum suos cothurnos ex omni parte subere consutos, quos fecit servari in posterum et servantur Wissegrad in camera ducis usque hodie."—See Schafarik "Slawische Alterthümer," ii. 422.

palæographers who are adverse to it; the linguistic forms are perplexing; the concocter seems to have considered that the nearer he got to the ecclesiastical Slavonic the older he could make his poem appear. We shall presently see how these same ideas actuated the forger of the modern glosses in the "Mater Verborum." Want of space would prevent us from doing anything like justice to this intricate question. But it must be confessed that a cloud hangs over many of the earlier specimens of Bohemian literature. The piece has been assigned to the ninth, or even the eighth, century by those who vindicate its authenticity. It has been translated by Mr. Wratislaw,* of whose more recent work we shall speak shortly. In his recent pamphlet on "The Judgment of Libusa," Professor Sembera also casts doubt on the "Fragment of the Gospel of St. John," preserved in the Museum, and assigned to the tenth century.

We now turn to the celebrated Königinhof manuscript; the story of its discovery is well known. It will suffice to give the outlines here. In 1817, Hanka, then a very young man, and engaged in editing selections from old Bohemian literature, paid a visit to a friend at Königinhof, a village in the north-eastern corner of Bohemia. Here he was introduced to the vicar of the place, named Borc, who casually mentioned that some old weapons, including arrows, were still preserved in a room in the church. On searching these stores, several manuscripts were found, and, among others of less value, the collection of historical and lyrical pieces, which has since become so famous. Concerning its genuineness there has been a storm of controversy, in which the works published on both sides would themselves form a literature. The assailants urge the false sentimental tone of many of the pieces, more resembling the style of poetry of the beginning of this century; the anachronisms (*e.g.*, mention of drums, tournaments, &c.), and the incorrect linguistic forms.† What can be said for the defence will be seen in M. Jirecok's book, previously quoted. It is but fair to say that some of the arguments which apply to the "Judgment of Libusa" do not affect this collection. We are told that many words which Hanka himself could not explain, or explained wrongly, have been made clear by the discovery of subsequent manuscripts, especially the "Legend of St. Catherine," preserved in Sweden, whither many Bohemian treasures were taken during the

* "The Queen's Court Manuscript, with other Ancient Bohemian Poems." By A. H. Wratislaw. Cambridge. 1852.

† We have copious allusions to the Slavonic mythology (*cf.* some of the additions to the "Mater Verborum"). Tras, Morena, &c., Lumir, the bard who with his voice and song could move the Vysehrad, has an Ossianic touch, and looks like an adumbration of Boian in the Russian "Song of Igor."

Thirty Years' War. In the *Vybor*, or "Selection from Bohemian Literature," the date of the *Königinhof* poems is fixed at the thirteenth century, but from a recent article by M. "Gebauer's (*Archiv für Slavische Philol.*, vol. ii. p. 155), it is shown that part of the poem of Jaroslav is copied from an old Bohemian translation of Marco Polo, executed about 1320, and thus the composition of these pieces is, to say the least, shifted a full century later. It is painful for the lover of Slavonic studies to be compelled to listen to these arguments, which cannot be explained away: we must remember the Aristotlean *ἔσιον προτιμᾶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν**.

The poems contained in the *Königinhof* collection are, on the whole, spirited, although of no particular merit, if we do away with their antiquity; nor can we see that Hanka (to judge from his acknowledged pieces) was incapable of forging them. He was well acquainted with the popular ballad literature of the Slavonic races, especially the Servian. One of the prettiest pieces describes a tournament (the "Lay of Ludise and Labor"). It is not touched, however, with so vigorous a hand as Chaucer's picture in the *Knight's Tale*, or Mr. Tennyson's—

"They reel, they roll in clanging lists,
And when the tide of combat stands,
Perfume and flowers fall in showers,
That lightly rain from ladies' hands."

At the conclusion, Ludise crowns the victor with a chaplet of oak-leaves.

From this collection we have selected a few little lyrics, which we shall present to the reader in a prose version; the colouring will thereby be lost, but accuracy will be preserved. The pieces are elegant.

THE ROSE.†

"O thou rose, thou red rose,
Why hast thou bloomed so early,
Why, having bloomed, art thou frost-stricken?
Why, frost-stricken, dost thou fade?
Why, having faded, dost thou fall?"

* The view of M. Jirecek, that the translator of Marco Polo copied from the *Königinhof* manuscript, will hardly recommend itself to our readers.

† Dr. Bowring's version of this is altogether unfaithful:—

"And I dreamt ---I dreamt I saw
One who brought to me, poor maiden,
One who with his right hand brought
Golden ring to grace my finger—
Ring with precious gems enwrought.
Where are now those gems? I know not;
And that youth—I vainly sought."

I sat during the night—I sat long,
 I sat till cock-crowing;
 No longer could I keep awake;
 All the pine-torch was burnt out.
 I slept: it appeared to me in my dream
 How from me, poor girl,
 From the finger of my right hand
 The golden ring fell:
 The precious stone was lost;
 I never found the stone—
 I never met my love.”

The following is also touchingly worded:—

THE LARK.

“A maid was weeding hemp
 In her master's garden.
 A lark asks her
 Why she is so sad?
 How can I be glad,
 Little lark!
 They have taken away my love
 To a stone tower.
 Would that I had a pen,
 I would have written a letter,—
 Thou, dear little lark,
 Wouldst have flown with it.
 I have no pen, no paper,
 Or I would have written a letter.*
 Salute my love with a song,
 Tell him that I die of grief.”

THE FORSAKEN.

“Ah! ye woods, ye gloomy woods,
 Woods of Miletin,
 Why are ye green
 In winter, in summer equally?
 I should be glad did I not weep,
 Did I not trouble my heart;
 But tell me, good people,
 Who would not weep here?”

* This poem has been a great stumbling-block. How could a country girl in the thirteenth century talk of writing a letter? To this, those who vindicate its authenticity reply that similar expressions are found in Servian and Ruthenish poetry in the mouths of rustic maidens. Still the idea of writing would be a far more remote one in the thirteenth century, when even peers and knights used their mark, than in the nineteenth, when pen and ink would be a familiar sight even to those who could not write.

Where is my father, my dear father,
 Buried in the earth?
 Where is my mother, my good mother?
 The grass grows over her.
 I have no brothers, no sisters—
 They have taken away my love."

The tone of this poem reminds us of Burns' lyric "The Lovely Lass of Inverness," but the lay of the Scotchman is more direct and impulsive.

THE CUCKOO.

"In a broad field an oak stands;
 On the oak a cuckoo
 Utters her note, and laments
 That it is not always spring.
 How could the corn ripen in the field
 If it were always spring?
 How could the apple ripen in the garden
 If it were always summer?
 Or how could the corn freeze in the heap
 If it were always autumn?
 How sad it would be for a maiden
 If she were always alone."

Whatever may be the case as regards the genuineness of this collection, that the hand of the forger, led by a narrow spirit of false patriotism, was being employed, is clear also from the additions which have been made to the "Mater Verborum," in the Library of the Museum at Prague. The whole subject has been investigated by MM. Patera and Baum, and the results of their labours published in the *Bohemian Literary Journal*, and the "Archiv," edited by Jagic. This valuable codex, which is on parchment and of the thirteenth century, is a Latin vocabulary, compiled by Solomon, Bishop of Constance, in Switzerland, who died in 920. To this some Bohemian monk had added unimportant glosses. The manuscript was presented to the Museum, soon after its foundation, by Count Joseph Kolovrat Krakovski. Since its reception into the stores of the Museum a number of glosses have been added by a later hand. The forger went to work in the following way:—We select two or three salient instances.

"Barbarus tardus truculentus atrox immitus." Out of *atrox* he made *nōmec* (German), in the following way:—Out of *at* he constructed an *u*, out of *r* an *e*, out of *ox*, *me*, and he added *c*.

Deities of the Slavonic mythology were, of course, introduced plentifully (just as they appear in the *Königinhof* poems). The following is ingenious:—

"Ares bellum nuncupatur." This last word was converted

into *svatouyth* (Svantovit, the Slavonic god), the last two letters having been scratched out.

The Illuminations were also tampered with, and to two of the figures, the names Vacerad and Miroslav added. All these additions to the original were adopted by Palacky and Schafarik in their "Oldest Monuments of the Bohemian Language" (*Die älteste Denkmäler der böhmischen Sprache*), and have in this way found their entrance into many works on Bohemia; thus, at page 458 of the work "*La Bohême Historique*," cited at the commencement of our Article, we find gravely introduced "Treizième Siècle, Vacerad, l'auteur de Mater Verborum."

In the Article in Jagic's "Archiv" Hanka is alluded to as the forger in unmistakable suggestions. If, for no other reason, it would be suspicious that among the glosses we find many forms which, in his imperfect knowledge of the structure of the old Bohemian language, he had supposed to exist, but which subsequent philological investigations have shown to be impossibilities.

And thus we leave this uncertain ground for one which is more certain. A cloud rests upon the name of the former librarian of the Museum, which does not seem likely to be removed.

The next literary work of importance among the Bohemians is the so-called chronicle of Dalimil. This production, reminding one of our own Robert of Gloucester or the Bruce of Barbour, is a tedious and somewhat colourless production: it is written in octo-syllabics, and extends from the creation of the world (your old chronicler never began later) till the year 1314. The literatures of most European countries have productions of the same kind, destitute of poetical merit, but interesting to the philologist and antiquarian. From a notice prefixed to the selections in the *Vybor*, we gather that the writer was probably a Bohemian knight: the supposed Dalimil is a fiction. The work is inspired by a frantic hatred of the Germans, as just at this time the House of Luxemburg (which gave to the Bohemians, among others, John, the blind king slain at Crecy, their best king, Charles IV., and his drunken and too celebrated son, Wenceslaus) were introducing everywhere German habits and the German language. The so-called Dalimil is, of course, uncritical, and his rhyming chronicle is full of the picturesque stories told by Cosmas, and forming an integral part of Bohemian history till the end of the eighteenth century. The once popular work of Wenceslaus, Hajek, teems with these legends. In 1762, Gelasius Dobner published a Latin translation of Hajek with critical notes, a work which, as F. Prochazka said, "*mentiendi finem fecit*" in Bohemian history. The stories

about Krok and his three wise daughters, and the fruitless attempt of the prophetess Libusa to enforce her decisions, have been already told; Libusa, or Lubusa as she is called, thus replies, according to the chronicle:—

“ I will now tell you frankly,
Although you have ill-treated me,
And have so despised me,
That would be a depraved man
Who would do evil to the community for his own advantage.
The community is the protection of all;
He who attacks it wants sense.
If you lose the community, do not count upon a refuge.
Without the community there will be a continual quarrel.
It would have been better for you to have acquiesced in my
decisions,
Than to have a man for prince.
The hand of a maden strikes lightly:
There is great trouble from the blow of a man.
You will first understand me
When you see your prince behind a throne of iron.
*If a stranger shall rule over you,
Your language shall not last long.
It is melancholy to live among strangers.*
When a person is sad he can comfort himself among his own
people.”

Afterwards Lubusa says:—

“ I know well
Who ought to be your master.
Follow where my horse leads.

And then, being a prophetess, she guides them to the abode of the peasant Premysl. Here we have the primitive ploughman of the Aryan legend; the Mikoula Selianuovich of the Russians and Piast of the Poles; and Professor Rhys, in his Oxford Lectures, has already tracked him among the Kelts. Cromer* shall tell us of Piast:—“*Erat Crusvicie oppidanus, Piastus nomine, Cossisconis filius statura infra mediocrem crassis atque robustis artibus mediam aetatem supergressus, agello modico colendo et mellificio vitam sustentans, homo simplex et justus et beneficus in egenos atque hospitalis pro modo facultatum suarum.*” But to proceed to Premysl—

“ The lords go behind the horse,
And come to the river Bielma,
The horse follows the course of the river,
And arrives at some fallow-land,

* Martini Cromeri, “*De Origine et Rebus Gestis Polonorum*, 1568,” p. 27.

Where a tall man was working,
 His feet covered with shoes of bark;
 The horse bounds forward to this man,
 And stops, careering before him."

The countryman chides the strangers for having interrupted his labours; he prophesies that he shall rule over them with a rod of iron because they would not obey the maiden. Out of his spade, which had been stuck in the earth, grew five branches, and out of the branches, nuts. Libusa is married to this worthy, and the city of Prague is afterwards founded. The prophetess herself gives orders for its erection, and its name is to be taken from the word *praha*, signifying door-sill.

"There where I show you
 On the Moldau, below Petrin,
 A carpenter is making a door-sill with his son,
 On account of this sill (*prah*,) call the place *Praha*."

Here and there we have some curious stories illustrating the animosities between the Germans and Bohemians; the latter seem to have had a presentiment that they were destined to be overpowered by the stronger nationality. In one part we are told of a prince who ordered the noses of all the Germans in the country to be cut off, and sent them home in this plight. He gave a *hrivna* (a piece of gold) to any man who brought him a hundred German noses. In the early chronicles of our own country we find similar curious stories illustrating the feeling existing between the English and Welsh.

As soon as we get into the fourteenth century we have the advantage of Mr. Wratislaw's book, cited at the commencement of our Article. The English reader, to whom in most cases the very names of the Bohemian authors are unknown, will here have an opportunity of becoming acquainted with the great literary activity of this little country at so early a period—the period, let us remember, of our own Wickliffe, Chaucer, and Gower. But the fate of the two lands was to be widely different; England, to advance in Constitutional development and territorial extent; Bohemia, to lose her civil and religious liberty, and to have all her aspirations for nationality crushed in the bud.

The "*Alexandreis*," written about this time, is but poor stuff, and at best only a translation from the German or Latin. There is nothing distinctly Bohemian about the piece. Tales of Troy, Alexander the Great, Arthur and his Round Table, and Charlemagne and his Peers, formed the regular pabulum of the reader throughout Europe at the period.

The "*Legend of St. Procopius*" is also a very tedious poem, and

can only interest the antiquarian. It is of the same kind as our own rhyming "Lives of the Saints" and "Versified Homilies," such as the Early English Text Society has been reprinting for us. It is a pity that Mr. Wratismaw has wasted his time in giving translations from these. It must not be forgotten that it is to St. Procopius that the writing of the Psalter of Rheims, commonly called "Evangile du Sacre," and alluded to in a previous Article in this REVIEW, has been traditionally assigned. More amusing matter can be found in the Satires on the Trades (*Satyry o remeslníciích*), from which copious extracts are given by Mr. Wratismaw, and a poem on the Ten Commandments. Some of these pieces show a good deal of humour, and remind us of Dunbar and Lyndsay. They are anonymous; but we meet with a man whom we can definitely fix upon as an author in Smil of Pardubitz, surnamed Flaska, a leading Bohemian of his day. But little is known of his life: he was killed in a skirmish in the year 1403, three years after our own Chaucer died. His chief work is the "New Council," one of the innumerable beast-epics so much in vogue in the Middle Ages. Others are, however, assigned to him, of which the most original and amusing is the dialogue between the groom and scholar (*Podkoni a Zak*), a quaint piece of mediæval humour, which gives us a picture of Bohemian social life.

A valuable legal document, the "Book of the old Lord of Rosenberg," may be cursorily mentioned. In the fourteenth century the whole Bible was translated into Bohemian, thus being contemporary with our own Wickliffe's version—a man destined to have so much influence upon the little Slavonic country. Wickliffe says of Anne of Luxemburg, the first wife of Richard II, "Nobilis regina Angliæ soror Cæsaris habet evangelium in lingua triplici exaratum, scilicet in lingua bohemica, teutonica et latina." The Gospels and Psalter were translated into Bohemian as early as the tenth century. It is to be regretted that such doubts have been thrown upon the fragment of the early version of the Gospel of St. John. We have already alluded to this, which was stated to have been found by Hanka in the binding of a book entitled "Disciplina et Doctrina Gymnasii Gorlicensis, 1595," and has had considerable doubts thrown upon its authenticity by Sembera. "It is curious," he says, "that no one has ever seen or heard of such a book as the one just mentioned." An interesting literary document is the chronicle of Pulkava, who died in 1380. This was first written in Latin, but afterwards translated into Bohemian. Its chief importance, however, is antiquarian and philological; and the same

may be said of the book on Cech law, by Andrew of Duba. For those interested in Slavonic legislation, the best work is by Maciejowski, of which there is a translation into German.

We now come to the curious prose-poem called "The Weaver" (Tkadleček), after the name of its author, who lived in the first half of the fourteenth century. In this production he celebrated the fair Adlicka (Adelaide), one of the beauties of the Bohemian Court. The piece is full of the usual conceits of the age; thus, we are told that "that super-excellent, widely-renowned queen of highest race, who is named Honour, sent her mantle embroidered with various imperishable flowers to her by her highest confidant, whose name is Circumspection." We might here be almost reading a Bohemian translation of Skelton's "Garlande of Laurell." To our mind, the best part of the book is the address of Misfortune to the Weaver: "Therefore, Weaver, hold thy peace, speak no more with me of thy darling. Take me not for so weak a power; think not that I am thine equal. I do as the sun that shines to the whole world, and is light in itself; to young and old, to Pagan and Jew, to Christian and Greek, to good and bad, to poor and rich alike. Even so there is none of these that has not at some time experienced my assault. Endure them, likewise, Weaver, according to custom."* Whether this piece is original, or only an adaptation, is a matter of controversy. It very much resembles a production entitled "Der Ackermann aus Böhmen," of which four manuscripts have been preserved. Dobrovsky considered the Bohemian to be the original; according to an interesting article by Gebauer ("Archiv. f. Slav. Phil., iii." 201), they are probably both adaptations of a piece which is now lost.

But the great glory of Bohemian literature in the fourteenth century is Thomas of Stitny, a voluminous writer, chiefly on religious subjects. The notices of his life and works we shall take from the introduction to the selection in the "Vybor" (vol. i. p. 635). The biography of Stitny is at best but scanty. He was born of a noble family, probably about 1330, and was certainly alive at the close of the same century. He appears to have been a well-educated man, to have studied at the University of Prague, then newly founded, and also to have been acquainted with the German and Latin languages. His chief works are a treatise on "General Christian Matters," in six books, which was edited by Erben in 1852, and the "Books of Christian Instruction," reprinted, with an introduction by Vrtatko, the present librarian of the Museum, in 1873. Some of his other productions still remain in manuscript. The style of Stitny is easy and flowing,

* Wratlslaw, p. 121.

and we can see from his writings that Bohemian prose was developed at a time when our own was in but a rudimentary condition. In some respects we might compare him as a theologian with our own Reginald Peacocke, who, however, flourished a century later than Stitny. Mr. Wratisslaw devotes a considerable part of his work to the discussion of the merits of this writer, and with justice. Did space permit, we should feel tempted to make many extracts. One passage, on a good wife, begins with a noble simile, and might well be compared with Sir Thomas Overbury's poem. "A wise and noble mistress (*hospodyn*) is like the moon. For as the moon receives all its beauty from the sun, so has she honour from her husband; if they look upon each other faithfully and truly with true love, so that there is no impediment between them through which true love may vanish."*

The same idea has been repeated elsewhere. We remember years ago to have seen in a literary journal some lines by an unknown author, where the thought was felicitously put—

"Man is the sun of home,
He shines, and all is bright;
And beauteous woman is the moon,
Made brilliant by his light."

Passing by some hymns and tales, we come to a Bohemian version of "The History of the Trojan War," composed by Guido of Colonna, from Dictys Cretensis and Dares Phrygius, which, to judge from the number of manuscripts in existence, would appear to have been a favourite work among the Bohemian knights. It was one of the first books printed and issued from the press, in 1468, at Pilsen.

We now come to the great name of Hus,† a man who has covered his country with glory, and earned a splendid reputation as one of the precursors of Luther. It would be idle to recapitulate the facts of his life, they belong to universal history, and are well known to all readers. We shall here only deal with the literary side of his character. During the latter part of the fourteenth and the beginning of the fifteenth century the University of Prague was at the height of its splendour, and the doctrines of Wickliffe soon spread among the professors and students. We must remember that at this time it was customary for men to study at foreign universities; Latin being the great

* Wratisslaw, p. 137. Eiben's edition, p. 100.

† For a full and fresh account of Hus, based upon original documents, see the third volume of Professor Tomek's "History of the City of Prague," p. 433. We have retained the Bohemian spelling of the name, which in the original language signifies "goose."

medium of teaching there was no hindrance, and there were no religious disabilities to exclude scholars. Hence there may have been truth in the statement of Hume, that at one time Oxford boasted 30,000 members.* Owing to the connection between England and Bohemia in the time of Richard II. many Cech students came to the University of Oxford, among others Hieronymus von Faulfisch, better known as Jerome of Prague, of whom more anon. In the same way an Englishman named Payne, going to Prague, spread abroad the teaching of Wickliffe, one of those quick and spontaneous minds which are destined to galvanize their age. Hus was born in 1369, took the degree of M.A. at the University of Prague in 1396, and was made Rector of the University in 1402. The great Papal schism at this time raging, and only to be settled by the Council of Constance, caused the doctrines of Wickliffe to be more widely spread, and Hus became one of their great propagators.† His Bohemian writings were collected and edited by Erben, 1865-68; they are of a miscellaneous character, and for the most part controversial. The "Vybor," vol. ii., contains selections from his "Postils," and from the "Daughter; or, the Knowledge of the Right Way to Salvation" (*Dcerka aneb o poznani cesty prave k spaseni*). The great Reformer did almost as much for his native tongue as Luther for German. He corrected the translation of the Bible, rearranged the Bohemian alphabet, and fixed the orthography. Alas! that, like the noble Slovenish apostle, Primus Truber, so much of his work was destined to be undone. The circumstances that made a Luther great were wanting to our Bohemian Magister, but the energy, the genius, and the purity of motive were there. Nine letters written by Hus while in prison at Constance have been preserved. Of these three are printed in the second volume of the "Vybor;" there is also an account of the death of Hus by Peter Mladenowic, who acted as notary to one of the noblemen who accompanied him to the Council of Constance, and was an eye-witness of the proceedings from the beginning. The martyrdoms of Hus and Jerome of Prague, are described in a letter of Poggio Bracciolini, the Italian. The English reader will naturally betake himself to the eloquent pages of Milman, who has given a glowing account of the great historical scene. The thin pale scholar, the plebeian who, to the great indignation of feudalism, had dared to mislead such a number of Bohemians, soon felt how completely he had been entrapped, and how little confidence was

* We are informed by Professor Rogers, of Oxford, that this statement is found in Gascoigne's "Dictionarium Theologicum," among the MSS. of Lincoln College, from whence it was copied by Hearne.

† Wratisslaw, *Contemporary Review*, Jan. 1872, p. 247. See also Milman's "Latin Christianity."

to be placed in the word of an Emperor. Once during his trial he gazed fixedly at Sigismund, when he alluded to the broken pledge of the German monarch, and a blush is said to have suffused the face of his betrayer. He was commanded to kneel and hear his sentence, was then stripped of his sacred vestments, and led off to execution, wearing a high paper crown covered with representations of devils. He was then burnt in a meadow outside the walls of the city. That there might be no possibility of preserving any relics of the heresiarch, his ashes were carefully collected and thrown into the lake. The affection, however, of his votaries was not to be disappointed. They scraped the earth round the stake, and carried back portions with them to Bohemia.* His affectionate pupil, Jerome (Hieronymus von Faulfisch), anxious, if possible, to rescue his master, set out for Constance without even the precaution of a safe-conduct, was arrested near the town, thrown into prison, and shared the fate of his great teacher in the following year, May 13th, 1416. Great indignation was felt in Bohemia when the fate of these two eminent men was known, but the besotted Wenceslaus made no effort to avenge them.

Now, however, broke out the fierce Hussite wars, which desolated the kingdom during so many years. The chief leaders were Nicholas, Lord of Hussinec, a nobleman of great influence, and John of Trocznow, surnamed Ziska,† who had previously distinguished himself in the wars between the Teutonic Order and the Lithuanians, and was a great personal friend of Wenceslaus. Ziska seems to have brooded deeply over the insult offered to his country by the murder of the two Bohemians, and when the King saw him one day absorbed in thought and inquired the cause, the knight asked how he could help being so, when such indignities had been heaped upon the nation. The King answered, that if he could devise any means of avenging his countrymen‡ he might claim his full permission to do so. An opportunity for this soon presented itself. On April 16th, 1419, while Ziska was accompanying a procession to the Church of St. Stephen, in the New Town of Prague, one of the priests was struck with a stone near the Townhall, where the magistrates were assembled. This insult was the signal for a general attack upon the building; the doors were forced open, and the magis-

* See Palacky and Milman. The Article of Mr. Wratislaw is full of original matter.

† Coxe ("House of Austria," vol. i. p. 214) endeavours unsuccessfully to explain this name. It is probably a familiar abbreviation of Sigismund—*cf.* Zisko in Slovenish.

‡ Coxe, ed. 1820, p. 264, quoting Pelzel.

trates murdered by the populace. In the midst of all these commotions the feeble Wenceslaus died, leaving his kingdom a prey to the various factions which were rending it; the regency was assumed by his wife, Sophia. The Hussite leaders, Ziska and Nicholas of Hussinec, now occupied the Vysehrad, and forced the Queen to grant a general liberty of conscience. Sigismund, the brother of the deceased monarch, was the next in order of succession, and on accepting the sovereignty inaugurated a crusade against the Hussites. Ziska accordingly betook himself to Pilsen, and fortified a camp (tabor) on a mountain.* Here he defied all the efforts of Sigismund. Ziska died of the plague in his camp, October 12th, 1424. Had the Hussites remained united, the Emperor would probably never have made himself master of Bohemia. But even so early as 1421 dissensions had arisen among them, and they finally split into many different parties. The two principal divisions were the Calixtins and Taborites, the former concluded a compact with the Catholics at Basle in 1434, by which a conditional religious liberty was granted, and they acknowledged Sigismund as their sovereign. The Taborites ultimately formed themselves into the United Brethren, and became the nucleus of the Moravians, of whom everybody has heard. To return to Ziska: four of his letters are printed in the "Vybor." In one of them he gives special orders that some property belonging to a poor woman, which was in the hands of one of his retainers, should be surrendered, thus evincing his great anxiety for strict discipline in his camp. There is still preserved the war-song of the Taborites (*Valecna pisen Taboruv*), which has been assigned by tradition to Ziska. A fairly accurate version of this has been given by Bowring ("Cheskian Anthology," p. 54), beginning as follows:—

"Ye champions who maintain
 God's everlasting law,
 Call on His name again,
 And tow'rd's His presence draw;
 And soon your steady march your foes shall overawe."

It is gratifying for an Englishman to see how often the name of Wickliffe is repeated in these religious songs; verily the influence of the great English Reformer was by no means an insular one.

We shall make no attempt to give any list of the many writers of political and religious pamphlets who flourished during these Hussite wars. Several heroes of the time were as vigorous with the pen as with the sword. Translations of the travels of Marco Polo and our Sir John Mandeville enjoyed great popularity.

* See "History of the Bohemian People," by J. Maly, vol. i., p. 404, a useful compilation.

There is a dearth of original work, as in so much of our own literature at the period. Bohemia, during the Middle Ages, saw an Oocleve and a Hawes, but certainly never boasted a Chaucer. Peter Chelcicky deserves a passing notice as a popular writer. He was one of the leaders of the United Brethren, and, like our own Bunyan, of exceedingly humble origin, being a cobbler by trade, hence his nickname, Kopyta, or the shoe-last. His works were all written between 1430 and 1456. The two most celebrated are his "Postils" and the "Web of Truth" (*Sit Viry*). An extract is given in the Anthology of M. Joseph Jirecek, a book which we will here take the opportunity of recommending, as containing well-assorted selections from Cech authors of the earliest till the latest period. Should any of our readers feel tempted to study this fine but somewhat difficult language, we know of no work more likely to be of service to them. The goodly array of authors cited is quite enough to repel the sneers of the Germans, and those who, for political purposes, are willing to ignore the existence of a Bohemian literature, to say nothing of the lists in Jungmann's History, of which we shall speak more anon. The first press was established in Prague in the year 1487. In 1488, the whole Bible was printed in Bohemian for the first time. The famous Bible in the old ecclesiastical Slavonic was issued at Ostrog, in Volhynia, in 1581. Under George Podebrad, a native Cech, who had been elected King, the national language and literature were still further developed. Podebrad had already been regent, and enjoyed much influence among his countrymen, and the Bohemians were so moved by the eloquence of the Calixtine priest, John Rokycana, who urged the Diet not to appoint a German prince, but a man of their own nation, that he was unanimously elected by the States. The Emperor Frederick was at first opposed to the appointment, but was ultimately compelled to assent, and at a Conference in 1459 invested George with the insignia of royalty.* Distasteful as this election had been at first to the Germans, it was still more offensive to the Pope, who disliked the Calixtine opinions of Podebrad, and when that monarch afterwards offered to lead an army against the Turks, the Papal legate was instructed to say that it was far more advantageous for Christian potentates to turn their arms against the heretic king than against the infidels. In the year 1464, Podebrad sent an embassy to the French King, Louis XI., to attempt a settlement of the religious difficulties then agitating the Christian world, but the mission was a failure. The Bohemians were too deeply tinged with heresy for the most Catholic King to care for closer dealings with them. An account

* Coxe, vol. i. p. 328.

of this embassy was kept by one of the *attachés* named Jaroslav, and the manuscript was preserved in the archives of the town of Budweiss. In 1827, it was discovered there by Palacky, the eminent historian, who printed it in the *Bohemian Literary Journal* in 1827. On this occasion it appeared with several gaps, as the censorship was strict in Austria, and publications in the Bohemian language were viewed with particular disfavour. At a later period, when these rules had been relaxed, and it seemed possible to print the manuscript in its entirety, the document had disappeared, spirited away probably by some over-officious ecclesiastic, who thought its contents injurious to the interests of the Roman Catholic Church.*

The Renaissance was now bursting upon Europe, and the Bohemians, as said before, were on a level with the best nations. Translations of parts of Lucian, Isocrates, Cicero, and Seneca, appeared. The Slavonic races showed themselves eager to make use of the old learning. Sebastian Petrycy, a doctor of medicine, translated the "Politics" of Aristotle in 1605, and the "Ethics" and "Economics" in 1618 into Polish. The Cechs were always fond of making pilgrimages to the Holy Land, and in Martin Kabatnik, a member of the United Brethren, we have one of these travellers. He was a citizen of Leutomischel, and himself unable to read and write. His work was accordingly taken down from his dictation by Adam Bakkalar (the Bachelor?), a notary of the same town. Kabatnik commenced his journey in March, 1491, and returned in November, 1492. The manuscript of this interesting journey is preserved at Prague. It has been printed many times, first in 1518, and forms one of the curious memorials of the old Bohemian press.

But a great disaster was now to fall upon the Bohemian people and the Bohemian language. At this time its history, as a separate nation, begins to wane. In the year 1471 the illustrious Podebrad died. Under Louis, King of Hungary and Bohemia, the sanguinary battle of Mohacs was fought, in which the Cechs and their allies were defeated in 1526. The King was killed while attempting to escape from the battle. Coxé computes that in this engagement fell 22,000 men, including seven bishops, twenty-eight magnates, and five hundred nobles. Louis was the last male of his family, and accordingly Ferdinand I., of Germany, claimed both the vacant crowns: Hungary, by virtue of a family compact, for this was a period of European history, we must remember, when a nation was treated as an entailed estate; and Bohemia, in right of his wife Anne,

* See the Preface to Mr. Wratisslaw's "Diary of an Embassy." London, 1871. A very interesting little book.

sister of the deceased monarch. These pretensions were, however, quite new to the Magyar and Cech, among whom their monarchs had up to this time been always elective. In Bohemia, he was only opposed by Albert, Duke of Bavaria, and was accordingly elected King on the 22nd of October, 1526. On the 4th of February, 1527, he and his wife were crowned in the Cathedral of Prague. The new monarch soon found himself in opposition to his subjects: he had stipulated at his coronation to govern according to the laws of the much-beloved Charles IV. In Bohemia, the power of the sovereign was extremely limited, since, without the consent of the Diet, he could not impose taxes, raise troops, make war or peace, coin money, or pass and abrogate laws. But there were not only political, but religious difficulties to be surmounted by Ferdinand: in no European country did these rage so much as in Bohemia; the Cechs had already led the van in liberty of opinion, and the doctrines of Luther rekindled the torch which had been for some time faintly smouldering. Ferdinand proceeded very gradually in his work of disintegration: he tried to weaken the independence of the city of Prague by separating the magistrates of the old and new town, and declaring that all attempts to reunite them were high treason, an ancient and ill-defined accusation in Bohemia as in England. Again he attempted to disarm the nobles by declaring that he stood in need of their assistance against the Turks; and, finally, he attempted to reverse—for, in reality, he had no legal power to do so—the acknowledgment that he had made of the right of election existing in the States. He pretended to declare himself hereditary sovereign in right of his marriage with Anne. Matters were now hastening to extremities: the King, in 1546, summoned a Diet at Prague, and obtained consent to raise a certain number of troops for the purpose of marching against the Turks. The soldiers, when afterwards led into the Voigtland, became mutinous: some of their leaders were executed, and the rest only pardoned at the intercession of the Queen.*

It was, however, in the next year that he made preparations for a final and decisive blow against the rights of his subjects. On the 12th of January, 1547, he required the Bohemians to send troops against the Elector of Saxony, without such troops having been voted by the Diet. The order concluded with a threat. The deputies remonstrated: the King only replied by denunciations, and declared that he would prosecute the war whether they assisted him or not. But, finally, when he dis-

* Coxe, vol. ii. p. 242. See for a very complete and interesting account of these struggles, "Resistance of the Bohemian States to Ferdinand I.," by Karel Tieftrunk, cited at the commencement of our Article.

covered that he was likely to be abandoned by the Bohemians he recalled his former language, and was willing that it should be known that he did not claim but requested their services. The States accordingly consented, and a contingent of troops was provided; but during the King's absence the whole city of Prague was in commotion; nobles and citizens came together unanimously to defend the ancient customs of the country, and sent a memorial to the King, entreating him to convoke a Diet at Prague, and threatening that if he did not do so, they themselves would summon one on their own authority. To this the King replied, that he would in person hold a Diet at Prague eight days after Easter. This measure only acted as a partial compromise: elated by the success of the Elector of Saxony, the States gave directions for assembling an army to defend Bohemia, and for its maintenance imposed a tax upon all property. The King again attempted to lull them with promises, but the States were not to be pacified; they coldly answered, that they had taken up arms because they had received information of a design to ruin the Constitution, and extirpate the language of Bohemia.

The Diet now assembled at Prague, and sent a memorial to their Sovereign, justifying their conduct on the score of ancient usages. Their courage, however, somewhat slackened, when soon afterwards arrived the news of the battle of Mühlberg (1547), and they exhibited signs of an inclination to treat with Ferdinand. The Emperor—for we will call him so for convenience, although he did not actually succeed till 1558—was not slow to avail himself of this change in popular feeling, and when he made his public entry into Prague, he summoned the chief citizens before him. On making their appearance a great number of charges were brought against them, to which Sixtus of Ottersdorf, their spokesman, had nothing to reply upon the spot, except that he and his fellow citizens submitted themselves to the mercy of his Majesty. Verily, this was an age of feudalism in which the burgher's life was held cheap. They were imprisoned till they agreed to the surrender of all their most valuable privileges, after which they were released, with the exception of forty, especially reserved for punishment. While these proceedings were taking place at Prague, very similar ones were being enacted at certain other leading towns of the kingdom, notably Pilsen, Budweiss, and Aussig. At length a Diet was convened at Prague on 2nd of August, 1547, and was opened by Ferdinand with the execution of four of his chief prisoners. These unhappy men were to suffer for the crime of merely having upheld the privileges and constitution of their country. Two belonged to the order of knights, and two to that of the burghers. One of the latter, Jacob Fikar, was in the seventieth year of his

age: the circumstances of their execution are fully described by M. Tieftrunk in the work previously mentioned. It is a valuable monograph, and has luckily been translated into German, and thus has become more readily accessible to the reader. From the fate of these men Bohemia might well have melancholy forebodings about the future. The Diet obtained among the people the name of the bloody tribunal (*krvavy soud*). Of the prisoners who still remained in custody, many were publicly flogged, and others detained till they had paid heavy fines. On the occasion of these punishments, the executioner duly proclaimed, that the criminals had suffered for rebellion against their *hereditary* master.

In spite of their grievous political struggles, this seems to have been a period of great intellectual activity among the Bohemians, and many works were published in the Cech language, upon which German had as yet made no serious encroachments. In the year 1533 appeared the first Grammar by Benes Oplat. Verse writers abounded at the time, but no poet of eminence. Jungmann, in his history of Bohemian literature, a monument of erudition, gives us long lists of compositions of this kind, but they can only be interesting to the antiquarian and the philologist. Valuable works on natural history were produced; Herbals, among which may be mentioned the celebrated translation from the Latin of Andrew Matthiolus, by Thaddeus Hajek. This Matthiolus, or Matthioli (by birth an Italian), was the physician of the Archduke Ferdinand. A copy of the Herbal is shown among the treasures of the Museum at Prague: it is illustrated with excellent woodcuts. Many good works on law appeared; and there are huge masses of sermons, which we shall not disinter. Simon Lomnický (born in 1560) has left a great deal of poetry: he was the laureate of the Emperor Rudolph II., who did so much to make Prague a literary and artistic centre. He also saluted the unfortunate "Winter King," Frederick and his wife, the Princess Elizabeth of England, with a "carmen triumphale." The poet was severely wounded at the battle of the White Mountain, and spent the rest of his life in poverty; but the stories of his sufferings have probably been greatly exaggerated. Lomnický is at best but a poor writer; Jirecek says, with truth, that his compositions are but little better than rhymed prose.* His comic pieces and satires have merit; his didactic poem, "Instruction to a Young Nobleman," has some good sound sense in it, but the metre is unfortunate. His importance in the history of Bohemian literature is that he did much to improve the style of composition; perhaps

* "Anthology," vol. iii. p. 275.

we might best compare him with Lomonósov among the Russians. To this period belongs the Bohemian historian, perhaps more correctly *chronicler*, Hajek. But little is known of his life, except what may be gathered from his writings. He appears to have been a Roman Catholic priest, and to have died in the year 1553. Three years later the Order of Jesuits was introduced into Bohemia. His chronicle is a very interesting production, but, of course, cannot be expected to show much critical power: these were not the days of criticism. He incorporates the old legends of Cosmas and Dalimil, just as Cromer, the Polish historian, works up the stories of Popiel and other traditions into classical Latin. The work was very popular, and was soon translated into German. Interesting also is the journey of Christopher Harant into the Holy Land. A new edition was published by the Bohemian Literary Society in 1854. Of the sad fate of the author we shall have something to say shortly. Portions of this book have been translated and printed by Mr. Wratislaw in a little work; there is a freshness about the details which cannot fail to amuse the reader.* He set out on his journey on the 2nd of April, 1598, with some companions, all dressed as Friars of the Order of St. Francis. The description of Jerusalem and the Holy Places is very full, but the book is too much swollen by historical and geographical digressions. The amount of learning contained in it is great, and gives one a favourable idea of a Bohemian nobleman of the time. We had thought of making one or two extracts, but want of space prevents us, and we have some startling episodes to narrate.

Leaving literature, we must take a short view of the terrible events which had been occurring during the period. The religious and national liberties of Bohemia were now being fast undermined; the independent spirit of the proud little country was being broken by a series of treacheries and cruelties only too much in keeping with the shameful traditions of the House of Austria. The Emperor Ferdinand I. died in July, 1564, and was succeeded by his son, Maximilian II., a very tolerant man—Maximilian by Rudolph, a gloomy recluse, but patron of learning, who was finally driven from his dominions by his brother, Matthias, in 1612. We pass quickly by events which are well known to every student of modern history. Matthias confirmed the *Letters of Majesty*, which may be termed the Bohemian *Magna Charta*. Being himself without issue, he procured the election of his cousin, Ferdinand, Duke of Styria, as King of Bohemia and

* "The Adventures of a Bohemian Nobleman in Palestine and Egypt in the reign of Queen Elizabeth."

Hungary. On this occasion he was crowned at Prague, and confirmed and even enlarged the celebrated Letters of Majesty. We can guess the character of Ferdinand II. from his portrait, a deceitful, sullen-looking man, of the type of Philip II. of Spain, whom he so much resembled. We may say of him in the words of Victor Hugo—

“S'il secouait parfois sa torpeur de couleuvre,
C'était pour assister le bourreau de son œuvre.”

Soon afterwards he left the kingdom under the guardianship of two of his creatures, Slavata and Martinic. During his absence the fanatical monarch visited the shrine of Loretto, and there took a vow that he would purge the kingdom from heresy, even if it were at the risk of his life.

The insurrection broke out in consequence of an order having been received from the Emperor to shut up the new churches which the Protestants had erected at Brunau and Klostergrab; some members of this party, still a powerful one, led by Count Thurn, rushed to the room in the Hradschin, where the two deputies, Slavata and Martinic, were sitting with their secretary Fabricius. Claiming to be exercising an ancient custom, which has been euphemistically termed defenestration, they hurled the unfortunate men from the window into the castle ditch below, and strange to say, they escaped comparatively unhurt, having alighted on some soft mud, although the distance was about eighty feet. It was with this episode that the Thirty Years' War began, into the details of which it would be foreign to our purpose to go, as they are well known to the student of history. Ferdinand II., on the death of Matthias, was opposed by the Bohemian Diet, and Frederick, Elector Palatine, son-in-law of our James I, chosen in his place, but the cause of the “Winter King,” as he was sarcastically named, was annihilated at the battle of the White Mountain (Bile Hora), in 1620. This was, indeed, the Charonea of Cechian nationality. The wretched Frederick, who closed his days in contempt and poverty, was not present at the battle himself, but while it was taking place was giving a grand entertainment to the English ambassador. He displayed the greatest pusillanimity. The citizens conjured him to defend Prague, as they had still sufficient strength to support a siege, and were expecting a reinforcement of Hungarians, who were as anxious as themselves not to fall under the despotism of Ferdinand. Frederick, however, looked only to his own safety, and accompanied by his wife and children, and his Generals, Anhalt and Hohenlohe, and Count Thurn, with some of his principal adherents, he hastened from the scene of danger to Breslau, and from thence to Berlin. A solitary relic of him—his German Bible—is still preserved in the

Museum at Prague. The unfortunate citizens had now nothing left but to hope for the mercy of the conqueror. Three months elapsed without any severity being exercised upon them, and they began to hope that the storm had blown over. Many of those who were greatly compromised, were even so rash as to remain at Prague. Their expectations of safety were soon, however, rudely terminated; on the night of the 21st January, 1621, forty of the principal insurgents were arrested, and a terrible spectacle was enacted in the Market Place of the Old Town shortly afterwards. A mandate had been issued, summoning the absent and exiled nobles to appear at Prague, but, of course, they did not obey the order. They were accordingly proclaimed guilty of high treason, and their goods and lives were forfeited. On the 19th of June, 1621, the sentence was finally pronounced upon the prisoners. Twenty-seven were condemned to death by beheading; in some instances the hand or tongue was to be cut off first; those whose lives were spared were sentenced to exile or imprisonment for life, and forfeiture of property. The Great Square before the Town Hall, at Prague, may be truly characterised as one of the most picturesque places in Europe. A long list of the great historical events which have taken place upon it is given in the pleasant pages of M. Léger's book, cited at the commencement of our Article. We have ourselves always felt while crossing it as if it carried with it some of the associations of the Tower of London, the old Place de Grève at Paris, and the Lobnoé Miesto of Moscow. In 1621, on the 21st July, a scaffold was prepared here. Many of the men who suffered were the noblest and most eminent patriots of their country.* The first victim was Count Joachim Andrew Schlick; when he heard that his body was to be dismembered, and his quarters exposed, he merely remarked, "The loss of a funeral is a trifling matter"—echoing the *facilis jactura sepulchri* of the ancients. Before decapitation his right hand was cut off; he was followed by Wenceslaus Budovecz Budova, celebrated for his learning and piety.† Another victim was Christopher Harant, whose journey to the Holy Land has been already mentioned, the Christian Ulysses, as his admiring countrymen were wont to call him. Kaspar Kaplir, a veteran of eighty, had to be led to the scaffold; he was too stiff and weak to kneel without difficulty, and entreated the executioner to give him the stroke as soon as possible, as he could not remain long in such a position. Doctor Jan Jesenky, an emi-

* See Léger's "La Bohême," &c., p. 194, where an interesting picture (after an old engraving) is given of these horrors.

† See an account of his writings in Jirecek, vol. ii. p. 303.

ment physician, and rector of the University, had his tongue cut out, and was afterwards beheaded; his body was quartered, and his limbs affixed to conspicuous parts of the city. When he heard the sentence of dismemberment, he said, in a kind of prophecy, "the time will come when our heads will receive honourable interment." Such was eventually the case, for when the Elector of Saxony afterwards entered Prague with a victorious army, the heads of the martyrs were taken down from the Tower of the Bridge, and interred in the presence of a large number of people. Others who suffered were the burgomaster of the Old Town, Jan Kulhauer, Simon Susicky, and Nathaniel Vodnauksy, all men of position in their native city. The national language was the object of especial proscription,* as it seemed to embody Protestantism in its every fibre; the whole country was to be Germanised, and books in the Cech language were hunted up in all quarters and burned. The Jesuits were very active in these labours; one especially, Andrew Konias, probably the greatest book-burner whom the world has ever seen, boasted that he had been instrumental in destroying 60,000 volumes.

Bohemia, after these tragic events, sank into a deep lethargy. Her nationality was annihilated; the evils of Germanism had closed more and more completely round her. Carlyle has graphically told us that Germany came out of the Thirty Years' War brayed as in a mortar, but Bohemia suffered even more than her enemies. She also had the misfortune of seeing many of her most precious Slavonic manuscripts carried off. To this day it is necessary for the student of the Cech language and literature, as was done by Dobrovsky, to visit the libraries of Stockholm and Upsala, in order to complete his researches. It was in this way that the well-known Gothic manuscript of Ulfilus was taken to Sweden.

The Bohemian language was now banished from the Government offices and the more aristocratic society of Prague, but it still flourished in the remote country, where it seemed inseparably linked with the proscribed religion. "The ungenial despotism of Austria," as Professor Bryce has appropriately styled it, was now occupied in furtively whittling away the Bohemian Constitution and the Bohemian Nationality. The policy which was commenced by Ferdinand I. was further developed by Ferdinand II., and consummated by the battle of the White Mountain. At the commencement of this period Bohemia, although a small country,

* We are reminded of the penal laws passed against the Irish language, and the extirpation of the native population in Ulster—one of the most iniquitous things in all history.

yet with its *entourage* of mountains—let the reader glance at any good map to satisfy himself—it was well fitted for independence. It had an admirable Constitution, worthy of the most progressive age. Protestantism was widely spread, and it could boast a vigorous native language and a good native literature. At the end of the period, let us see what Ferdinand and his Jesuits had done. Let us see what Austria has been in her hour of triumph. Thirty thousand families who preferred exile to a change of religion had emigrated; among these 185 were noble, the others, merchants, mechanics, and labourers. In 1617, Bohemia had 732 cities and 34,700 villages; when Ferdinand II. died, in 1637, there remained 130 cities and 6000 villages; and its three millions of inhabitants were reduced to 780,000. It is with truth that Menzel, the German historian, says of Ferdinand II. that, like an aged hyæna, he expired amid mouldering bones and ruins.

“Tantum religio potuit suadere malorum.”

For almost 200 years, as previously stated, Bohemia was lost from the nationalities of Europe. A few patriotic men were not wholly wanting to their country, among these the Jesuit Balbiu, or Balbinus (1621–1688) did not forget that he was a Bohemian. He was Professor of Rhetoric at Prague, and author of “*Epitome Rerum Bohemicarum*, 1677,” also “*Miscellanea Rerum Bohemicarum*, 1680–1681.” His services to Bohemian literature were considerable, but his writings are in Latin. Many of the most celebrated authors were, however, at this time in exile, and of these no one has earned a greater renown than Jan Amos Komensky (frequently styled by the Latin form of his name, Comenius): This eminent man was born at Komna, in Moravia, and was the last Bishop of the Moravian Brethren. After the battle of the White Mountain, any further stay in Bohemia became impossible for him. He fled to Poland, which at that time had not altogether lost its glory of toleration.* Here he was joined by some Polish dissidents, and formed the nucleus of a religious society. In 1631, he published his “*Janua Linguarum Reserata*,” in which he developed a new theory of learning languages. This work became very popular, and has been frequently translated. He afterwards visited England and Sweden, and, in 1659, gave to the world his “*Orbis Pictus*,” which also enjoyed great reputation as an educational work. We may mention, by the way, that at this time England enrolled amongst its citizens another illustrious Bohemian, who made a permanent stay and died among us—

* See Valerian Krasinski's “*Historical Sketch of the Reformation in Poland*.” 2 vols. London, 1838.

Wenceslaus Hollar. No one familiar with the literature of the seventeenth century can be unacquainted with the works of this celebrated engraver, who illustrated so many books in his time, and whose "Ornatus Muliebris," &c., make us as familiar with the English of the time of Charles II. as the picturesque diary of Pepys, and the more stately composition of his contemporary, Evelyn. A short time ago, an interesting exhibition of the chief works of Hollar was held in London.

It was in such a pitiable state that Bohemian nationality languished till the time of the Emperor Joseph II., whose edicts containing sweeping reforms, ameliorated the condition of the Protestants, of whom a few were still to be found. He did mischief, however, by endeavouring to regulate all the different nationalities which composed his dominions by a kind of procrustean bed, and in nothing did he fail more than in his attempt to Germanise Bohemia. In 1793, a Professorship of the Bohemian Language and Literature was founded in the University of Prague. There was now a faint glimpse of the dawning of a better day. Enthusiastic patriots and scholars were at hand to forward the good work. One of the most efficient of these was Dobrovsky, who died in 1829. Although he did so much for the Bohemian language and Slavonic studies in general, with the exception of one or two trifling pamphlets, all his works are in German or Latin; indeed, as we have mentioned at the commencement of our Article, Dobrovsky despaired of the resuscitation of the Bohemian language. His opus magnum was his "Institutiones Linguae Slavicae Veteris Dialecti" which appeared at Vienna in 1822. This work still remains classical, although much of its learning has been superseded in the great advance of comparative philosophy, and the labours of Schleicher and Miklosich. In fact, Dobrovsky stands very much in the same position among Slavists as Horace Wilson among Sanskritists.* In philology, as in all other branches of human progress, we may remember the words of Göthe,

"Eine Bresche ist jeder Tag
Die viele Menschen erstürmen
Wer da auch fallen mag
Die Todten sich niemals thürmen."

Animated by the example of Dobrovsky, a band of scholars arose, whose labours have been of great and permanent value. A true disciple of the veteran was Paul Joseph Schafarik, a Slovak, born in North Hungary, in 1790. In 1826, he pub-

* We have not heard yet whether the correspondence of Dobrovsky has been published, which was said to be in course of preparation for the Press.

lished at Pesth his "History of the Slavonic Languages and Literature," a very valuable book, although now somewhat antiquated. It has, however, unquestionably formed the groundwork of all subsequent publications of the sort. Here the Slavonic languages are classified; the leading authors are grouped in distinct periods, and the book contains much valuable criticism, for Schafarik was both a scholar and a man of taste. But his great work was his "Slavonic Antiquities," more familiar to scholars in the Western part of Europe, in the German version of Klasopolski (under the pseudonym of Mosig von Aehrenfeld), published at Leipzig in 1844. This is still the chief authority for all Slavonic ethnology, but is full of curious learning, although his enthusiasm occasionally leads our author into strange statements, as when he finds the Wiltzen settled in our English Wiltshire. For a considerable period of his life Schafarik was head of a gymnasium at Neusatz, a Servian town in the south of Hungary. While resident there, he busied himself with the Servian language, and was the founder of a Servian literary society, which still flourishes. Schafarik returned to Prague in 1833, where he held the appointment of keeper of the University Library. He died there in 1861. In 1864 a posthumous work in German, by him, was published, a "History of South Slavonic Literature." Here we have lists of all the prominent names among the Croats, Servians, Slovenes, and Dalmatians; we have also an account of the books published at the Protestant Printing Press, at Tübingen, in the sixteenth century, in the Glagolitic character. Concerning this puzzling alphabet he wrote a learned disquisition, but there still remain many difficulties to be cleared up on the subject.

About the years 1818 to 1822, a Bohemian National Museum was formed to gather up the reliques, such as they were, of the former history of the country, fragments of their ancient literature, and other signs of their former independence. After having survived much ridicule, and more systematized opposition, the Bohemian Museum is still a flourishing institution.* A very fine Slavonic library has been collected here. Besides their Museum, the indefatigable Cechs established a literary society called the *Matice Ceska*, which has been the parent of many others in various Slavonic lands. A few years ago, one of those daughters, the *Matice of the Slovaks*, was arbitrarily suppressed by the Hungarian Government. This Society furnishes a fund whereby classical works in old Bohemian are reprinted, beside

* See "Geschichte des Museums des Königreiches Böhmen" Von W. Nebesky. Prague. 1868. The Museum buildings received a great many shots during the fighting at Prague in 1848, which could not all have been accidental.

bringing out productions of value by rising authors. The literary journal published in connection with the Society is a mine of information on all points connected with Slavonic studies. Here will be found articles by Schafarik, Palacky, Hattala, Schleicher, and others. So great a command had the last-mentioned scholar acquired over this difficult language that he composed in it with ease and elegance, and enriched the pages of the journal with several translations of the Ramayana into Cech.

The great developer of the theory of Pan Slavism, after the Croatian Krizanic,* who may be said to have been the founder of the doctrine, was Jan Kollar, by birth a Slovak, from Mosovec, where he first saw the light, July 29, 1793. Most of his life was spent as a Protestant clergyman at Pesth. In the year 1849 he was appointed Professor of Slavonic Archæology at Vienna. He died January 14th, 1852. His life glided peacefully on amid his sacred and literary duties, and was only varied by tours which he made to Italy and Southern Germany, in 1841 and 1844. Kollar has earned the reputation of being the most conspicuous Bohemian poet; before proceeding, however, to the "Slavy Dcera," which constitutes his chief claim to be remembered by his countrymen, a few words may be permitted on his antiquarian and philological labours. Throughout these there is a want of sobriety, which at the present time renders them quite valueless. They must be classed with the ebullitions of Dankowski, Rakowski, Wolanski, and others; in his Goddess Slava (Slava bohyně), he professes to establish a close relation between the Hindoos and the Slavs; in his "Staro-italia Slavjanska," he finds a connection between the ancient Etruscans, a people whose country has formed the exercising ground of so much philological inebriety, and the Slavs! The modern scholar may well smile at this madness, but we must not forget that opinions as wild were put forth in Dehnbaldson's Varronianus, a text-book in our English Universities, about twenty years ago, and the errors contained in it are probably not yet quite exploded. Some of the derivations contained in Kollar's "Rosprawy, o jmenach," &c. Essays on Slavonic names and antiquities, are of the strangest kind. In the same way in England we have had our Keltomaniacs, and that the race is not extirpated our literary journals of three or four years ago would show.

For two hundred years there had been no poets in Bohemia worthy of mention. The influence of the Zelenohorsky and Kratovsky manuscripts had rekindled the national feeling, and

* See Article in this Review, April, 1878, "Literature of the Servians and Croats."

under such circumstances Kollar commenced his career. However popular "The Daughter of Glory" may be among the author's countrymen, we doubt whether it will meet with a favourable reception among foreigners. The versification, in the first place, is tedious, as it consists of a series of sonnets in five books. The heroine of the poem is partly Slava, or the genius of the Slavonians personified, and partly an earth-born goddess, Mina, or Wilhelmina, the daughter of a Protestant minister of Jena, with whom Kollar had fallen in love during his career at the University. They were afterwards married, but although the poet had celebrated his love so passionately, the union was not a happy one.

As Dante performed his peregrinations under the guidance of Virgil, so does Kollar under the tutelage of Milek, the Slavonic god of Love. Kollar traverses all regions occupied by Slavs, either at the present time or formerly, and he is especially eloquent in those parts which have been settled by Germans, and where the original Slavonic element has almost been rooted out. The gods of the Slavonic mythology and the national heroes are copiously introduced. Some of the sonnets have been translated by Bowring in his "Cheskian Anthology," but very inaccurately; and from his mistakes, too minute to be particularised here, we cannot but feel that he has been working from a German version. In Francis Palacky, who died a few years ago, Bohemia found her historian. His work is tolerably familiar in this country, from a German translation. Palacky had many of the requirements of a true writer of history: his industry was indefatigable, and he was essentially a lover of truth. His book is written with a strong anti-Austrian bias; he was too much of a patriot not to see how his country had been *exploit * by the German element. Palacky frankly avowed in his latter days that he despaired of any permanent reconciliation between Austria and Bohemia. His work concludes with the election of Ferdinand I. in 1527, the deathblow of Cech independence.

Of Hanka we have already spoken in connection with the *Kratodvorsky Rukopis*: it is a pity that such a cloud hangs over his name, which we are afraid rather grows denser than is dissipated, since the discovery of the forged glosses of the *Mater Verborum*. He did good service by editing some of the early Bohemian manuscripts, but his labours have been superseded. Philology has made great strides since his time, and Hanka was by no means a profound scholar. His original productions consist of a few trifling songs of little worth. He died, as custodian of the National Library, in 1861. In Jungmann (who died in 1847) the Bohemians found an excellent lexicographer: his "Bohemian-German Dictionary" is a standard work, and occupies the same

position with regard to Cech as Linde's labours do to the Polish. We have also an excellent history of the national literature from his pen, of which a second edition was published from the fund of the Bohemian Museum in 1849. It is as minute in respect to every Bohemian composition down to the time of its publication, as Allibone's gigantic production, the more ample material explaining the far greater extent of the latter. Besides these tasks, Jungmann executed a good translation of Milton's "Paradise Lost," and created a correct style of blank verse in the Bohemian language, for which it is well adapted, as shown by the translation of Shakspeare "by several hands," which has just been completed.

The only other poet of much eminence among the Bohemians is Celakowsky, who died in 1852. His inspiration seems to have come chiefly from national songs, and he was happy in seizing their manner. He published "The Echo of Russian Songs" (*Ohlas Pisni Ruskych*), and also "The Echo of Bohemian Songs" (*Ohlas Pisni Ceskych*); his only other production which enjoys any celebrity is "The Rose with a Hundred Leaves" (*Ruze Stolista*), which has many charming verses. His work, entitled "Words of Wisdom of the Slavonic Race in Proverbs," is an invaluable collection, and we must remember that in this species of literature the Slavs are especially rich. The recent "History of Bulgaria," by K. J. Jirecek, is a useful work, especially as our information about this people was previously so scanty.

Before closing our Article, we must find space for a few words on the Slovaks, who are a people living in the north-western corner of Hungary, and numbering about 1,958,825. They are closely connected with the Bohemians, and their language, contemptuously treated by the latter as a dialect, is interesting to philologists as exhibiting an earlier form of Cech, which they used for a long time for such literary works as they put forth. This lasted till the close of the Eighteenth Century, when Arnolak published the first "Slovakian Grammar.* The attempt to form a new literary language was, perhaps, on some grounds to be deplored. The Slovakian has to struggle between Magyar, German, and Bohemian influences. The Magyar is anxious to depress the Slav, and to spread his language throughout the so-called kingdom of Hungary. He has in a great measure succeeded; the Slovakian nobility are now almost entirely Magyarised, to take Kossuth alone as an instance. On the other hand, German is gaining greatly throughout the Hungarian dominions, in spite of all attempts to limit its area. Lastly, the Bohemian

* Presburg, 1790. Since this time have appeared the works of Dianiska and Viktorin.

resents the attempt at separation by the Slovak, and considers him as weakening the Slavonic cause by his division. Some years ago, a work was published by the Cech Literary Society, entreating the Slovaks to abandon their attempt, and citing a formidable list of authorities against them.

Of Slovakian authors, two or three seem to merit attention. The poet Holly has gained the most celebrity among his countrymen. His poems are in the heavy classical style, and he has generally made use of classical metres. We have an Epic in twelve books on Svatopluk, and the Cyrilla-Methodiada in six. He died in 1840, just as the great collision between Hungary and the House of Hapsburg was about to commence. Other poets who have gained a reputation are Hodza, Chalupka, and Sladkovic. How long this small nationality will be able to resist Magyarisation is doubtful. If they unite with their brother Bohemians they are more likely to be successful. According to a recent Article in the "Bohemian Literary Journal" (Casopis) by Professor Sembera, the number of Cechs, including Moravians and Slovaks, amounts to 7,581,187.

—1838—

ART. VI.—PRINCE BISMARCK.

1. *Bismarck in the Franco-German War.* Authorised Translation from the German of Dr. MORITZ BUSCH. London: Macmillan & Co. 1879.
2. *Études sur l'Empire d'Allemagne.* Par J. COHEN. Paris: Calmann Lévy. 1879.

and half of the nineteenth century opened with the prospects for all believers in that respectable system of European politics which was based on the monarchical principle, the Christian religion, and the "union of Conservative interest." Revolutionary storms had risen and fallen again, and the Continental Governments were busily and carefully restoring the *status quo*. By the end of the year 1850 France had become quite ashamed of her little Socialistic experiment; and the relations between the country, the Assembly, and the President Bonaparte, seemed to promise well for the speedy restoration of Monarchical Government. Spain and Portugal were almost reconciled to the mild sway of their more or less legitimate sovereigns. Pope Pius IX. had re-entered Rome with considerable pomp; French and Austrian bayonets were at hand to protect the Holy Father against his devoted subjects; and the unprin-

cipl'd ambition of Piedmont had received a salutary check. In Germany the triumph of Conservatism was almost equally complete. The Parliament of Erfurt had gone the way of the Parliament of Frankfort; German unity was no longer to be made the pretext for revolutionary disturbance; and Austria, freed from all her Constitutional vows, and firmly planted in the good old ways of Metternich by the strong hand of Felix von Schwarzenberg, resumed her position of rightful supremacy. Prussia was prepared to do penance in sackcloth and ashes for the boundless, numberless indiscretions of her king, Friedrich-Wilhelm IV. The Manteuffel Ministry at Berlin was hampered by the forms of a new and somewhat complicated Constitution; but it was humbly anxious to give evidence of its loyalty to Conservative principles and Austrian supremacy. Its loyalty took the form of the once notorious Compromise of Olmütz, signed on the 29th November, 1850, by which Prussia, on the demand of Austria, agreed to withdraw the troops which she had advanced for the protection of the popular party in Hesse-Cassel, and to abandon her whilom *protégés* to the tender mercies of the Elector and his Austrian patrons.

When the news of this Compromise arrived in Berlin, the Liberal majority of the House of Deputies was roused to fury. They could not turn the Ministry out, because no such power was given them by the written Constitution; but they spoke their minds freely enough, and there were few, even among the Conservatives, who ventured to defend the Government. Almost alone in that sorrowful and indignant assembly the deputy Von Bismarck came forward to speak with hearty approval of the Compromise as another blow struck in the cause of right against the Revolution. His speech gained him the thanks of the king, and in no long time a more solid reward was to follow. In the spring of 1851 the Diet—the real old Diet of 1815—resumed its sittings at Frankfort as if '48 had been nothing more than a holiday. Bismarck was offered the post of Prussian representative in the Diet, accepted the offer with a promptitude which rather alarmed his royal master, and set off for Frankfort in the month of May with the rank of Secretary of Legation, from which, in the following August, he was duly advanced to the position of Plenipotentiary. Such was the entry upon the diplomatic scene of the man who was to exclude Austria from Germany, to found national unity on the basis of universal suffrage, to break up "the solidarity of Conservative interests," and to make the brother of Friedrich-Wilhelm IV. an Emperor. The contrast between the Bismarck of 1849 and the Bismarck of to-day is certainly striking; but like other historical antitheses it loses something of its point on a complete view of the facts. We propose to restate the main

facts of the German Imperial Chancellor's personal and political life in such a way as to exhibit, so far as existing knowledge permits, the natural development of those schemes whose execution has been such as to justify us in applying to him the words of a biographer of Friedrich of Hohenstaufen: "Stupor mundi, et immutator mirabilis."

Bismarck (that is Bishop's Mark) on the Biese, is or was a stronghold in the Alt Mark of Brandenburg, which gave its name in very early times to one of those knightly families by whose persistent valour the region of the Elbe was held in the name of German Christianity against the heathen Wends. The Von Bismarcks had their reward in lauds held on feudal terms under the Bishops of Havelberg and others: in the fourteenth century they were even "schlossgesessen," or possessed of a castle, at Burgstall by the Elbe. Nicolás or Claus von Bismarck, the first Castellán of his house, was a man of some note in his time; commandant of the episcopal forces of Magdeburg, head of the aristocratic Guild of Merchant Tailors in the then flourishing city of Stendal, and the stoutest champion of the independence of the Marks against the encroaching ambition of the Kaiser, Karl IV. His descendants were duly enrolled among the nobility of the Alt Mark, but their fortunes never rose very high. Burgstall passed into the hands of the Elector in exchange for the less desirable lands of Crevese and Schönhausen—an exchange which seems to indicate a descent from the rank of nobles to that of squires. There was no falling off, however, in the fighting quantities of the Bismarcks; and they bore their full share in the wars by which the Markgraf of Brandenburg became, in the fulness of time, the King of Prussia. Only one diplomatist is mentioned in the family records—Ludolf August, who forsook the standard of Friedrich-Wilhelm I. to take service in Russia, attached himself to the party of Biron, and appeared for a time under the auspices of that favourite of fortune and of Anna Ivanovna, as Russian Envoy in London. Ludolf was of the younger branch of the Schönhausen Bismarcks; the elder branch was represented in his time by "the Colonel," a gallant old soldier and toper, a man after Friedrich-Wilhelm's own heart. Charles Alexander, the colonel's son, was of a peaceable and literary turn, and would fain have been a diplomatist; but this the great Friedrich would by no means permit. Taught by his own experience that there was only one career for Prussian gentlemen, Charles Alexander put his four sons into the army. To the youngest and least exalted in military rank of the four, Captain Von Bismarck of the Guards, the domain of Schönhausen was assigned in the partition of the family estates. In the gloomy year of 1806 the Captain took to wife a daughter of Dr. Anastatius Meuken, of the Prussian Civil

Service ; but the young bride (she was only sixteen) was scarcely settled in the old mansion by the Elbe when she had to fly to the forest with her husband to escape the advancing army of Ney. They show you still at Schönhausen the cracks in the library door where some French soldiers who were pursuing the youthful Frau Capitänin drove their bayonets through the panels. In spite of this ill omened opening, the Captain's married life was fairly prosperous : of his children three survived to maturity, and are still living—Bernhard, born in 1810, who has spent his life in the Prussian Civil Service ; Otto, born on the 1st April, 1815, who is Chancellor of the German Empire ; and Malwina, born in 1827, who is the wife of Oscar von Arnim.

When Otto was a year old the family removed to Kniephof, in Pomerania, where the Captain had inherited an estate. From the woods and fields of that sombre and thinly-peopled region the first impressions of the future statesman were derived ; and when he was sent away to a famous institute in Berlin at the age of six his heart yearned after Kniephof so fondly that the sight of horses in a field caused him to weep. He seems to have been an engaging child, easily managed by sensible people, as strong-willed children usually are. He was not a precociously accomplished schoolboy ; but he did his work well and quickly, and entered into all kinds of sport when he was at home with a zest which delighted his father. The Captain seems to have been a humorous gentleman, hard of hearing and a trifle stiff in manner, much addicted to field sports and especially to the shooting of foxes, which is the pastime of gentlemen in Pomerania—so strangely do moral principles vary with the longitude. His lady, on the other hand, was a person of some pretensions to culture, and liked to spend the winter in Berlin, where one might converse with Schleiermacher and other ornaments of the "Lawless Club" which then dictated the opinions of "Athens on the Spree." Her ambition was to make her boy Otto a diplomatist : and with this view he was sent, in 1831, to the University of Göttingen. Much to the good lady's grief, the promising school-boy developed into a most unruly student, who fought duels, drank beer, smoked incessantly, and was never seen in any of the lecture-rooms of Georgia-Augusta. After a brief period of nominal attendance on lectures at Berlin, a place was found for him in one of the Courts, that he might acquire a competent knowledge of law. In the course of a few years he passed through situations of the same kind at Aachen, Potsdam, and Greifswald, served twice in the army, and attended an Agricultural College. These unsettled courses came to an end with his mother's death in 1839. Under the rule of the Captain and his literary wife, the family estates had not prospered ; the brothers

Bernhard and Otto had to set themselves to introduce some order into the management of the Pomeranian property. Otto was settled at Kniephof, and soon hard at work; but his student frolics were not over. "Mad Bismarck" became the talk of the circle of Naugard; and many were the tales told of his sporting feats, of the distances he would ride to appear "like an eagle in a dove-cot" at some mild *café dansant*, but especially of the bachelor-parties at Kniephof, where the guests were kept up half the night drinking porter-and-champagne, and listening to interminable political discussions (in the course of which Bismarck would start the most atrociously liberal theories), and roused in the morning by the sound of miscellaneous pistol practice in their bedrooms. It was a time of stormy activity with the young squire—a time of disappointed love, as it would seem, and of unsatisfied, ill-regulated ambition. He was the victim of strange fancies; at one moment he said he was consumptive and would die young; then he would declare his intention to emigrate and make a fortune in India; and the next time we hear of him he is reading the works of Spinoza in the full persuasion that he understands them.

This period of storm and stress came to a natural close when, on his father's death in 1845, Bismarck became the owner of Schönhausen. Two years after this event, he is already "Dyke-Captain" of his district, knight's deputy to the Provincial Diet of Merseburg and safely betrothed (not without misgivings on the part of the lady's parents) to the Fräulein Johanna von Puttkamer. Before he led his bride to the altar, Bismarck had already made his first appearance as a politician. Under the ordinances issued by Friedrich-Wilhelm IV. in February, 1847, a meeting of the United Diets of the kingdom was called at Berlin; and the Squire of Schönhausen was one of the brilliant audience who attended in the White Saloon, to listen to one of the most extraordinary king's speeches on record. Dispensing with manuscript and with ministerial assistance, his Majesty delivered an eloquent harangue, in which he alluded in general terms to the repeated promises of a Representative Constitution given by his lamented father, asserted that the convocation of the United Diets was a fulfilment of those promises, and wound up with the expression of an earnest hope that the right worthy princes, nobles, knights, and burghers, before him would not take advantage of his kindness or attempt to play the part of "what are called representatives of the people." When the Lower Chamber began to debate upon the address to be made in answer to this speech, the Liberal majority declared that the United Diets could not be regarded as a true Parliament, and put forward a programme including electoral reform, ministerial responsibility,

and Parliamentary control of the national expenditure. Among the most uncompromising opponents of these moderate demands was the deputy, Von Bismarck. The supposed "Liberalism" which had terrified his neighbours in the circle of Naugard had never been more than a whim; his Junker blood boiled at the notion that Liberal professors and bankers were to lay down the law for their social superiors; he plunged at once into the fray to defend the sacred principle of personal authority against the rising pretensions of democracy; and his maiden speech gave him at once a prominent place among the debaters of the Diets. Liberal orators were plentiful in those days; but the wisdom of Prussian Conservatism was inarticulate enough to satisfy Mr. Carlyle. "We are not even *bad* speakers," was the mournful remark of one faithful supporter of divine right. Now the deputy, Von Bismarck, could speak—not gracefully or persuasively, perhaps, but intelligibly and forcibly; and his personal remarks about honourable members who criticised or interrupted him made both the ears of him that heard them to tingle. His advent was hailed with joy by the Manteuffels and their friends; he became a sort of leader of the King's party, one to whom Conservatives looked for direction in the troubles of '48 and the eventful years that followed. Bismarck helped to found the famous Cross Party, and in the columns of its organ, the *Kreuzzeitung*, he was always ready to defend every article of the Conservative programme—personal government, intimate Union of Church and State, exclusion of Jews from office, support of the monarchical principle throughout Europe, and supremacy of Austria in Germany as the representative of that principle, and the bulwark against democracy. He rejoiced over the extinction of the liberties of Cracow; he approved the intervention of Russia in Hungary; and he thought that the inhabitants of the Elbe Duchies should be forcibly brought into proper subjection to their lawful sovereign the King of Denmark.

English sympathy then, as now, was with the cause of popular government, not with the haughty caste of squires and nobles whose orator was the deputy, Von Bismarck. But there was something to be said on the Junker side of the question. German Liberalism has never shown any great capacity for action, and the Prussian Constitutionalists of that day had but a vague conception of the means by which a system of personal government tempered by bureaucracy was to be brought under parliamentary control. Moreover, they were troubled with European ambitions, which aggravated the incoherency of their politics. They were keenly sensitive to the awkwardness of their country's figure on the map; and the unity of Germany was the theme of their nightly speeches and the vision of their daily dreams. If

Bismarck had been in the habit of advising the Liberals for their own good, as he sometimes does nowadays, he might have said to them:—"If you want to make the country great, you must leave off this talk about the glorious principles of 1688 and 1789, and accept the plain facts of your own history. The Prussian Government is neither parliamentary nor popular; it is, in law and in fact, a divine-right monarchy. If Prussia is to take the lead of Germany, there are only two ways of it—the revolution, which you fear as much as we do, or the loyal acceptance of a strong government. Keep your Constitution by all means, but let your Chambers confine themselves to offering advice, and leave the army and the taxes to those whose business it is to govern. You have ambition, but you have no power; be content to wait, and don't go into patriotic transports about Austrian dictation till we are strong enough to resist it. An army must have its head-quarters somewhere; ours are, for the time being, at Vienna; and if Berlin sets the example of insubordination, every member of the Confederation will set up a policy of his own, and Germany will fall to pieces like Poland."

We have recorded already the characteristic incident which led to the appointment of the deputy, Von Bismarck, to represent Prussia in the Diet. He remained at Frankfort nearly eight years; exchanged his post there for the Prussian Embassy at St. Petersburg in 1859; from St. Petersburg he was removed in the summer of 1862 to Paris; and from Paris he was recalled in the autumn of the same year to take the supreme command of affairs at Berlin. These eleven years of diplomatic activity have furnished the world with an immense number of more or less authentic anecdotes, which the picturesque historian has no difficulty in arranging so as to illustrate his conception of Bismarck's character and policy. For our present purpose it is almost sufficient to record that he wrote a great many able despatches, disposed of the business entrusted to him in a thoroughly workmanlike style, travelled assiduously in the intervals of his diplomatic employment, made the acquaintance of the men and women whom a diplomatist should know, and established his reputation in half the capitals of Europe as an excellent companion and a first-rate shot. From the letters which he dashed off in the course of his rapid journeys we get the impression that he enjoyed life immensely, whether he was bathing in the Rhine by moonlight, tramping over swamp and boulders with a gun in his hand, or combating the doubts of a sceptical friend over a bottle and a box of cigars. In his letters to his wife he touches more than once on the subject of religion, and speaks with evidently sincere thankfulness of the share

which she and her children have had in teaching him his duty to God and man, with equally sincere penitence of the mad days when he heard the chimes at midnight and drank porter-and-champagne with his friends at Kniephof. But as often as he has occasion to speak of politics, the joyous and assured tone changes to a tone of disappointment, impatience, and scorn. He chafes and jibes at the nullities of diplomacy, the pedantic stupidity of his colleagues in the Diet, the timid formality of the "wigs of Potsdam." In the hours of depression which followed a severe illness in 1860 he spoke of giving up his appointment, of retiring to Schönhausen, of applying for the Embassy at Berne. The reason of this discontented temper was not any personal grievance; it is to be found in the policy, or rather want of policy, of the Prussian Government.

If we are right in our reading of Bismarck's early opinions, his devotion to Austria had never been so absorbing as to exclude the hope that his own country might one day become her successful rival in Germany. It was better to submit to Prince Schwarzenberg than to accept independence, or even empire, at the hands of a Revolutionary Assembly; but the true policy of Prussia was to submit only for the time—to strengthen her position in the Confederation, to increase her military resources, and to take every opportunity of asserting her position as one of the Great Powers of Europe. The actual course of Prussia from 1851 to 1859 was diametrically the reverse of that which Bismarck wished her to follow. The Crimean War brought her a splendid opportunity of making her influence felt, and she behaved so foolishly and pusillanimously as to run the risk of being struck from the list of Great Powers, and relegated to the rank of Hanover. It was plainly her interest to make the Zollverein a purely German association, from which Austria should be excluded; but she was content to follow, in a matter which affected the material interests of all the secondary States, a policy of half-measures and delays. When the Italian War of 1859 broke out, Prussia was actually attempting to mobilise, with the intention of coming to the assistance of her rival; and if the intention was not carried out, it was only because she discovered in time the countless defects of her military organisation. All these mistakes were noted by Bismarck with the utmost disgust. He went to the Diet a partisan of the Austrian alliance; but he meant it for an alliance between equals, and he had no desire to sit there to be insulted and out-manœuvred, and looked down upon by the Cabinet of Vienna. There was, he thought and said, a radical vice in the relations of Prussia to the Confederation, which must be cured, if necessary, *ferro et igne*. But to carry out this programme of Bismarck's, Prussia

wanted three great instruments, not one of which did she possess when she missed her opportunity in 1859. She wanted a king—for Friedrich-Wilhelm had become incapable, and his brother was only Prince Regent. She wanted an army—for her whole military system was old-fashioned and ineffective. And she wanted a Minister, free from Conservative prejudice and Liberal weakness, who should repair the errors and establish the power of his country, *ferro et igne*.

On New Year's Day, 1861, died at Potsdam the unlucky king, Friedrich-Wilhelm IV. His brother and successor was exactly the king for whom the party of action was praying—not a man of genius, by any means, but an upright, sensible soldier, devoted to his profession, and conscientiously opposed to Parliamentary Government. He was at pains to indicate his belief in the divine right of his office by going to be crowned at Königsberg—a ceremony which no Prussian sovereign had thought it necessary to repeat since the occasion when Sophie Charlotte refreshed herself with that pinch of snuff so fondly commemorated by Mr. Carlyle. The next step to Prussia's greatness was to strengthen the army, a work which the King was eager to set on foot; but here the difficulties of the Government began. Their proposal to increase the number of soldiers under arms, to strengthen the staff, and to increase the period of compulsory service, was treated by the Lower House of the Prussian Diet as a direct attack on popular liberties, and an insult to the Landwehr militia, associated in the popular memory with the glories of 1813. Angry debates took place, in which the Ministry lost ground daily; and a "penal dissolution," in the spring of 1862, afforded conclusive proof that the fears of the Liberal deputies were shared by the country. On the 23rd September of that year the new House of Deputies rejected the Budget for 1863 by 308 votes against 11; next day it was announced that Herr von der Heydt had resigned, and that his place had been taken by Herr von Bismarck-Schönhausen. On the 13th October the Chambers were dismissed with a curt intimation that the refusal of supplies by the Lower House would compel his Majesty to govern for a time without their assistance. In the hour of need the heaven-born Minister had appeared, and Prussia was fairly on the way to greatness. Bismarck had chosen his own time to descend into the parliamentary arena; he might have been Minister months before, but he had waited till the question of the hour should come to a crisis. He deliberately staked his own head and his master's crown on his ability to govern without a Parliament, and went forward cheerfully with his work. The incidents of the political campaign which followed may be briefly recapitulated. Three Budgets in

three successive years were presented by the Ministry, rejected by the House of Deputies, and approved *en bloc* by the House of Peers. Taxes were raised, and large sums spent on the public services without authority, except such as was given, according to the letter of the Constitution, by the last Budget legally passed. Addresses from the Chamber and petitions from every town in the kingdom were answered in the briefest manner by the Minister-President, while a deputation of half a dozen noblemen and civil servants to express confidence in the Government was received by the King in person with every mark of favour. Deputies were indicted at the instance of the Minister of Justice for words spoken in the Chamber. Newspapers hostile to the Ministry were suppressed, and foreign journals stopped at the frontiers. A modest and temperate letter of remonstrance, addressed to the King, was like to cost the Crown Prince his commission in the Army. Never since the days of Strafford had the system of "thorough" been more energetically carried out in a free country.

Prince Bismarck has since published a collection of the speeches which he delivered at this period in the two Houses of the Prussian Legislature;* and from them we may gather a fairly correct notion of the case for the Crown, as it was stated by himself and his colleagues. He takes his stand on the letter of the Constitution: on the prerogative right of the king to choose his Ministers, to make peace and war, and to provide for the safety of the country. He admits that in England such rights are exercised with constant regard to the wishes of those who represent the people; he denies that the example of a country where respect for law is universal, where the Constitution is the growth of ages, and divine right a thing of the past, has any application to Prussia, where the Constitution is only twelve years old, and the principle of divine right the one safe-guard against lawlessness and democracy. He refuses to enter into elaborate argument in support of this view of the law; his utterances are all in the same brief, clear, autocratic style; his contempt for his audience not unfrequently takes a humorous form—as, for instance, in the well-known passage where he undertakes to give the Opposition, flushed with its recent victory in the elections,

* He was a member of the Upper House; but Ministers had the right usually reserved to them by Continental Constitutions, of speaking in explanation and defence of their measures in either House. Bismarck maintained that it was the duty of the President of the Chamber to make and keep a House for him when he wanted to speak, and to refrain from interrupting or calling him to order. The same view was put forward by the War Minister, Von Roon, on the memorable occasion when Herr Boeckm-Doffa "put on his hat."

arithmetical proof that a majority of deputies may represent a minority of electors. Bismarck is usually candid, even to audacity, in communicating his plans to all and sundry; but he never condescended, during those three years, to give the House of Deputies any insight whatever into the vast scheme which he was carrying out for the aggrandisement of Prussia. We cannot help thinking that his parliamentary battles occupied but a small share of the Minister-President's thoughts. He had taken office with a vague hope of bringing the deputies to order, and so making them co-operate in his designs; that hope vanished as soon as he found himself facing the compact ranks of the Opposition; and he was now resolved to maintain his defiant attitude till they should return to what he told them was their duty.

Meantime the campaign for the rights of Prussia in Germany had been begun with one of those master-strokes of candour which have been so highly lauded by Prince Bismarck's admirers. In December, 1862, the Cabinet of Vienna was invited to consider the unsatisfactory position of Prussia in the Confederation, and the pressing necessity of some change in her relations to the Confederates in general, and to Austria in particular. The Cabinet of Vienna was not alarmed; plans for the reconstruction of Germany were in fashion just then, and it was only natural that Prussia should have her plan, as Beust and King Ludwig of Bavaria had theirs. To be sure Prussia was arming, but that was only in case the Chamber should have to be put down with the strong hand. There was no cause for immediate alarm; and in the last resort all the States of Germany could be trusted to stand by Austria. Such was the happy security of mind which led the Austrian Government to look quietly on while Bismarck made the first great point in the game. The "unarmed agitation" which had been proceeding for some two years in Poland, developed into open insurrection in January, 1863. Austria, certain of the loyalty of her own Polish subjects, was inclined to sympathise with the unfortunate rebels, and saw no reason to recede from her treaty obligation to see that Russia carried out her repeated promises of clemency and reform. Prussia regarded Polish affairs from a very different point of view; there was, or seemed to be, real danger that the insurrectionary movement would extend to her own subjects in Posen; and the Bismarck Ministry concluded an armed Convention with Russia, by which either Power was authorised to cross the frontier of the other in case the movements of the insurgents should render such a step necessary. This Convention had, as it happened, no actual influence on events in Poland; but it was interpreted by all Europe as a declaration that Prussia, alone

among the Great Powers, abandoned the Poles and sanctioned all the acts of Russia. It is not a grateful task to apologise for either party to the bargain; but it should not be forgotten that the case was not so one-sided as many Liberals then imagined. Russia had made great efforts to satisfy the Poles; she had witnessed the failure of those efforts with sincere regret; and she was deeply offended by the condemnation heaped upon her by Western Governments, who saw only her faults and took no account of her difficulties. The sympathy of Prussia was therefore well timed; and it was a sympathy pregnant with great results. Austria stood aloof while Russia and Prussia joined hands over the extinguished nationality of the Poles; and Bismarck had secured a friend, if not an ally, in his scheme of conquest.

The next step was to raise, or rather to aggravate, the chronic question of the Constitution of the German Confederation in such a way as to shake the foundation of the Austrian supremacy: and here we touch on two subjects to which it would be impossible within our present limits to do anything like justice. Nothing but a close comparison of dates and documents can give an adequate notion of the consummate skill which Bismarck displayed in dealing with the reconstruction of Germany, and the Schleswig-Holstein imbroglio. We can only take a few fixed points to show how the innumerable items of the confused account were entered in the annual balance-sheets of the Bismarck Ministry. By the end of 1863 Austria's fifth project of Federal Reform was going the way of its four predecessors; and the Congress of Princes had ridden through Frankfort in a style to satisfy all lovers of the glorious antique. The Diet had interfered on behalf of German rights in Holstein and Lauenburg; Denmark was vainly appealing to England and France, while Austria and Prussia had discovered a right of interference in Schleswig, which they were preparing to exercise jointly, to the bewilderment and alarm of civilised mankind.* By the end of 1864 the Conference of London had ended in failure; the Duke of Augustenburg and his highly questionable rights had passed into the limbo of things unrecognised; the Syndics of the Prussian Crown had benevolently conferred on the King of Denmark the right to part with the Duchies; Austria's clients

* Austria joined in the proposal to interfere in Schleswig (rejected by the Diet, January 22, 1864), partly because she was afraid to allow Prussia to net alone, and partly because the failure of her projects of Federal Reform had disposed her to put a slight upon the Diet, and to assert her own freedom of action. At this time both Powers would probably have been satisfied with the establishment of the Duke of Augustenburg in Schleswig-Holstein—Prussia hoping to keep the Duke under her own influence.

in the Diet were horror-struck at the iniquitous partnership with Prussia; and the Berlin deputies, who were the victims of a sentimental attachment to his *soi-disant* Majesty of Augustenburg, had suffered another insult at the hands of the Minister-President. Upon these joint gains of 1864 ensues the inevitable quarrel between the allied invaders as to their respective shares in the spoil. Austria, threatened and lectured by turns from Berlin, coldly regarded from Paris and St. Petersburg, sincerely desirous of peace at almost any price, is driven from concession to concession till at last, by the Treaty of Gastein (14th August, 1865), Prussia is put in full possession of Schleswig and Lauenburg, and entrusted with the "defence" of every point of strategic importance in Holstein. And at the moment when the Convention was signed Bismarck was at no pains to conceal his opinion that peace was not to last much longer. "War is inevitable," he said, "and one battle in Bohemia will decide the campaign." Meantime the Diet had condemned the Treaty; and the influence of Austria among the German States was less than it had ever been.*

It would be difficult to find a historical parallel to the position of Bismarck in the spring of 1866. He had gained as yet only a questionable and contested footing in the Duchies; he was on the verge of war with three considerable Powers; and he was the most unpopular man in Germany. His treatment of the deputies had brought Prussia almost into a state of revolution; and it was very generally believed throughout Germany that he was prepared to purchase the support of France in the approaching struggle by giving up the left bank of the Rhine. It was one of the dangers of his audacious scheme that he was firmly resolved to make no such bargain. If he did, Germany would never forgive him; and he was now preparing to change, almost at one stroke, the whole outward character of his policy, and to reveal the Imperial aims which had been masked by the Prussian policy of the last three years. On the 24th March, 1866, he issued the circular in which all believers in German unity were invited to look to Prussia as their leader. It was not to any Congress of Princes that this appeal was to be made, but to the people; and Bismarck, the destroyer of Constitutional Government in Prussia, was about to tear a leaf out of the book of Cavour. On the 9th April the Prussian representative in the Diet demanded the convocation of a German Parliament to be

* Bismarck declares that he threw Count Bleme off his guard at Gastein by recklessly losing 200 thalers to him at piquet; some wisecrack having told the Austrian negotiator that a man's diplomatic ability might be estimated according to his piquet play. Perhaps the Hungarian Constitutional question was the true cause of Austria's readiness to give way.

elected by universal suffrage to consider the question of Federal Reform. At this time Bismarck was not only in close co-operation with the Italian Government; he was carrying on an active correspondence with Kossuth and Mazzini. It was natural enough that he should; for he was going to war, and in war any ally is welcome. But his Radical manifestos and intrigues were not suddenly adopted temporary expedients; they were intended to prepare the way for the new Confederation, which he already saw rising on the ruins of the old. If his object had been merely popularity for the moment, this last and boldest move in the game would have been a mere failure; for when the war broke out the name of Bismarck was more odious than ever, and the Prussian soldiers marched away into Bohemia cursing under their breath the Minister who had sent them into a fratricidal war. But when the war was over those declarations, from which Prussia could not recede, bound her to pursue her Imperial mission; and the victory of Königgrätz was not turned to account merely for the extension of the domains of the Hohenzollerns, but for the establishment, in the name of nationalities and popular rights, of a real German Confederation, out of which might be born in due time the German Empire of the future. A bolder game was never played by any of the masters of statecraft; and we need not wonder that when the moment came for the throwing of the "iron dice of destiny," the man who had staked his country's fortunes on the event should have given signs of profound excitement and anxiety.* When Bismarck paced up and down his garden at Berlin on the night of the 14th June, 1866, he knew that the very existence of Prussia depended on the swiftness and completeness of her military success; and there were few who believed at that moment that her success was even possible.

The unforeseen happened, as usual; and the seven days' war revealed at once to the victorious nation the secret of their great Minister's policy. Austria was to be excluded from Germany; and Prussia, strengthened by the "incorporation" of two or three of her jealous neighbours, was to enter upon a grander and more satisfactory national life than she had hitherto enjoyed. The spirit of the Great Friedrich was aroused in the breast of King William; and the kindly old man, who had gone into the war so reluctantly, was now too intent upon the territorial interests of his kingdom to waste much sympathy on the fate of his brother of Hanover. When it was announced that the head of

* It was on the 8th May, 1866, that young Blind made his attempt on the Minister-President's life. Bismarck is said to have taken his escape as a signal from heaven that his work was to be accomplished.

the new Confederation had entered into a close alliance with the most important of the Southern States—an alliance which conclusively negatived any notion of a corrupt understanding with France—the joy and pride of the people were at their height. At such a moment the little difficulty which still existed between the Government and the Chamber could not be allowed to interfere with the general rejoicings. A month after Königgrätz the King, addressing the two Houses of the Diet and speaking with the modesty which becomes a victor, acknowledged that the public expenditure had lacked for three years past a legal basis, and asked for a Bill of Indemnity to cover the acts of his Ministers. The refusal of the Bill at such a time would have been a lesson in Constitutional Government which even a Hohenzollern and a conqueror could hardly have failed to appreciate. But such a course would have savoured of ingratitude; the Berlin crowd was cheering itself hoarse for Count Bismarck (he had been Count since the Treaty of Gasteln); and the leaders of the national Liberal party had been talked over by the Minister-President in a series of those private conferences where his ability is more conspicuously displayed than in the tribune. The Bill of Indemnity was passed; and the successful Minister was free to address himself to the immense labour of preparing and carrying through the Constitution of the North German Confederation.

It is said that some of the King's military advisers, carried away by the success of the Seven Days' War, proposed to march at once to the Rhine, and offer battle to Napoleon III. Such wild schemes as these met with no encouragement from the Chancellor of the new Confederation. "We shall do very well," he said, "if we are moderate, and do not suppose that we have conquered the world." At the same time he was perfectly aware that the success of Prussia would be followed, in no very long time, by a French war. Napoleon had seen in his dream a new Europe in which France, Prussia, and Italy should each represent a national unity—Italy occupying the whole of her peninsula, Prussia rounded off and extended to the Main, and France restored to the "natural frontier" taken from her in 1815. The dream was rudely dispelled, and now he found himself facing an almost united Germany, with the prospect before him that his sentimental neighbours might one day begin to take the same kind of interest in Alsace and Lorraine as they had taken in the Elbe Duchies. Count Bismarck was absolutely deaf to all reminders of the promises he had made or seemed to make in respect of the "legitimate aspirations" of France before the war of 1866; and when the Luxemburg affair gave him an opportunity of obliging his friend at the Tuileries, he persisted in dealing with it as a

matter on which the opinion of Europe was to be taken, and separate action avoided. As for a certain document in M. Benedetti's handwriting, embodying the rough notes of a scheme for promoting the welfare of Belgium, one might have imagined from the Chancellor's behaviour that no such paper had ever existed. All Europe began to inform the poor Emperor that he had been tricked; and his domestic advisers whispered that the state of public feeling was critical, and that he must not forget that he lived on his *prestige*. If Napoleon had known the true state of matters on the other side of the Rhine, we are inclined to think that he knew himself and his resources well enough to have made a strenuous effort for peace. But it was a fixed idea with him that you could always drive a wedge between South and North Germany; and it may be that some vague hope of rehabilitating the scheme of the "Trois Trouçons" was still floating in his mind. He delayed, and Bismarck waited, and Count Moltke's assistants made maps of the Vosges Mountains; until the miserable affairs of the Spanish candidature lighted the magazine and the war was begun. On the 18th July, 1870, Count Bismarck refused to accept the offered mediation of England, unless France would accept first. On the 25th of the same month the *Times* published the *Projet de Traité*, afterwards admitted to be in the handwriting of M. Benedetti. Early in the morning of the 2nd September Bismarck, riding forward in the direction of Sedan, dismounted at Donchéry to take the orders of the Emperor of the French, and to explain to his Majesty that it was impossible for the King of Prussia to receive him until the capitulation of Sedan had been signed. A fortnight after he issued from Meaux the circular in which the territorial demands of Germany were made known to the world. On the 18th of January, 1871, in the Hall of Mirrors at Versailles, Count Bismarck, standing, appropriately enough, between the two great allegorical pictures, "Le Roy gouverne par luy-même" and "L'Ordre rétabli dans les finances" read aloud the proclamation of the German Empire; his own nomination as Chancellor followed within a few days of the proclamation, and the patent of his rank as a Prince of the Empire was conferred on the return of the German troops from France.

In a curious pamphlet, published in 1858, and entitled, "A Defence of Machiavellism," the veteran journalist, Bollman, declared that what Germany needed was a reformer in arms (*einon bewaffneten Reformator*). This was the part which Bismarck had undertaken to sustain; and his success has made him the foremost political personage of our time. But when we attempt to submit his aims and his means of action to the test of those moral laws by which statesman in their public capacity are

supposed to be bound, we are confronted with a problem of no ordinary difficulty. It is, indeed, a problem which writers of different schools have been ready enough to solve for us. By one party we are told that Bismarck is a "blameless foreign minister," that he has never made an aggressive war, that he has founded the greatness of Prussia on the facts of geography and of national character, and that the interests which he has destroyed—the Danish rule in the Duchies, the Austrian supremacy in Germany, the French Empire and its European prestige—have no claim to our regretful sympathy. On the other hand, we are assured by French, Austrian, and German writers, Conservative and Liberal, that Bismarck is a cynical freebooter, whose accomplice in one expedition is pretty sure to be his victim in the next—a man who might have been, and ought to have been, stopped at the outset of his nefarious operations, in the name of international law and common honesty. Before we can decide between these conflicting views, it behoves us to ask what our standard of morality is, if, indeed, we can be said to have any standard at all? We have a tolerably correct notion of the rules to which an individual must conform in the contest for social advancement, and we brand the man who transgresses them as a knave or an adventurer; but we are content to form our judgments of popular statesmen on principles of the most vague and shifting character. Take, for example, the case of that statesman with whom Bismarck is most frequently compared, the ardent patriot and enlightened Liberal who founded the unity of Italy. None but a bigoted reactionary would question the title of Cavour to the admiration and gratitude of mankind. But the successes of Cavour were obtained by means which, if they had been used for his own individual advancement, would have been pronounced more than questionable. He entered on a war which was wholly unprovoked; he intrigued against Italian governments which had done his own country no harm—Governments of which some might fairly claim to be considered enlightened and humane; he entered into the crooked schemes of Napoleon III.; he deliberately plotted against the peace of Europe; and he was not ashamed to hand over some millions of his fellow-subjects to France as the price of her assistance. Let it be admitted that Italian unity was in itself a great gain to Europe, and that unity was not to be attained except by the means which Cavour employed; the serious question still remains whether we, as Liberals, are to pronounce an unqualified approval of such acts—an approval which may fairly be taken to imply that in the dealings of nations the end justifies the means. And if such doubts suggest themselves in the case of Cavour, much more do they press for consideration in the case

of Bismarck. When Prussia assumed the rôle of the "Piedmont of Germany," there was no foreign oppressor to be expelled, nor were the Governments of the secondary states chargeable with any such abuses as existed in the Kingdom of Naples and the States of the Church. Indeed, there was more than one of the minor capitals of Germany which might claim to be superior to Berlin in intellectual and political activity. The one indisputable title of Prussia to the German hegemony was her superiority in force; and it is somewhat discouraging to observe how readily and widely this title was accepted, as soon as it had been proved by events. We have been told that the history of Prussia is a fine instance of "Darwinism in politics," a conclusive proof that the more educated and moral a nation becomes the better is its chance of survival in the struggle for existence; and it has been assumed that a rising nation is justified in clearing the ground for its own development by despoiling and, if necessary, destroying its neighbours. This doctrine admits of being stated in sufficiently specious general terms—we have seen what it means when reduced to practice. Bismarck found his country in a position unworthy of her history and her undoubted virtues; and his object was to make her powerful and respected. He began by crushing her independence that he might take all her resources into his own hand, and so provide himself with a military instrument strong enough to overturn the balance of Europe. He then proceeded to interfere in a dispute which had no bearing whatever on the safety or the lawful interests of his own country; he set aside treaty obligations, and recognised hereditary rights; and he gave not one moment's consideration to the wishes or the welfare of the unhappy population over whom their neighbours had chosen to quarrel. He made the disappointed greed of his accomplice the starting point of another war, in which forty thousand lives were sacrificed to prove that Prussia was the natural leader of Germany. The proof being complete, he waited for France just as he had waited for Austria; and when the expected challenge came, he made no secret of his readiness to accept it. To attain his ends he used indifferently the sentiment of the *Nationalverein* and the *chauvinisme* of a military aristocracy, the religious loyalty of King William to his own divine right, and the democratic aspirations of the Mazzinians. He represented no great cause, political or religious; his victories were won by force and by force alone. We may well hesitate to admit that national unity is to justify such a course as this.

If we can make good the view above suggested as to the essential principle of Bismarck's policy, we are not disposed to attach importance to the charges which occupy the chief place in

most of the hostile descriptions which have been given of it. He is charged with destroying the "solidarity of Conservative interests," and the guarantees of peace afforded by the Treaties of Vienna; but the artificial systems and outworn beliefs in which Continental Conservatism still places its trust were bound to disappear, sooner or later, before the active criticism of such a generation as ours. He is charged with bad faith; but the charge seems to us wide of the mark. Bismarck has often deceived; but he has seldom condescended to the vulgar and dangerous expedient of lying. He has a strong preference, partly religious, partly business-like, for the simple truth: he gives his opponents the opportunity of deceiving themselves, and they may take advantage of it at their peril. Neither Count Rechberg nor Louis Napoleon could show any formal engagement which Bismarck had evaded or repudiated; they were simple enough to rely on general understandings, projected agreements, solidarity of acquisitive interests, and so forth; and when they found out too late that they had taken no material guarantees, they could hardly be said to have any right to complain. The charge of ingratitude which French writers continue to hurl at the German Chancellor, because he would not give Louis Napoleon the left bank of the Rhine, is perfectly unfounded.* Napoleon allowed Prussia to begin her career of conquest because he thought himself strong enough to stop that career at any moment, and wise enough to choose a moment when it might be stopped so as to turn to his own profit. He was utterly mistaken on both points; but if he chose to speculate on another man's game, he had no right to complain when the game went finally against him.

Prince Bismarck has never been supposed to underrate his own abilities, or to allow himself to be daunted by the reputation of his adversaries. When he went to Frankfort in 1851, he seems to have measured himself against the diplomatic sages there with some degree of self-complacency. He found them talking a useless jargon of their own—"pacific intentions of our august master" and all the rest of it—busy with the smallest of intrigues and the most obvious of mysteries, fearful of overstepping the bounds of etiquette, and quite persuaded that without their assistance the world could not continue to go

* M. Cohen, who is usually moderate in his language, says: "La Prusse a agi, dans cette lugubre tragédie, avec un machiavélisme sans exemple. Elle s'est servie de nous pour réaliser le but de ses ambitions, puis, au lieu de nous en avoir quelque reconnaissance, elle nous a perfidement joués et a abusé de notre confiance" (*Études*, p. 80). M. Cohen thinks that Bismarck should have united Germany in 1806, the consent of Napoleon having been obtained, as he somewhat curiously phrases it. "En le désintéressant du côté du Rhin."

round. In such a circle Bismarck could not fail to succeed. The directness and certainty of his method of doing business only exhibit one side of his nature; his social and personal qualities are not less remarkable and not less useful to him as a politician. He is not a great speaker, but he is one of the greatest of talkers; the still visible Junker pride is rendered interesting and almost attractive by the cordial courtesy of his manner; he speaks with freedom, amounting to audacity, of all men and policies and institutions; he pursues the theory, or the paradox, or the humorous fancy of the moment, with an apparently complete disregard of everything but the impression he is producing on his listener. He certainly calculates upon the effect he produces; he is a consummate master of high comedy. The phrase is not pleasing to his admirers; but when we say that Bismarck is a comedian, we do not mean to allege that he is destitute of sincerity. The consummate man of the world knows how to put his own personality—even his beliefs and superstitions—on the stage, as it were, and to make it a means of effect. To do this, the conversational artist must practise a certain detachment of mind; he must beware of allowing himself to be carried away by the ideas and feelings to which he is giving expression. Bismarck can talk Liberalism,* or Toryism, or general patriotism with any man; but when he comes to act he drops abstractions and thinks only of success. The long discussions which he used to hold with the late Emperor of the French on the sands at Biarritz must have furnished a peculiarly interesting illustration of the difference between the speculator and the man of action. In fertility of mind, in power of political combination, the two men were, perhaps, nearer equality than the German statesman's admirers would admit. But the Emperor brooded over his combinations till they became to him realities, and prevented him from facing the actual facts. The schemes which Bismarck kept unfolding with endless ingenuity before the mind of his bewildered listener were of the moment and for the moment; when the time for action came he dismissed them altogether from his mind, and considered only what was possible and expedient.

In the entertaining work of Dr. Busch, whose title we prefix to this Article, we have a picture of the great Chancellor as he appeared to his admirers in the close of the militant period of his career, a picture drawn by one who has too much of the spirit of Boswell to leave out any of the characteristic defects of his hero. Bismarck's is a personality full of those striking con-

* He said to M. Favre, at Ferrières, "For my part, I do not believe in any Government but such as is founded on the wishes and necessities of the people. In fact, I am a Republican. But the King, my master." &c.

traditions and inconsistencies which so often mark the man of genius. He is a man of herculean frame and iron endurance ; but his nerves are so finely strung that the slightest shock upsets him ; he can work, and eat, and drink like a Homeric hero ; but he seldom sleeps till daybreak, and his labours leave him so exhausted, that he requires long and frequent intervals of absolute repose. His mind has gained from long experience of affairs an extreme acuteness of critical insight ; he knows much of men and books ; but he judges them according to the narrowest canons, and has no sympathy for any sort of belief or culture, except in so far as it helps to make men strong and successful. He is a humble, Evangelical Christian, striving to hold faithfully the place assigned him by God, in the midst of a sceptical generation ; but he never shows the faintest sympathy for the faith or the feelings of those among his brethren whom the fortune of the time has made his enemies. Within the circle of his family, his dependants, the associates of his labours, he is full of kindness and consideration ; but the mere mention of generosity or mercy to a fallen foe moves him to scorn and wrath. He is a German, full of simple admiration of the virtues of his countrymen ; an aristocrat who despises " democratic pot-politics ;" and yet a man of the world who regards patriotic sentiment and feudal pride as useful delusions, which may serve his own political ends. He is eager to engross power, impatient of contradiction and control, easily irritated by any show of assumption on the part of princes or military chiefs ; and yet he bows with unfeigned loyalty before his sovereign, and submits cheerfully to be set aside as a mere civilian by the *chauvinistes* of the army. He has made himself an almost absolute ruler, but his constant complaint is, that he has not power enough. He must " use the means he has, for want of better," and he will use them with deliberate, unscrupulous courage, under no fanatic or sentimental illusion as to the work he is doing. His business is to make Germany a strong, united, rich, and well-governed nation ; and he will allow no rule of right to prevent him from discarding or annexing, destroying or building up, as the exigencies of that business may require. It may well have seemed questionable to impartial observers whether a statesman of this temper would succeed in the task which was begun at Versailles in the winter of 1870. By the ruthless application of force, and by unrivalled diplomatic skill, Bismarck had overturned a system which had seemed to defy the spirit of change and revolution to do its worst. He had divided and destroyed, and now he was called upon to unite, to repair, to settle—to construct a new edifice in the place of that which was overthrown. We shall endeavour to estimate the measure of his success in Germany itself ; but before doing so we must review,

as comprehensively as the present condition of our knowledge will admit, the foreign policy of the new Empire.

"No disturbance of the peace of Europe is to be apprehended from Germany." These were the words of Bismarck after Sedan ; and it must be admitted that he has laboured, not unsuccessfully, to make them good. At a time when nothing seemed too great for German ambition—when the soberest of newspapers were advising him to seize the German provinces of Austria, to demand Heligoland and Antwerp, to settle the Eastern Question by a final partition of the Sick Man's goods—he did his best to moderate the desires and enlighten the minds of his countrymen. In the spring of 1875, when the military party, which is strongly represented in the Imperial Court, was clamouring for a second war with France, the infernal design was steadily discountenanced by the Chancellor. To his desire of peace we may attribute the support accorded by Prince Bismarck to the Conservative Republic of M. Thiers ; and we cannot hesitate to condemn the language used on this subject by M. Klaczko in a work which is familiar to most of our readers.* By what possible rule of right or expediency is the German Chancellor bound to plot the downfall of an established Government in the interest of the so-called "monarchical principle?" It is his plain duty to keep the peace between the two countries ; and the Republic is less likely to be troubled with warlike ambitions, and more likely to respect that "European order" for which M. Klaczko professes so much reverence, than any of the pretenders who aspire to the succession of Napoleon III. Prince Bismarck does not mean to play in Western Europe the part of Alexander I, and we believe that his policy in the East has been, in intention at least, as peaceful as his policy in the West.

Some six years ago the Sovereigns of Europe entered on a round of complimentary visits, which recalled the happy days spent by the Allied Sovereigns of 1814 in Paris and London. Watering-place meetings were held, at which "épanchements de cœur" were the order of the day ; and significant toasts were proposed at Royal and Imperial dinner-tables. Rumour began to speak of a combination of the three Emperors, for the settlement of the eternally troublesome Eastern Question, and a programme was soon drawn up, and accepted in the name of the League by European journalism. Russia was to receive a return for the support she had given to the ambition of Prussia ; and Austria was to be compensated for her exclusion from Germany by an

* . . . Sacrifiant ainsi le principe monarchique et les considérations les plus élevées d'ordre européen à un calcul purement égoïste et vindicatif." Klaczko, *Deux Chanceliers*, ch. x.

extension of territory, and possibly by the possession of a port on the *Ægean*. The consent of England might, perhaps, be gained by giving her Egypt; and Italy, the spoiled child of modern diplomacy, might receive a present of part of the Dalmatian coast of the Adriatic. As for Prince Bismarck, the supposed author of the scheme, he was to secure a moral advantage by making Austria an Oriental Power; perhaps, in time, the German provinces might fall away from their Slav and Magyar associates and join themselves to the German Empire. How far these ingenious conjectures correspond with the actual plans of Prince Bismarck it is impossible to say. His conduct during the Russo-Turkish war and the Berlin Congress, sufficiently proves that he was not unwilling to see the settlement of 1856 set aside by Russia and Austria. He cannot co-operate in any scheme which would make Russia undisputed mistress of the Lower Danube; nor can he permit either Russia or Austria to act in the settlement of South-Eastern Europe by the mere right of the strongest, without reference to the Law of Nations, and the wishes of other Powers. Germany has been made by the "policy of the free hand," but no country would suffer more than Germany if that policy were converted into a law for the future conduct of Great Powers. If Prince Bismarck ever thought of settling the Eastern Question by means of the Three Emperors' League, he has probably given up the notion long ago. It has been proved that the allies cannot count upon being left undisturbed to carry out their designs. The course of England in regard to the Eastern Question has been marked by many disastrous blunders and lost opportunities; but we have, at least, shown that we can interfere with effect, and may some day interfere with a purpose. It has been further proved that the League itself is by no means secure against the ordinary accidents of human friendship. The "Two Chancellors," whose alliance seems so significant to M. Klaczko, have lately been girding at one another indirectly through their respective official newspapers; and special precautions have been necessary to convince the public that the quarrel does not extend to their august masters. It seems possible that Count Andrassy's successor may not work so harmoniously with Prince Bismarck as the Count himself has done. In short, the Three Emperors' League is not, as we are sometimes told, a revival of the Holy Alliance, but a combination for a temporary purpose, a combination which may be broken up or modified at any moment, as circumstances may require.*

* At one of the Chancellor's parliamentary soirées, when a Conservative member happened to mention the "Drei-Kaiser-Bund," Bismarck said, with considerable emphasis, "I am not aware of the existence of any such League."

When the history of the Berlin Congress is given to the world it will probably be found that Prince Bismarck contributed powerfully to the establishment of peace. None had a better right to be heard by Russia on the question whether she was to moderate her pretensions and take from a Congress what she would have preferred to take by right of conquest. None could more skilfully bring England to the point of tearing up her manifestos in favour of the *status quo* and joining in the partition ("concentration," the wise it call) of Turkey. When he was interrogated in Parliament as to the line to be taken by Germany in Congress, the Chancellor had expressly disclaimed any desire to assume the powers and responsibility of a judge. "We," he said, "will not go the way of Napoleon. We shall not pose as the arbiters, much less as the schoolmasters, of Europe." The part he assigned to himself was that of the "honest broker," and it will be generally allowed that he performed this difficult duty with impartiality, dignity, and success.

If we consider the present condition of German politics and society, we shall find more than one good reason for the peaceful policy pursued by Prince Bismarck since 1871. He said himself, "I require ten years to make Germany," and now that eight of the ten are gone he is probably inclined to demand even a longer time. We speak of the unity of Germany as of an accomplished fact; but the most cursory consideration of the actual working of the Imperial Constitution will convince us that this is a complete mistake. The difficulties which were encountered in the old days of the Bund are encountered still; the Constitution works only by the agreement of a host of independent and sometimes conflicting powers. The rights of the Emperor are limited on every hand by the rights of subordinate sovereignties. In the exercise of some of his most important prerogatives he is controlled by the Federal Council, whose fifty-six members sit as the nominees of twenty-five independent Governments; these Governments vary in character, from the complicated representative system of Prussia to the feudal simplicity of Mecklenburg-Schwerin; and each is tenacious of its sovereignty. Below the Council comes the Imperial Parliament, which consists of 397 members elected by universal or nearly universal suffrage. To the Council alone belongs the initiative in Imperial legislation; the Parliament can only discuss and vote upon such Bills as are sent down to it; and its powers of amendment are curtailed by the power reserved to the Council of placing a veto on any law which has passed the Parliament. This complicated system has hitherto been worked by the dominating energy of the Chancellor. As long as the destinies of the Empire are guided by its founder, so long will a majority in Council and Parliament be

willing to defer to the Central Government, and to postpone their own ambitions. But when that strong hand is withdrawn the Constitutional fabric will be exposed to danger on two sides. The National Liberals, if they are to justify their existence, must claim a higher position for the Imperial Parliament, a responsible Ministry for the Empire, and a further levelling down of feudal privileges and independent local sovereignties. On the other side, the spirit of particularism may be expected to assert itself; the subordinate Princes and their Governments will rebel against the dictation of Berlin, and their efforts will be seconded by the irreconcilable opponents of unity whom Prince Bismarck has never wholly subdued. The present Parliament is so composed that its continued cohesion seems almost impossible; and the danger of reopening the question of "reconstruction" is so palpable that even the boldest of his opponents shrink from the proposal to dispense with the services of the one man who can work the present Constitution. Bismarck is the "*homme nécessaire*" of German unity; he has only to threaten resignation to bring the whole nation to his feet. Seven times within as many years has he delivered this kind of ultimatum to the country, and the mere threat has always been sufficient to answer his purpose.

The Chancellor has won his greatest parliamentary triumphs by means of the influence which he exercises over the National Liberals—the party which aims at preserving unity by the extinction of those local privileges which interfere with the formation of a single system of government for the Empire, and by the firm union of the popular and parliamentary elements in the separate States. It is therefore on the international character of the Liberal programme, on what he would have called in earlier days "the solidarity of the Revolution" that Prince Bismarck has relied. He is at one with the Liberals in desiring the extinction of particularism; he is impatient of the absurd tenacity of local independence. "If we Germans were a rich people," he said once, "each of us would have a king to himself." To complete the work of unification he will make concessions to the Liberals; but these concessions have a very definite limit. He has accepted universal suffrage and discarded some Conservative prejudices; he has changed with the times, till many of his old friends regard him as a revolutionary demagogue; but the Junker instinct of domination is as strong in him as ever. He will not consent to be a mere party leader, bound to "take the House with him" before he can move a step, deferring at every moment to the opinions of colleagues and supporters, wielding or resigning power as the chances of a General Election may determine. If the Liberals cease to support him he will find a majority elsewhere; if he takes

any of them into the Government it is on the clear understanding that they are to be subalterns and not colleagues. Under such a *régime* the uses of a parliamentary party are not evident; and it is a noteworthy fact that the National Liberals have lost of late years both in numbers and in influence. The disintegrating forces of German Imperial politics have become stronger and not weaker since 1871. From Posen, from Schleswig, from Hanover, from Alsace, from the once free town of Frankfort, members are still returned to protest against the acts by which these places were included in the Empire; and there are others who were among the ranks of the Pangermanists eight years ago whom we must now count as Particularists. In 1871, Archbishop Ketteler, of Mainz, published a pamphlet, in which he welcomed the new Empire in the name of his co-religionists; but the *Culturkampf* has changed all that, and the Ultramontanes are now declaring eagerly against centralisation, and foremost in the agitation for "local autonomy." And whilst the Liberals have declined, the Ultramontanes have advanced rapidly and steadily. They have doubled the number of their parliamentary representatives; they secure almost every seat in the Catholic parts of the Empire; they are better disciplined and better led than any of the Liberal sections; and they are bent on extorting from the Chancellor conditions which will lower his personal *prestige* and discredit the institutions of the Empire.

The danger to which German unity is exposed from the growing power of Ultramontanism is the direct consequence of that *Culturkampf*, or Battle of Civilisation, on which Prince Bismarck entered some seven years ago. It will be remembered that up to the time of the Franco-German war the relations between Prussia and the Vatican were eminently satisfactory. The Roman See had long forgotten the small enmities of the time when the Kings of Prussia were persistently described in clerical almanacks as Electors of Brandenburg; and the Prussian Government had exerted itself to command the goodwill of its Romish subjects by tolerating and endowing their Church. When the Temporal Power fell, it was to the Protestant King William that Pope Pius IX. appealed against the violence of the Catholic King of Italy; and though the appeal was without effect, the fact that it was made testified to the strength of the friendship between the two Courts. But this happy state of things was not to last. The collapse of Liberal Catholicism, and the proclamation of the Pope's infallibility in 1870, marked the opening of a new stage in the war carried on by the Pope and the Jesuits against modern society generally, and especially against all Governments which refused to regard the temporal power and the rights of the Church as necessary

factors in European politics. It became clear that the diplomacy of Rome had been deeply engaged in the intrigues which led to the wars of 1866 and 1870; and since the Church had lost her protectors she was preparing to act for herself, and to carry the war into the enemy's country. German Catholicism had always prided itself, like the Gallican Church, on its independence of Rome, and on the comparative liberality of its teaching. But the nationality and freedom of the German Church had been surrendered in the Council; the bonds of clerical discipline were drawn tighter; occasions of conflict were sought out, that the Powers of this world might be convinced of the necessity of coming to terms with Rome if they wished to keep the allegiance of their own subjects. It was impossible for Prince Bismarck to look on with indifference while the curates and schoolmasters of Catholic districts were enrolled as agents of a foreign Power; nor could he pass over the encouragement given by the priests to the disaffections of Alsace and Posen. It was for the State to teach the "black International" that such courses were not permitted to an Established Church. The lesson was administered with the Chancellor's accustomed energy and promptitude. He dismissed Von Mühlner, the Prussian Minister of Worship, whose zeal in the cause was open to doubt; and he chose as his successor Dr. Falk, a jurist of the new German school, whose chief doctrine is the omnipotence of the State. It was determined to give an active support to the Old Catholics; and the *Culturkampf* was inaugurated by legal proceedings taken against a Bishop who had set aside an Old Catholic teacher without obtaining permission from the Government. The Imperial Legislature was induced to pass a law expelling the Jesuits and other religious orders from Germany. But it was in the Prussian Parliament that the policy of the Chancellor and Minister-President received its fullest legislative development. The laws of May, 1873, introduced by Dr. Falk, were based on the principle that the State is invested with the right and duty of superintending religious education, and framed with the design of reducing the clergy to the position of Government functionaries. Facilities were provided for leaving the "Civil Communion" of the Church of Rome; strict limits were set to the punishments which might be inflicted by Ecclesiastical Courts on laymen or priests; a Royal Court was established to hear appeals in Ecclesiastical cases; the education of priests and their examination for orders were subjected to State supervision; and the law relating to the tenure of livings was so altered as to make the parish clergy more independent of their Bishops.

These laws were carried out with unsparing severity. Bishops

who instituted priests contrary to law were fined, imprisoned, and prohibited from exercising their spiritual functions; Catholic parents were compelled under penalties to send their children to be taught by Old Catholic schoolmasters; the Royal Court at Berlin decided that an excommunicated Old Catholic was still a Catholic, and required the Romish clergy to recognise him as such. The result of all this aggressive energy on the part of the State has been a most conspicuous failure. The Old Catholics, officiously patronised by the Prussian Government, made no way among the people, but the zeal of Ultramontane Catholicism increases daily; the bishops are more powerful in prison than they were in the days of their freedom, and the increased liberality of the faithful more than compensates for fines imposed and salaries withheld. Prince Bismarck has recognised his mistake; and there are signs that he is preparing a retreat. Dr. Falk has resigned; and his successor, the Baron Von Puttkammer, has been received with effusive welcome by the Romish clergy. Already promises have been given of a less rigorous enforcement of the laws of May; and though we are assured that the laws themselves will not be repealed, a compromise on this point seems by no means impossible. "We shall not go to Canossa," said the Chancellor; but some convenient half-way house may be found where the "new Attila" and the successor of Pius IX. may settle their differences. We cannot profess to regard this conclusion of the *Culturkampf* with any satisfaction. It was a struggle between two great despotisms, between a Church which has declared open war against progress and enlightenment, and a Government which would, if it could, cast the very bodies and souls of men in moulds warranted and stamped by an inspector in uniform. If the battle had been fought out, it could hardly have failed to teach the German people a much-needed lesson on the limits of authority in Church and State, it might have resulted in the establishment of a boundary confining each of the conflicting powers to its own domain. But sacerdotalism and bureaucracy have met together; Cæsarism and Hildebrandism have kissed each other. The alliance is of ill-omen for the cause of liberty.

In the *Culturkampf* we see Prince Bismarck attempting to control the formation of public opinion, in so far as opinion is affected by religion. He has made another effort of the same kind in his dealings with the public Press. The censorship was abolished in Prussia in 1848; but it would be contrary to Bismarckian principles of government to leave so powerful an instrument as the Press to be worked for or against him, according to the fluctuations of public opinion. It was part of the Chancellor's policy to hold the Press in his own hands; and with

this view he extended and reorganised the important institution known as the Central Press Bureau. In this office a large staff is or was employed in the manufacture of telegrams, paragraphs, and leading articles; the insertion of these literary products in German and foreign journals is secured sometimes by influence and sometimes by money. The gentlemen of the Press Bureau are pleasantly styled by the Prince his "swineherds;" it is their function to guide an obstinate and irreflective public into ways of pleasantness, where suitable literary pabulum will be found for it. From the pages of Dr. Moritz Busch (who was one of the deserving body in question) we learn how much of the Chancellor's time and thought is given to the due presentation of his acts and views before the reading public of Europe. Bismarck supplied the notes or verbal suggestions out of which his "Büschlein" elaborated sometimes as many as six leading articles in one day, to say nothing of telegrams, paragraphs, and official contradictions without number—all which were duly despatched to London, or Hanover, or Vienna, as circumstances might require; so careful is the great statesman lest the cause of truth should suffer from the "irresponsible frivolity" of independent journalism. Let it not be supposed that we suggest anything to the discredit of the persons by whom these communications are given to the world: the Press Bureau is officered by Doctors and Privy Councillors, and the highest Prussian law court holds that it is no libel to say of a newspaper proprietor that he is in the pay of the Government. Prince Bismarck declares with pardonable pride that he is the best-hated man in Europe; he is attacked in a hundred newspapers every morning; French writers have been known to assert that he beats his wife, gambles on the Stock Exchange, and keeps a harem at Varzin. Surely, then, he should be provided with the means of following the reptile authors of these calumnies to their dens, and counter-working their execrable plots. There was a paltry sum—barely twenty millions of thalers—part of the spoil of Hanover and Hesse, which the Prussian Parliament wished to set aside as a fund for the suppression of possible conspiracies in favour of the dethroned princes. This is the famous "Reptile Fund," which Prince Bismarck uses at his own discretion for purposes chiefly connected with the Press; he requires the money to bribe some people not to tell lies, and to bribe other people to tell the truth; and 199 members of the Reichstag, struck by the moral beauty of the design, voted against the proposal to make the Chancellor account for his disposal of the fund.

Where persuasion and "inspiration" are not enough, the Chancellor is quite ready to resort to force. The German police are active in seizing and prosecuting journals which offend the

Government; and the law courts give the widest interpretation to the powers conferred on them by the Imperial Press Law of 1873. In the heat of the *Culturkampf* the *Germania*, a respectable Catholic print, was prosecuted to conviction thirty-nine times in six months; and several Socialist papers have been almost ruined by fines and seizures. It need hardly be said that opposition journalism is not to be extinguished by such means, any more than Ultramontane agitation. While the Herr Staatsankläger and the Herr Polizei-Lieutenant are peering into some poor editor's cradles and handboxes, or searching his coffee-pot and tobacco-pouch for libels on the Chancellor, they are being made ridiculous through the whole country-side by some rough bit of satire, printed at Prague or London, and circulated through the working-men's club. The oppressive severity with which Prince Bismarck treats the Press is a striking proof of the weakness of despotism. Almost all Governments like to see that their measures are fairly represented in the newspapers; but only a centralised despotism would take such elaborate pains to interfere with the free formation of public opinion. Of late years, it is said, the Press Bureau has been somewhat less active than before: Prince Bismarck has discovered that his allies in the Press compromise him quite as much as they assist him. The use which he has been able to make of such an institution is one of many discouraging symptoms of indifference and lack of political spirit, symptoms which every German Liberal has reason to study anxiously and impartially.

The political difficulties of Prince Bismarck's government since 1871 have been much aggravated by social and commercial disturbance. He has had to guide the affairs of his country through a period of inflation and a period of depression. When the German armies had torn two provinces from France, and imposed on the vanquished nation a ruinous indemnity, the fatal delusion was spread abroad in Germany that the balance of material prosperity had been altered by the war, and that the milliards were to be the foundation of universal prosperity. The sanguine delusions of the nation were turned to account by speculators of all kinds; banks, building societies, and joint-stock companies were multiplied on every hand; railways were projected and constructed in eager haste; and the whole nation—nobles, traders, and farmers alike—poured its savings into these new undertakings in the hope of a great and speedy return. The working classes shared in the questionable blessings of those years of speculation; hours were short and wages high. This was the period known as "The Spin" (*der Schwindel*); the period of inevitable collapse which followed is known as "The Crash" (*der Krach*). It was discovered that the milliards had

barely sufficed to cover the extraordinary loans and other expenses of the war. The fury of speculation had deranged and demoralised every sort of industry; the new banks and companies came down as fast as they had gone up; the new railway lines paid no dividends; traders had thrown away the capital which should have helped to tide them over the coming years of depression; and the workmen, many of whom were out of employment or working at low wages, were quite in a humour to listen to the orators of the Socialist Labour League. "The Crash" came in 1873, and Germany has not yet recovered from its effects. No country made so poor a show in the Philadelphia Exhibition of 1876; in the Paris Exhibition of last year Germany was hardly represented at all, except in the department of fine art. Complaints are rife of the inferiority of German goods, and even before the adoption of a protective tariff the foreign trade of the country had begun to fall off.

At the very time when the Spin was at its height, there were many signs of coming misfortune. The French Government could raise the milliards among its own people; but Prince Bismarck, in the very hour of victory, could not place his war loans in the German market, and was obliged to have recourse to English assistance. The imports of Germany kept steadily ahead of her exports—and the difference could not be accounted for, as in the case of England, by pointing to investments of German capital in foreign countries; all, and more than all, the capital of Germany was required at home. It was during the years when speculation was fiercest and most sanguine that the tide of emigration reached its height; the effects of the exodus were severely felt, more especially in North Germany, where the population, so far from being redundant, is not sufficient for the due development of the country's natural resources.

The Chambers of Commerce meanwhile were complaining of the decline of industry; from the cotton-mills of Alsace to the looms of Silesia every form of production seemed to be falling off—except, indeed, those great works at Essen, where Herr Krupp elaborates in the silence of the night his designs for new and more efficient engines of destruction. These discouraging signs did not escape the notice of Prince Bismarck, and if he could have been indifferent to them, his attention would have been called to the state of his country's resources by the condition of the Imperial Budget. Every year the difficulty of raising revenue became greater; military votes, which should have been met out of income, had to be covered by loans, and at last the Chancellor was obliged to acknowledge a deficit. The situation was extremely serious. No further contributions were to be expected from the Confederate States, most of which have their own

financial troubles to deal with. Projects of new taxation and of Government monopolies met with little favour in the Parliament. Expenditure was already reduced to the lowest point compatible with efficiency—excepting always the expenditure on the army, which Bismarck will never willingly reduce. In this strait, what was the Chancellor to do?

Prince Bismarck is a man of many expedients and marvellous insight; but the defects of his training and his mental habits are painfully conspicuous when he has to deal with economic questions. He is a man of beliefs, but not of principles; he has never studied the science of national wealth; he is the ideal "practical man" whose blunders are the despair of sound economists. There was a time when the temporary inconvenience consequent on his adoption of a gold standard almost made him a bi-metallist; perhaps the danger from that quarter is not yet wholly past. And in the same way, when he was beset by all kinds of difficulties in raising revenue, he turned for relief to the system of Protection. The name of Bismarck had been honourably identified with the improvements introduced, in a Free trade sense, into the tariffs of the Zollverein; but those tariffs were the work of the National Liberals, carried in the better days of the party, before they had learned to sacrifice their convictions to their belief in the great Chancellor. It was now becoming apparent that the alliance between Bismarck and Liberalism had almost reached the term of its natural existence. The Liberals had voted all the measures necessary to the unity of the Empire, and they had done yeoman service in the *Kulturkampf*, but they had refused to follow the Chancellor in his anti-socialist campaign, and they were not accessible to persuasion on the subject of Protection. Besides, they were losing ground at every election, and a majority in the Parliament could be formed without their assistance. It was therefore to the Conservative side of the Reichstag that Prince Bismarck now turned; and it soon became apparent that among the supporters of a Protectionist Government would be found those Ultramontanes who had for years been denouncing the Chancellor as a tyrant, an oppressor, and an enemy of religion. What were the concessions by which the support of the Romish leaders was purchased? Dr. Falk has resigned; but his fall will not be enough to satisfy Herr Windthorst and his colleagues. Are we to expect a total cessation of hostilities between Bismarck and the Vatican? or has he made the Ultramontanes his allies to-day only to make them his victims to-morrow? These are questions which we cannot yet attempt to answer.

Germany is now enjoying the fruit of Prince Bismarck's new alliance in the shape of the Protectionist tariff, carried in the

spring of the present year by a coalition of Conservatives, Ultramontanes, and Bismarckian Liberals, against the protests of almost all the enlightened politicians of the country. At a time when German industry required to be aided by the supplies and stimulated by the competition of her neighbours, the lines of Protection are drawn round it, and it is left to "simmer in its own juice," as Bismarck said of the City of Paris. The country has calmly acquiesced; and the Chancellor shows his respect for his parliamentary supporters by the proposal which he has already submitted to the Federal Council, that the Reichstag should meet in future only once in two years, and vote a biennial Budget. He is tired of the Constitutional forms which have hitherto impeded his personal rule; and, what is far more ominous, the country is tired of them also. German Liberalism is as theoretical, as undisciplined, as destitute of the true party spirit as it ever was; the nation at large is afraid of the burdens and responsibilities of freedom, and willing to accept any tolerable conditions of national existence at the hands of absolute power.

There is, indeed, some excuse for the forebodings of those who are inclined to despair of the prospects of Parliamentary Government in Germany. From the account of the state of parties in the Reichstag, given by M. Cohen in the able and interesting work from which we have already quoted, it is easy to perceive that the jealousies of contending fractions make it comparatively easy for the Chancellor to find support in one quarter as often as he loses it in another. The Liberals are divided into National Liberals proper, Bismarckians (whose political creed bears a tolerably close resemblance to that of the French Bonapartists), Progressists, and avowed Socialists. The Conservatives include the *temporis acti* party who aim at fashioning the Empire after the model of the Bund, the Old Prussians, whose political ideal is the Prussianisation (*Verpreussung*) of Germany, and the New Conservatives, whose programme is the maintenance of the Empire, combined with a large measure of local autonomy, and with a revival of the old-fashioned régime of Protection, supremacy of the landed interest, and intimate union of Church and State. Besides these Liberal and Conservative fractions, there is a very strong body of Ultramontanes, whose movements are mainly determined by the interests of their Church; and the background of Reichstag politics is filled up with a considerable number of irreconcilable and unattached politicians, whose course cannot be calculated by any ordinary rules. In such a state of parties it is easy for Prince Bismarck to practise the old imperial maxim—*Divide et impera*. The people see that the tedious debates of the

Reichstag always end in submission to the Chancellor's will, they have never learned to count on any party or leader; they look to the Government for everything, and the Government is Prince Bismarck.

There is one party hardly represented at all in the Parliament, whose recent achievements have taught its rivals a lesson in practical politics which they are not likely to forget. Some four years ago the sections into which the Socialist party of labour had previously been divided were united and placed under the direction of the International. They provided themselves with a complete and effective organisation, they took their place as one of the political powers of the country. They admitted that it might be long before they could have an opportunity of acting, but they were quite certain that the opportunity would come and were resolved to be ready to take advantage of it. The Socialist leaders were recognised as men to be courted by militant politicians, overtures were made to them by the Ultramontane clergy, even Prince Bismarck himself was supposed to be inclined to treat with them. But after the changes introduced into its organisation by Karl Marx and his associates of the International, Socialism passed into a new stage and it was no longer possible for the authorities in Church or State to patronise or utilise the labour movement. The avowed object of the new Socialist propaganda is the uncontrolled supremacy of universal suffrage, the abolition of royalty, aristocracy, and Established Churches, the reappropriation by the people of the wealth now monopolised by possessors of capital. This is the political creed of the working classes in Germany for the Catholic Clergy, and dominant Socialists have made but few converts except among the middle classes, the labour vote in all the great towns is given to a candidate of the 'party of action' as to any representative of the moderate sections. It was easy to see beforehand how Prince Bismarck would proceed to deal with these threatening manifestations. As soon as he had convinced himself that Socialism was not a political force of which he might himself obtain the direction, his only thought was to suppress it as promptly and decisively as might be. A new *Culturkampf* was announced, and the Chancellor's Liberal allies, who had followed him so faithfully in the battle against reaction, were now summoned to his aid against the Revolution. But the Liberals hung back, and even the Conservatives hesitated to grant the sweeping powers which Prince Bismarck demanded. Advantage was taken of the atrocious crime of Hoedel to lay before the Reichstag, in May, 1878, a Bill by which all the liberties of the subject were placed at the mercy of the Government, the Bill

was rejected by an overwhelming majority, and the Chancellor took advantage of the profound excitement caused by a second attempt on the Emperor's life to dissolve Parliament and appeal to the country. The appeal was so far successful; the Progressist or Radical party lost many seats in the general election, and the Socialists, though they polled large minorities in many constituencies, were only able to return two of their members. The new Parliament has conceded to the Government, not, indeed, all that it asked, but powers as extensive as any Government ever wielded in a nominally free country. These powers have been unsparingly used, but Socialism still continues to advance. Nothing has been done or said to convince the labouring classes of Germany that the men who govern them understand the causes of their discontent, or sympathise with what is legitimate in their aspirations. Peel and Cobden have done more to keep Socialism out of England than all Prince Bismarck's police will do to keep it out of Germany.

It was impossible within the limits of a review article to do more than touch upon many of the important problems with which Prince Bismarck has been called upon to deal; but we have perhaps said enough to exhibit fairly the quality and temper of his statesmanship. We have tried to do justice to the marvellous grasp and flexibility of his mind, and to the sincerity of his belief in the political creed which he professes; we have endeavoured neither to conceal nor to exaggerate the defects of his mind and the weaknesses of his system of government. The admirers of despotism are constantly calling our attention to the fickle inconsequence of popular movements; but we have seen that centralised arbitrary power may be guilty of mistakes and inconsistencies as gross as were ever committed by any demagogue. It will be well for Germany if her people can lay to heart the lesson that is taught them by the failures of their great Minister. They have a saying: *Noch lange nicht genug, sagt Bismarck* (Not enough by a long way, says Bismarck), which was supposed to express the motive energy of the Minister-President's policy in the days when Prussia's greatness was yet in the making; and the same words might serve as a motto for German Liberalism at the present time. It is not enough by a long way that they have conquered half Europe in arms, and won the right to call themselves a nation. Germany has shown what she can do in war, but where is the statesman who is to guide her in the ways of peace? The task of such a statesman will not be an easy one; he will have to contend with the prejudices of a military monarchy, to curtail the privileges of a powerful, intelligent, and obstinate aristocracy, and to convince a nation which has been made by the sword that the

most glorious success is not that which is won on the battle-field. The whole condition of Germany cries out for a statesman of this type. The country can make no advance in civilisation or in political development till it rejects the fatal gift which Bismarck has forced upon it—the monstrous burden and sham called a “citizen army,” presumably because it is officered exclusively by the men of lineage who live by the sword, manned by the flower of the educated and industrious classes, and maintained on a scale which is a standing menace to the liberties of Germany and the peace of every other country in Europe.

There is no reason to despair of the prospects of peace and rational liberty in Germany. We are apt to forget that the political education of the German people was begun but a short time ago; they still forget easily the lessons they have learned. But they have among them all the elements of a sound and active Constitutional existence; and we may hope in time to see Central Europe occupied by a really united, peaceful, and progressive Germany. Before such a hope can be realised, Prince Bismarck's fame will belong to history; it will no longer be the fashion either to worship or abuse him. He will be remembered as one who did a great work—not a work perfect or complete in itself, but a work of preparation. He is like King David, a man of war from his youth; and therefore it is only given him to mark out the ground on which those who come after him may build the temple of peace and justice.

ART. VII.—LORD BROUGHAM.

1. *Cassell's Representative Biographies. The Life and Career of Henry, Lord Brougham, with Extracts from his Speeches.* By JOHN MCGILCHRIST. London: Cassell, Petter and Galpin. 1868.
2. *The Life and Times of Henry, Lord Brougham.* Written by Himself. Three vols. Wm. Blackwood & Sons. Edinburgh and London. 1871.
3. *The Lives of the Lord Chancellors and Keepers of the Great Seal of England, from the Earliest Times to the Reign of Queen Victoria.* By the late JOHN, Lord CAMPBELL, LL.D., F.R.S.E. Eight vols. Vol. VIII. (containing memoirs of Lord Lyndhurst and Lord Brougham). London: John Murray. 1869.
4. *Works of Henry, Lord Brougham.* Ten vols. Edinburgh: Adam and Charles Black. 1873.
5. *Selection from the Correspondence of the late Macvey Napier, Esq.* Edited by his Son, MACVEY NAPIER. London: Macmillan & Co. 1879.

“THE fame with posterity (in the opinion of Lord Campbell) of a man's actions during his life depends much upon the time and manner of his death. If Peel had lived on in the common routine of parliamentary warfare, and died of old age, he would have had no statues erected to his memory. Had Louis Philippe fallen fighting in the insurrection of 1848, he would have been reckoned a great Sovereign. Melbourne would have stood much better in history if he had died the day he resigned in 1841, instead of languishing several years a paralytic.”* The case of Lord Brougham supplies an illustration equally strong, if, indeed, it be not stronger, of his biographer's theory. Had his natural life ended simultaneously with his official career on the dismissal of the Melbourne Ministry, he would have occupied one of the highest positions amongst English statesmen and orators. His memory would have been long cherished with respect, with gratitude, and even with affection. His remains would have been interred in the “Great Temple of Reconciliation and Silence,” and his statue would have had a place amongst those of the other parliamentary heroes which adorn the Palace of Westminster. As it was, his death excited little, if any, attention. Mr. Roebuck's suggestion to erect a statue to him in the Abbey was received with the utmost coldness by the Ministry, and found no response from the House of Commons.

* “Lives of the Chancellors,” vol. viii. p. 543, Note.

He is buried in a foreign land, and no public monument perpetuates the name and memory of one who long filled a prominent and, for some years, brilliant position at the Bar, in Parliament, and in literature. The appearance of his autobiography did not revive public interest in his career, and, with the exception of our own notice of the work,* it received scarcely any attention from reviewers. The recent publication of the "Selected Correspondence of Mr. Macvey Napier," of which letters from Lord Brougham, written between 1835 and 1845, form a large part, brings Lord Brougham again before the public. These letters reveal to us his opinions of himself and his former colleagues, his pursuits, his objects, and his relations with the Whigs during this period. We propose to avail ourselves of the opportunity afforded by the publication of these letters to give a brief sketch of Lord Brougham's life, and endeavour to form a calm and judicial estimate of his career. In so doing we shall compare and contrast the narrative of Lord Brougham with that of Lord Campbell, and endeavour with the aid of all the light we can obtain from other sources, to arrive at the truth, when their accounts of the same transactions differ.

The autobiography of one of the principal actors in such eventful periods as the trial of Queen Caroline and the passing of the first Reform Bill, ought to be an interesting book, but we cannot say that Lord Brougham has made his autobiography interesting. When the rumour first arose that he was employed upon it, Lord Campbell foretold that it would be a literary failure.

"From his failure as a novelist in 'Albert Lunel,' wrote Campbell, in 1856, "I doubt whether he possesses the tact of presenting an individual personally before the readers of a book, bringing them acquainted with him, and making them take a sympathetic interest in his progress and adventures. But he knows a great deal, which, if disclosed, would be most valuable."†

Such disclosures are conspicuous by their absence from the book, and in fact its value is little, if any, greater than its interest.

"We all (once wrote Mr. Anthony Froude) write legends. Little as we may be conscious, we all of us continually act on the very same principle which made the lives of the Saints such as we find them, only, perhaps, less poetically. Who has not observed in himself in his

* *Vide* WESTMINSTER REVIEW, No. XCIV., April, 1875, Art. "Recent Political Memoirs."

† *Ibid.*, p. 584. Lord Brougham's novel, "Albert Lunel, or the Château of Languedoc," was originally published anonymously (if we recollect rightly) in 1844, and was shortly afterwards suppressed. After his death it was republished. It consists of Brougham's opinions on various subjects, especially the French Revolution and Natural Theology, given in the shape of endless harangues by the shadowy characters of the book. No one ever probably read the book through, or will or could do so.

ordinary dealings with the facts of every-day life, with the sayings and doings of his acquaintance, in short, with everything that comes before him as a *fact*, a disposition to forget the real order in which they appear, and rearrange them according to the theory of how they ought to be* (or, as the same idea is stated in a more limited and cautious form by Sir George Cornwall Lewis), in any narrative composed after the whole series of events has been worked out, the narrator is tempted to suppress, or has learned to forget, the proof of his own want of foresight."†

Lord Brougham's autobiography is certainly no exception to this rule. Moreover, he himself says—

"I cannot but regret that I did not some years ago begin to put down many details which I now may find it difficult to recall with that accuracy which a narrative professing to be in many respects historical essentially requires, and to note down many circumstances relating to myself and others which I may now find it impossible to remember.‡

We will give a striking instance of the confusion of dates and persons in Lord Brougham's narrative. Writing of the rearrangement of the law offices in 1833, Lord Brougham says—

"When in November (1833) I saw Lyndhurst, I told him of Campbell's attempt upon the Rolls, and entered fully into all the circumstances. He said I could not possibly have acted otherwise, but added, that for one reason he rather regretted what had happened, because it would to a certainty make Campbell my enemy for life. I could not see the matter in that light, but he insisted. 'Depend upon it,' said he, 'Campbell will never forgive you. In process of time Pepys may be Chancellor, and vacate the Rolls, and then what has happened will be a reason for passing Campbell over again. He will be furious, and lay the whole blame upon you, and I'll tell you how he will pay you off. You remember Wetherell said when the lives of the deceased Chancellors came out, Campbell has added a new sting to death. I predict that he will take his revenge on you by describing you with all the gall of his nature. He will write of you, and perhaps of me too, with envy, hatred, malice, and all uncharitableness, for such is his nature.'"§

That Lyndhurst at some time or other did thus speak of Campbell we doubt not, but the conversation could not have taken place at the date here assigned to it (1833), for the "Lives of the Chancellors" was not commenced till after Campbell ceased to be Chancellor of Ireland, and the first three volumes were not published until 1846. || The remark to give it in its more usual form, that "it added a fresh pang to the terrors of dying to think that Campbell is writing your life," is commonly attributed

* "Lives of the English Saints," Toovey, 1844, Introduction to the Life of St. Neot.

† *Vide* his *Essays on Administrations*, from 1783 to 1830.

‡ "Life and Times," vol. i. p. 1.

§ *Ibid.*, vol. iii. pp. 434, 435.

|| "Campbell," vol. viii. p. 161.

not to Sir Charles Wetherell, but to Lyndhurst himself, while by Campbell it is said to have been uttered by Brougham in 1846.* He might, however, be then quoting or referring to a remark earlier made by Lyndhurst. If Campbell was accurate in his prophecy as to Brougham's autobiography, Lyndhurst was not less accurate in his prophetic description of what Campbell's Lives of Brougham and of Lyndhurst himself would be. On the publication of those lives, they were justly condemned by Bishop Wilberforce,† as "the production of a singularly coarse nature," and it would have been far better for Campbell's reputation as a man and as a writer had they never seen the light. It is due to his memory to say in the words of the editor, that this volume "suffers from the disadvantage of not having the final corrections and revisions of the author's own hand.‡ Lord Campbell's sudden death prevented his completing the memoirs. Had he lived to complete, and also revise and correct them, we trust he would have removed many; and modified still more, of the statements, expressions, opinions, hints, and suggestions, which, as the memoirs now stand, prove that Lyndhurst only too justly and accurately estimated Campbell's nature. In reading these memoirs, and comparing and contrasting their statements with those of Brougham himself, it is necessary to bear in mind the relations which existed between Campbell and Brougham on the one hand, and between each of them and Lyndhurst on the other, and that the careers of the three men were inseparably intermingled. A favourite quotation of Brougham's was the saying, "*Idem velle atque idem nolle eadem inter malos est firma amicitia.*" Of each of the three men, Lyndhurst, Brougham, and Campbell—it might be truly said, "*Idem vult et valde vult.*" The *idem* being the Chancellorship, but the *amicitia* between them can in no way be said to be *firma*, let us trust, because they did not belong to the class to whom the application of the saying is limited. The accounts of their mutual rivalries and jealousies, their alliances, quarrels, and reconciliations, given by Campbell, are most amusing, and we cannot better describe their mutual relations than in his words. He says that Lyndhurst and Brougham, ever since he knew them, acted on a maxim of Rochefoucauld, which they seem to have thus translated—

"In private conversation flatter those who are present, and abuse and ridicule the absent, although closely connected in office or friendship with those who are present, for you may safely trust to the law

* "Campbell," vol. viii. p. 163.

† In the *Quarterly Review*, reprinted in the Bishop's Essays.

‡ "Lives," vol. viii., Preface.

of confidence which forbids a betrayal of such communications, and you may be certain that the witty censure of others is always agreeable to the *amour propre* of the listener, so that it creates an impression in favour of the amusing detractor."

And he adds the following note—

"I am ashamed when I consider how much I am myself the victim of this system as practised among the law lords down to the present time.* Lyndhurst in conversing with me abuses and laughs at Brougham; Brougham abuses and laughs at Lyndhurst. I am morally certain that Brougham and Lyndhurst when talking together abuse and laugh at Campbell. Yet, instead of checking them, I am afraid that I join with them in this wicked propensity.†"

We now turn to our task of endeavouring briefly to sketch Brougham's long and busy life of nearly ninety years. In approaching it we feel the same difficulty which Campbell felt in commencing his memoir—namely, we are oppressed with the abundance of our materials, "volumes to load many camels, truly says the noble lord, might be filled with detailed accounts of all the doings, writings, and speeches, by which Brougham has excited the passing interest of his contemporaries," and it is hard to compress this wealth of materials within the narrow limits of an Article.

Henry Peter Brougham‡ was born in Edinburgh, 19th September, 1778, but though born in Scotland he was by descent and by possessions a Westmoreland man. Campbell treats with ridicule and contempt, inconsistent in a Scot, whose weakness for "a lang pedigree" is proverbial, Brougham's pretensions to be descended from an ancient family of Burgham or De Burgham, who were settled at Brougham, in Westmoreland, when Antoninus compiled his itinerary. Brougham, in his autobiography, says little on the subject. There is no doubt his forefathers had for some generations lived at the present Brougham Hall, and there is also no doubt that he believed himself to be entitled by descent to the ancient barony of Vaux or De Vaulx. His mother was a niece of Principal Robertson, the historian. Brougham was proud of his connection with Robertson, who was the god of his literary "Idolatry," and he claimed to owe much to the Celtic blood "which his mother brought him from the clans of Kinloch Moidart." He used to say that through the Robertsons he had in his veins the blood of all the most distinguished Presbyterian Reformers. We have the evidence of his mother that his great mental powers early showed themselves.

* This note was written 5th September, 1855.

† "Lives," vol. viii. pp. 356, 357.

‡ After his settlement in England he altogether dropped the name of Peter.

"From mere infancy he showed a marked attention to everything he saw, and this before he could speak; afterwards to everything he heard, and he had a memory the most retentive. He spoke distinctly several words when he was eight months and two weeks old, and this aptitude to learn continued progressive. At a very early age he showed a disposition for public speaking. His grandmother, a very clever woman, was an enthusiastic admirer of all intellectual acquirements, and used to compare him to the Admirable Croighton from his excelling in everything he undertook."*

Brougham's education was, as Campbell justly boasts, "essentially and exclusively Scotch." He entered the High School of Edinburgh when barely seven years old, and came away Dux of the Rector's Class before he had attained his thirteenth year. Even at this early age he displayed not only his aptitude in acquiring knowledge but also his unbounded self-confidence. Having been punished by one of the masters for some errors in Latin composition, he next morning came loaded with books, from which he proved that his supposed errors and solecisms had been used by Roman writers of the Augustine Age. At twelve years old he read *La Place* in the original French, thus not only studying mathematics for pleasure but through the medium of a foreign tongue.† After a short time passed at Brougham with a tutor, he became an alumnus of the University of Edinburgh, and passed through the usual curriculum of four years. Here he was the pupil of Dugald Stewart, whom Mr. McGilchrist aptly calls "the literary and intellectual father of the Whiggism of the nineteenth century," and of whom Brougham said from him we "derived the most solid instruction that lectures could afford in the most attractive form of eloquence." The regulations of the University did not afford Brougham the opportunity of gaining academical honours, and it had ceased to be the practice at Edinburgh to grant degrees. During these four years he contributed to the Transactions of the Royal Society of London several papers on subjects connected with mathematical and physical science. Referring to one of these productions it was said by Professor Prevost, of Geneva, of its writer, "Il semble qu'il ne parle pas d'une manière précise." This exactly describes his mental state through life; his knowledge was ever multifarious, never exact.‡ The students at Edinburgh had formed amongst themselves two societies, the Junior Debating Society and its Senior, the well-known Speculative Society. These were the scenes in which he first exercised the remarkable power of speech which was afterwards to make him one of the ornaments of Parliament and the Bar. The Church Courts and

* "Life and Times," vol. i. p. 34.

† *Vide* "Life and Times," vol. i. pp. 12, 13. "Campbell," vol. viii. p. 224.
 "Campbell," vol. viii. pp. 226-232. "Life and Times," vol. i. pp. 65-82

the various churches of Edinburgh afforded him examples of what in public speaking to imitate and to avoid. From a preacher with a very feeble voice, which he dropped at particular passages to command general attention, Brougham learned what Speaker Abercromby called "Brougham's whispers," alluding to the power he had of "whispering through the House of Commons to the very door and wall." Many of the gestures employed by him in speaking were derived from Scottish preachers—*e.g.*, his attitude during his peroration in the Queen's case, which he delivered with both arms equally uplifted above his head, after the manner of a Scotch Presbyterian minister in blessing the congregation.* That he studied pulpit oratory to an extent to which it is studied by few ministers and fewer laymen, and perhaps never before or since by one who was not only a layman but a lawyer, appears from his excellent dissertation on pulpit eloquence,† which shows how deeply he had studied the sermons of the great preachers of the French Church.

He did not, however, follow the then common practice of the Scotch Bar, as did Wedderburn (Lord Loughborough) and many others, and become a ruling elder and lay member of the General Assembly, which is the more remarkable, as he would have entered it under the auspices of his great-uncle, Principal Robertson, who had long been the leader of the governing party in the Assembly. The Court of Session, and the speeches of Henry Erskine, Tait, and Charles Hope, then the great speakers at the Scottish Bar, supplied him with models of eloquence better suited for his after career. During his residence in Edinburgh he had frequent and familiar intercourse with Henry Erskine, afterwards Dean of Faculty and, under "All the Talents," Lord Advocate. On Brougham's removal to London he became equally intimate with the great ornament of the English Bar, Henry Erskine's brother Thomas, afterwards Lord Chancellor Erskine. Both these eminent men (he tells us) impressed upon him as the first of qualities "in an advocate that to which they owed their own great success, the sacrificing everything to the cause, and indulging in no one topic or any illustration or any comment, or even in a phrase or a word that did not directly and manifestly serve the cause in some material particular."‡ This lesson we fear Brougham never learned. Campbell, throughout his memoir, speaks disparagingly of Brougham as an advocate, saying he always thought more of the speech than the verdict, and even going so far as to say, "If the

* "Life and Times," vol. i. p. 82. "Campbell," vol. viii. p. 232.

† "Works," vol. vii. p. 256.

‡ "Life and Times," vol. i. pp. 55, 56.

verdict could by indiscreet management go against him, he was sure to confer the splendour of victory on his opponent.* We read all Campbell's depreciatory remarks on Brougham with distrust; but we have heard attorneys who remembered Brougham at the Bar say that he was not fitted or trusted for ordinary business, though he was sought after in any case where a great speech was required, which he could invariably supply on demand, though it did not as invariably gain the verdict. Though he chose the law for his profession, it was a pursuit he never really liked. "God knows," he wrote to Lord Grey just before his call to the English Bar, "there are few things so hateful †" Law is a very jealous mistress, and her honours will not be given to those who flirt with others. Literature, science, and, above all, politics, had greater charms than the law for Brougham; and the result was that though he attained the highest legal office, he cannot be called "a great lawyer." His theoretical knowledge of law was extensive, if not deep, and his multifarious general reading and acquirements gave him clearer ideas of what law should be than those possessed by any mere legal monk, such as Eldon, Kenyon, or Grant, brought up to believe in the law as "the perfection of reason." He was therefore well qualified for the office of a law reformer, and in various ways he fulfilled its duties with great advantage to the country. While yet at the University he exhibited much of that eccentricity and incongruity of character which distinguished him through life, and which led Bentham thus accurately to sum up his character—

"O, Henry, what a mystery you are;
Nil fuit unquam tibi tam impar." ‡

Ardent and devoted student as he was, and the friend of the most intellectual of his fellow-students, he was at the same time equally the friend of the "fastest set" amongst them; and Campbell, on the authority of Sir Thomas Dick Lauder, the intimate friend of the Brougham family, tells us that, "after having been found discussing literary and philosophical questions with the first set, he was sure soon after to be found rollicking in taverns, ringing bells in the streets, twisting off bell-pulls and knockers, or smashing lamps with the second."§ At the close of his University course, and before he commenced the practice of the law, he travelled with Mr. Stuart, afterwards Lord Stuart de Rothesay, through the capitals and the most interesting provinces of Sweden, Norway, and Denmark. Having returned

* "Life and Times," vol. viii. p. 289.

† *Ibid.*, vol. i. p. 400.

‡ "Bowring's Autobiographical Recollections," p. 294.

§ "Campbell," vol. viii. p. 230.

to Edinburgh, Brougham, like Alan Fairford in "Redgauntlet," "passed his private Scots' Law Examinations with good approbation, and his public trials, which were nothing in comparison save a mere form." At the sitting of the Court of Session on an early day in June, 1800,* he, to use the proper Scotch phrase, "passed advocate." All readers of "Lockhart's Life of Scott" remember that on the day when Scott and his friend William Clerk passed advocates, Scott said "to his comrade, mimicking the air and tone of a Highland lass waiting at the Cross of Edinburgh to be hired for the harvest work, 'We've stood here an hour by the Tron, Hinny, and de'il a ane has speered our price.'" Scott, his biographer tells us, before the close of the day earned sufficient to buy a nightcap, but Brougham had not even that degree of success. Many a day and hour by the Tron he waited in the Outer House, and "de'il a ane speered his price." Campbell says he has diligently searched the Scotch reports of the time, and can find in them no mention of Brougham's name. He adds what, judging from Brougham's English career is probably true, "that although his talents and acquirements had gained him a certain sort of celebrity, he was considered a man of science rather than a lawyer, and that no Writer to the Signet would trust him with a brief."† This opinion is strengthened by the fact that Brougham, in his autobiography, does not mention that he was ever engaged in any case in the Court of Session. He only says he went the Circuit for the Summer Assizes for the counties of Berwick, Roxburgh, and Selkirk, where his chief, indeed his only, business was to defend prisoners who were too poor to pay for professional assistance.‡ Brougham made his first appearance on Circuit at Jedburgh. The Judge of the Assize was Lord Eskgrove, whom Campbell describes as "a foolish old gentleman, of whom ludicrous stories had been told, and upon whom tricks had been played for near half a century."§ Brougham on his first joining the Circuit gave an example of the eccentricity and contempt for the ordinary rules of life which distinguished him from boyhood. He travelled from Edinburgh in a one-horse chaise. As he entered Jedburgh the Judge, in full robes, attended by the sheriffs, the magistrates of Jedburgh, and other magistrates, and escorted by a band of men, with halberds, called the "Crailing Guard," was proceeding slowly on foot towards the Town Hall. Brougham approaching at a hard trot, the "Crail-

* According to "Life and Times," vol. i. pp. 226, 547, June 1st; according to "Campbell," vol. viii. p. 236, June 10, Campbell is right, as his extract from the Minutes of the Faculty of Advocates show.

† "Lockhart's Life of Scott," p. 51, Edition 1845. ‡ Vol. viii. p. 237.

§ Vol. viii. p. 238, and conf. Lockhart's Scott, *ubi supra*.

ing Guard' presented their halberds and ordered him to stop. He charged the guard, broke the line of the procession, nearly set the judge into the gutter, and splashed his robes."* Years afterwards, when Lord Chancellor, Brougham was accused in the House of Lords of a similar but more serious offence—viz., forcing the King's guard on his way through the Horse Guards to the Palace—though he denied any intention so to offend, he seems to have failed to convince William IV. that his was an *innocent* offence.† To return to Jedburgh, the incensed and bespattered judge having taken his seat, Brougham being, except the advocate for the Crown, the only advocate present, defended all the prisoners. At no time of his life did he care to grapple with a strong judge, but on this, his first appearance in Court, he showed the propensity which ever afterwards he exhibited, to take liberties with a weak one. He accordingly perplexed Lord Eskgrove by elaborate arguments, delivered with all his vehemence and force of rhetoric, and with apparent sincerity, on such questions as whether, in an indictment for sheep stealing, it is necessary to state the sex of the stolen animal; whether a man indicted for stealing a pair of boots can be convicted of stealing a pair of *half boots*? whether, where a woman made her husband drunk, and he being drunk assaulted her, the woman was not the *causa causans*, or, in the language of Scots law, *art and part*, so as to entitle the husband to the benefit of the maxim "*volenti non fit injuria*." It was not without difficulty that the prosecuting advocate convinced the not very clear-minded judge of the fallacy of Brougham's arguments, and his lordship gave this utterance to his feelings: "I declare that man Broom or Brougham is the torment of my life."‡ The name Brougham is variously pronounced, but its correct pronunciation, according to the judgment of its most illustrious bearer, is "Broom." At his first appearance as Counsel at the Bar of the House of Lords, Lord Eldon called him "Mr. Bruffam." Indignant at being so miscalled, the offended advocate sent the Chancellor a rather angry message, accompanied with a paper, on which, to insure for the future the proper and monosyllabic pronunciation of the name, were written in large round text the letters B R O O M. At the end of the argument Lord Eldon, with his usual kindness of manner towards the Bar, observed: "Every authority upon the question has now been brought before us. New BROOMS sweep clean."§ We may add, that the common methods of pronouncing the name, as "Bro-~~am~~" or

* Campbell, *ubi supra*. † Campbell, vol. viii. pp. 239, 240.

‡ *Ibid.*, vol. viii. pp. 240, 241. § McGilchrist's "Life," p. 37.

|| Campbell, vol. viii. p. 257.

"Broo—am," were equally distasteful to its bearer as Lord Eldon's "Bruffam."

Brougham's eccentricities at the time of his first circuit are buttable, as we learn from Campbell, on the authority of Sir Thom^{as} Dick Lauder, to the fact that on this, as on more than one later occasion, he showed a tendency to insanity.* From his invincible repugnance to the profession he had chosen, he would have changed it for diplomacy, but failed to find an opening in that profession. As early as December, 1800, he, then in his twenty-third year, wrote to Sir Joseph Banks, "my resolution is still unaltered to attempt an opening in the political line." At this time his political opinions were unsettled. From his grand-uncle, the Principal, he had derived strong Conservative tendencies, but they had been shaken by association with some members of the Speculative Society, who were Liberals. According to Campbell, "he wavered much, and from time to time took the opposite sides with equal violence."† He was wholly unknown to the managers of parties and the owners of nomination boroughs; his determination to attempt an opening in politics was therefore necessarily postponed, and he resolved for the present to devote himself to literary and scientific pursuits; "but he continued to work," he himself tells us, "at his distasteful profession, in the hope that some day or other business might come to him."‡ The greater part of the years 1801—1802 was devoted to the composition of his "Colonial Policy of the European Powers," which appeared in 1803. Like all his compositions, it was written in haste, and was incomplete and inexact. It now possesses neither interest nor value. He showed himself to be then, what Macaulay described him thirty years later, "a kind of semi-Solomon. He half-knows everything, from the cedar to the hyssop."§ During 1802, Jeffrey, Horner, and Sydney Smith were planning the establishment of the *Edinburgh Review*. "There was some reluctance to ask Brougham's co-operation, on account of Smith's strong impression of Brougham's indiscretion and rashness;" and on Brougham's part there was some coyness in accepting the invitation, owing to his hesitation in committing himself to the Whig party. The first number of the *Edinburgh* appeared 10th October, 1802, and contained three articles by Brougham on non-political subjects. After the publication of his "Colonial Policy," he completely joined the Liberal side. Henceforward, and down to 1842, if not later, he was, especially in the earlier time of his connection with the *Review*, certainly, as respects the quantity, not always in the quality, of his contributions, the greatest of its

* Campbell, ubi supra. † Vol. viii. p. 243. ‡ "Life," vol. i. p. 228.
§ Napier, "Correspondence," 98.

contributors. In his old age he claimed to have written eighty articles in the first twenty numbers, and about one-fifth of the whole *Review*.* Convinced that no success as an advocate awaited him in Scotland, and stimulated by the example of Mansfield, Loughborough, and Erskine, who, with little if any more English interest or connection than he himself possessed, had gained the highest honours of the legal profession, and by that of his colleague on the *Edinburgh*, Francis Horner, who had also ventured into the English arena, he determined to be called to the English Bar. His self-confidence was increased by the opportunity he had of observing English lawyers, and comparing them with Scotch, when he appeared at the Bar of the House of Lords, as Counsel in appeal cases, being yet only a Scotch advocate. On the 14th November, 1803, he was entered at Lincoln's Inn. The abolition of the Slave Trade already engaged his attention, and in the autumn of 1804 he determined to go to Holland, where, he says, "I hoped to obtain much information on the subject of the Slave Trade, with the intention of afterwards proceeding through Germany, if I found that it could be done without much difficulty, and thence to Italy. . . . The state of the Continent made travelling there difficult for any one, for an Englishman impossible, so I went as an American, furnished with an American passport and papers."† He accomplished this tour without difficulty. We cannot find either in the "Autobiography" or in Campbell's life the exact date at which he finally removed to London, but it was at or about this time. He seems soon to have got into society, and very early became a member of Brooke's, and one of the intimates of Holland House, where he "partook of the grace, and the kindness far more admirable than grace, with which the princely hospitality of that ancient mansion was dispensed.‡ Here he made the acquaintance of Charles, Viscount Howick, who shortly afterwards became Earl Grey, whose Cabinet a quarter of a century later Brougham so largely contributed to form, to maintain, and to destroy. We can gain neither from the Autobiography, from Campbell, nor from any other source open to us, information as to the origin, nature, and extent of Brougham's connection with that remarkable group of men, called variously "the Saints," "the Evangelists," and "the Patent Christians of Clapham," of whom William Wilberforce was the leader. That this connection existed we have testimony of Sir James Stephen, though Brougham's was in the walks of the "Inner Temple, yet he

* As to the *Edinburgh Review* conf. "Life and Times," vol. i. p. 245 to 270, with Campbell, vol. viii. p. 244, Essay, and Napier's "Correspondence," passim.

† "Life," vol. i. pp. 271, 272.

‡ Macaulay quoted in "Campbell," vol. viii. p. 252.

be encountered in the less inviting walks which led him to the suburban councils of his brethren in command. There he formed or cemented attachments, of which no subsequent elevation of rank, or intoxicating triumph of genius, or agony of political strife, have ever rendered him forgetful.* Campbell, with divers characteristic sneers, says, "Nothing helped him (Brougham) more in his ascent than his connection with a party called 'the Saints,' having William Wilberforce at their head."† As we lately pointed out, the association of Brougham with these excellent men was one of the incongruities in his life.‡ With all his intellectual power and pleasing social qualities he had, even thus early in his English career, inspired men with a secret distrust of his sincerity. Bentham, who knew him well, and, though fond of him, judged him with impartial shrewdness—expressed the common idea of him in this couplet—

"Frailty, thy name is woman;
Insincerity, thy name is Brougham."

He sometimes varied the expression of the same idea by putting it in the shape of the admonition—"Henry, if you want to study insincerity, stand before a looking-glass." Accordingly, at the advent to office of "All the Talents," Brougham, who had expected to have been offered both office and a seat in Parliament, received neither. Employment, however, he did obtain. Lords Vincent and Rosslyn, and Lieutenant-General Simcoe, went on a mission to Portugal. Brougham was appointed secretary to this mission, with all the powers of a fourth Commissioner. The object of the mission was to arrange with the Portuguese Government for the defence of the country against invasion by France. This employment, though honourable, was not remunerative to Brougham, for he tells us that he was left considerably out of pocket by this mission. Neither his disappointment nor his pecuniary loss prevented him from exerting himself most strenuously on behalf of the Whigs at the General Election of 1807. Lord Holland, in his "Memoirs of the Whig Party," bears witness to Brougham's exertions on behalf of the Whig party at this crisis. Campbell pronounces them to have been "gigantic and incredible (unless miraculous)," and insinuates that "Brougham probably persuaded Lord Holland, who was very good-natured and a little credulous, that he had worked impossibilities."|| The General Election being over, Brougham found it necessary to turn again to the law. He became a pupil of Mr. Tindal, who was afterwards one of his juniors in the Queen's case, and subsequently

* "Essays on Ecclesiastical Biography"—Art. "The Clapham Sect," p. 550, Edition, 1875.

† Vol. viii. 253.

‡ WESTMINSTER REVIEW, No. 5, No. CX., April, 1879, p. 477.

§ Sir John Bowring's "Autobiographical Recollections" *ubi supra*. Conf. Campbell, vol. viii. 252, 253.

|| Vol. viii. pp. 253, 254.

Chief Justice of the Common Pleas. Here he formed the acquaintance of James Parke, afterwards a Baron of the Exchequer, and Lord Wensleydale. Two men more opposite to each other than Brougham and Parke could not be found—Brougham, brilliant and ambitious, but wanting steadiness and discretion; Parke, slow, plodding, cautious, and persevering. With Brougham, politics, literature, and science shared his energies with the law. To Parke, law was "all in all." We have heard that shortly before his death a lady said to him, "I wonder that with your great mind, Baron, you have never written anything." "Written anything," was the astonished answer, "why, my dear madam, I have written the judgments in the volumes of Meason and Welsby, and they will remain long after the perishable literature of the present time has passed away." Brougham became a tolerable special pleader, but was not versed in the subtleties of the English law of real property.* Indeed, his knowledge of it was inferior to his knowledge of the Scotch law on the same subject. His contributions to the *Edinburgh Review*, it would appear, were at this time his chief means of subsistence. He now applied to be called to the English Bar, but his Whig proclivities and his electioneering activity on behalf of the party had attracted the attention and excited the alarm of the Government.

"To my great surprise," he writes to Earl Grey, "they sent down the Attorney- and Solicitor-General, who frightened the benchers, and with Saint Allan Park (one of the greatest knaves in the profession) rejected my application by a majority of one vote. Every one admits that this is a vile political job, and scarcely ever before attempted. They luckily cannot easily prevent me next term—but I am infinitely injured by the delay; besides," he adds with shrewd foresight, "the foretaste it gives me of what I have to expect in future when I shall stand in need of a silk gown."†

This display of paltry spite on the part of the Government postponed his call to the following Michaelmas Term. He was called on the 22nd November, 1808, the day on which, twenty-two years later, he received the Great Seal. "I set out," he wrote to Lord Grey, "with too slender a provision of law, no doubt, and may very possibly never see a jury until I have to address it, my stock of practice being so slender that I never yet saw a *Nisi Prius* trial."‡

His first employment of importance was as Counsel at the Bar of both Houses for certain Liverpool and Manchester merchants,

* If Campbell be to be trusted, the revival of the ancient Earldom of Devon was due to Brougham's ignorance of the English law of descent.

† "Life," vol. i. p. 406, under date July 2, 1808. Saint Allan Park was James Allan Park, afterwards Justice of the Common Pleas, a man of vile temper who made a great profession of religion.

‡ "Life," vol. i. p. 401

in support of their petition against the Orders in Council issued in retaliation for Napoleon's Berlin and Milan Decrees. The design of these Orders, as well described by Brougham, was to "collect all the trade of the world into England;" their result, as he truly said, "was effectually to ruin whatever Napoleon's measures had left of our own." By his conduct of the Petitioners' case he gained great reputation, and laid the foundation of his future eminence.

Being one of a northern county, and having made a favourable impression upon his Liverpool and Manchester clients, he determined to join the Northern Circuit. His friends hoped that he would equal, if not exceed, Erskine in the rapidity of his rise. These expectations were by no means fulfilled. Attorneys soon discovered that, unlike Erskine, his principal object was not to gain the verdict for his client but distinction for himself; and so far from rising rapidly, after two years at the Bar, he spoke of himself "as going down in the world." Of his merits as an advocate, when addressing the Court as distinguished from the jury, we have the opinion of a shrewd but friendly critic—Horner :

"Great reach and compass of mind he must ever display, and he shows much industry too in collecting information, but his arguments are not in the best style of legal reasoning. Precision and clearness in the details, symmetry in the putting them together, an air of finish on the whole, are the merits of that style, and there is not one of those qualities in which he is not very defective. But his desultory reasoning has much force in some parts, and much ingenuity in others."^{*}

A more congenial sphere of labour now presented itself. The "long desired opening in the political line" was at hand. A seat for the Cornish borough of Camelford was vacated by Lord Henry Petty on his becoming the third Marquis of Lansdowne. Through Lord Holland Brougham was returned, on the nomination of the Duke of Bedford, then the owner of the borough. As an illustration of the then state of the representation, which may be a novelty to some of our younger readers, we shall give the letter in which the Duke acknowledged Brougham's acceptance of the seat :

"The entire confidence I have in your attachment to those political principles which have uniformly guided my own conduct through life, and the advantages I anticipate to the party with which I act, as well as to the country, from the exercise of great and acknowledged talents in a just cause in the crisis of unexampled difficulty and danger in which we are placed, combine to make this arrangement peculiarly gratifying to me. The writ will be moved on the first day of the Session, and perhaps it may be necessary to give you the trouble of a journey to Camelford."[†]

* Quoted by Campbell, vol. viii. p. 256, Note.

† "Life," vol. i. p. 498.

Many a one there is, even amongst advanced Liberals, who may feel a pang of envious regret at the thought of the days when an apology was deemed necessary if the candidate was asked to visit the constituency which he was ambitious to represent. No mention of any such visit occurs in his Autobiography, and, so far as we are aware, Camelford never saw in the flesh her most distinguished parliamentary representative. An able writer, not long since removed from amongst us, speaks of Brougham as a "man of fitful, defective, and strange greatness;" and says of him, "He was connected with the Whigs, but he never was one. His impulsive ardour is the opposite of their coolness; his irregular discursive intellect contrasts with their quiet retiring mind."* We do not think Brougham's character and his relation with the Whigs could be more accurately described.

Horner, with equal accuracy, forecast Brougham's House of Commons' career—

"Brougham," he writes to John Allen, "never could have found a more fortunate moment for setting out upon his career, which, though it may appear less brilliant at first on account of the expectations which are formed of him, will be very speedily distinguished, and upon the whole I would predict, that though he may very often cause irritation and uncertainty about him to be felt by those with whom he is politically connected, he will prove in the main firm to the true faith of liberty and Liberal principles."†

The new member first spoke on Mr. Whitbread's motion relative to the unconstitutional suppression of Lord Chatham's "Narrative of the Expedition to the Scheldt." Campbell says, "His first speech was considered a failure." On the other hand, Brougham says, "I had no reason to be dissatisfied with my speech, which was favourably received, as indeed first attempts generally are, and I was afterwards told that my arguments had assisted to produce the defeat of the Ministers." With this agrees the testimony of Horner, who wrote to Brougham's mother—

"You will naturally be very anxious to have some account of Henry's speech last night, which I had the pleasure of hearing. The manner in which he spoke was in every respect most parliamentary, and gave all his friends the most complete assurance of the success he will have in the House. His language and delivery were perfectly suited to the style which the House requires, and he showed himself to be in complete possession of it."‡

Even Campbell is compelled frankly to admit that "during the present century there has not been any instance of the rank

* "Literary Studies," by the late Walter Bagehot, vol. i.—Art. "The First Edinburgh Reviewers," p. 40.

† Campbell, vol. viii. p. 260.

‡ Conf. Campbell, vol. viii. p. 261, and Brougham's Life, vol. i. p. 500.

of leading member of the House of Commons being attained so rapidly as by Brougham.*

Wilberforce's declining health prevented his longer taking the lead in Parliament of the Anti-Slavery Cause, and he gladly accepted the proffered services of Brougham, within four months from the day when he took his seat, "without, as even Campbell admits, being supposed to be guilty of any presumption, he brought forward a motion for an address to the Crown, praying that more stringent measures might be taken against the Slave Trade—the motion was unanimously agreed to." This was the first of his many and persistent efforts on behalf of the slave; for, on whatever other subjects he may have changed or vacillated, from first to last there was no variability, neither shadow of turning, in his unrelenting enmity and unceasing warfare against what he called "the wild and guilty phantasy that man can hold property in man." He followed up his first blow with a second and more effectual one. In the next Session he carried, without a dissentient voice, a Bill declaring Slave Trading a felony, punishable by transportation.

The Session of 1812 witnessed what he himself calls his "greatest achievement. It was second to none (he wrote fifty years afterwards) of the many efforts made by me, and not altogether without success, to ameliorate the condition of my fellow-men."† This was the repeal of the Orders in Council, his opposition to which as Counsel at the Bar of the House, first fixed public attention on him.

"It was supposed," says Campbell, "that the extraordinary zeal which Brougham then displayed as Counsel was stimulated by the heavy fees which he received from wealthy clients; but now that he was acting as a representative of the people from pure patriotism, his zeal was still more ardent, and to gain his object he sacrificed much time which he might profitably have employed in his profession."‡

He was assisted in the work by Mr. Alexander Baring, a member of the great firm of Barings & Co., and afterwards Lord Ashburton, "than whom it would not have been possible to find a more powerful coadjutor." Seven weeks were spent in examining witnesses at the Bar of the House, showing incontestably the existence of distress all over the country, and connecting this by clear indications with the operation of the impolitic measure of the Orders. At the close of this evidence, Brougham moved an address to the Prince Regent for their repeal. "On this occasion," says Campbell, "he delivered a speech which he himself considered a *chef-d'œuvre*."§ This was *not* Brougham's opinion.

"The Orders in Council speech in 1808," he wrote to Mr. Macvey

* Vol. viii. p. 264.

† Vol. viii. p. 267.

‡ "Life," vol. ii. p. 1.

§ Vol. viii. p. 268.

Napier in 1838, "was a mighty poor affair. It was in my *first* manner (as painters say), and before I had acquired my diction, which I did with great labour, constant reading of old English authors, especially Swift and Addison, whom I had almost by heart, and then studying and getting by heart and translating Demosthenes and Cicero."

Be the merits of the speech what they may, it effected its purpose, for after Rose, the head of the Board of Trade, weakly attempted to defend the Orders, to whom Mr. Baring replied, Lord Castlereagh immediately announced there was no need to press the motion to a division, as the Crown had been advised immediately to rescind the Orders. At this time there were deceptive signs of the return of the Whigs to power, and it was expected that Brougham, abandoning the law, would become President of the Board of Trade—an office for which his successful conduct of the campaign against the Orders in Council showed him eminently fit. The Whig prospects of office faded away, and Parliament was dissolved. The Duke of Bedford had sold Camelford, and the purchaser wanted both seats for nominees of his own. Brougham's services to the mercantile world led to his being brought forward for Liverpool, but, owing to mismanagement, which Horner truly said "was an instance of that wrong-headed impracticable want of judgment which is so often exemplified in those who are the most earnest friends of liberty," he lost his election, and remained out of Parliament until 1816. It was significant of the distrust felt of him by the party to whom he had attached himself, that no step was taken to secure him one of the many seats belonging to members of the party. He felt his exclusion bitterly, and his bad opinion of the Whig leaders, except Earl Grey, often appears in his letters. For the next four years his time was mostly given to his profession, which he had somewhat neglected during his parliamentary career. He had, however, by no means abandoned it. In fact, in 1811, the second year of his parliamentary career, he made his first great speech at the Bar. The *Examiner* was then edited by John and Leigh Hunt; they had re-published from a Lincolnshire paper a leader commenting plainly and forcibly on the sentence of a court-martial, which ordered a soldier to receive 1000 lashes, of which 750 were inflicted, and the man carried senseless from the field. The then Attorney-General filed an *ex officio* information against the Hunts, for publishing a libel on the military authorities. Brougham was retained for their defence; his speech is described by Campbell as "extremely temperate and judicious, as well as forcible." The Chief Justice

* Napier's "Correspondence," 236. We have quoted the date 1808 correctly from Lord Brougham's letter, but the speech, 1812, is the one intended. It is to be found in Brougham's "Works," Edition, 1873, vol. x.

† It is given in "Works," vol. ix. p. 12.

(Lord Ellenborough) also characterised it as "a speech of great ability, eloquence, and manliness," and endeavoured to undo its effect on the jury by a flagrant perversion of Mr. Fox's Act, telling the jury, without scruple or hesitation, that the article was a libel, and was published with the criminal intent imputed to it in the information. A Middlesex jury were not to be browbeaten by a judge, and acquitted the defendants. Great was the rejoicing of Brougham's friends, and, indeed, of all Liberals, at this success.

"The accounts of your speech," writes J. A. Murray, from Edinburgh,* "and the verdict which like a victory is the substantial proof of a good general, have given us more delight than anything that has of late happened in these bad times. I think it a great victory for the public, for the prosecution of libels is carried too far, and it is a great object it should be checked. You are the first person since Erskine who has done so, and you have now a much higher position than any Ministry can give you."

A far greater than Murray—Erskine—whose services on behalf of the Rights of Juries and the Freedom of the Press it is impossible to over-estimate, joined in congratulating Brougham. After commenting on the usefulness of maintaining the rank and character of the Bar, "a profession so inseparably connected with the safety of the Government and the liberties of the people," he added, "I am sure that this result will be exemplified in *your* future life, you have given ample proof and earnest already."† Erskine's estimate of Brougham's future was correct. Of Erskine Brougham was a follower, and, as his speeches show, with no feeble or faltering steps. The trial of the Hunts in Middlesex was quickly followed by that of another *ex officio* information against the editor of the *Stamford Mercury*, the paper from which the article in the *Examiner* had been taken. Here a Tory judge again perverted Fox's Act, and a jury of Lincolnshire squires, gladly following his lead, Brougham had the mortification of seeing his client convicted and severely punished. Nor was he more successful when a second time he defended the Hunts. An *ex officio* information was filed against them by the Attorney-General (Sir Vicary Gibbs), "who filed so many *ex officio* informations in a few months, that no two Attorney-Generals ever in a long course of years loaded the files of the Court with so many," and who perhaps may escape total oblivion by being handed down in Brougham's "Sketches of Statesmen" as the model of an "eminent though narrow-minded lawyer," an "inferior but able man"—"of the English set

* Afterwards Lord Advocate, and Judge of the Court of Session.

† "Life," vol. i. pp. 505, 521.

of more lawyers." The Hunts' offence (if we recollect rightly) was calling the Prince Regent a "fat and elderly Adonis." Brougham defended them in a speech which Lord Ellenborough said "was inoculated with all the poison of the libel." "I fired for two hours," writes Brougham to Lord Grey, "very close and hard into the Prince on all points, public and private, and in such a way they *could* not find any opening to break in upon, and were therefore prevented from interrupting, me." Horner described Brougham's speech in terms which Campbell, who also heard it, says "give its just character, with an unexaggerated account of the demeanour of the Judge."

"Brougham made a powerful speech—unequal and wanting that unity which is so effective with a jury; some parts were eloquent, particularly in the conclusion, where he had the address without giving any advantage to fasten the words *effeminary* and *cowardice* where everybody could apply them. One very difficult part of the case, the conduct of the Regent to the Princess, he managed with skill and great effect, and his transition from that subject to the next part of his case was a moment of real eloquence. Lord Ellenborough was more than usually impatient and indecently violent."

Brougham thus describes, to Earl Grey, Lord Ellenborough's conduct—

"In summing up he attacked me with a personal bitterness wholly unknown in a Court and towards a Counsel—who, you know, of course is supposed to speak his client's sentiments—most gross and unjustifiable. All the profession are with me, and he is either in a scrape or next to it. He coarsely hinted at Lord Holland's having had a Cabinet place, though convicted of adultery, by way of showing that the Prince is not more immoral than his father. . . . After all his fury the jury, to his infinite astonishment, hesitated and then withdrew."

Spite of their hesitation the jury found the defendants guilty, and they suffered a long imprisonment; but the retiring, as Brougham added, was of itself really a victory under the circumstances.* He also said, and with perfect truth, "that the defence would be a thousand times more unpleasant than the libel"—a more temperate speech such as he made in the Hunts' first case might perhaps have had a better effect on the jury. It was such speeches as this in the Hunts' second case which gave rise to the remark reported by Campbell, that whereas Erskine never spoke a word except with a view to the verdict, Brougham was chiefly solicitous about himself, and having made a brilliant† speech, was rather apathetic as to the result of the trial;" but it must ever be borne in mind that this speech and

* Campbell, vol. viii. pp. 279, 280; "Life," vol. ii. pp. 72, 73.

† Vol. viii. p. 324.

others like it had their effect on public opinion, and helped not a little to procure for us the freedom of the Press which we now enjoy. As a consequence of his exclusion from Parliament his business at the Bar declined. He complained at this time to Lord Grey of the sort of interdict or excommunication which "the Whigs generally laid on him." When the long vacation of 1815 arrived, he felt much inclined to give up law, politics, and everything, and to retire into the country to write books. A few weeks of rest and perfect quiet at Brougham restored him, and banished the "fit of lowness and low spirits and despondency which had so afflicted him." Brougham's periods of rest and quiet would be considered by other people to be periods of considerable activity, for during his three weeks at Brougham he wrote several articles for the *Edinburgh*, and devoted much time to speculations and investigations into the working of bees. These pursuits "did as much to cure him as the healthy air of Westmoreland."* His recovery was perfected early in 1816, by his return, through the influence of Lord Darlington, for the nomination borough of Winchelsea, which seat he held for the next fourteen years. Campbell admits that "Brougham did nothing mean to gain the seat, and never in any degree sacrificed his independence while representing a peer or peeress."† On re-entering Parliament he at once sought to make himself leader of the Opposition, but the Whigs looked on Lord Althorp as the fittest man for that position, and Brougham was compelled to act as a sort of guerilla chief. In this capacity, by pursuing the tactics by which he had defeated the Orders in Council, he greatly aided the defeat of the Government proposal for the continuance of the war income-tax after the peace of 1815. During his absence from Parliament he became the confidential adviser of the ill-fated Caroline of Brunswick, by his bold and fearless advocacy of whose case he raised himself to a position of renown never before or since attained by any member of the English Bar. His first acquaintance with his illustrious client seems to have begun before even the commencement of his parliamentary career; and as early as 1810 the Princess of Wales consulted him on behalf of her daughter, the Princess Charlotte, as to her father's (the Regent) conduct towards her.‡ To the Prince Regent Brougham from the first felt an intuitive aversion, and whilst the Prince was still intimate at the great Whig houses, Brougham, except on one occasion, declined to meet him, and altogether avoided invitations to Carlton House. About 1813 the unhappy relations between the Regent and

* *Vide* "Life," vol. ii. p. 290.

† Vol. viii. p. 283.

‡ "Life," vol. ii. p. 141.

his wife became worse than ever. The unfortunate Princess wanted a champion and adviser. The Tories, who had been her friends at the "delicate investigation" in 1806, were now the tools of the Regent. The Whigs had advised and directed the "investigation," and to that extent were committed, and perhaps prejudiced against her. Many of them also were unwilling by espousing her cause to increase the disfavour with which the party were looked on by the Regent. Brougham now became the acknowledged adviser both of the Princess of Wales and the Princess Charlotte. His Autobiography gives us some further particulars of the miserable relations between the Regent and his wife and daughter, and the ill-treatment of the two Princesses not only by their husband and father, but by the Queen and other members of the Royal Family. We will only refer to that melancholy history so far as it is necessary for our sketch of Brougham. That he was both an able and honest adviser to the Princesses there can be no doubt. The advice which he states he gave the Princess Charlotte on her escape from Warwick House is a good illustration of his conduct throughout as her adviser. It is so generally known that it is only needful to refer to it.* The very honesty of his counsels was disagreeable to the Princess of Wales, and at all times she had other and secret advisers who were always ready, to use Bacon's phrase, "instead of giving her free counsel, to sing her a song of plabebo."

Brougham's honesty and ability as adviser of the unhappy Caroline received a fresh illustration on the publication of his Autobiography. The facts were not previously known to the world. We refer to the remonstrance addressed by him to the Princess on her deciding to reside on the Continent. It is remarkable also for the foresight with which he pointed out to the Princess the consequences of disregarding his remonstrances. His predictions were fulfilled to the letter.

"As long," he wrote to the Princess, "as you remain in this country, I will answer for it that no plot can succeed against you. But if you are living abroad, and surrounded by the base spies and tools who will be always planted about you, ready to invent and swear as they may be directed, who can pretend to say what may happen, especially after your absence shall have lessened the numbers and weakened the zeal of your friends? I declare I do not see how a proposition hostile to your Royal Highness's marriage could be resisted if you continued living abroad. Never let your Royal Highness forget that in England spies and false witnesses can do nothing, abroad everything may be apprehended from them. Above all, do not flatter yourself that it will

* See also his Letter to the Princess Charlotte, "Life," vol. ii. p. 182, as to the Warwick House; *vide* "Life," vol. ii. p. 227, and the letter to Earl Grey, at p. 233; Conf. Campbell, vol. viii. p. 293.

be time enough to return when you see steps taken against you. The blow will come without any warning as soon as the public feeling is prepared for it."*

In face of this warning the Princess, at the instigation of some† whom Brougham denounced to Grey for "selling the Princess," went to reside abroad. She was surrounded by spies from the first. After her daughter's death the notorious "Milan commission" was sent out to reduce to formal shape the report previously sent over by the spies. As the Princess had secret counsellors, who advised her behind the back of her acknowledged advocate and adviser, so the Prince Regent, in addition to his responsible ministers, had his confidential adviser in the person of his Chancellor of the Duchy of Cornwall, Sir John Leach. We agree with Brougham that for a matter of such delicacy, intricacy, and importance, not only to the persons themselves, but to the country, as the relations between the Regent and his wife, "not all England, certainly not all its Bar, could have produced a more unsafe counsellor."

"During the Princess's absence many rumours," writes Brougham, "of course reached this country; but I had accounts on which I could better rely from those in her suite, and there was great ground for alarm at the carelessness with which she suffered strangers to make her acquaintance, and of her gaiety and love of amusement, leading her into the society of foreigners, and thus exposing her to the constant risk of false reports being conveyed to England by the spies set about her."‡

We agree with Campbell, that these "rumours seem to have made a very deep impression upon Brougham's mind."§ A letter written in 1815 shows that at the time he thought more seriously of these reports than we should judge he did had we only to guide us the statement in his long after written "Life."

"The accounts of the Princess of Wales," he wrote to Earl Grey, "are worse and worse. She embarked on the 17th November for Palermo, *Courier* (i.e., Bergami) and all. Captain Briggs volunteered taking her, and if they have evidence against her I should think he may bring her home and not to Palermo. If they have not, the voyage may furnish it. On the daughter's account, I hope she may not be got rid of, and it may be said that bad treatment drove her to it originally. My opinion is they will be afraid to touch her, at least until they have obtained *English witnesses*; for no Italians would be believed; but the voyage may supply this defect in their case. Of course I should not wish to be quoted on this subject."||

* "Life," vol. ii. pp. 253-5.

† *Ibid.*, pp. 259-352.

‡ "Life," vol. ii. p. 252.

§ Campbell, vol. viii. 295.

|| "Life," vol. ii. pp. 298-299.

Under the impressions produced by these rumours, Brougham, according to Campbell's version of the affair, without authority from the Princess, took on himself, on her behalf, to propose to Lord Liverpool that on her having secured to her for her life the annuity of 35,000*l.* to which she was entitled as Princess of Wales, she would agree to live permanently abroad, and never assume the title of Queen of England. Lord Liverpool's reply (we still follow Campbell's account) was, that there would be no indisposition at the proper time to entertain the principle on which the proposal was grounded, if it had the assent of the Princess.* Brougham's own account differs materially from Campbell's. He says—

"My correspondence with some friends of the Princess, on whom I could entirely depend—as Sir William Gell, the Miss Berrys, Lady Charlotte Lindsay, and Lady Glenbervie—made it quite clear that after her daughter's death she had given up all wish to return; but that the vexation of the constant spies she was beset by, and all the mean contrivances to lower her in the eyes of whatever Court she came near, had made her existence intolerable under this endless annoyance of every kind, and that she would be most happy if any arrangement could be made for her entire freedom from all vexation. Her wish was to take some Royal title in the family, and having her income secured, to be recognised by our Foreign Ministers at whatever Court she might choose for a time to have her residence. Being on intimate terms with Lord Hutchinson, a political as well as a personal friend, I wrote him a letter which he was at liberty to communicate to the Prince, with whom he was on intimate terms, though not at all one of the Carlton House set. Though I well knew that the Princess would adopt this plan, yet I purposely avoided any direct communication with her in order that I might not in any way commit her, and might state distinctly that it was only a proposition which I was disposed to make to her, and advise her to consider it."†

What reception this proposal met with on the part of the Prince, Brougham does not tell us; he says only, "I have little or no doubt that if the proposal had been at once accepted by the Regent and his advisers, she would have been glad to have remained abroad." Campbell says, but we treat this statement not as a fact, but merely an inference more or less correctly drawn, "that the proposal gave great satisfaction and confidence to the Regent and his Ministers, who, armed with the supposed discoveries of the Milan Commission, thought that when the time for action arrived they must be able to dictate their own terms of degradation."<‡

Early in the year 1820 the time for action arrived. On the 29th January, George III., who for the last ten years "had a name that he lived, but was dead," passed away. The Regent

* Vol. viii. p. 295. † "Life," vol. viii. p. 354. ‡ Vol. viii. p. 296.

became King, by the title of George IV., of all kingly names in English history the most unsavoury, and Caroline of Brunswick became of right Queen Consort. War to the knife between the new King and his Queen began at once. The King as a first step took the hitherto unprecedented course of ordering the omission of the Queen's name in the prayers for the Royal Family. This was punishment, not only before trial and conviction, but before any direct accusation had been made against her. This rash and hasty step, taken against the advice of the Ministers,* led to what was commonly called the "Queen's Trial," which Campbell truly says "brought disgrace upon the King and Queen, disgusted the whole world, and nearly brought about a revolution in this country."

Brougham and his friend Denman were appointed the Queen's Attorney- and Solicitor-General, and on the first day of Easter Term, 1820, much to the disgust of the Chief Justice (Lord Ellenborough), took their seats within the Bar accordingly. Brougham's conduct at this crisis was at first "wavering, mysterious, suspicious." One of his warmest admirers accounts for this on the theory "that the key to his conduct throughout seems to be his inward conviction of the Queen's guilt, which made him desirous of a compromise while there was yet time. Once involved in the fight, he rightly resolved to do his utmost for his client,"† and he did that utmost, as even Campbell admits, in an open, bold, and skilful manner, so "as to rescue the Queen from the destruction to which she seemed to be doomed, to make the King tremble on the throne, and to gain for himself immortal renown."

The secret advisers who surrounded the Queen inspired her with suspicions of Brougham, and an offer was made to Sir James Scarlett, afterwards Lord Abinger, to make him the Queen's Attorney-General in Brougham's place.

Scarlett had no desire to thwart the King's wishes, and refused to be in any way connected with the case; and Mr. Wild, a cautious man, who had practised as an attorney, and who afterwards became Lord Chancellor Truro, was brought into the case to keep a watch over his more brilliant but erratic leader.

For some time proceedings hung fire. The general opinion was that held by Sir Walter Scott, that whichever party struck the first blow would lose the battle. The King's Ministers were much embarrassed; on the one hand, some of the Opposition called for inquiry into the rumours as to the Queen's conduct, which arose from what had leaked out as to the Milan

* Greville, vol. i. p. 24.

† G. W. Hastings, *Gentleman's Magazine*, June, 1869.

Commission, and declared that without such an inquiry they could not vote for a continuance to the Queen of the income allowed her as Princess. On the other hand, the King was urging them to take immediate proceedings for degrading and divorcing the Queen. Such a course was most repugnant to men like Liverpool, Eldon, and Castlereagh, who foresaw the storm in the country which such proceedings would rouse, and whose caution and prudence were more striking than any of their other qualities. On one occasion the King drove, both the Premier and the Chancellor from his presence with taunts and insults, and the whole Cabinet resigned. Unfortunately for their own reputation, they were induced to resume office at the cost of humbling themselves, for the sake of gratifying the passions that swayed the royal breast, and deferring to the conceited arrogance that inspired his vulgar adviser (Leach), of whom it was said at the time, "if he be in his Sovereign's confidence, he has the confidence of no other person in his dominions."²

At length, on the day on which Brougham first publicly appeared as the Queen's Attorney-General, he, according to Campbell's narrative, received from Lord Liverpool a proposal that the King would ask Parliament to allow the Queen the increased yearly income of 50,000*l.*, provided she did not take the title of Queen, nor come into any part of the British dominions, nor exercise any of the rights or privileges of Queen, other than with respect to the appointment of law officers. Brougham states the proposition to have been, that "she should have all the rights of a Queen Consort, especially as regarded money and patronage."

"A mystery now arose which never has been, and never will be, cleared up." Brougham did not communicate this proposal to the Queen, who was still at Rome, nor did she ever hear of it, until after her arrival in London. Urged by her secret advisers, she determined to leave Italy and come to England, and there defy her husband. At St. Omer she was met by Brougham and by Lord Hutchinson. Brougham describes her as "surrounded by Italians, and resolved to come to England." Lord Hutchinson "was the bearer of a proposition substantially the same as that made by Lord Liverpool to Brougham." Whether by mistake, or acting according to secret instructions, is unknown, but Lord Hutchinson would not regularly submit the proposal to the Queen, while he plainly stated that it had been decided to take proceedings against her as soon as she set foot on English soil.

* Brougham's "Statesmen," pp. 236, 257; Greville, vol. i. pp. 27, 28, 29; Conf. Campbell, viii. pp. 297, 298, with Colchester's "Diary," vol. iii. pp. 115, 117; Brougham's "Life," vol. ii. p. 356.

Brougham tried to dissuade her from coming to England, but in vain ; and, on the 6th June, she arrived in London. The great mass of the people thought her an injured woman, and gave her a triumphal reception. In some cases, their sympathy was blunderingly expressed. She was accompanied by a boy, whom she said she had adopted, but of whom no satisfactory account could be given, and the mob shouted as she passed, "God bless your Majesty and your innocent child," a salutation which involved the admission that she was guilty of the worst crime laid to her charge.*

On the very day of the Queen's arrival a Royal message was brought down to each House of Parliament, accompanied by a green bag containing the evidence on which the charge against her was founded. The Ministers' object was to "stun the nation by the immediate explosion of the green bag." The Lords at once appointed a secret committee, to whom the contents of the bag were referred. In the Commons, the Government endeavoured to act with equal rapidity, but were defeated by Brougham, who now made the earliest of his ever-memorable efforts on his client's behalf.

On the 7th June the Commons met to consider a motion for an address in reply to the Royal message. Before the debate began, Brougham read to the House a message from the Queen,

"Solemnly protesting in the face of the Sovereign, the Parliament, and the country, against the formation of a secret tribunal to examine documents privately prepared by her adversaries, as a proceeding unknown to the law of the land, and a flagrant violation of all the principles of justice. She also protested against the omission of her name from the Liturgy, and other measures of the Government designed to prejudice the world against her.† On this occasion the Duke of Wellington (Brougham writes to Napier) sat under the gallery, and commanded the ministerial army. I out-manceuvred him, and got a delay which saved the Queen."‡

Lord Castlereagh, having moved to refer the "green bag" to a select committee, Brougham, without consulting any one but Denman, made what his friends said was the best speech ever made, and which all admit was good. He went fully into the case, threw in an ominous hint that he would not hesitate to secure the Queen "at any desperate expense," and urged delay. The speech made a great impression. Wilberforce, with a view to avoid the public scandal of the trial, and to give opportunity for further negotiation, moved the adjournment of the debate ;

* See Torrens's "Life of Lord Melbourne," vol. i. p. 160 ; Spencer Walpole's "History of England," vol. i. 515.

† *Vide* Campbell, vol. viii. p. 304. ‡ Napier, "Correspondence," p. 257.

the county members rose one after the other, and so strongly concurred in the wish for an adjournment that Lord Castlereagh was obliged to give way. A long and tedious negotiation, both by correspondence and conferences, took place, in which Brougham took the most active part on the Queen's side. No arrangement could be come to, because the feelings both of the King and of the Queen were too much exasperated and embittered to permit either of them to be guided by sober reason.

Upon the motion of Wilberforce, an address to the Queen was agreed to by the House of Commons, the object of which was to prevent the investigation of the case. A deputation, consisting of Wilberforce, Mr. Stuart Wortley, Sir Thomas Dyke Acland, and Mr. Banks, representing respectively the then undivided counties of York, Devon, and Dorset, waited on the Queen to present the address. It was with difficulty that they escaped maltreatment; the hisses and screams against them were excessive, and Wilberforce was saluted by the name of "Dr. Cantwell." What occurred was thus related by Brougham to Greville—

"All the Queen's Counsel were assembled, and before receiving the deputation from the Commons she asked their advice. Brougham said that she was disposed to acquiesce, but wanted *them* to advise her to do so, and that her intention was if they had, to act on that advice, but to save her popularity by throwing the odium on them, and devoting them to popular execration. He therefore resolved, and his brethren likewise, to give no advice at all; and when she turned to him and said, 'What do you think I ought to do?' he replied, 'Your Majesty is undoubtedly the best judge of the answer you ought to give; and your own feelings will point out to you the proper course.' 'Well; but what is your opinion?' 'Madame, I have certainly a strong opinion on the subject; but I think there cannot be a shadow of doubt of what your Majesty ought to do; and there can be no doubt your Majesty's admirable sense will suggest to you what that opinion is.' 'Humph,' said she, turning to Denman, 'and, Mr. Solicitor, what is your opinion?' 'Madame, I concur entirely in that which has been expressed by the Attorney-General,' and so they all repeated. She was furious, and being left to herself, she resolved not to agree to the request of the Commons.* We retired," adds Brougham in his written account of the transaction, "in order that she might come to a determination. She called us in, and announced that she had resolved to refuse, and said that she had from the beginning no doubt or hesitation, though she desired to have our opinion."

The danger and disgrace of the trial was not, therefore, to be avoided. On the 5th July, Lord Liverpool brought in a Bill, founded on the recommendations of the Lords' Select Committee,

* Conf. Greville, vol. iii. pp. 36, 37, with Brougham's "Life," vol. ii. 376, 377.

to deprive the Queen "of the title, prerogatives, rights, and privileges of Queen Consort, and to dissolve her marriage with his Majesty." To this Bill the people, as Brougham wrote years afterwards, in one voice demurred.

"They said, suppose all to be true that her enemies allege, we care not. She was ill-used; she was persecuted; she was turned out of her husband's house; she was denied the rights of a wife, as well as of a mother; she was condemned to live the life of the widow and the childless, that he who should have been her comforter might live the life of an adulterous libertine, and she shall not be trampled down and destroyed to satiate his vengeance, or humour his caprice. This was the universal feeling that occupied the country. Had the whole facts as charged been proved by a cloud of unimpeachable witnesses, such would have been the universal verdict of that country, the real jury which was to try this great cause."*

Brougham's knowledge that the feeling of the people was wholly on the Queen's side, and against the King, nerved him for the arduous struggle on which he now entered. Never before was the House of Lords addressed by a member of the House, much less by Counsel at their Bar, in terms so sarcastic, so defiant, and, as some said, insolent, as those which they were now compelled to hear from Brougham.

In his first address to the House against the principle of the Bill, he contrasted the Queen's position with that of any wife in humble life, from whom her husband sought to be divorced—in that case there must have been the verdict of a jury of honest, impartial, disinterested Englishmen.

"There would then," he said, "have been among her judges none who were the servants of her husband, for her Counsel would have had the right of challenging all such—none who were hired by him during his pleasure—none who were placed in a situation to feel gratitude for the past, or expectation for the future favours which he had it in his power to bestow."†

On the question that the Bill be read a second time, he addressed to the House another argument against its principle. In this he referred very plainly to the notorious fact of the King's profligate life since his marriage, and again gave one of his ominous warnings:

"Be the consequences what they may to any other persons, powers, principalities, dominions, or nations, an advocate is bound to do his duty; and I shall not fail to exert every means in my power to put a

* "Statesmen of George III.," p. 236. Edition 1839. Conf. the passage in its modified form in Brougham's speeches, vol. i. p. 88, Edition 1838, and "Works," vol. ix. p. 77, Edition 1873, where it is omitted.

† As quoted by Campbell, vol. viii. p. 309.

stop to the progress of this Bill. I will appeal to the spirit of holiness, and to the heads of the Church now ranged before me, whether adultery is to be considered only a crime in woman."

He "thought it fit" likewise to remind their lordships of their standing order "that every husband who applies for a divorce shall personally attend the House, in order that he may be examined before the divorce is granted—and to show that he himself, having always acted as a kind and faithful husband, is entitled to a dissolution of the marriage by reason of the infidelity of his wife."*

Throughout the case Brougham insisted on treating it as an ordinary divorce suit, the promoter of which was the husband, whose right to a divorce was barred if he were proved to have been guilty of the same misconduct as that of which he accused his wife. The law officers of the Crown, on the other hand insisted that the Bill was a public measure brought forward by the Government for the welfare of the State. On one occasion this contention gave rise to a memorable episode in the case. A Mr. Powell being called as a witness, stated he was the agent for the Bill; Brougham immediately asked him, if he were an agent, who was his principal. The question being objected to, it was supported by Brougham in a speech described by Greville as "uncommonly clever." In the course of it he said—

"After the assertion of my learned friend I am bound to believe that this measure is not to gratify the wishes of the King; and that his Majesty looks on with indifference, solicitous only that right be done. But who then is the prosecutor?" And then, at the suggestion of a bystander, he declaimed with all his oratorical power that magnificent passage in Milton's description of death.—"What is this mysterious being (he continued)—

"That shape hath none
Distinguishable in member, joint, or limb;
Or substance may be called which shadow seems?
What seems his head?
The likeness of a kingly crown hath on."

This produced a great sensation in the House, and some of the King's friends amongst the Peers, who had more zeal than discretion, would have committed Brougham to the Tower; but wiser counsels prevailed. The sensation was not confined to the House. Amongst all the mortifications and annoyances which the King's ill-advised measure caused him—this, next only to Deuman's misunderstood comparison of him with Nero, gave him

* As quoted by Campbell, vol. viii. p. 310.

the greatest vexation. He said Brougham might have spared him the attack on his shape. He was more vain of his person and of his slim figure than of almost anything else, and he said that he thought everybody allowed, whatever faults he might have, his legs were not as Brougham described them. It was in vain pointed out to him that the quotation was only introduced for the sake of the passage—

“What seems his head?

The likeness of a kingly crown hath on,”

to show the speaker's impression that the King was the true author of the proceedings. He persisted that he was certain Brougham had heard of his piquing himself on his shape, and thought it would plague him to have it held up to ridicule.*

If Campbell accurately states Brougham's opinion, he considered his defence of the Queen “the most wonderful effort of genius recorded in the annals of oratory.” Certainly he took immense, even excessive, pains in its preparation. As is well known, he wrote the peroration seventeen times, before he hit on the form he thought worthy the occasion. We cannot assent to the estimate of it which Campbell imputes to Brougham. Every one knows Mr. Fox's test of a speech. Does it read well? If so, it was a bad speech; and if the converse be true, that a speech which does not read well is a good speech, then the defence of the Queen was a good speech, for assuredly it does not read well. Be that as it may, beyond all controversy, the effect produced at the time of its delivery was immense. Lord Russell calls it the “most wonderful effort of oratory he ever heard.”† Lord Minto, a supporter of the Bill, and therefore not prejudiced in favour of the speaker or his cause, wrote to Brougham's mother—

“Brougham has just concluded a speech which has delighted and *astonished* the most sanguine of his friends, who you may believe were prepared to expect as much from him as man is capable of. In addition to his own peculiar and powerful style of eloquence, he has on this occasion shown that he is capable of equal excellence in a species of oratory for which many had not given him credit. I will not say a word more of it; but I assure you that its effect even upon those who are not disposed to judge kindly, has been equally flattering; it will never be forgotten.”‡

We have also the generous and heartfelt testimony of his colleague, Denman—

“Brougham's was one of the most powerful orations that ever proceeded from human lips. His arguments, his observations, his tones,

* Campbell, vol. viii. p. 312; Brougham's “Life,” vol. iii. p. 412; Greville, vol. i. p. 38.

† “Recollections,” &c., p. 137. ‡ Brougham's “Life,” vol. ii. p. 400.

his attitude, his eye, left an impression on my mind which is scarcely ever renewed without exciting strong emotion. The peroration was sublime, 'Spare the altar which must stagger from the shock that rends its kindred throne.' Erskine rushed out of the House in tears. The defect of the speech was a want of due care in the comments on the prosecutor's case. If he had taken pains to demonstrate the falsehood of a large part of the evidence, and contrast the proof with the opening, we might have had a fair excuse for claiming an acquittal on the failure of all the charges against us. But this would have been suspicious and difficult after pausing three weeks in the case, and when it was known that we had sent for witnesses from so many different quarters."*

After much study of the speech, though we do not assent to Campbell's unsparing depreciation of it, yet we agree with him that it is inferior to the "unpremeditated ebullitions of invective and sarcasm which Brougham poured forth during the proceedings."† It shows in many places over-preparation, yet so skilfully were the prepared and the extempore parts blended in the delivery, that he tells us the extempore parts were supposed to be prepared, and the prepared, except the peroration, to be extempore. Even Lord Erskine, a most practised judge, was taken in.‡ To our mind there is a want of precision and finish in the analysis of the evidence, and numerous instances of what we agree with Campbell is the great defect in Brougham's speeches, "he dwelt too long upon the same topic, whether grave or gay, and he weakened both his logic and his wit by excessive elongation."§ The peroration is as Denman described it, and is worthy of the pains bestowed upon it; but the defence, taken as a whole, is far inferior to the condensed energy, to use Brougham's own words, "the distilled venom" of the celebrated defence of Williams for a libel on the Durham clergy, which, we agree with Campbell, "is the best Brougham ever delivered, either at the Bar or in Parliament. The noble biographer adds, "and I would almost say" [we could say, not almost, but altogether] "that it is worthy to be bound up in a collection of English oratory with Erskine's and Burke's." ||

* Arnold's "Memoirs of Denman," vol. i. p. 169.

† *Vide* vol. viii. p. 313.

‡ Letter to Mr. Napier, "Correspondence," p. 234. The same letter contains mention of one of Brougham's peculiar powers: "I have the faculty of being able to write word for word after delivering it, a speech *extempore made*, if I do not delay it above a day or a day and a half, because the speaking extempore is such an effort as engraves it on the memory."

§ Vol. viii. p. 288. In illustration of what is said in the text we refer to the passage comparing the proceedings of George IV. against Caroline of Brunswick with those of Henry VIII. against Catherine of Arragon. *Vide* the Speech, "Works," vol. ix. Edition 1873, pp. 106, 107.

|| Vol. viii. p. 330. The Speech will be found in "Works," vol. ix. p. 222.

Lord Russell says "that it carried satire and sarcasm to a height that may be called sublime."* We have referred to the mysterious warnings of undisclosed but terrible evils which Brougham more than once uttered during the proceedings. This was understood at the time to refer to counter-charges against the King, founded on his notorious misconduct with Lady Jersey and others; but Brougham, in his "Life," tells us that what he had in his mind, and what he intended to do, "was neither more nor less than to impeach the King's own title by proving that he had forfeited the Crown. He had married a Roman Catholic (Mrs. Fitzherbert) while Hair-Apparent, and this is declared by the Act of Settlement to be a forfeiture of the Crown *as if he were naturally dead.*" Brougham further adds, that there would have been no difficulty in proving the fact of the marriage. This was written over forty years after the trial, and when more evidence of the marriage had come to light than (as Brougham admits) he knew of in 1820. We think that he underrated the difficulty of proving the marriage, and that he overrated the importance of the marriage and its consequences as an answer to the case for the Bill. We doubt whether the House would have received evidence of the marriage, if tendered. Logically, it would be no answer to the charge against the Queen of conjugal infidelity that the King had, previous to his marriage with her, contracted an illegal marriage with another woman; nor do we think that, having regard to the danger likely to arise to the State from questioning the title of its Head to the Crown, that Brougham would have been justified in raising that defence. In his memorable but overcharged description of the duties of an advocate he said: "Nay, separating even the duties of a patriot from those of an advocate, and casting them, if need be, to the wind, he must go on, reckless of the consequences of his fate, if it should unhappily be to involve his country in confusion for his clients' protection;" † but this requires both the qualification and restriction put on it by one of the greatest advocates of our time, the last and most brilliant of the Chief Justices of England.

"My noble and learned friend, Lord Brougham," said Sir Alexander Cockburn, "whose words are the words of wisdom, said that an advocate should be fearless in carrying out the interests of his client, but I couple that with this qualification and this restriction, that the arms which he wields are to be the arms of the warrior, and not of the assassin. It is his duty to strive to accomplish the interests of his clients *per fas* and not *per nefas*; it is his duty to the utmost of his power to seek to reconcile the interests he is bound to maintain, and

* "Recollections," &c., p. 137. † *Vide* "Life," vol. ii. pp. 405, 411.

the duty it is incumbent on him to discharge, with the eternal and immutable interests of truth and justice."*

According to this definition of the duties of an advocate Brougham was justified in all that he in fact said and did on behalf of the Queen, but he would not have been justified "in involving his country in confusion" by raising the question as to the forfeiture of the Crown. That would be, if we may express an opinion, working not *per fas*, but "*per nefas*," using the arms of the assassin rather than those of the warrior.

Whether Brougham, like Denman,† really believed in the Queen's innocence, is a question which cannot now be solved. Campbell says—

"Although he has talked to me with unbounded license on almost all other subjects, and of almost all other persons, he has never volunteered to tell me what he really thought of the truth of the charge against his Royal client; and I could not with any decency ask him his conscientious belief."‡

His utterance on the subject in the House of Commons, shortly after the trial, was ambiguous :

"If instead of an advocate I had been sitting as a judge, I should have been found among the number of those who, laying their hands upon their hearts, conscientiously pronounced her *not guilty*. For the truth of this assertion I desire to tender every pledge that may be most valued and most sacred. I wish to make it in every form which may be deemed most solemn and most binding; and if I believe it not as I now advance it, I here imprecate on myself every curse which is most horrid and most penal."

Forcible as this language is, it amounts—as Campbell points out—to nothing more than a statement of what his vote would have been, which might have proceeded on the ground of "not proven," the evidence being such as not to warrant a verdict of guilty; as to his private opinion on the question of her innocence, he said nothing. At Edinburgh in 1825, he said of the Queen, "that borne down by the hand of unscrupulous power, she had been saved *only* by *her innocence*, and by the force of that law which the King and his Ministers had combined to destroy."§ In his "Life," after admitting that he was acquainted with circumstances unknown to the Queen's other Counsel, of great indiscretions on her part, though entirely "unconnected with the charges against her," he continues—

"Of the utter groundlessness of those charges we all—*i.e.*, the Queen's Counsel—had the most complete and unhesitating belief, and I, quite

* Speech at the dinner given by the Bar of England to M. Berryer. "The Oratorical Year-Book for 1865," p. 418.

† See Denman's letter to Brougham in "Life," vol. ii. p. 389.

‡ Vol. viii. p. 322.

§ "Life," vol. iii. p. 3.

as much as any of the others. The evidence and the discussion at the trial not only failed to shake the conviction with which we set out from our knowledge of the Milan proceedings, and from our communication with such of her household as had attended her in the South, but very greatly confirmed it, and removed whatever doubts had for a moment crossed our minds. I can most positively affirm that if every one of us had been put upon our oaths as jurymen we should have all declared that there was not the least ground for the charges against her."

It will be seen that here he states that all the Queen's Counsel, had they been jurymen, would not merely have said "not guilty," but would have declared the charges against her groundless—*i.e.*, that all the evidence against her was false, and that she was absolutely innocent. It may be, perhaps, that the speech of 1820, made when the facts were fresh in his mind, more accurately expressed his opinion than the speech of 1825, or the passage we have quoted from his "Life," which was not written until 1861.* The popularity which Brougham gained by his defence of the Queen was unbounded. London presented him with the Freedom of the City. In returning thanks for the House of Lords, in one of his last public appearances, he proudly referred to the fact that he had been a citizen of London for nearly half a century, and to the event which was the cause of his being made a citizen.

"It was," said he, "my having in the discharge of my professional duty resisted all the force of a powerful, I will not say corrupt, but powerful and unscrupulous Court, and having by that resistance defeated their project of ruining a highly connected individual."

Similar honours were paid to him by many other corporations and public bodies; but, perhaps, the mark of approbation which he most valued was the testimony of Erskine, who thus expressed the sentiments of every thoughtful person—

"My life, whether it has been for good or for evil, has been passed under the sacred rule of the law. In this moment I feel my strength renovated by that rule being restored. The accursed change, where-with we have been menaced, has passed over our heads. There is an end of that horrid and portentous excrescence of a new law, retrospective, iniquitous, and oppressive; and the constitution and scheme of our polity is once more safe. My heart is too full of the escape we have just had to let me do more than praise the blessings of the system we have regained."†

* *Vide* Note to 2nd Edition of vol. i. prefixed to vol. ii. of Edition of 1871.

† Quoted by Mr. McGilchrist in his "Life of Brougham," p. 102.

A more substantial reward was the great increase of his professional business. Against these marks of popular favour must be set the mark of Royal disfavour. Lord Eldon, at the cost of great inconvenience to the suitors and the Bar, and in order to gratify the mean spite of George IV., humiliated himself to withhold from Brougham and Denman the rank at the Bar which they alike lost by the death of their ill-fated client.

We have necessarily dwelt at length on this, the most brilliant part of Brougham's career, and can only glance at that portion of it which embraces the ten years from 1820 to 1830, when the Reform movement again made him the popular idol of the day. These ten years "were years of substantial progress and gain," and Brougham stands forth as prominent among the leaders, in many cases *the* leader, in all the movements by which these gains were secured. He was the first to attempt a reform of the abuses in the endowed charities of the kingdom. Campbell says, his efforts in this direction "have cost the nation several hundred thousand pounds distributed amongst various sets of Commissioners, but as yet no real benefit has been gained from their labours."* We borrow our reply to this from Mr. G. W. Hastings. "From these words," he says, "the common sense and common knowledge of Englishmen recoil, as equally ungrateful and unjust."† "It would be taking a narrow view," says Lord Russell, "that large sums have been spent upon inquiries, and we have not as yet had an adequate return." Brougham was one of the first who brought before Parliament the subject of National Education. His plan showed too great deference to the monopolising claims of the clergy of the Establishment to allow its receiving the support of the Liberal party, either in or out of Parliament. His extra-parliamentary labours in the cause of education were more successful. He was one of the first promoters of "The London Mechanics' Institution," the parent of hundreds of like institutions throughout the country, which have done incalculable good, though—as is the case with most human institutions—not of the particular kind and in the precise way intended by their original promoters. Brougham, with Lord John Russell, Lushington, William Allen, and others, formed the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge, of which he was the first President. The first publication of the Society was the President's discourse, "On the Objects, Pleasures, and Advantages of Science."‡ If that Society, during the seventeen years of its existence, had done nothing more than publish *The*

* Vol. viii. p. 338.

In *Gentleman's Magazine*, June, 1869,—Art. "Campbell on Brougham." It will be found in the "Works," Edition 1878, vol. vii. p. 293.

Penny Magazine and *The Penny Encyclopedia* it would be difficult to overrate the value of its labours in the diffusion of useful knowledge. Brougham contributed much, both as an author and as an editor, to the Society's publications. As to the amount of his literary labours in its behalf, no exact information, so far as we know, can now be obtained. In his inaugural address, at the first Conference of the Social Science Association, he gave a most interesting sketch* of the history of the Society.

The most successful of his extra-parliamentary services in the cause of Education was the foundation of University College, London, in which he took, as usual, a leading part. From the College sprang the University of London. The growth of that Institution is one of the most remarkable events of modern days. Brougham who, to use Grattan's words, "sat by its cradle," lived to see it successfully claim a right to representation in Parliament, equally with its elder sisters of Oxford, Cambridge, and Dublin. He did not live to see its choice of its first, and present, and most worthy representative, whose ability as a parliamentary gladiator would have delighted Brougham, and whose Conservative-Liberalism would have represented Brougham's latest political opinions. Nor was he less abundant in parliamentary labours during this period. He now appeared to share with Macintosh the labours and the fame of successors to Romilly as Law Reformers. He assailed the administration of the law by Lord Eldon, but the theory of the law still more needed reform. In the Session of 1828 he made his memorable speech on Law Reform. Campbell, in the tone of sneering and depreciation habitual to him, says—

"It may now be glanced at with wonder, although I cannot say that it would be justifiable to condemn any one actually to read it through, unless as a punishment for some grave delict. It lasted above six hours, during which long period of time, notwithstanding the dryness of his subject, there was seldom any serious danger of the House being counted out."†

A judge, at once far more candid and competent, Sir Robert Peel,

"Used to say that he having intended only to hear the opening of the speech, he found himself chained to the House till its close by its power and effectiveness."‡

* It will be found in McGilchrist's "Life of Brougham," p. 222.

† Vol. viii. p. 358.

‡ Quoted by Mr. Hastings in *Gentleman's Magazine*, June, 1869.

Any one who reads the speech* will find that it proposes in principle, if not in detail, the various legal reforms which have been made by Parliament during the fifty years which have passed since the speech was delivered.

Its immediate effect was the issuing of Commissions of Inquiry into the proceedings of the then Common Law Courts, and into the Law of Real Property. The reports of these Commissioners were followed up by Acts of Parliament, commencing the measures of Reform we have alluded to. His devotion to Popular Education and Law Reform did not cause him to forget the Anti-Slavery cause. He it was who brought before the Commons the well-known case of the Missionary Smith. Smith was sent by the London Missionary Society to Demerara, where he exerted himself very zealously for the conversion to Christianity of the negro population. An insurrection amongst the slaves broke out, and the planters, as is their fashion, laid the blame at the door of the missionaries, and Smith was accused of exciting the negroes to revolt, tried before a court-martial, and sentenced to death. The capital sentence was not carried out, but the Missionary was cast into a small and loathsome dungeon, where he soon died. Brougham brought forward a motion of censure on the Government of Demerara and the court-martial, its accomplice in guilt. "A debate of surpassing interest ensued." Brougham's speech in moving the Resolution, and his reply, are given in both the collections of his speeches. Campbell states that Brougham "frankly declared that he considered his speech on this occasion was his *chef-d'œuvre*." Campbell's own criticism on it is that there is no simplicity or pathos in any of its passages that are intended to be touching, and the air of exaggeration which pervades his vehemence sully detracts from its effect."† Lord Russell, on the other hand, says, "It combined the closest and most pressing logic with the most eloquent denunciations of oppression, and the most powerful appeal to justice. It contributed no doubt in a very marked degree to the extinction of slavery throughout the dominions of the Crown of England." To us it seems there is little attempt at pathos; the speaker intended simply to state the facts, and on them found his argument, which is certainly one of the most powerful he ever delivered; but we do not see, any more than Lord Russell, the exaggeration which Campbell sees. The previous question, moved by Canning, was carried by 193 votes

* It is given at length in "Lord Brougham's Speeches," Edition 1839, but only the peroration is given in the "Works," Edition 1873, *vide* vol. x. p. 30. *Vide* the Original Edition of 1839, and the Revised Edition of 1873.

† Vol. viii. p. 314. Campbell attributes to Brougham the same estimate of his defence of the Queen.

against 196, but the effect of the debate was extreme and powerful.

The minds of the men were turned to the real state of negro bondage. The measures of the Abolitionists all over the country became more bold and decided. Campbell says Brougham ascribed mainly to this speech the abolition of slavery in English colonies. What Brougham did say was that the cause of negro emancipation owed more to this case of individual oppression, mixed with religious persecution, than to all the other enormities of which slavery has ever been convicted.*

It is singular that no mention is made by Campbell of Brougham's Anti-Slavery motion, which led to his being elected member for Yorkshire, and all the memorable consequences of that event. On the 13th July, 1830, a few days before the dissolution of Parliament, after the death of George IV., Brougham moved—

“That the House would at the earliest practicable period of the next Session take into its serious consideration the state of the slaves in the colonies of Great Britain, in order to the mitigation and final abolition of their slavery.”

He introduced the motion by the greatest speech he had yet made against slavery. Towards the conclusion he uttered this memorable declaration—

“Tell me not of rights; talk not of the property of the planter in his slaves. I deny the right. I acknowledge not the property. The principles, the feelings of our common nature, rise in rebellion against it. Be the appeal made to the understanding or to the heart, the sentence is the same that rejects it. In vain you tell me of laws that sanction such a claim. There is a law above all the enactments of human codes—the same throughout the world, the same in all times—such as it was before the daring genius of Columbus pierced the night of ages, and opened to one world the sources of power, wealth, and knowledge, to another all unutterable woes, such as it is at this day; it is the law written on the heart of man by the finger of his Maker, and by that law unchangeable and eternal; while men despise fraud and loathe rapine and abhor blood, they will reject with indignation the wild and guilty phantasy that man can hold property in man. In vain you appeal to treaties; to covenants between nations; the covenants of the Almighty, whether the Old Covenant or the New, denounce such unholy pretensions.”

The motion was feebly opposed by Sir Robert Peel, and rejected only by 29 votes. Sir Robert used to say he never knew what eloquence was till he heard this speech of

* Introduction to speech in the case of the Rev. John Smith, “Works,” Edition 1873, vol. x. p. 118.

Brougham's.* "The speech," says Brougham, "certainly was fully appreciated in this country, because that speech, as much as anything I had ever done, exercised a notable influence on the coming Yorkshire election."† It first boldly proclaimed the proposition which underlay all the arguments against slavery and the slave-trade, and which is thus expressed by Francis W. Newman, that "*men and women are not and cannot be chattels, and that all human enactments which decree this are morally null and void, as being against the higher law of Nature and of God.*"‡ The consequences of this proclamation we will describe in the words—lately reproduced by us§—of one of the most zealous supporters of the Anti-Slavery cause, who has just been removed from the world he served so well (we refer to the late Sir George Stephen, Q.C.)—

"Up to this time, worst of all, we found the people not actually against us, but apathetic, lethargic, incredulous, indifferent. It was then, and not *till then*, that we sounded the right note and touched a chord that never ceased to vibrate. To uphold slavery was a crime against God! It was a novel doctrine, but it was a cry that was heard, for it would be heard. The national conscience was awakened to inquiry, and inquiry soon produced conviction."

Yorkshire, which, to use the words of one of Brougham's successors in its representation, "has a knack of making utopias realities,"|| was the first to be awakened. Many of the men who had at their own cost sent as their member to Parliament Wilberforce, the abolisher of the slave-trade, were still alive. Other and younger men of like feelings filled the place of the elders who had gone. The ancient spirit which, from 1784 till his retirement, sent the plain Yorkshire squire to Parliament against the combined influence of the "great houses" revived, and Henry Brougham, not owning a rood of land in the county, and known only as the most zealous and intrepid of advocates and a devoted labourer in the cause of human improvement, won the blue ribbon of the representation, and was elected member for the yet undivided county of York. It was not merely the revival of Anti-Slavery enthusiasm which gained his election.

"Parliamentary Reform, he himself tells us, had been almost a kind of local question with Yorkshiremen ever since the days of Sir George Saville and Wyvill, and the part I had taken in the question was often referred to in the canvass as well as in the Castle Yard of York.

* *Vide* C. Sumner's "Life," vol. ii. p. 48.

† "Life," vol. iii. p. 38. ‡ "Phases of Faith," p. 104, Edition 1874.

§ WESTMINSTER REVIEW, April, 1879—Art. "The Early Evangelical Leaders."

|| Richard Cobden's Speech at Wakefield, 11th April, 1849.

I was therefore pledged to take the lead in that question now that I had become member for the county.”*

In his speech, at the declaration of the poll, he said—

“I am now possessed of a power (having such a constituency to support me) that will enable me to compel the execution of measures which I have only hitherto been ventilating. *Nothing on earth shall ever tempt me to accept place.* I have more pride in representing Yorkshire than I could derive from any other the King can bestow, because I have more effectual means of being useful to my fellow-citizens, and of gaining for myself an honest fame.”†

We doubt not that he truly expressed what at the time was his real feeling and opinion as to taking office, but so unreserved a declaration showed a great want of foresight and judgment. The fall of the Wellington Government was only a question of time. On its fall there must be a Whig Government, and in a Whig Government Brougham must be offered office, and could hardly, if he wished, decline it. Indeed, Lord Grey's letters to him, given in the “Life,” show that he considered that it was an indispensable condition of his forming any Ministry that Brougham should hold office in it.

“In his ‘Life,’ he says, ‘My return for the great county of York was my greatest victory, my most unsullied success. I may say without hyperbole that when as Knight of the Shire I was girt with the sword, it was the proudest moment of my life, my return to Parliament by the greatest and most wealthy constituency in England was the highest compliment ever paid to a public man.’‡ Even Campbell is constrained to admit that Brougham's ‘return for Yorkshire was the spontaneous declaration of the most numerous, wealthy, and intelligent constituency in England; that he was the fittest man to guide the destinies of his country, and he really may be said to have gained this elevation by good without any mixture of evil arts’§

Prior to Brougham's election for Yorkshire, the University of Glasgow chose him as the most distinguished living example of purely Scottish education for the office of its Lord Rector. His inaugural discourse on being installed is one of his best productions. In an eminently practical way it treats of two subjects—“the study of the rhetorical art, by which useful truths are promulgated with effect, and the purposes to which a proficiency in this art should be made subservient.” To any one who wishes to train himself as a public speaker, this discourse is a guide and companion invaluable.||

We must take a final glance at Brougham's position at the

* “Life,” vol. iii. p. 47.

† As quoted by Campbell, vol. viii. p. 367.

‡ “Life,” vol. iii. p. 42.

§ *Ibid.*, vol. viii., 369.

|| It will be found reprinted amongst his *Rhetorical Dissertations* in “Works,” Edition 1873, vol. vii. p. 113.

Bar. On the retirement of Lord Eldon, Lord Lyndhurst at once gave Brougham the rank as King's Counsel, of which he had so long and so unjustly been deprived. Scarlett was made Attorney-General, and left the Northern Circuit, of which Brougham became the leader; next to him in seniority stood the late Sir Frederick Pollock, a dull, heavy, and obtuse man, of whom as an advocate Lord Denman said, "He bestowed tediousness in a spirit of lavish prodigality."

"But Pollock," says Campbell, "was discovered to have a far better chance of the verdict than Brougham, and on all common occasions was decidedly preferred to him. In practice at the Bar Brougham continued to decline, till he was unexpectedly raised to the woolsack."*

Macaulay, who certainly was not biassed by any partiality for Brougham, gives a different account.

"You will be pleased to hear," he writes to his father from circuit, "that Brougham has been rising through the whole of the struggle. At York, Pollock decidedly took the lead." At Durham, Brougham overtook him, passed him at Newcastle, and got immensely ahead of him at Carlisle and Appleby. . . . He appears to improve in industry and prudence. He learns his story more thoroughly, and tells it more clearly than formerly. If he continues to manage causes as well as he has done of late he must rise to the summit of the profession. I cannot say quite so much for his temper, which this close and constant rivalry does not improve."

Macaulay adds some particulars as to the relations between Brougham and Pollock, which will amuse those who, like ourselves, remember the two men—

"Brougham squabbles with Pollock more than in generosity or policy he ought to do. I have heard several of our younger men wondering that he does not show more magnanimity. He yawns while Pollock is speaking, a sign of weariness which, in their present relation to each, he would do well to suppress.† He has said some good but very bitter things. There was a case of a lead mine. Pollock was for the proprietors, and complained bitterly of the encroachments which Brougham's clients had made upon this property, which he represented as of immense value. Brougham said that the estimate which his learned friend formed of the property was vastly exaggerated; but that it was no wonder that a person who found it so easy to get gold for his lead should appreciate that heavy metal so highly. The other day Pollock laid down a point of law rather dogmatically. 'Mr. Pollock,' said Brougham, 'perhaps before you rule the point you will suffer his lordship to submit a few observations on it to your consideration.'‡

Even before his election for Yorkshire there was a strong

* Vol. viii. p. 355.

† We doubt if it were possible.

‡ "Life of Macaulay," vol. i. pp. 144, 145.

desire on many, if not all, sides to get Brougham out of the House of Commons. Canning offered him the Chief Baronship of the Exchequer; but as the offer was not accompanied with that of a peerage, Brougham declined to be shelved.* "Why," said Canning, "the post of Chief Baron is, as you know, the half-way house to that of Chancellor." "Yes," replied Brougham, "but you deprive me of the horses that are to take me on." We believe, though we cannot at this moment adduce our authority, that Wellington offered Brougham the Mastership of the Rolls, an office which, as the law then stood, he could have held and yet continued to be a member of Parliament. If the offer were made, it was declined, Brougham wishing to be the leader, or one of the leaders, of the Whigs, a position certainly inconsistent with the holding of any judicial office. We now come to the later of the two most eventful portions of Brougham's career—the Reform era. To understand it aright, it is necessary to consider Brougham's relations with the Whigs.

"The Whig party," Campbell says, "never cordially took to Brougham, nor Brougham to the Whig party; they had no confidence in his steadiness, nor much in his sincerity."

We agree with this statement except as regards Lord Grey, who, as the long series of letters between them shows, had not only esteem for, but confidence in, Brougham. As early in Brougham's public life as 1818, Romilly, after describing him as "a man of the most splendid talents and the most extensive acquirements," adds—

"How much is it to be lamented that his want of judgment and of prudence should prevent his great talents and such good intentions from being as great a blessing to mankind as they ought to be." †

Lord Russell tells us, that many years before the Reform era the late Lord Dudley said to him—

"What a character Brougham would have been for the pen of Lord Clarendon. Lord Appleby (supposing he had got his peerage) was a man who, if the solidity of his judgment had been equal to the pregnancy of his wit, would not have been surpassed in this or any other time. This," adds Lord Russell, "was the truth; his vast powers of mind were neutralised by a want of judgment, which prevented any party from placing entire confidence in him, and by a frequent forgetfulness of what he himself had done or said but a short time before." §

In the autumn of 1830 the first Parliament of William IV. met. On the first night of the Session (Nov. 2nd)

* *Vide* Correspondence with Earl Grey, in "Life," vol. ii. *passim*.

† McGilchrist, p. 116.

‡ "Life," vol. iii. p. 237.

§ "Recollections and Suggestions," p. 139.

Brougham gave notice for that day fortnight for leave to introduce a Reform Bill, an announcement which "took the Whig party by surprise, and was very coldly received." Lord Althorp in the Commons, and Lord Grey in the Lords, raised the question of Reform; the latter did so with great judgment, and elicited the Duke of Wellington's memorable declaration against all Reform, which he was surprised to learn was an announcement of the speedy fall of his Ministry.

It is somewhat difficult, amidst the numerous and varying accounts of the important events of the next three weeks, to ascertain their real history. After a careful examination of the authorities, we believe what follows to be the true story of these transactions. Mr. Roebuck, in his "History of the Whig Administration," asserts that "Brougham called a meeting of his friends, and fully explained to them the plan of Reform." This statement Campbell "most positively contradicts,"* and as positively affirms that Brougham never called any such meeting, nor ever explained his plan to any one, and that indeed his most intimate friends professed ignorance of its nature. Brougham contradicts Campbell as positively as Campbell contradicts Roebuck. Brougham records, in his "Life," that a meeting was held at Lord Althorp's, at which he explained his scheme of Reform. It was in substance this—that the great unenfranchised towns of Manchester, Birmingham, Leeds, Sheffield, &c. should send members; that, in order to avoid increasing the number of members, five or six of the close boroughs should be disfranchised altogether, and the others should send one member only; the suffrage in towns was to be household suffrage; copyholders and leaseholders were to have votes for counties; elections were to be confined to one day, and the duration of Parliament limited to three years. That a large meeting of the members on the Reform question was held at Althorp's rooms the week after the opening of the Session is clear from his biography, and this no doubt was the meeting to which Brougham refers.† The 16th, the day fixed for Brougham's Reform motion, arrived; but that very morning the Wellington Administration resigned. Lord Althorp, as leader of the Opposition, urged that there being no Ministry, Brougham's motion should be postponed. Brougham expressed the greatest repugnance to its postponement, and then made one of his rash declarations, but which he calls "a statement of his positive and well-considered resolution at the time"—

* Vol. viii. p. 383. Mr. Roebuck is wrong in fixing the date of the meeting as November 18.

† *Vide* Campbell, vol. viii. p. 383; Brougham's "Life," vol. iii. p. 51 *et seq.*; Le Marchant's "Memoir of Earl Spencer," p. 256.

"As no changes that may take place in the Administration can by any possibility affect me, I beg it to be understood that, in putting off this motion, I will put it off until the 25th of this month, and no longer; I will then, and at no more distant period, bring forward the question of parliamentary reform, whatever may be the then state of affairs, and whosoever may then be his Majesty's Ministers."

According to Campbell, he expressed to the members of the Bar his intention to "take no office whatever, and said that when he was returned for Yorkshire he made his election between place and the service of the people." Campbell says, "His speech in the House was made in a low and hollow voice, indicating suppressed wrath and purposed vengeance." This we think is an exaggeration. Lady Grey wrote to Brougham "the moment that Lord Grey was sent for by the King," on the 16th November. Brougham could hardly have expected an offer of the Great Seal by the time the House met in the afternoon of that day, but Greville says he was displeased "at not being one of those whom Grey first consulted." Lord Grey was desirous of continuing Lord Lyndhurst as Chancellor. Lord Melbourne, "who had sat in the Cabinet with Lyndhurst, and understood his flexibility, thought he might with advantage be retained." Lord Russell, however, says that "the chiefs of the Whig party were not willing to see the high office of Chancellor in the hands of any other person than Brougham." Many of Brougham's friends pressed him to take the Attorney-Generalship if it were offered to him. He said he would not, if for no other reason because of the certainty of a contest for Yorkshire on taking office, which he might lose in a month, and with it a large part of his professional income by quitting the circuit to which, according to the rules of the Bar, having been Attorney-General, he could not return. On the 17th Lord Grey offered him the post of Attorney-General, which he steadily refused, saying that he wished for no office whatever, that he was member for Yorkshire, and desired to keep by that and his profession. The offer was renewed the following day, and he was told that his persistent refusal imperilled the formation of the new Ministry; he still refused to take the subordinate office of Attorney-General, but he offered to take the Mastership of the Rolls, which office he could hold and yet continue member for Yorkshire, and which Sir John Leach, who was seeking the Great Seal, would have gladly vacated for him. Brougham professed, however, that without office he would zealously support the Government. Lord Grey wavered, and was disposed to accede to Brougham's terms, but first consulted Lord Althorp, who was to be the ministerial leader in the Commons. Lord Althorp simply answered, "If Brougham is left in Parliament

with an irremovable office, the Ministry will not last three months, and I certainly will not belong to it." On the morning of the 19th Lord Grey told Brougham that he had been desired *by the King* to ask if he would take the Great Seal. * It would appear that the King positively refused to sanction the proposed arrangement as to the Rolls, having, according to Brougham's belief, been advised by the Duke of Wellington on no account to allow him to be the Master of the Rolls; "for such a position, coupled with the representation of Yorkshire, would make him too powerful for any Government;" the King, however, while refusing the Rolls, said, "There is no one I would rather have for my Chancellor." The *Times*, writing of Brougham after his death, said "that he forced himself into Lord Grey's Cabinet against the wish of its chief members."* There could not be a more erroneous assertion. In reply to the offer made by Lord Grey, Brougham at first positively declined the Great Seal on the ground that he could not give up the Bar and take the chance of being turned out in two or three months, with a fortune inadequate to support a peerage. Lord Grey begged him not finally to refuse the Seal without seeing Lord Althorp, telling him if he persisted in his refusal the attempt to form a Ministry must be abandoned.

Brougham accordingly saw Lords Althorp, Sefton, and Duncannon; a long discussion ensued, Brougham remained firm, and alleged his objections with his usual power and fertility of argument. At length Lord Althorp said—

"Well, I have not a word to say against your reasons and your feelings, and therefore there is an end of the matter; and you take upon yourself the responsibility of keeping our party for another twenty-five years out of power, and the loss of all the great questions which will follow instead of being carried."

Brougham requested an hour for consideration, and after consulting his brother James and his friend Denman, and in consequence of their advice, signified to Lord Grey his willingness to take the Chancellorship.†

"Great," says Greville, "was the surprise, greater still the joy, at a charm having been found potent enough to lay the unquiet spirit, a

* Annual Summaries of the *Times* for a Quarter of a Century, p. 365.

† Conf. Campbell, vol. viii. p. 373; "Brougham's Life," vol. iii. p. 76-80; "Memoirs of Viscount Melbourne," vol. i. p. 344; Greville, vol. ii. pp. 64, 65; Earl Russell's "Recollections," &c., p. 67; "Mémoir of Earl Spencer" (Viscount Althorp), pp. 261, 262. The late Matthew Davenport Hill wrote a letter to the *Times* on the appearance in that paper of the remark we have quoted. In it he reports at length a conversation between him and Lord Althorp, in May, 1831, which completely bears out the statements in Brougham's "Life."

bait rich enough to tempt his restless ambition. All men feel that he is emasculated, and drops on the woolsack as on his political death-bed; once in the House of Lords there is an end to him, and he may rant, storm, and thunder, without hurting anybody.*

Nor was this feeling confined to Brougham's enemies or opponents; his friend John Allen, one of the intimates of Holland House, strongly advised him not to take office, and his mother warned him not to throw away the great position he had raised himself to—"a position greater than could be bestowed by King or Minister."† "Few mothers" he wrote on her death, "would have disliked to have a son Lord Chancellor: if I had got the letter three days before I certainly should have been decided by it."‡

Contrary to the anticipations alike of friends and foes, the woolsack was not Brougham's death-bed. Few, if any, Chancellors, before or since, have been more influential: None before or since have been so prominent a member of the Cabinet. He truly says himself, "There was hardly any difficulty, great or small, that I was not called in upon, and Lord Grey was never satisfied with any debate in which I did not come forward."§ By the public Brougham was regarded as the tutelary genius of Reform, more even than the veteran Premier himself. The *Times* thus expressed the popular belief: "Parliamentary Reform is safe from the gigantic powers of its champion on the woolsack."|| He received the Great Seal on the 22nd November, and, with characteristic energy, went at once from the Palace to the House of Lords, and, while yet a Commoner, sat as Speaker. His patent of peerage being completed, he the next day took his seat as "Baron Brougham and Vaux." The world was astonished at his assumption of a double title, his claim to be the descendant on the female side of the ancient Barons of Vaux or De Vaulx not being generally known, Peers only use two titles where each title being of the same grade and separately created, they unite by descent in the same holder; a creation of a double peerage was a thing unknown. That Brougham, who had always been considered "a man of the people," and prided himself on being so considered, should make such aristocratic pretensions, excited much ridicule. It was said that Henry Brougham had extinguished himself and become "*Vox [Vaux] et preterea nihil*," while his habit of walking to Westminster or Lincoln's Inn, contrary to the custom

* Greville, vol. ii. p. 66.

† See her letter in "Life," vol. iii. p. 80.

‡ Napier's "Correspondence," p. 316.

§ "Life," vol. iii. p. 441. The assertion is proved by his correspondence with Earl Grey.

|| *Times*, February 1, 1831.

of his predecessors, who, with their officers, went in semi-state in carriages, gave rise to the riddle, "Why does not the new Chancellor use his carriage like other Chancellors?" The answer to which was, "Because he is Lord Brougham and 'Valks.'" In truth, though theoretically a democrat, and affecting to despise what he called the "trappings of office," he was by no means indifferent to the homage to which his new rank entitled him. On his first presiding in the Lords at the hearing of appeals he revived the disused custom of requiring three bows from the Counsel as they approached the Bar; and writing his "Life" in his extreme old age, he mentions with evident pleasure the number of distinguished persons who attended the ceremony of his being sworn in at Lincoln's Inn, and that owing to a Chapter of the Garter having been held that day, many who gave him their support and countenance were in full Court dress, and thus made the whole affair very gay.* The suddenness of his rise, after his protestations that no change of Ministers could possibly affect him, called forth a spiteful attack in the Commons by J. W. Croker. This occasioned Brougham's first speech in the Lords. In it he sounded his own praises somewhat too loudly. After expressing his astonishment at finding himself Chancellor, he said—

"The thing which dazzled me most in the prospect opening to my view, was not the gewgaw splendour of the place, but that it seemed to afford me, if I were honest, on which I could rely, if I were consistent, which I knew to be matter of absolute necessity in my nature, if I were as able as I was honest and consistent, a field of more extended exertion."

There is no need to go into the oft-told history of the first Reform Bill, except to notice one or two episodes with which Brougham was especially connected. Every one knows the story, first told by Mr. Roebuck, of the Chancellor's ordering the attendance of the Life-Guards to escort the King to the House, on the memorable occasion of his dissolving Parliament in April, 1831. Campbell describes Mr. Roebuck's account of the transaction as "utterly fabulous;" but Brougham himself says—

"I had foreseen the difficulty (about the escort), and on ascertaining that the Life-Guards, the regiment usually in attendance on such an occasion, were quartered at some distant barracks (I think it was Knightsbridge), sent to the Horse Guards for such men as happened to be there. On the King making an observation about the troops, I said, 'I hoped his Majesty would excuse the great liberty I had taken: but being quite certain he would graciously accede to our request, I had sent to the Horse Guards for an escort to be ready at half-past

* "Life," vol. iii. p. 84.

one.' He said, 'Well, that was a strong measure, or a strong thing to do.' I believe I had prepared him for this by a little more apology and explanation than is mentioned above, but he ever after, when in very good-humour, used to remind me of what he called my high treason.*

This proceeding was no doubt unprecedented, but completely justified by the necessities of the time. In order to prevent the Houses addressing the Crown against a dissolution, a proceeding which in the then state of public feeling would have been full of danger, it was necessary that the King should prorogue in person and that immediately, and Royal etiquette would not allow his going to Parliament unescorted by his Guards. If it be an exaggeration to say, as did the *Times*, of Brougham's speech on the second reading of the Reform Bill that it was "overpowering, matchless, and immortal," yet it will always keep the front rank among the monuments of English parliamentary eloquence. Lyndhurst, who followed him, confessed that "a more powerful speech of the kind had never been delivered." Lord Grey, whose life covered the period of Pitt and Fox, said it was "the greatest speech he had ever heard in his life." Greville notes the opinion of the day, that "the Chancellor surpassed all his former efforts." Campbell admits that the speech was "a wonderful performance, showing a most stupendous memory and extraordinary dexterity." He began in a mild and conciliatory manner, as if unwilling to injure his cause by the harshness in which he too commonly indulged, and answered his opponents' arguments in a strain of good-humoured wit and pleasantry rarely surpassed. Repeated interruptions, equally unfair and disorderly, made him change his tone, and during the remainder of his speech he addressed the House in the defiant, if it be not too much to say, bullying tone in which he often indulged, and which much weakened his influence with the peers. His peroration was magnificent; nothing can be more happy than the introduction of the parable of the Sibyl. His closing words, it will be remembered, were—

"I solemnly adjure you—I warn you—I implore you—yea, on my bended knees—[here he knelt]—I supplicate you—reject not this Bill."

On this Campbell makes the following characteristic comment—

"He continued for some time as if in prayer, but his friends, alarmed for him, lest he should be suffering from the effects of nullied port imbibed by him copiously towards the conclusion of the four hours during which he was on his legs, picked him up and placed him safely on the

* Conf. Campbell, vol. viii. p. 391, *et seq.*, and the passage from Roebuck there quoted with Brougham's "Life," vol. iii. pp. 114, 115.

† 7th October, 1831, "Works," vol. x. p. 319, a good example of rhetorical skill is the reference to Earl Sandon and his Son, at pp. 338-9-40.

woolsack. Like Burke's dagger-scene in the House of Commons, this prostration was a failure, so unsuited was it to the spectators and to the actor, that it produced a sensation of ridicule, and considerably impaired the effect of his speech."*

We believe that Campbell grossly misrepresents what occurred ; he himself says more than once that Brougham was never, as was by some falsely represented, an immoderate drinker. Charles Sumner indeed was struck by the fact that Brougham took less wine than any gentleman he saw in England at the head of his table.† No contemporary account of the debate, not even the diary of that inveterate collector of gossip, Greville, who hated Brougham, mentions any such scene as Campbell describes. After the defeat in the Lords of the first Reform Bill, Brougham was incessant in urging Lord Grey to obtain power from the King to create a sufficient number of peers to carry the Bill. His correspondence with Grey is valuable as showing Brougham's thorough determination at the time on that measure of which he early foresaw the necessity, though afterwards he affected to think that rather than have taken such a dangerous step he would have allowed the Reform Bill to be defeated.‡

When the Grey Ministry resigned, in consequence of Lord Lyndhurst's mischievously intended, but to his party's success fatal, amendment in Committee, the *Times* announced "that the Lord Chancellor was pressed again and again to continue in his high office, but peremptorily refused ;" on which Campbell remarks, "it is quite certain that such a preposterous conception never entered the Royal mind." Sir Denis Le Marchant, who was then private secretary to Brougham, says that Brougham told him that the King pressed him most urgently not to give up the Great Seal, and reminded him of what had passed when he came into office, and said, "I told you then that you were my Chancellor. The King wept, but the Chancellor was firm and withdrew."§ In his "Life" Brougham records that the Royal entreaty was that he would undertake the formation of a new Government, and that the King when told that that was utterly out of the question, was affected to tears, and asked Brougham if he meant to abandon him. On the failure of the Duke of Wellington and Lord Lyndhurst to form a Government and the return of the Whigs, it was Brougham who wrung from the vacillating and reluctant King his consent to the proposed creation of peers, and shocked Lord Grey by exacting a promise that the consent should be given in writing. This was

* Vol. viii. p. 388. † "C. Sumner's Life," vol. i. p. 350.

‡ See "Life," vol. iii. p. 151, *et seq.* 170-190, *et seq.* conf. p. 206.

§ "Memoir of Earl Spencer," p. 123, Note.

done, and as Brougham foresaw it, enabled Sir Herbert Taylor to inform the peers that "the King's authority had been given, and was in hands which he was certain would use it." The knowledge of this fact caused the peers to withdraw further opposition to the Bill, and the proposed creation became unnecessary. Brougham's earnestness carried the Reform Bill. He was now at his highest point of greatness. No Chancellor before or since ever attained such popularity, or united the character of a popular leader and the office of keeper of the King's conscience. In devising and promoting the other beneficial measures of the Whig Government he took his full share. The Poor Law Bill which, next to the Reform Bill, was their most valuable if not most brilliant achievement, originated mainly with Brougham and Althorp. He reformed the office of Lord Chancellor, created the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council and the Central Criminal Court, and he proposed to establish our present County Court system, but was prevented by the profligate and unprincipled opposition of Lyndhurst. Strange to relate, the blow which destroyed the greatest Ministry England had seen since 1806, was given by its most brilliant member. Brougham's indiscreet correspondence with the Viceroy of Ireland as to the omission of certain clauses from an Irish Coercion Bill, led to an entanglement which caused the resignation of Earl Grey and the dissolution of his Ministry. Campbell insinuates that Brougham intrigued to upset Grey, in order to gain the Premiership himself, and asserts that Lord Grey himself suspected it, and that his family openly asserted it.

The following letter from Lord Grey effectually disposes of this charge of intrigue:—

"Into the other matters of your letter I will not now enter, further than to express to you how very sensible I am of all its kindness to me, and to repeat to you that *I never for one moment believed that you had entered into any intrigue, and least of all with Althorp, to remove me from office. Independently of all the other considerations which would repel such an idea, the reasons you state, both public and private, to show the impossibility of such a design, would be quite conclusive to anybody who gave one moment's consideration to such a charge.*"*

It was certainly Brougham who rallied the Whigs under the leadership of Melbourne, and prevented the formation of a Conservative Government. He believed that this was the cause

* Written from Howick, 15th September, 1835, "Life of Brougham," vol. iii. p. 435; and see "Brougham's Letter," at page 434, where he shows he would have been a loser of 9000*l.* a year by the change of office.

which alienated William IV. from "his Chancellor,"* and altered the opinion which he had once expressed to him—"I shall be glad to see you take anything out of the bag except the Great Seal."† There can be little doubt, we think, that Brougham's excessive labour, and the annoyance which at this time he received from attacks on him in the Press, affected his mind,‡ and that he acted on many occasions with great indiscretion. The Session of 1834 was followed by Brougham's celebrated visit to Scotland, described by Lord Beaconsfield as "the vagrant and grotesque apocalypse of the Lord Chancellor, and the fierce recrimination and memorable defiance of the Edinburgh banquet." Brougham's actual indiscretions, with many exaggerations, were reported at Windsor, and still further alienated the King from *his* Chancellor. We have the King's own authority that one of the grounds on which, in November of that year, he dismissed the Melbourne Government was "the injudicious and extravagant conduct of Lord Brougham, which had tended to shake his confidence in the course which might be pursued by the administration of which he formed so prominent and so active a feature, and in its consistency."§

With this dismissal ended for ever Brougham's official career. Here also ends his "Life" of himself. He did not attempt any "apologia pro vita sua" during its last thirty-four years. "The rest of his life, as was well said, was spent in restless efforts to sustain the reputation which had been compromised by political failure."

His errors in judgment continued. His mischievous communication to the *Times* on the dismissal of the Ministry that "the Queen has done it all," still further irritated the King, and led to the Duke of Wellington's yielding to the Royal wish to undertake the Government, with which at first he was unwilling to comply. His next step in writing to Lyndhurst, offering to take the Chief Baronship of the Exchequer, about to be vacated by Lyndhurst again becoming Chancellor, and his speedy retraction of it, "Melbourne thought proved greater want of judgment, a grosser ignorance of his own situation, than any which he had yet taken."¶ If it be true—as Brougham wrote to Spencer—that he wrote "to the King to throw all the consequences of the change of Government on him, and relieve myself,"|| the relations between the King and his ex-Chancellor were not improved.

* "Life," vol. iii. pp. 401-410.

† Related by Mrs. Brougham to Charles Sumner at Brougham, in 1838. "Life of Sumner," vol. i. p. 354.

‡ Campbell, vol. viii.

§ See the King's own memoir, given in "Memoirs of Baron Stockmar," vol. i. p. 331.

|| "Memoirs of Viscount Melbourne," vol. ii. pp. 45-51.

We dismiss his judicial career in one sentence. He was not a great lawyer, and therefore, though a most industrious, not a good judge. He had been a great advocate, and, as is too often the case, he could not when raised to the Bench lay aside the habits of the advocate.*

Why, on the return of the Whigs to power, did not Brougham return with them? He wrote to his friend and ex-colleague, Earl Spencer, "I know that I have been treated as no one man since the Athenian Republic was."† Campbell having been refused the Great Seal by Melbourne, which he claimed when he heard of the difficulties as to Brougham, thought himself at liberty freely to speak his mind about the Whigs, and has left it as his opinion "that Brougham was atrociously ill-used by them, and that they showed disingenuousness, cowardice, and ingratitude." Whether he would have thought so had they made him Chancellor we take leave to doubt. The most connected, and probably the most accurate, history of this transaction is that given in Earl Russell's "Recollections."

"What then," he says, "was the nature of the objections which prevented Lord Melbourne from offering to return the Great Seal into the hands of Lord Brougham when he himself resumed office? *These objections came first from Lord Melbourne, and were frankly communicated by him to Lord Brougham before he finally decided to form an administration.* In the next place, these objections could not fairly be said to imply any charge of treachery towards his chief or his colleagues during the former administration. . . . His faults were a recklessness of judgment which hurried him beyond all the bounds of prudence—an omnivorous appetite for praise—a perpetual interference in matters with which he had no direct concern, and, above all, a disregard of truth. . . . It was for these reasons I conceive that many weeks before the change of Government he resolved not to offer the Great Seal to Lord Brougham. He told me of his fixed resolution on this head many weeks before the dissolution of Sir Robert Peel's Ministry. When this resolution became known, Lord Melbourne exposed himself and his party to the charge of ingratitude to a man whose vast powers and splendid services made him an object of general admiration. Observing as I did the characters of the two men, I thought Lord Melbourne justified in his decision, and I willingly stood by him in his difficulties.‡ 'I suppose,' wrote Earl Spencer to Mr. Spring Rice, 'I must say I believe you right, but I cannot but be grievously sorry for poor Brougham. I see, of course, his glaring defects. I know the mischief these defects are calculated to do to himself, and to every one with whom he is acting; but still I have worked with him for so many years, and have at different

* For the proof of this see Campbell, Greville, and Sumner, *passim*.

† Memoir of Earl Spencer, 130, p. 550.

‡ Pp. 138-9-40.

times lived on such intimate terms with him, that I must lament, though by no means censure, his being thrown overboard when I fear there is no whale ready to receive him, and after a limited time to replace him on dry land.'"

Subsequently, when it appeared likely that Lord Spencer would be called on to form an administration, he said that he felt he was bound to offer the Chancellorship to Brougham, if he chose to accept it.* Lord Melbourne himself is reported to have said that Brougham left out would be dangerous, but if taken in would simply be destructive. "We may," he said, "have little chance of going on without him, but to go on with him would be impossible." This was afterwards twisted by Brougham into a confession that Melbourne felt that so long as Brougham was Chancellor, he himself must be a cipher.† To another friend Melbourne said that "even if all the rest agreed to let in Brougham, I could not bring myself to force him on the King."‡ Brougham told Campbell, "with tears in his eyes," that if Melbourne had treated him openly and kindly, he might have done what he liked with the Great Seal, and "that they might ever have remained friends, that the story of the King's dislike to him was false, and even had it been true, the King having been forced to change his Ministers, cared not who were their successors."§ This statement we attribute to Brougham's mortified vanity and habitual insincerity. Lord Russell, it will be observed, expressly states that Melbourne, weeks before he undertook to form his second Ministry, frankly communicated to Brougham the objections he felt to again offering him the Great Seal.

In the Session of 1836, Brougham, out of office, rendered to the Ministry and the country a signal service, by conducting the Municipal Reform Bill through the Lords, against the perverse and subtle opposition of Lyndhurst. Had he been a member of the Government he could not have worked harder for them. The measure originated in the report of a Committee of Inquiry issued by Brougham when Chancellor—a principal share in this great reform therefore belongs to him. We have Brougham's own testimony that early in December (1835) he felt bound to release Melbourne "from all *personal* obligation as to the Great Seal, in case he considered the strength of the Government required to have a Chancellor."|| This should be borne in mind in considering Brougham's subsequent conduct to the Whigs. If we

* "Memoir of Earl Spencer," pp. 541-59.

† See his letter to Napier, "Correspondence," p. 811.

‡ "Memoirs of Melbourne," vol. ii. pp. 110, 111.

§ Vol. viii. p. 476.

|| Napier, "Correspondence," p. 175. The letter is dated "Brougham, 4 Jan. 1836."

may believe a speech made by him at this time—on laying the foundation-stone of the Liverpool Mechanics' Institute,* he then gave up all desire for office. After referring to the fetter and the cramp imposed upon one used to independence—to the being buried while yet alive, to the people's conditions and claims, in the House of form and etiquette appointed for all Ministers, he continued—

“Who, then, can marvel at the exultation which I feel to shake off and to brace every fibre of my frame, when casting off these trammels, bursting through the cerements of that tomb, I start into new life and resume my position in the van of my countrymen, struggling for their rights, and moving onwards in the accelerated progress of improvement, with a boundless might and a resistless fury, which prostrate in the dust all the puny obstacles that can be raised by the tyranny of Courts and their intrigues, the persecution of bigots and their cunning, the sordid plots of greedy monopolists or corrupt municipalities? In this proud position I am now placed; and I have no desire to leave it, I am once more absolutely free, the slave of no party, at the mercy of no Court intrigue, in the service of my country, and of that only master.”

These virtuous resolves were early put to a severe test. Before the opening of the Session 1836, Brougham, then at his Westmoreland home, learned that Sir Charles Pepys, whom he had made Master of the Rolls, was made Chancellor and Baron Cottenham. This unexpected event seems to have affected Brougham's mind, and during that Session he did not appear in Parliament. When Brougham was deprived of the Great Seal, Lyndhurst said to Greville—

“He will be the most troublesome fellow that ever existed, and do all the mischief he can; he will come down night after night and produce plans of Reform on any subject, he will make speeches two or three hours long to very thin houses, which will be printed in all the newspapers, or published by himself and circulated—in fact, a series of pamphlets.”‡

This accurately described Brougham's subsequent parliamentary career. In the Session of 1837 he returned to Parliament. He might have addressed his former colleagues in the language of Achilles: “You shall know the difference now that I am back again.” Thenceforward until their fall from power—notwithstanding his Liverpool protestations—his release of Melbourne from “all personal claims on the Great Seal, nothing could exceed his rancour and animosity against them. We learn from his letters

* July 20th, 1835.

† “Works,” Edition 1873, vol. x. p. 86.

‡ Journal, vol. ii. p. 153. In the Session of 1835 Brougham is recorded by Hansard to have spoken not less than 221 times.

to Mr. Napier that he would not even meet them in society. Looking at his speeches of 1837-8-9, as specimens of rhetorical invective, they justify his opinion, controverted by Campbell, that he had made greater speeches in the House of Lords than he had in the House of Commons. In corroboration of his own opinion it should be stated that he now made what he termed his "*πεφι, στεφανω*, to compare small things with great." This was his speech on "the immediate emancipation of the negro apprentices," by far the greatest of all his Anti-Slavery speeches.* One of his great objects was to make the *Edinburgh Review* not the organ of the Whig party but his own, in order to turn it into a weapon of offence against the hated ministers. Mr. Napier would not allow the *Review* to be made the organ of private spite and mortified vanity, and in the end Brougham severed his long connection with the *Edinburgh*. On this part of Brougham's career it is best for his admirers—amongst whom we are proud to number ourselves—to say, "*taceamus de his*." He had made himself an impossible colleague, and then attacked his former colleagues with all the force and vehemence of his character, because he had made it impossible for them to act with him. "In his own mind," says Campbell, "he had vowed their political destruction, and he was indefatigable in the efforts he used to accomplish that object."† But his animus was too evident, and his invectives neither influenced votes in the House nor opinions out of doors. Whether he had dreamed that on the accession of the Queen a new Government would be formed, in which he would be asked to take part, no one knows, but it is certain that he showed "particular hostility to the Court, as if offended by personal slight." Not only did he attack and protest in the journals against the settlement of the Civil List, but in the introduction to his Speech in the Queen's Case, which he was then writing for the first edition of his speeches, he drew a parallel between the visit of Caroline to St. Paul's to return thanks for her acquittal, and the visit of Victoria to the Guildhall banquet after her accession; "the far more simple and unbought grandeur" of the one is contrasted with the "extraordinary pomp of the other," and any comparison between the two is said to be "altogether ridiculous." The visit of Caroline "was a real occasion," that of Victoria "a tame and unmeaning pageant."‡ His conduct at this time disgusted even those most inclined to admire him.

"I am almost sorry," writes Charles Sumner, "that I have seen Lord Brougham, for I can paint him to my mind's eye no longer as the pure and enlightened orator of Christianity, civilisation, and

* January 29, 1838, "Works," Edition 1873, vol. x. p. 223.

† Vol. viii. p. 482. ‡ *Vide* "Works," Edition 1873, vol. ix. pp. 206, 207.

humanity. I see him before, as now, with powers such as belong to angels; why could I not have found him with an angel's purity, gentleness, and simplicity? I must always admire his productions as models of art, but I fear that I shall distrust his sincerity and the purity of his motives. . . . Certainly, in the society in which I have moved, I have heard but one opinion expressed with regard to the dishonesty and malevolence which have characterised his late conduct."*

At this time a sudden report arose that Brougham had been killed in Westmoreland by an accident to his carriage. It created a very great sensation: more than two thousand people went to his house to inquire as to the truth of the rumour. The general opinion was that it either originated with or was connived at by him, in order that not only he but the Government might know how he was regarded by the public. Campbell says he was dissatisfied; but to Napier he professed himself abundantly satisfied with the result. There was, no doubt, much good feeling towards him displayed, but as Jeffrey remarked—

"The English public is naturally generous and humane, and there was much in such a fate to soften all asperities. I rather think, however, that these kind-hearted people should be entitled to a *jus retractus* or a *restitutio in integrum* on the failure of the condition on which their praises were given, like the worthy man who was persuaded to tender his forgiveness to an ancient foe who was said to be dying, and turned round after he had shaken hands, and said, 'Remember, though, if you recover I retract my forgiveness.' †

With the fall of the Melbourne Ministry the interest of Brougham's career ceased, though he was a prominent member of the Upper House, until within a short time of his death. His unrelenting enmity to the Whigs continued—in fact, all his old acquaintance seem to have been the subjects on whom his powers of invective were exercised. ‡ Not, as one of his oldest friends said, that "he was a malignant or bad-hearted man, but he was an unscrupulous one, and where his passions are concerned or his vanity irritated, there is no excess or dereliction of principle of which he is not capable." § He made many approaches to the Conservative party, but though they accepted his support they would never enrol him as one of themselves. His speeches continued to be as numerous, and his subjects as diversified, as ever. "At all times as a speaker," says one of his most friendly

* "Sumner's Life," vol. i. p. 352.

† Letter to Napier, "Correspondence," p. 302. A full account of this transaction and the comments on it in the press will be found in Campbell, vol. viii. p. 506, *et seq.*, and see references to it in Napier's "Correspondence," pp. 302, 312, 313.

‡ Letter from Sir Jas. Stephen to Napier, "Correspondence," p. 279.

§ Letter from John Allen to Napier, "Correspondence," p. 323.

critics, "Brougham was extremely unequal. His mediocre speeches—all but those which are really great—are the dullest and heaviest reading."* After 1841 his speeches never rose above mediocrity.† As Lyndhurst foretold, he constantly introduced Bills for the amendment of the law, drawn for the most part very crudely, and which, as introduced by him, seldom, if ever, found their way into the Lower House, still less into the Statute Book; but they were useful in keeping the great cause of Law Reform before Parliament and the public, and they were in many instances the germ of measures which have since received the sanction of the Legislature. To the same cause he devoted much time and labour, as the Chairman of the Law Amendment Society, and afterwards of the Social Science Association. His industry and versatility remained long unimpaired. When far past threescore and ten, enraged at the rejection of his Bill to codify the Criminal Law, he persuaded the editors of the *Quarterly* and the *Edinburgh* to insert an article in each of these Reviews, criticising the judges' report against the measure; and he wrote—Mr. Hastings tells us—both articles in styles "so different, and employing arguments and illustrations so diverse, that it would not have been easy to believe them the products of the same pen;"‡ but as early as 1850 Greville noted the deterioration of his social qualities and his colloquial powers;§ and Macaulay, when he met him in the House of Lords in 1857, thus described him: "Strange fellow; his powers gone; his spite immortal—a dead-nettle."|| He continued, when in London, occasionally to take part in hearing appeals in the Lords, and was so engaged with his sometime friend sometime foe, Campbell, on the last day but one of Campbell's life. He spent a considerable part of each winter at Cannes, in the château Eleanor Louise, so named after his deceased daughter. Over the portal of the château (we have heard) he placed this inscription—

"Portum Inveni Spes et Fortuna Vulete."

"Here," writes Campbell, describing a visit to him, "he comes, a solitary being to a foreign land, where there is no one to welcome him, without any occupation to excite him, the projects of ambition which he has been fostering since his fall from power for ever blasted, and the infirmities of old age perceptibly laying hold of him. At first he seemed very melancholy, but he gradually brightened up as we talked over our old friends. He conversed very agreeably about the culture

* McGilchrist, p. 423.

† In illustration conf. his speech on Wellington, 1839, with that on Wellington's death, 1852, "Works," vol. ix. pp. 443-53.

‡ *Gentleman's Magazine*, June, 1869.

§ "Journal," vol. iii. p. 339.

|| "Life," vol. ii. p. 431.

of his oranges and his olives, but he chiefly delighted in discussing the Bills of the last Session, and those of the Session to come.”*

We suspect that this is an exaggeration—Brougham’s temperament was too buoyant to give way to melancholy, and his literary labours, in which he continued until almost the end of his life, afforded him occupation which amused and soothed, if it did not excite him.† His residence at Cannes gave occasion for the last glaring eccentricity with which he amazed the public. After the Revolution of 1848, he applied to the Provisional Government to be naturalised as a French citizen; with the view, Campbell insinuated, of becoming one of the Deputies to the National Assembly for the department of the Var, in which his château is situate, and even if it might be so, President of the Republic. He was informed that the cost of his naturalisation would be the loss of his English peerage and pension. Whereupon, in his place in the House of Lords, with as much coolness as if he had never sought French citizenship at the hands of the Provisional Government of the Republic, he in a highly Conservative speech reviewed and denounced the recent revolutionary proceedings in France, Germany, and Italy.‡ In his yearly journeys to and from Cannes he never failed to visit Paris, and to attend the meetings of the Academy and the Academy of Sciences. This he did even in the last year of his life. One who then saw him describes “his vigorous body, now weighed down with infirmity, the gait, once so energetic, now so slow, advancing with difficulty, expressing himself with hesitation; the will still firm, but the mind less ready, and the old fire of the glance already nearly extinct.”§

“The goodwill, which is naturally entertained for old age”—said the *Times* writer whom we have before quoted—“induced a younger generation to gratify him with habitual eulogy.” This was especially the case at the yearly meetings of the Social Science Association. His last public appearance in England was at the yearly meeting of the Association, for 1866. He read part of the customary inaugural address, but the larger part was read by Mr. Hastings. We must find space for Brougham’s last public utterance. After referring to the close of the seven weeks’ war between Austria and Prussia, the address concluded with these startling sentences:—

“While men will fight and slay their tens of thousands, the crime

* Vol. viii. p. 573.

† Several volumes of the Edition of his work in the Edition of 1873, were used and edited by him at Cannes—*vide* vol. ix., Preface.

‡ Campbell, vol. viii. p. 550.

§ M. Miguet of the Academy of Sciences, *vide* “Works,” vol. ix., Preface.

of murder on the largest scale must go unpunished and unrepented. Yes, unpunished in this world! But our heavenly Father, while bestowing free-will on his creatures, hath declared them accountable for its abuse; and administering justice in mercy towards the numbers deceived or compelled into blood-guiltiness, he condemns those who betrayed or forced them as their accomplices or instruments to the unspeakable and enduring torments of Hell!*

He spent his last winter at Cannes, apparently in solitude, and died there in his sleep, May 7, 1868, in his ninetieth year.

"Who would not mourn for Brougham," wrote his life-long friend, Jeffrey, on the false report of his death, "and who does not rejoice that the time is not yet come when the land is to be darkened by the extinction of so great a light? I wish to heaven its courses were better ordered. A glorious planet he might have been; but, disdainful to be less than a sun, he has run the wild career of a comet, threatening all systems with disturbance. What will the end be?"†

The end, we fear it must be said, was that the latter portion of Brougham's career overclouded the splendour of the earlier. We regret to think that he must often have felt in the decline of his life that his achievements had not corresponded with his efforts or his hopes.‡

"It is agreeable to turn," we adopt Macaulay's words in reference to Atterbury, "from his public to his private life. His turbulent spirit, wearied with faction, now and then required repose; and he found it in domestic endearments, and in the society of the most illustrious of the living and the dead. Of his wife little is known; but between him and his daughter there was an affection singularly close and tender. The gentleness of his manner when in the company of a few friends was such as seemed hardly credible to those who knew him only by his writings and speeches."

"No human being, probably," wrote one who knew him long and well, "uttered a greater number of severe expressions of his fellow-creatures; and I believe, at the same time, there is hardly any man who has shown more constant and affectionate regard to the interior circle which enjoys his real and abiding goodwill.§"

We dismiss our subject in the familiar words of Burke. Brougham fell into errors—he had faults—"but our error is greater, and our fault radically ruinous to ourselves, if we do not bear, if we do not even applaud the whole compound and mixed mass of such a character. Not to act thus is folly! I had almost said it is impiety. He censures God, who quarrels with the imperfections of man."

* McGilchrist, p. 239.

† Napier, "Correspondence," p. 303.

‡ *Times*, *ubi supra*.

§ Sir James Stephen to Napier, "Correspondence," p. 279. What is said in the text is allowed *consensu omnium*, as is also his filial reverence and affection for his mother, and his devoted affection for his brother.

INDIA AND OUR COLONIAL EMPIRE.

INDIA AND CENTRAL ASIA (2nd October).—In Vol. CX. we brought down the narrative of Afghan affairs to the period of tentative negotiations with Yakub Khan. At length a demonstration of advance on our part from Jalalabad towards Cabul decided his wavering purpose. He came in person, with some degree of state, to Gandamak, the farthest point of our advance, to confer with Major Cavagnari. He did not express his father's unwillingness to receive a Resident. Indeed, the only article of our demands to which he made any serious objection was that which involved the concession of territorial rights. On the 26th of May the English Plenipotentiary signed the definitive Treaty of Peace. The main provisions were that the relations of the Amir with foreign States should be subject to British control and advice; that the British Government should support him against external aggression; that the Kuram, Peshin, and Sibi Valleys, though continuing to be Afghan territory, should be assigned for occupation to the British, the Amir receiving the surplus revenue after payment of the expense of administration. The British authorities were to have complete control of the Khaibar and Michni passes as well as of relations with the independent tribes of the districts in which the passes are situated. The Amir was to receive an annual subsidy of six lakhs of rupees (60,000*l.*), payment being contingent upon his strictly executing the treaty. Commercial faculties formed the subject of a separate agreement concluded for a term of twelve months. Telegraphic communication, *vid* the Kuram valley, was to be established between British territory and Cabul. Recollections of the misfortunes that befell our friends after our withdrawal in 1842 suggested the provision that an amnesty should be proclaimed guaranteeing all subjects of the Amir from molestation on account of their intercourse with the British during the period of occupation. But, judged by the light of events, the most serious of all the stipulations was that which permitted a British agent, provided with a sufficient escort, to reside at Cabul and authorised him to depute British agents to points on the frontier on special occasions. The settlement thus arrived at was criticised in England from two opposite points of view: the point of view of those

who thought Government had done too much, and of those who thought it had done too little. Critics of the first kind were, of course, those who had uniformly—if not consistently—opposed a policy of action in Afghanistan. We need not repeat the general arguments we have already employed to show that action of some kind was imperative. But as some champions of the Inactivity School treat the tragic fate of our Envoy as conclusive evidence of the impolicy of sending an English Resident to Cabul, we may briefly refer to some matters they have not thought it judicious to notice. Shir Ali, in 1873, would beyond question have been willing to receive agents on his frontier if we had given him the specific pledge of help against Russia which he demanded. He was then strong, and could have taken efficient measures for securing the safety of his English guests. Yakub was weak, and thus the experiment was tried under the most unfavourable conditions. We shall see, too, that the policy failed not so much from any intrinsic fault as from the neglect of the necessary precautions in its execution. No reasonable person has ever doubted that Englishmen in Cabul run grave risks. Those who say they ought not to be sent there, have first to show how without British agents British influence is to be paramount. It is mere idleness now to say that it need not be paramount. If we left Afghanistan alone, we should leave it to anarchy first and then to Russian influence; an influence not stable, perhaps, not advantageous to Russia except as an engine of mischief against us. The Duke of Argyll himself, in 1873, was most anxious to send an English officer to the frontier. The need is greater now that Russia is advancing, if not on Merv, towards Merv. More worthy of serious consideration are the objections made on the other side to the Government policy. It is charged with having (1) made a premature peace, and (2) made a peace on conditions which do not give us the guarantees we need. Sir Henry Rawlinson's opinion has been—unfairly, we think—cited as condemnatory of the treaty. It is certain that he does not regard the settlement arrived at as one very likely to be permanent. Herat, he says, is the key of India. On it our eyes should be fixed—with reference to it all our arrangements should be made. Candahar is a step to Herat; we ought not to have abandoned it; we shall probably before long have to return to it. Events seem to justify his prediction. We do not pretend to discuss here what are the minimum or maximum strategic requirements of the situation; but the explanation of its policy given by Government is plausible, and when supplemented by considerations which Government cannot, in the present state of public feeling, prudently avow, seems to us not unreasonable. The Amir Shir Ali compelled us to go to war with him. It was in

the truest sense a defensive war, undertaken to defend legitimate interests. But the opportunity seemed a good one for terminating the period of uncertainty and inconvenience which had lasted so long, and for rendering the recurrence of the provocation—so far as ordinary means and foresight could render it—impossible. We were to uphold as far as circumstances permitted the traditional policy of England, and while excluding foreign influence from Cabul to interfere as little as possible in the concerns of that country, and keep it, if we could, strong, prosperous, and independent. We might have simply retained the points of vantage we had gained, or we might have made peace with the separate tribal chiefs. But it seemed more conducive to permanent tranquillity and the realisation of our ends to recognise and foster a central authority. Yakub Khan in his youth had been able and popular. There was no reason to believe he had lost beyond recovery either his power or his popularity. Therefore it was desirable to make peace with him.

It is easy to say now that he has lost the obedience of his subjects because he accepted our alliance. But it is not clear that he has lost it—or lost it from that cause. At any rate, at the time there was quite as good reason to hope that our recognition and support would strengthen his authority. Even if he proved weak and faithless, we had still as substantial results of the campaign the strong frontier, the vindication of our prestige, and the blow to Russian influence. From our new posts we would always be within striking distance of Cabul. To give Yakub every chance, it was necessary to reduce our demands to a minimum. We gave up Candahar and Jalalabad, because to have retained them would have deprived him of the richest and most valued of his provinces. They were not necessary for such a strategic plan as present circumstances suggested. They could always be easily reoccupied from our posts at Peshin or Lundi Kotal. There was need, too, of a speedy settlement. Our troops, unhoused and far from their base, were exposed to the hardships of a peculiarly sickly season. The financial distress of India rendered the military expenditure peculiarly embarrassing. There was, no doubt, a desire to discomfit the Liberals by a show of moderation. On all these grounds, peace having been made, our Government refrained from a victorious occupation of Cabul, and thus, no doubt, an opportunity was lost of giving the turbulent populace of that town a salutary lesson. To "set free the soil" the homeward march was commenced; cholera and other forms of disease followed our worn-out soldiers through the hot plains of Jalalabad, and the mortality is said to have been so great that even now Government hardly avows the full loss of men.

The fresh crisis found the thinned ranks of our boy regiments resting dispirited in their camps on the new frontier or in the cantonments of the Punjab. The evacuation of Candahar was fortunately postponed; the Amir returned alone to his capital, and set about the task of consolidating his authority. At Herat, his half-brother, Ayub Khan, showed a disposition to rebel—he certainly wrote to the Amir, expressing his angry disapproval of the English alliance. In Badakshan, Mir Baba Khan had openly asserted his independence, and even asked the Viceroy to recognise it. Abdu-r-rahmar from his refuge in Bokhara, backed, it was believed, by Russian influence, was intriguing. Though many of the leading Afghan chiefs—the Ghilzai and the Kunar chiefs, for instance, and even Wali Muhamad—recognised the Amir's authority, there were rumours of plots and disaffection everywhere. The Amir, after the manner of Afghans, had to defend his throne by consigning many of his relatives to prison. At Herat especially—a town half Persian, half Afghan—mischief was rife. But Yakub Khan showed an honest willingness to fulfil his engagement with us. The amnesty was duly proclaimed. A Russian Envoy, who tried to approach him with a complimentary letter, was sent back to the frontier, and General Kaufmann was told in future to send communications through the British Government. The Amir even made fair preparations for reasserting his authority. Troops were despatched to Balkh. The Turkomans who harassed the great trade route from Persia by Herat and Maimena were repulsed. On the 24th of July, Major Cavagnari, as British Resident, accompanied by Mr. Jenkins of the Punjab Civil Service as Assistant, and an escort of 26 cavalry and 50 infantry of the corps of Guides, reached Cabul. He had been met on the frontier by an escort. He was welcomed to the city with imposing ceremonial, and received a cordial greeting from the Amir. It is said that subsequently the Amir's manner became cold, and that the attitude of the people, especially of the soldiers, was threatening. But the official reports of the Resident—by this time Sir L. P. Cavagnari—and the letters sent by his colleagues to the Press in India and their friends at home, give no indications of a change. The Envoy meditated a tour through the troubled provinces with the Amir, and later it was arranged that the Amir was to come to Calcutta to be received by the Viceroy at a grand durbar. The houses assigned to the Resident were in the Bala Hissar. Though incapable of defence in themselves, they were assumed to be defended by the works of the citadel. Unhappily, on the 3rd of September, some half-mutinuous regiments that had come from Herat, panic-stricken with cholera, were admitted to the Bala Hissar. The

accounts of the few survivors of the escort and attendants are conflicting. According to that which seems most trustworthy, the Herati soldiers clamoured for pay, reviled the Amir, insisted that he should expel the infidels, and as, with vain entreaties, he refused to do so, they went in a body and attacked the Residency buildings. The garrison made a strenuous but fruitless defence. When the house was at last set on fire, they charged out, hoping to gain the shelter of a stone building; but they were borne down by numbers. With hardly an exception, all fell fighting sword in hand. Of their assailants 210 perished. The wretched Amir sat helpless in his palace; he sent his commander-in-chief, the burly Daud Shah, to quell the tumult; but the rioters stoned him. So serious were his wounds that he was at first reported to be dead. The Amir then sent his son; he sent Mollahs with a Koran—but all in vain. The mutineers had been joined by other regiments and by some of the townspeople, whom the hope of plunder, hatred of the foreigner, and religious fanaticism—it was the month of Ramazan—attracted to the fray. The agents of the various factions that convulse Afghanistan had of course been busy. Tidings of the disaster were brought to Ali Khel by a messenger. Fortunately there is a telegraph to the Kuram Valley from Simla. The Viceroy, apprised of what had occurred, ordered an immediate advance on Cabul. Major Massey, hurrying on from Ali Khel, seized the summit of the Shuturgardan. The troops that had just left Candahar marched back to reoccupy it. Troops were hurried from the neighbouring cantonments to the Khaibar and the Kuram. The frightful loss of beasts of burden during the campaign had almost denuded the Punjab of mules and camels. But in default of adequate transport, it was decided to send the troops lightly equipped. Experience gained in the Zulu War no doubt suggested expedients. Government, we think, hardly regretted that the necessity of reducing the number of non-combatants gave it a pretext for escaping from the embarrassments which the presence of Special Correspondents in the camps had caused in the late war. General Kennedy, whose power of organisation had been found so useful in the Bombay famine, was appointed to the absolute control of transport and supply. Though the wildest reports were in circulation, there was no indication that the rebellion was likely to extend beyond Cabul. At Candahar (where our orderly Government and profitable custom had rendered us popular) the Governor made cordial offers of help. The Ghilzai Chief (whose district extends from the Shuturgardan to Cabul), declared himself warmly our friend. At first there were grave fears

that the Amir either had connived at the massacre, or would be compelled by the pressure of the disaffected to head the insurrection. It seems, however, that he was guilty at the worst only of deplorable want of energy and resource. He sent piteous letters to the Viceroy and to General Roberts describing his helplessness—his indignation at the treacherous violation of the rights of hospitality (the one duty recognised by Afghan ethics)—and his resolve to inflict exemplary chastisement on the guilty. Finally, he came in person to our camp. For by this time the Kuram force under General Roberts had occupied Kushi. With him came his principal officers and a host of Sirdars. Wali Muhammad, Hashim Khan, and other possible pretenders to the Afghan throne also came to pay their respects. On the second of October the advance of our troops from Kushi commenced, and it was expected that the whole expeditionary force would be concentrated for the attack on Cabul on the fifth. General Roberts had issued a proclamation warning all non-combatants to withdrawal, and declaring that all persons found with arms would be treated as enemies. As to the state of things in the city nothing was known but that anarchy prevailed—that the gates had been closed to prevent the flight of the well-disposed, and that some mutinous regiments from Turkestan had arrived to assist the Cabul mutineers. It is necessary to explain here that almost simultaneous with the outbreak at Cabul had been revolts of the soldiery at Herat and in Turkestan. The immediate cause was discontent growing out of unsatisfied demands for pay; but at Herat, at any rate, the feeling against the English alliance was strong. Persian intrigues—and possibly Russian influence—were active there. In the meanwhile a column of British troops from Candahar was advancing on Khelat-i-Ghilzai—a stronghold occupied for a short time by our troops during the last campaign. The Afghan Governor welcomed their approach. The force advancing from the Khaibar, too, occupied Daka without a blow. If we except a treacherous attack by Mangals on a convoy—a determined attack by a levy of Ghilzais and Mangals on the force proceeding with General Roberts over the Shuturgardan—and an ambuscade of Orakzais, in which one of our officers fell, there has been no serious overt act of hostility to our arms. All these occurrences were on the Kuram route. Elsewhere the Amir's officials have in obedience to his orders facilitated our advance. The Afridis of the Khaibar have sent deputies to Peshawar, and through them have entered into fresh stipulations for the safety of the Pass. We do not wish to disguise the political difficulties of the situation. But it is clear that the Treaty of Gandamak, or the war that preceded it, has given us—1. Command of fairly easy access to Cabul. 2. A thorough

acquaintance with routes and local conditions. 3. The goodwill of large sections of the people. 4. The co-operation of a ruler who at least retains authority enough to make his co-operation a great gain.

The successful issue of the first campaign had a most tranquilising effect in India. Congratulations poured in on the Viceroy from all the native States. At home it certainly strengthened the political position of Government. Votes of thanks to the army were passed without any real dissent, the only objection being that the vote included thanks to Lord Lytton. Lord Napier paid a well-deserved compliment to the gallantry and capacity shown by native officers, and seized the occasion to enforce his well-known views as to the adequacy of the present proportion of European officers in native regiments. When the Bill by which the English Government lent India two millions sterling, without interest, was under debate, Mr. Fawcett made an ineffectual protest against throwing on India almost exclusively the burden of a war which was undertaken as a part of a scheme of Imperial policy. Government answered in effect that India had not been asked to pay any part of the other expenses that policy involved, though it was maintained in her interest.

There has been hardly any change in the situation as regards Birma. The King sent an expedition against the Shans, which was ignominiously defeated; he has grown in disfavour with the Phoongyes, or priests, and day by day widens the breach with his old Ministers. He shows a growing dislike of foreigners. The Italian Consul, after a spirited protest regarding the massacres, left Mandalay. Our Resident told the King that if further massacres occurred our flag would be pulled down. Other massacres of princes and ladies of the Royal House did occur, but our Resident remained. Intercourse with the palace, however, almost ceased. Mr. Shaw, the Resident (to whose courage the Nyoung Yan prince and others owed their escape), died suddenly. Colonel Browne was sent to take temporary charge of the duties of the office; but he, too, was recalled, and only a *Chargé d'Affaires* left. At last, when the massacre at Cabul occurred, Government, fearing that a similar outrage might occur at Mandalay, wished to withdraw what remained of the Mission. It was feared, however, that if a gunboat attempted to proceed up the Irrawady for this purpose it would be fired on from the bank, and thus war—and possibly the catastrophe we were anxious to avert—would be precipitated. Meanwhile, the trade of British Birmah is paralyzed. There has been a decrease of 1½ millions sterling in the value of goods cleared for consumption. The King still sends his ragamuffin levies hither and thither

and our troops are in crowded cantonments on the frontier, where they have suffered much from cholera. Public opinion in Birma urges the Government to action. It is pointed out that the Nyoung Yan prince would be a ruler attached to us, and acceptable to the people. But the drunken Thibaw has hitherto abstained from open outrage. He sent a Mission to Simla, which the Viceroy declined to receive—very properly, as the Burmese Court declines to accord an audience to our Envoy unless he complies with a humiliating ceremonial. The King's talk about us to his subjects is ridiculously but irritatingly pretentious. Lately he has advanced a claim to the Western Karen country. In 1875 we compelled the old King to withdraw a similar claim to the Eastern Karen country. A Burmese occupation of Western Karen would expose us to grave strategic danger. It cannot be permitted. Meanwhile the granaries at Mandalay are empty. The crops have been deficient. All Mandalay has gone mad about public lotteries, and famine is likely to come soon to sweep away the King and thousands of his light-hearted subjects. We shall intervene probably, not to depose Thibaw, but to instal his successor.

The discomfiture of Russian schemes in Afghanistan has but stimulated their activity in Central Asia. A Chinese Embassy came to St. Petersburg to negotiate for the retrocession of Kulja. It is known, we may explain, that the Chinese have had great difficulty in maintaining their hold on Kashgar. Hakim Khan Tura (the son of the Atalik Ghazi) has invaded their territory with a large army, and is welcomed by the Musulman inhabitants. The repressive measures adopted by the Chinese Governor are of a characteristically cruel kind. On the frontier of Kulja almost hostile relations existed till lately between the Russians and the Chinese. The latter excluded Russian traders and pursued robber bands into Russian territory. The military party in Russia objected strongly to the relinquishment of a province so fruitful and important. Many of the inhabitants no doubt wished to see the Russian occupation prolonged. But the Czar has finally decided to keep his promise—exacting, it must be owned, a full price for his "act of grace." Russia retains the southern portion of Kulja, including the important passes of the great mountain range, commanding on the one side Kulja and on the other Kashgar. She gets a large indemnity for the expense of occupation and the grievances of Russian subjects. She obtains trading facilities in Chinese territory (whence she hopes thereby to exclude English enterprise) and establishes Consular agencies there. She also obtains a rectification of frontier towards Mongolia. The pride of the Celestials is of course gratified by thus completing the reconquest of all their revolted pro-

vinces. We may, perhaps, remark here that China is every day becoming a better recognised factor in Asiatic politics. The growing estrangement between Germany and Russia is simultaneous with German efforts to conciliate the Chinese. The relations between certain trans-Himalayan States on our northern frontier and China, under which these States render formal homage to the Pekin Emperor, has lately been a subject of discussion in Indian political circles. Our unwillingness to meddle with Birma arises in part from a reluctance to have the Chinese as neighbours.

Since the early spring a Russian expedition, 20,000 strong, has been collecting at Chikislar, on the Caspian. As to its objects the professions of the Russian press varied, apparently, according to the temper of the Russian Government. Sometimes they declared defiantly that it was a reply to the English occupation of Cabul, and that Merv was its objective point. Sometimes they said, half-apologetically, that it was designed simply to release Russian prisoners, who, it is admitted on all hands, are kept prisoners by the Tekke Turkomans, and to repress the murderous raids by which these fierce desert tribes harass the caravans of Russian subjects. No Englishman can deny that the legitimate policy of Russia may necessitate the inception of strong punitive and repressive measures against the Turkomans; but these measures, to be effectual, may involve the occupation of Merv, and a Russian occupation of Merv would (even a Liberal Government declared) be a source of concern to England. The expedition, if not against Merv, is towards Merv. The preparations made have been colossal. On the sandy shore at Chikislar a fortified camp has been formed; a telegraph connects it with Baku; nevertheless, hitherto the force has done as little as General Lomakin's expedition last year. In April some Turkomans made a successful attack at Barnak, an outpost north-east of Krasnovodsk, and carried off some camels. Their unwonted use of fire-arms and skill in European tactics suggested to the Russians that they were led by a deserter, or an Englishman. In June the vanguard started, amid violent storms, for Duzulum. In July the advance of the whole force, in small echelons, was announced; but the heat, the sand, the brackish water, and the want of wholesome food, has caused the most intense suffering, and led to an almost unparalleled mortality. To add to the Russian misfortunes, General Lazareff, the commander, died, and though General Tergukasoff was appointed to succeed, there was at first some talk of the abandonment or postponement of the expedition. It seems, however, that General Lomakin, who was left in command, thought he had an opportunity of retrieving his disaster of the previous year. The Russian force seems to

have been advancing up the Sumbar towards Kizil Arvat, hoping thence to advance by what is known as the Attock road along the northern slopes of the Kopet Dagh towards Merv. Baffled in his attempt to do this, General Lomakin crossed some passes in the mountains to the north-east, and thus struck the Attock road east of Kizil Arvat. At Geok-tepe he was attacked by the Turkomans. In his official despatches he claimed to have followed them to their stronghold of Denziltepe, where 20,000 Tekes, including women and children, were collected. The place, according to General Lomakin, was shelled and finally captured. He admitted great loss, and as he described his troops as occupying after the engagement a post (Beurma) which he had previously passed, it was generally believed that the report which reached India through Persia that he had been defeated was well-founded. Again, there was talk of a withdrawal to Chikislar. The Russian press, excited by the English approach to Herat, frankly avowed that the object of the expedition was Merv, but argued that it was no longer worth aiming at. Supplies abound along the Attock road, except for the three last marches to Merv, which are over desert. But through fruitful valleys of the Kopet Dagh lies a direct road to Herat. By this, said the Russian generals, the Czar's troops should advance to sieze Herat. Merv could easily be approached from Charjui (on the Oxus). Early, indeed, in the campaign a corps was said to be assembled at Charjui, which was to advance and effect a junction with the Chikislar column, but we have heard nothing of its movements. The English settlement of Cabul affairs was said at first to have restored English prestige in Persia, and the Russian organs complained that at the instigation of the English the Persian Government refused to allow the Russian force to advance by the easy route along the Persian frontier; refused, too, to facilitate the supply of provisions, &c., and to co-operate generally in the expedition. But more trustworthy intelligence indicates that the Persian Government sent a force, officered by Austrians and Russians, to co-operate with the Russian column. A number of Russian officers, sent to organise the Persian cavalry on the Cossack model, were received at Teheran with much consideration. Among the more curious operations of the campaign were the wholesale diversions of the course of rivers. Thus, the Russians tried to bring back the Atrék to Chikislar, and the Turkomans retaliated by diverting the Sambar. In these level wastes a mere embankment is often sufficient to change the whole river system. The retirement of General Kaufmann probably marked a change in Russian policy in Asia. A perfect Oriental in tastes, habits, and morals, his rule was signalled by the prodigious extension of Russian conquests.

His splendid state pleased the people, but he failed by thrifty and judicious administration to consolidate what he had gained. The appointment of the late administrator of Bulgaria as his successor was supposed to indicate that henceforth Russia would devote her energies to peaceful development rather than to limitless intrigue. At present Russian genius busies itself with vast schemes for improving communication between its Asiatic and European provinces. The ground for the railway from Orenburg to Samarcand is being surveyed. The commission charged with the duty of selecting a route for the Great Central Asiatic Railway is about to start from Samarcand, across Bukhara to the Oxus, and thence descend by boat to Khiva. The possibilities of navigating the Jaxartes and the Oxus have been carefully examined. Works are said to have been already commenced for restoring the Oxus to its old bed, and thus giving Russia a water route by the Volga, the Caspian, and the Oxus to the Afghan frontier. A canal is even contemplated to connect the "Black Sea, or Sea of Azof, with the Caspian. Meanwhile, England pursued its policy of friendly vigilance, a token of which was the transfer of the Consulate from Resht to Asterabad. It was evident that an English advance on Herat would lead to a new crisis in the Central Asian Question. Herat is the key of Afghanistan, but would be important, too, as a base of operations against Persia or Turkestan. Persia has a traditional claim to the coveted fortress, but we could not allow it to pass into her possession unless we could assume to Persia the same relation that we have assumed to Afghanistan. Persia had reason to fear Russia, but for the present it seemed that Russia might be disposed to back up Persian claims. Russia had an army on the spot, and the co-operation of the Shah alone was necessary to enable it to march on Herat by easy roads through Persia. All the great authorities on Central Asian affairs were summoned, in October, to Livadia, to advise the Czar. Among them was General Kaufmann—who was hardly likely to counsel inaction. It was even rumoured that General Kaufmann was to return forthwith to Tashkent. The Russians were known to be active in Central Asia. Hostilities between Badakshan and Darwaz gave General Abramoff a pretext for a demonstration. He crossed from Ferghana with his artillery by a pass 14,000 feet high, and was known to be "operating" in the Sub-Pamir Khanates." By annexing Darwaz, Russia would have control of the upper Oxus, and would command the fertile province of Badakshan. She would, in fact, be at the foot of the Hindu Kush. It was probable that if Russia sought compensation, she would find it in this direction.

Cashmere has for two years been the scene of a frightful famine,

due not so much to the inclemency of the seasons, as to the persistent misgovernment of years. It commands the great trade routes from Central Asia; the soil is fruitful, the climate kindly, the scenery has for ages been a theme of romance; the people, if of low morale, are tractable and well-disposed to the British. It is no wonder, then, if nearly every English visitor leaves the valley an ardent annexationist. The father of the present ruler carved out the kingdom for himself in the old Sikh days; he helped us with a gift of three-fourths of a million when we were in sad want of money at the close of the first Sikh war. In return we recognised his sovereignty. The account of the present horrors serve as a text to many appeals to the British Government. We ought, we are told, to return the money, and save the people from their ruler; he is well-meaning enough, but is weak and vacillating; he is a bigoted Hindoo, and as such has little sympathy with his Mussulman subjects. He (or rather the many-graded horde of officials) leaves to the cultivators only enough to maintain a miserable existence; the rest is spent on idle state and rabble armaments. The Government of Cashmere is indeed a fair type of that native rule to which Mr. John Bright thinks we ought to abandon India if we cannot govern without a license tax. But we must not prejudice our political position in India, even to save the people of Cashmere from misgovernment. The existence of independent States is a necessary part of our system; the Maharajah has always been a faithful ally to us. To depose him would shock the loyal confidence of every native ruler in India. Our Government has done all it can to relieve the distress; it has sent in grain in abundance, but the members of the Durban have thwarted the efforts of our officers, now by their selfish greed, now by reckless apathy, now by silly interference. The last harvest, though not bountiful, will it is hoped be sufficient to support the people—that is, those who remain—for half have died of hunger or have left the valley.

In May the prevalence of dacoities or gang robberies in the Deccan caused some anxiety to the Local Government. Such plundering organisations were a normal and spontaneous product of social conditions in the times that preceded our rule. They have never anywhere been completely repressed, and they have a tendency to expand whenever the old conditions revive; such conditions are an inefficient police—a lax magistrate—an incapable judge—general distress. The districts of the Deccan in which the dacoities occurred were those which had been most grievously afflicted by the years of famine. The system of rural police, recommended to pseudo-economists, because it enabled Government to show a small expenditure,

was inefficient—that is to say, extravagant. The thieves did not belong to the ordinary cultivating classes; they were for the most part members of the Ramúsi caste, one of the many criminal tribes of India. They had been partially reclaimed, but under the pressure of distress relapsed into their old criminal practices. Just at this time a Government clerk of an ambitious and adventurous turn absconded, and joining the bandits, devoted his singular talent for organisation to the enterprise in which they were engaged. It so happened that the denunciations of Government, with which Mr. Bright and Mr. Hyndman have made us familiar, were then at their height; Wasadeo Balwant, the absconded clerk, had, it is clear, not an atom of real enthusiasm for popular rights, and was not even fired by the old Marathi traditions; but he had read enough of the Anglo-Indian press to see that he had an opportunity of giving political colour to his enterprise. He issued a magniloquent proclamation, in which he demanded that Government should redress the wrongs of the people, should open public works on a large scale (herein he showed a culpable contempt of Mr. Hyndman's doctrine), should encourage native trades, should reduce taxation, and cut down the enormous salaries of Europeans. Unless Government did this, the patriotic Wasadeo—or rather, King Sevaji the Second—would no longer confine his ravages to his unoffending countrymen. He had the impudence to set a price on the Governor's head; his hands seemed to the panic-stricken people to be everywhere. Traffic on the road from Puna to Mahableswar was for a time stopped; Wasadeo's pretensions were absurd, but the ignorant and excitable sentiment of English Liberalism was ready to believe anything which discredited the Indian Government. Even the *Times* spoke of "bands of desperate peasants" taking the law into their "own hands." Unfortunately, it happened just at this time that the keeper of the Government Book Depôt at Puna set fire to the Vishranbagh and Budhwar palaces (two buildings of the Peshwa's time, which the English Government had used as public offices), in order to destroy the evidence of his defalcations. There is a party in India which sees a political plot in everything. The cry was soon raised in India, and echoed in England, that the disaffected Brahmins, and the educated natives generally, represented by a "progressive" society at Puna, called the Sarva Janik Sabha, had contrived both the dacoities and the conflagration. Happily, judicial inquiry dispelled the delusion. The dacoits one by one have been hunted down; Wasadeo Balwant was captured after a splendid chase by the Bombay police. He had engaged at Haidarabad a body of Arabs and Rohillas to assist in his patriotic thieving. His system was to pay his fellow-regenators so much a month, and keep

the proceeds of the robberies for himself. The disturbances were grave enough, but were not of an "agrarian" or "political" character.

More serious was a rebellion on the Godavery Vizagapatam frontier. Rampa is a tract of unhealthy country, little visited by Europeans; the people are of the simple aboriginal type, which, according to the system of management, may be converted into either bandits or loyal subjects, like the Santhals. The excise dues of Rampa had been farmed out to the native chief; his exactions drove the people first into riot and then, when police were sent against them, into rebels. They plundered peaceful villages and attacked police parties. The malarious character of the country rendered military operations difficult. The Madras Government, fussy and vacillating, thwarted local effort. The rebels had the hardihood to attack and capture a steam launch. At last Colonel Rammel surrounded them by a cordon of soldiers and police, and in a regular engagement defeated the insurgents with great loss.

The growing numbers and neglected condition of the poor Eurasian and European population in India have long been recognised as an element of grave political danger. Lord Lytton has addressed himself to the subject with that kindly common-sense which he has so often brought to bear on social questions. European boys may be trained to be soldiers, and to this end the Lawrence Asylums are to be reformed. As a local Indian Army is likely to be revived, the State will gain as much as the poor whites. For both classes elementary schools are to be established where they do not now exist. Education is to be compulsory. Industrial Schools and Boarding Schools are also to be provided, and the State is to concern itself to obtain employment for those who have a difficulty in finding it. The scheme is experimental, and is to be tried first in the Punjab, Oudh, and North-Western Provinces. The Eurasian community has lately given satisfactory evidence of its anxiety to help itself. Emigration to Australia, settlements in the Hills, have been proposed, without as yet much practical result.

The operations in Afghanistan revealed, in the opinion of competent judges, faults of military organisation (especially as regards the officering of native regiments, transport and commissariat), which, had the strain been greater, would certainly have ended in disaster. Almost immediately after it was brought to a close a Commission of Inquiry was appointed in India. It included many distinguished names, but the absence of regimental experience was made matter of unfavourable comment. The subjects of inquiry include the number and distribution of the Native and British army, in war and in peace, the question

of a *reserve* force, the organisation and system of recruiting and reliefs of the British army, the territorial organisation and division of command, the question of the best units of organisation for the field service, the existence of separate armies for each Presidency, with separate staffs and departments, organisation of transport and supply, supply of warlike stores, the question, "What new lines of railway and road are of the most urgent political importance?" Unhappily, events have not awaited reforms. Our native regiments must go into action without European Company officers. The Indus rolls still unbridged; no tramways or railways have been constructed to the Passes. Orders have, however, been given for the construction of tramways through the Kuram and the Khaibar, and of a railway to the Kuram route.

The Report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons, appointed last Session, to inquire regarding Public Works policy with reference to the question of Famine, has been published. The conclusions are in favour of railways and adverse to canals. Though the Government have opened new markets, encouraged exports and rendered reduction of military expenditure possible, yet the State has suffered a *direct* loss hitherto of 25 millions sterling by its outlay on them. Of course, the benefit to the country far outweighs the loss. It would, the Committee report, be financially impossible to extend canals so as to give general immunity from drought. India, as a whole, produces food enough each year for its people. Only means of communication are necessary to prevent famine. The general financial recommendations of the Committee accord completely with the principles which, as we explained in Vol. CXI., Government has already laid down.

It was easy to predict that the credulous interest shown by some English statesmen in regard to so-called Indian grievances would develop a new factor in the politics of both countries. An association of educated Bangalis exists at Calcutta. It recently sent to this country a Mr. Ialmohun Ghose, a gentleman of much tact, culture, and capacity, to expound to Englishmen the feelings of the people of India. We need hardly say that the people of India are as little of one mind as the people of England, and that Mr. Ghose has less claim to represent them than the ordinary English civilian, who at any rate has practical experience of their needs. On the subjects which Mr. Ghose discusses not one native out of a thousand ever thinks. However, Mr. Ghose represents a class—the class of educated Liberal English-speaking, reading, and writing natives. A meeting was held at Willis's Rooms at which Mr. John Bright presided, and Mr. Ghose

spoke. The financial and foreign policy of the Indian Government was of course denounced; so was the Vernacular Press Act. But the chief indictment was the persistent exclusion of natives from the public service. On this point, Mr. John Bright dilated with arrogant ignorance of the most elementary conditions of the very grave question he was handling. He condemned, unconsciously of course, Lord Lawrence and Lord Northbrook even more strongly than Lord Lytton, for the latter sympathises to a fault with native aspirations. The truth is, every judicious Englishman wishes to see natives occupying high positions in the public service, but the practical difficulties are great. The powers of officials in India are enormous. An Englishman exercises them, not always wisely and temperately, but at least honestly. His position as one of a small marked class saves him from temptations to which a native, surrounded by all the various influences of native society, would be prone. His loyalty is assured. As a foreigner and a member of the ruling class, he is not so much a mark for jealousy and even contempt as a native would be. Rulers must be selected from an aristocratic class, or must be made aristocratic by pay and privileges. The Englishman is an aristocrat, in popular estimation, by virtue of the fact that he is an Englishman. A native would need higher pay to win the same prestige. Hence economy would not be effected by any extensive change of system. Again, Englishmen *must* be the backbone of the higher administrative order, and, owing perhaps to faults of the English nature, the introduction of native members, to whom Englishmen would be subordinate, would cause grave practical embarrassment. Then, *what* natives are to be selected, and *how*? If by competition, clever Bangalis and Parsis will fill the ranks, and admitting, for argument's sake, that they will show in responsible posts at critical times the moral and physical *vigour* and the honesty of the Englishman, their appointment would certainly be distasteful to the native gentlemen of the old school, who, except near the great towns, form the district aristocracy. If by nomination, the clever Bangalis will object, as they have done already. They argue with justice that nomination will lead to more favouritism, and tend further to increase the subordination of the "independent" natives to the domineering civilian. It would no doubt be desirable to employ the sons of native noblemen and gentlemen, but how many of them could or would do the work which now taxes to the full the talents and energy of selected Englishmen? The "educated" Bangali says no one is fit for the public service who has not been in England. Yet the grievance is that the competitive examinations (which practically exclude them) are held in England. We need not refer to natives who sit in the High Court or in the

Legislative Council. Thousands are employed in the uncovenanted service in posts of great responsibility. Nearly all the civil judicial work of the country is done by natives. There will be serious embarrassment if here and there a clever young A.B. of Calcutta University is put in a post of nominal superiority to these. However, the Government has attempted to solve the difficulty, and fulfil the pledges given long ago. The new rules empower Local Governments to nominate natives in *India*, under 33 Vic., cap. 3, s. 6, to offices ordinarily held by members of the Covenanted Civil Service. No person below the age of twenty-five is to be nominated, except on grounds of merit shown in Government service or the practice of a profession. Nominations are subject to the sanction of the Governor-General, and are to be confirmed only after a period of two years' probation. The total number is not to exceed in ordinary years one-fifth of the number of vacancies filled by competition. We have summarised the criticism which from opposite quarters they have evoked. The school represented by Mr. Ghose is certainly not satisfied. Throughout Northern India cholera has been unusually prevalent. There is still distress in Eastern Bengal and in Bombay. In the latter Presidency the depredations of rats caused such loss to cultivators that special measures—happily effectual—had to be taken to exterminate them. The decision of Government to construct the Ahmadabad Pablanpur railway on the narrow-gauge system has been met by warm protests throughout India, especially in Bombay. The break of gauge is fatal to the use of the line as a through route from Bombay to Delhi for strategic or even ordinary commercial purposes. The only argument in its favour is that of economy. Yet even here it is open to question whether the greater expense in rolling stock does not counterbalance the gain in cost of construction. As a preliminary to the resignation of Maisur to the rule of its young Raja, the native element is being more fully introduced into the higher branches of the administration. The skilled observer employed to examine the Wynaad gold-fields reports that they may be profitably worked. The press generally urges Government not to allow the enterprise to fall into the hands of ignorant and resourceless adventurers. A charge of assault preferred by the judge of Firukhabad against the (native) subordinate judge induced the Local Government to dismiss the offender. The Indian Government directed that the matter should be inquired into by a committee consisting of one English civilian and two natives. The proceedings were watched with painful interest. The finding is said to have been favourable to the accused, who is to be reinstated. The incident has suggested to Lord Lytton the propriety of issuing

rules to facilitate appeals from orders of dismissal passed by local authorities. By those who think that the permanent interests of India are of greater importance than a temporary saving, the proposed dispersion of the splendid collections of the Indian Museum to Kew, Kensington, and perhaps the British Museum, is regretted.

We must defer reference to the proposed legislation for the relief of the indebted cultivators of the Deccan.

South Africa (15th September).—The Zulus were at once stunned into inactivity by the unexpected completeness of their success at Isandula, and *dispirited* by their fearful loss and their repulse at Rorke's Drift. With the relief of Ekowe and the victory at Kambula ended, on our side, the period of panic and disaster. But the destruction of the Zulu power was still to be undertaken. The capture of the royal kraal at Ulundi was the first object of the campaign. There were two possible routes: one, along the coast, was to a certain distance already well established. It was short, and was near the port by which our reinforcements and military stores were being landed. There was, too, a probability—since realised—that another landing-place would be found at the mouth of one of the rivers which it crossed; but it was in many places broken and wooded, and offered great advantages to the attack of the enemy. It was, further, very unhealthy, and almost fatal to cavalry. The northern route, on the other hand, was far from our base; but it was convenient for supplies from Natal, the Free States, and the Transvaal. The uplands were healthy, and the advance could be made along natural ridges commanding the country round. It was desirable to utilise General Wood's splendid force for the general advance, and yet it would have been inexpedient to withdraw it from its position on the Transvaal border, where it had done and was doing such splendid service. The Boers of the Transvaal were disaffected, and there was even reason to fear that they would rise in arms. It was necessary at once to overawe them and to protect the Natal frontier. The old road, by Rorke's Drift, was the shortest, but experience had shown that it was heavy and difficult, and wound through an irregular, broken country. On the other hand, the route by Koppie Allein was tolerably open, along ridges and rolling downs. Lord Chelmsford, therefore, decided to advance along an arc, instead of by the diameter. The difficulties of supply and transport were extreme, for the country to be traversed offered nothing but grass and water—often not even these. The reinforcements sent consisted in great part of raw stripplings, whom the experience of the campaign was to convert into soldiers. Where a check would have been a disaster, it was necessary

to make success certain. There never was a campaign in which the unknown formed a larger element. It was impossible to adjust our preparations with absolute nicety to our eventual needs. The Zulu force was so mobile that it had to be regarded as practically ubiquitous. Therefore the unwieldy transport train and the whole line of supplies had to be guarded at every point by a force sufficient to resist a sudden attack. A long line of forts connected the head of the column with the base. The army was, in fact, a wedge, of which only the apex could reach Ulundi. Great as was the difficulty of collecting supplies, the difficulty of getting drivers was greater. The experience of a lifetime is required to manage the long train of oxen which draws the heavy Cape waggon. The Kafir drivers, awed by the recollection of Isandula, were unwilling to enter Zululand, and deserted in hosts. Nevertheless, the splendid exertions of the Transport and Commissariat Departments overcame all difficulties, and in June the advance commenced. A junction was soon effected with Colonel Wood's column, and that dashing commander, returning to the base with the empty waggons, escorted thence a fresh convoy of supplies. Thereafter his flying column was used as an advance guard for the main force, under General Newdigate. Katshwayo, meanwhile, had sent various messengers to ask for peace. There can be no doubt that he was desirous of peace on his own terms, but he never made any practicable offer of submission on ours. In the Zulu councils there was a party of old men willing to save the nation from extinction by provisional submission; but there was also a party of younger chiefs, who thought that the Zulus would still be a match for the English in the open field, or that our strength could be exhausted by prolonged resistance. Katshwayo hesitated between the two impulses, and the despatch of the messengers was probably a measure of compromise. His purpose was, perhaps, not treacherous, but he had not made up his mind to submit. At any rate, he felt that his overtures, if they were entertained, would delay our advance, and possibly lead us to relax our preparations.

Lord Chelmsford is admitted by every one to be sensitive and conscientious. He earnestly wished to give Katshwayo a chance of favourable terms, and to save his own troops from unnecessary risks, but he had no means of ascertaining whether Katshwayo was entirely sincere. It is puerile to say that, having thought it right to invade Zululand, we ought to have withdrawn our troops—for this is what Katshwayo asked us to do—on the mere chance that he would ultimately agree to a reasonable settlement. On the 30th of June Lord Chelmsford was within ten miles of the Umvalosi River; thence he dismissed some Chiefs of rank who had come from Katshwayo with

elephants' tusks, the Zulu pledge of good faith. * They were told that if the King really wished to give evidence of his sincerity, he should send to our camp the two guns, the cattle, and 1000 of the rifles taken at Isandula. These were conditions with which, had he wished, he could easily have complied. After our victory at Ulundi, the guns were found at Amanze Kange, the stronghold Katshwayo had prepared for his retreat. It was necessary, Lord Chelmsford told the Chiefs, that the army should advance to the Umvalosi, but it would halt on its banks till the 3rd of June. He has been blamed for thus delaying the advance, but one result of his conciliatory attitude was that the army traversed unopposed the remaining distance to the Umvalosi, a tract peculiarly favourable for an enemy's attack. No reply was received by the 3rd July. Some of our soldiers who went to the river in the morning were fired on by Zulus from the opposite bank. Colonel Buller crossed with his irregular cavalry to reconnoitre; he was soon surrounded by Zulus, and had to cut his way back to camp. On the morning of the 4th, the whole force, consisting of 1103 Natives and 4062 Europeans, crossed the river; they had time to form in a hollow square, in a singularly advantageous position, when streams of Zulus appeared on all sides. The Zulus advanced in loose formation. While they were still at a distance the cavalry engaged them. When they came nearer the horsemen retired within the square and the artillery fire commenced. Then, as the Zulus pressed on, the infantry met them with a storm of bullets. The Zulus wavered, then they steadied themselves as if for a final sloop, then suddenly broke and fled. The cavalry sallied forth, and the rout of the enemy was complete. The force pressed on to Ulundi, burnt it and the adjacent kraals, and by the evening were back in camp. It is computed that of 20,000 Zulus engaged, 1000 fell. Lord Chelmsford, partly in obedience to orders received from Sir G. Wolseley, immediately broke up his force; one section under General Newdigate retired to quarters on the Upoko River, where grass, water, and wood were abundant; while the rest with Lord Chelmsford returned to St. Paul's, a station on the new road from Port Durnford. There he met Sir G. Wolseley; a few days later he left the scene of war.

During the march of General Newdigate's column there had been some spirited reconnaissances and fighting with Zulu "tribal levies," bodies whose independence of the King's control showed that even his sincerity was not necessarily a guarantee of peace. Before and during the main advance, detachments went to the field of Isandula and buried the long neglected dead. The old route by Rorke's Drift was re-established. The subsequent relegation of the splendid cavalry

brigade to mere convoy duties in the rear was a humiliating necessity enjoined by the scarcity of forage. Everywhere the use of heliographs assisted operations by rendering signalling easy. We must now turn to the operations of the First Division on the Lower Tugela, under General Crealock. The object of that column was to clear the country along the coast, to destroy the military kraals, to secure the adhesion of chiefs, to establish a line of forts, to open up a new base at Port Durnford, and, if possible, to co-operate with General Newdigate's Division by a simultaneous advance on Ulundi. It achieved all these objects except the last. The unhealthiness of the country, the difficulties of transport, aggravated by the want of cordial co-operation on the part of the Natal authorities, prevented General Crealock from pushing into the heart of Zululand. The delay which the thoroughness of Lord Chelmsford's preparations involved naturally caused discontent among the troops. This feeling found expression in the reckless and ungenerous criticisms of nearly all the newspaper correspondents. As to the soundness of his plans, of course reasonable opinions may differ, but in many cases the telegrams were malignant to the verge of imbecility. Now he was censured for leaving the frontier unprotected; now for not making a cavalry dash at Ulundi. Happily, events have shown the unsoundness of the criticisms, as they have in most cases falsified the predictions of the correspondents. With the same persistent unreasonableness, but on wholly different grounds, he has been attacked by Bishop Coleuso and a section of colonial opinion, which for want of a better name we may call the *Cape Argus* party. Their views are in brief that Katslwayo and his military system was not a source of danger to Natal; that he was sincerely desirous of submission to our (reasonable) terms; that persistence in the war would lead to certain disaster to our arms; that the chiefs and people would not abandon the King, or make a separate peace; that everything is to be presumed in favour of a barbarian and as against Englishmen. Events have shown how unsound all these assumptions were. In the colony, the reaction in favour of Lord Chelmsford was complete. At a banquet at Capetown he defended his conduct at great length, and referred with injudicious warmth to the comments of the press. Colonial opinion is vehemently in favour of the policy followed by Sir Bartle Frere. Natal sentiment may be affected by the profits which the campaign has brought to some of the settlers. Nor is it easy to explain what there is to blind the judgment of Cape Colony. It has gained little; it will have to pay much. We can interpret its approval only as an evidence that it felt the Zulu danger real and imminent. Most of Lord Chelmsford's comrades have

returned to England. To Colonel Buller and to Colonel Wood the welcome has been general and enthusiastic. Lord Chelmsford has been received with respect and sympathy. On all the State has conferred signal honours, and the Queen has bestowed marks of personal favour.

Sir G. Wolseley on arriving in Natal left the management of civil affairs in the experienced hands of Sir H. Bulwer. After an unsuccessful attempt to land at Port Durnford, the new station on the Zulu sea-board, he had to return to Durban and proceed thence by land to St. Paul's. He recognised Lord Chelmsford's victory as decisive, and with characteristic sensitiveness to the tendencies of home opinion, he promptly announced that great reductions of expenditure would be effected. Colonel Crealock's column was broken up, and the troops composing it, as well as others, sent home. The "old colonists" were of opinion that this reduction of force was premature. Katshwayo had escaped, after his defeat at Ulundi, and as long as he was at large there seemed no prospect of a peaceful settlement. At first, the submissions of the coast natives were almost embarrassingly numerous. Some of Katshwayo's principal chiefs came into our camp. But our precipitate retirement from Ulundi was interpreted as a sign of weakness, and the tribes of the north and centre, prompted it was said by boastful messages from Katshwayo, kept aloof. Ulundi was therefore reoccupied by a strong force under General Clarke. The chiefs of Zululand were summoned there to hear from Sir Garnet Wolseley what the will of the Queen was regarding the future. No punishment was to be inflicted on those who fought so bravely. Katshwayo was no longer king. The military system was at an end; all men might marry, and come and go as they liked. Zululand was to be kept for the Zulu people. No sales or gifts or transfer of land to white men would be permitted. The land would be divided into several independent States, each ruled according to the old laws of the Untetwas, by a sovereign chief. Cruel and arbitrary punishments would not be permitted. All these provisions the Chiefs heard with pleasure; they assented without any show of reluctance to the deposition of the King, for whose right to misgovern they had fought so stubbornly. The new Constitution provides effectually for the safety of Natal, but the history of our relations with the Kaffirs makes it doubtful whether the provisions intended to save Zulu independence from the intrusive and disintegrating influence of the white man, will prove effectual. The aspect of Zululand soon became peaceful. It remained only to hunt down Katshwayo, who was at first reported to have a considerable force with him.

Elaborate preparations were made. A flying column, under Colonel Baker Russell, was to clear the country north-west of Ulundi. The Swazis under English officers were to cross the Pongelo, and sweep the King from his hiding-place in the forest. Oham, the King's brother, with his Zulus, was to be employed for the same purpose. Happily it has been found unnecessary to employ these rather disreputable allies. The King fled southwards; a small force under Colonel Barrow pressed close at his heels. He was tracked from kraal to kraal, the Zulus, faithful to the fallen fortunes of the monarch, being compelled reluctantly to act as guides. His Ministers and the Chiefs who were the guiding spirit of his policy surrendered.

The conduct of the native levies throughout the campaign has been loyal and brave. The irregular cavalry, of all nationalities, have in many cases done splendid service, but in some have caused embarrassment by their disorderly conduct. The happy issue is due in great part to the zeal and energy of John Dunn, an Englishman who has long resided among the Zulus, and by adopting in some respects their habits has acquired their confidence. Through his agency all the important defections have been secured. His spies have seen and heard all that Zulu wariness permits spies to see or hear. His scouts have been ever active to discover the lurking foe.

One of Sir Garnet Wolseley's first measures was to substitute a system of transport by carriers for that of transport by oxen. Now that the country is pacified it works well, and it is gratifying to observe that as the Kafir carriers leave, the local Zulus take their place; they work by stages. A long day's rest follows a morning's light work; the fact is suggestive. Under an elastic military system—one which would allow the men to be sometimes with their regiments and sometimes with their families—Zulus may become the soldiers of our South African Empire. While the issue of the conflict was still doubtful, some English officers visited the country of the Tongas and effected an alliance with the Chiefs. Moirosi, the insurgent Basuto chief, has contrived to escape through the force which beleaguered his stronghold, and is still at large. Sakakuni, too, is still defiant. Great indignation was felt at the suspension of active operations against him, but a force is now on its way which, it is to be hoped, will at last reduce him to submission.

The Pondos have attacked the Xesibes, a section of the tribe which we permitted some time ago to withdraw from allegiance to the Pondo Chief, Umguikela. The latter denies all participation in the outrage, but his professions are not believed. Quiet has been restored, but the Cape statesmen speak suggestively of annexing what remains of

independent Pondo land. The *Cape Argus* party in Africa, and Mr. Courtney in this country, attribute all the unrest which undoubtedly has shown itself in the native tribes to the recent extension of British influence in the shape of resident magistrates, and to the disarmament policy. We believe that both measures were necessary, and on the whole salutary even in their immediate effects. There could hardly have been a more critical period than the last nine months, yet during that time there has been no outbreak which can be attributed to any diffused political feeling.

The Boers demand with greater violence than ever the restoration of their independence. Mr. Joubert—one of their great leaders—refuses to pay taxes, and Government apparently shrinks from the attempt to coerce him. The conclusions to which Sir Bartle Frere's inquiries led him, is that the agitation is kept up by a comparatively small faction, which coerces the ignorant but peaceable mass into an irreconcilable attitude. The Act of Annexation cannot be reversed, and a full measure of self-government—the exclusion of the "alien" element in the administration—will satisfy all the legitimate wants of the people. A large force will soon be free to act in the Transvaal, and it is probable that the party in the State friendly to annexation will then have the courage to make its voice heard.

The cost of the Zulu War is estimated at four and a half millions. A Commission is to determine the proportions in which it is to be borne by the various colonies and the mother country. A despatch from the Colonial Office has told the Cape Colony that the decision may be influenced by their willingness to accept a scheme of Confederation. In the Speech from the Throne at the opening of the Cape Parliament the question of Confederation was not referred to. Since then the matter has been strongly urged on their consideration by the Home authorities. The Cape Ministry have not unreasonably explained that it would be premature to discuss Confederation till the Zulu difficulty is settled. "Give us," they say in effect, "a clear and fair field, and we will undertake to work it." In England, both in Parliament and the press, the question has been much discussed, with reference, unhappily, chiefly to the policy of the past, not the future. The gift of responsible Government was, it is clear, premature. The right to autonomy ought always to carry with it the duty, in ordinary cases, of self-defence; this duty the Cape has not been able to perform. "Since," argues Mr. Forster, "we have to help you, you ought to allow us to control your policy." "Since," says Mr. Courtney, "we cannot control you, we shall not henceforth help you. Your policy of abolishing neighbours will land you in the middle of Africa." The native question

is of course the root of the difficulty; it can only be solved by Confederation, and yet it stands in the way of Confederation. The Dutch of the Transvaal and the Englishmen of the Eastern Province of Cape Colony, are little likely to agree in a common scheme for conducting relations with Kafirs. Cape Colony will hardly care to take the financial responsibility of Boer mismanagement. In spite of the war, the Cape Budget showed a surplus, and schemes of railway extension, though postponed, have been seriously discussed. The work of laying the cable to connect Capetown with London, by way of Natal, Zanzibar, and Aden, is being vigorously prosecuted.

Canada (15th Sept.).—In Canada, as indeed in most of our Colonies, railway administration is the direct concern of the State. Charges of corrupt or injudicious use of the powers thus vested in Government are the commonplace of political controversy. In March, 1878, a Liberal Dominion Government was in power at Ottawa; there was a Liberal Lieutenant-Governor at Quebec, but the Government of the province was Conservative. A new and important line of railway was under construction, to the cost of which various municipalities, which were interested in its execution, promised to contribute. Unfortunately, there was laxity, or worse, in the prosecution of the work. The original plan was modified, and some of the municipalities, thinking themselves aggrieved, declined to pay their subscriptions. Works were at a standstill; the contractors were clamouring for payment. The Government introduced into the Assembly a measure by which the municipalities would be compelled to contribute, and were prevented from appealing for relief to the ordinary tribunals. The Lieutenant-Governor, Mr. Letellier, objected to the measure as unconstitutional. He complained, too, that he had not been consulted by his Ministers. He asked the Premier to name some one who would form a Cabinet, which he would regard as acceptable. As the Premier declined to do so, he abruptly dismissed them, and called on Mr. Joly, the leader of the (Liberal) Opposition, to form a Government. The Conservatives, especially the French Canadian party, denounced the action of the Lieutenant-Governor as unconstitutional, and exasperated themselves by the suspicion that his motive was to recall the Liberals to power. They appealed to the Conservative leaders in the Dominion Parliament, and on their initiative the Senate passed a vote of censure on Mr. Letellier. Meanwhile, the Joly Ministry, having to face a hostile majority, appealed to the country. As the result of the elections, parties were so evenly balanced, that in important divisions Government had a majority only by the vote of the Speaker. When at the general election for the Dominion Parliament the Con-

servatives obtained a decisive victory, the attack on Mr. Letellier was renewed. The House of Commons censured his conduct, and declared that he ought to be dismissed; Sir John Macdonald therefore recommended the Governor-General to remove him from his post. The question was a grave one, both as regards the power of the Governor-General and of the Lieutenant-Governor. The Constitution Act declared that the Lieutenant-Governor should be appointed by the Governor-General on the recommendation of his Ministers, but was liable to dismissal, for sufficient reason, by the Governor-General (not the Governor-General in Council). The Conservatives argued that the Lieutenant-Governor was a mere agent of the Dominion Ministry. The Liberals contended that he represented the Crown, and therefore was entitled to exercise the Crown's prerogative of appealing from the Ministers or the Parliamentary majority to the constituencies. The question was one new in the history of Colonial Constitutions, and the precedent the decision would establish would be one of the gravest importance. The Governor-General therefore reserved the matter—the merits of Mr. Letellier's action apparently as well as the Constitutional point—for the decision of the Home authorities. Forthwith all the anger that had been exercising itself on Mr. Letellier was directed to Lord Lorne. Offensive and seditious language was held by the leaders of the French Canadian party. Both the parties interested sent Missions to England to urge their views. Mr. Letellier, it was understood, wished to have the matter settled by the Privy Council. The Conservatives were wildly resentful of the theory that the supremacy of the popular will, as shown by a vote of the Dominion House of Commons, should be questioned. The Liberals, on the other hand, became the champions of provincial independence. For in the meanwhile a series of bye-elections had in each instance declared in favour of the Joly Ministry, which, of course, had assumed the responsibility for Mr. Letellier's acts. The decision of the Home Government was practically that the Dominion Government should be allowed to act on its own interpretation of its constitutional document. It accordingly, in July last, dismissed Mr. Letellier on the ground that his usefulness had ceased—*i.e.*, we suppose, because he had lost the confidence of the Dominion Parliament. Thus the doctrine is recognised that the Lieutenant-Governor holds offices practically at the will of the Dominion majority. Meanwhile, the Conservative Opposition at Quebec had, by persistent and vindictive obstruction, striven to discredit the Government. The financial situation was undoubtedly grave. Leaving out of the question the expenditure on railways, which—for some years, at any rate

—was not likely to be reproductive, there had been a series of deficits. Mr. Joly promised to restore equilibrium by retrenchments; but the Conservatives argued that additional taxation was necessary. The Ministers triumphed in the divisions, but in some instances—notably, as regards their proposal to lease the Government railway—had to alter their policy to please their followers. A new element was now about to be introduced into the seething cauldron of Quebec politics. The Council was Conservative, and, in the opinion of the Liberals, useless—or, worse, obstructive. The Upper House, in other Canadian Provinces, has been abolished. The Liberals announced that their policy was to abolish it in Quebec. The doomed Chamber anticipated the attack. It passed a series of resolutions impeaching, on plausible grounds, the conduct of the Ministry, and refused to pass the Supply Bill till the Lieutenant-Governor had chosen safer advisers. The new Lieutenant-Governor—who was, of course, a Liberal—counselled moderation. In the Assembly the Opposition leader renewed his attacks, with the declared view of procuring the formation of a Ministry to be chosen from both parties. Such a Ministry would undoubtedly be strong, and there is some reason to fear that a purely Liberal Government may be tempted to maintain its precarious majority by lax or corrupt administration. These overtures, however, were rejected by the Ministry. Both Chambers have adjourned. Supplies have not been voted, and the dead-lock is complete. There can be little doubt that an appeal to the country would increase the Ministerial majority. There had been general expressions of sympathy with Mr. Letellier.

The policy of Protection has now been for some time on its trial, and has signally failed to fulfil the extravagant promises by which the constituencies were induced to vote for it. The Macdonald Cabinet have been anxious to show that it is not anti-British. The classes of goods—cottons, for instance, and iron—on which the heaviest duties have been imposed, are those on which the steady decline of imports from England, and steady increase of imports from America, show that the British trade was, independently of tariff influences, doomed to decay. Protectionists make much of the fact that some American manufacturers have transferred their capital to Canada. But farming—the natural industry of Canada—and railway extension, on which it depends for development, have been discouraged. Immigration has been checked by the greater cost of the necessaries of life. The question can be discussed effectively only on broad and general grounds, which the vulgar intelligence to which Sir J. Macdonald appealed is incapable of appreciating. The new policy will be injurious

just in proportion to its success in "creating" new industries. It was designed to increase the revenue; but when allowance is made for the excessive importations in the beginning of the year, due to the prospect of prohibitive duties, the revenue returns show a decided decline. The result of the Ontario elections—in which, according to the declarations of the members of the Dominion Government who took an active part in it, the main issue was approval or disapproval of the "National Policy"—shows that already there is a reaction against Protection. A large majority favourable to the Mowat administration was returned.

The Macdonald Cabinet, possibly to satisfy the clamours of British Columbia, introduced a series of resolutions in the Dominion Parliament, sketching out a new policy for the construction of the Pacific Railway. New surveys are to be undertaken, and it is probable that the line will be taken through the Peace River Country, and over the Pine River Pass, and that it will touch the sea at Bute Inlet—not Burrard Inlet. We have already reviewed the arguments on both sides. The new line will be longer and will cost more to construct than the old, but Ministers allege it will pass through a country more favourable for settlement and better worth developing. The new route will be from Red River, westward, to the line already located. It will pass through land as yet unsettled, of unequalled fertility. This is the key-note of the Government scheme. It hopes by selling one hundred millions of acres of land on both sides of the line to create a fund which ultimately will defray the cost of construction. Meanwhile, the land would be security for a loan which it hoped to raise under a guarantee of the Imperial Government. From its vague indications we infer, too, that it contemplates the necessity of defraying part of the cost from taxation. The scheme was violently attacked by the Opposition. The abandonment of the cheap Burrard Inlet Route was denounced, and the scheme of hypothecating the "national domain" described as illusive. The experience of the United States was appealed to to prove that the rates proposed for the sale of the land would be prohibitive. England, irritated by the hostile fiscal policy of Canada, would, it was said, refuse a guarantee. Nevertheless, the leading members of the Dominion Government came to this country to negotiate. Whether England helps or not, the Ottawa Government wishes an Imperial Commissioner to be associated with the Canadian Commissioner in the management of the land and the funds to be derived therefrom. Railway extension, colonisation, and agricultural development, are three factors mutually dependent and mutually helpful. The difficulty is to find capital to

introduce one before the others exist. At present there is a vast influx of settlers into Manitoba, and the Quebec Government has recently granted subventions to colonisation societies designed to send distressed families from the large towns into the interior. The Government has also invited associations of English tenant farmers, possessed of the necessary capital and willing to emigrate, to send representatives to satisfy themselves of the agricultural condition of Canada. The Government pays their expenses and gives them all facilities.

The distress among the Indians of the north-west continues, but great success has attended the efforts to induce them to abandon their roving life and settle in agricultural communities.

The fishery dispute with America has become a matter of grave concern. The new American ambassador to London is to be specially charged to bring negotiations to an issue. The American Government has lodged a claim for \$103,000 as compensation for the Fortune Bay outrage. It also proposes a Conference to settle outstanding disputes, and to arrive at an understanding on the whole question of the Fisheries. The Treaty of Washington provides that the present agreement may be terminated after ten years; three years of the term are still to run. But the American Government (acting on the resolution of the Senate) may probably wish to withdraw from it prematurely. There is at present an American vessel in Canadian waters which is believed to be collecting information with a view to supporting the representatives of the State Department. The Washington Treaty left still undecided two points, about which misunderstandings have long existed—(1) As to the interpretation of the "three-mile" limit; (2) as to rights of American fishermen landing in Canadian ports. A conference would remove the ambiguity. But the United States objects to Canada being represented at the Conference. It wishes, it says, to deal with principals whom it can hold responsible. Canadian statesmen are not likely to consent readily to forego a privilege which when previously enjoyed was pleasing to the national pride, and certainly gave them, in the negotiations, the advantage which complete must have over imperfect information. The political status of Canada is not analagous, as the United States Government contends, to that of a single American State.

The failure of the Consolidated and other banks at Montreal was but a symptom of the distress generally prevailing in the Dominion. Though it caused much private suffering, the collapse of credit, by destroying many wholly unsound concerns, gave healthy commerce a fresh start. There have been serious riots at Quebec. The

French ship labourers, being willing to work at reduced rates of wages, seceded from the trades union and formed a separate union of their own. The Irish unionists attacked them as they walked in procession. The military were called out, and after a few days quiet was restored, but the exhibition of race animosity is a symptom of grave danger for the future. The Governor-General with the Princess Louise has visited Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia, and, in spite of his temporary unpopularity with the Quebec Conservatives, has everywhere been received with enthusiastic loyalty.

CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

THEOLOGY.

"THE Early Years of Christianity" is a reproduction in English of Dr. E. de Pressensé's History of the First Three Centuries of the Christian Church.¹ It is, however, more than a mere translation of the French edition. By condensation and omission the work before us has been brought into a smaller compass, and thus, in some measure, has a character of its own. The picture of the Apostolic Age which we find in the first of the four volumes of which it consists does credit to the taste, to the literary skill, to the research, to the descriptive talent of the artist. To his judgment, to his critical discernment, to his historical sense, to his philosophical power, it offers a less flattering testimony. It is a strictly conservative work, a work of second-rate orthodoxy, a work which predicts the realisation of that shadowy ideal—the Church of the Future; a work which, while denouncing the scientific theology of the German school, repudiates the principle of Catholic authority, and aspires to make that advance in its own theology "which prudence and necessity alike dictate." Such a work, written by an eloquent and learned divine, and rendered into readable English by the lady whose name appears below, has undoubted merit, and should command success in this country. To reconstruct a picture of the past we must first analyse the reported phenomena; we must examine the documentary evidence and rightly interpret that evidence when examined; we must examine and interpret it, not in the light of the "Christian science of our day," but in that of science which is for all time and which is baptised by no party name. Such an examination and such an interpretation Dr. E. Pressensé has not conducted, and is quite unable to conduct. In treating of the community of property among the Early Christians, Neander admits, in opposition to the statements in the Acts of the Apostles, that, in reality, it was not complete. It is incredible; Zeller remarks, that every one of the five thousand men who were the earliest converts to Christianity should have sold lands and even houses, so that none could any longer have possessed a dwelling of his own. This, however, is what the original document asserts, and this substantially, though with characteristic qualification, is what Dr. Pressensé asserts when he states that the community of goods was certainly for a time *almost fully* carried out in Jerusalem. The question of the Council at Jerusalem again (Acts xv.) is treated in a similar uncritical spirit. In Galatians ii. St. Paul declares that his

¹ "The Early Years of Christianity: a Comprehensive History of the First Three Centuries of the Christian Church." By E. de Pressensé, D.D., &c. Translated by Annie Harwood-Holmden. In 4 Vols. London, Hodder and Stoughton. 1879.

authorisation was not from man; that after his conversion he did not consult the Apostles in Jerusalem; that not till the lapse of three years did he meet Peter, and then only for a fortnight; and that on his return to Syria and Cilisia he continued unknown except by hearsay to the Christians in Judæa. The *Acts* contradict these statements in every particular. There it is said that his mission was originally Jewish as well as Gentile; that after a brief period of distrust he entered into a close intimacy with the Apostles at Jerusalem; and that with their concurrence he preached to the Jews generally (*Acts* ix. 26-29; xxvi. 20). Again, the journey in *Galatians* is prompted by a spontaneous impulse; in *Acts* it is magnified into a commission from the Church at Antioch; in *Acts* the conferences are public, in *Galatians* they are private. Pressensé, without any evidence for the statement, declares that the conferences were both public and private. He is bold enough to say that it is impossible to find in the *Galatians* any trace of a serious opposition among the Apostles, and forgets that, after the right hand of fellowship had been given, the encounter at Antioch took place between Paul and Peter. He insinuates quite arbitrarily that the formal decree of the Council at Jerusalem (*Acts* xv.) was no longer operative, when Paul and Peter came into a determinate collision. It is not only the leaders of the Tübingen school, as might be supposed from his pages, who hold views on this question obnoxious to Dr. Pressensé. Mr. Jowett, in his valuable work on St. Paul's Epistles, though less decided than we could wish, admits the fact of a continuous opposition to Paul, which was not felt towards the Apostles at Jerusalem, but which arrayed itself under their authority; he describes the difference between Paul and the Twelve as radical, and sees in the pious fictions of the second century the desire of the Church to throw a veil over that occasion on which Paul and Peter withstood one another to the face. Eminent theologians of the Dutch school coincide in this opinion. Dr. Martineau, in his "Studies of Christianity," concludes that with external mutual toleration, on the part of Paul and the Twelve, there was wanting the inner unity of an identic faith, a collision of irreconcilable principles, ending in a profound and final antithesis. Equally unsatisfactory is Pressensé's treatment of the conflicting recitals of St. Paul's conversion; his defence of the narratives of the Apostle's miracles with his "two magicians and two paralytics;" his estimate of St. Matthew's Gospel as only a translation; his view of the Apocalypse, which makes Nero an incarnation of Antichrist, and yet announces a future Antichrist in whom Nero may be said to reappear. Because he thinks John could not contradict the recorded prophecies of the Saviour, which declare the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple (*St. Luke* xxi. 5, 6, 24; and *Rev.* xi. 1-13), he evaporates the material temple into a type of the Christian Church. His acceptance or rejection of canonical books betrays a want of true critical faculty, and indicates historical incompleteness of view. He tells us that the Churches of Asia Minor, following the example of St. John, celebrated the anniversary of the Lord's death on the 14th Nisan, at the same

time as the Jews partook of the paschal lamb. This is precisely what the Churches of Asia Minor did *not* do. They celebrated the Passover on the 14th Nisan, and commemorated the Lord's death on the 15th, appealing to the synoptical Gospels and the *personal authority* of John; while the Western Church, following the so-called *Gospel of St. John*, and adopting the symbolism of Paul (1 Cor. v. 7), which makes Christ Himself the Passover, commemorated his death on the 14th Nisan, the day on which the paschal lamb was slain. De Wette discarded the Epistle to the Ephesians, and pronounced the pastoral letters, as Eichhorn had done before him, to be post-Pauline, and Schleiermacher attacked 1 Timothy; yet our author treats as genuine all the letters which bear the Apostle's name. The hypothesis of St. Paul's second captivity, however, he rejects. He rejects also the so-called Second Epistle of Peter, but considers the First to be really his. Further critical idiosyncrasies might be remarked, but we must briefly characterise the three remaining volumes of the work. The main subject of the second volume is the History of the Martyrs and Apologists; of the third, Heresy and Christian Doctrine; of the fourth, Life and Practice in the Early Church. There is evidence of great research and of competent erudition throughout. The literary illustrations, biographical or archæological, are to the purpose; the interest is sustained; and though there is little narrative and much disquisition, the reader who cares to open such a book at all will probably be inclined to finish it.

The Bampton Lecturer for 1879 has produced an elaborate and learned commentary on the Prophet Zechariah.² There is no doubt as to his candour and his erudition. He has read much, he has reflected much, but he has reflected, like Pressensé, under the pressure of foregone conclusions. He is more rigidly and consistently orthodox than the eloquent Frenchman, whose History we have just noticed. His tendency is to believe all things—that is, all things which will confirm his prepossessions. It is well known to critical theologians that the authenticity of Zechariah ix.-xiv. has long been a subject of dispute. The grounds for the opinion which refers these chapters to a different authorship have appeared so convincing that unimpeachable witnesses, like Mede, Hammond, Secker, and Newcome, have ascribed this portion wholly or in part to Jeremiah; while Michaelis, Eichhorn, Knobel, Maurer, Ewald, Hitzig, Meier, Paulus, and Pye Smith, are all opposed to the traditional opinion which assigns the whole book to Zechariah. Mr. Wright endeavours to set aside the evidence which would establish a double authorship, by various ingenious explanations. It is in vain to point out the difference in style, in the technicality of language, in the historical circumstances, which presents itself in the first eight as compared with the last six chapters. In Zechariah's time there was neither king nor kingdom, nor was a destruction of Jerusalem (chap. xi.) a plausible prediction; the teraphim and false prophets are consistent only with a period prior to the exile; the two kingdoms of

² "Zechariah and his Prophecies." By Rev. C. H. H. Wright, B.D. Bampton Lectures, 1878. Second Edition. Hodder & Stoughton. 1879.

Judah and Israel still exist (ix. 10), and the cities which are denounced as Judah's enemies (chaps. ix., x.) were in Zechariah's time, no less than the Jewish people, vassals of Persia, and therefore little likely to threaten Judah. All these difficulties, however, Mr. Wright waves aside, and he is far too good a Hebrew scholar to entitle us to impute this procedure to ignorance. It lies in ingenious non-natural interpretation, and in the assumption that the obscure is made luminous by the mystical. This last blemish is illustrated in his explanation of the difficult passage, not in the second, but in the first part of the book. The English reader should be informed that the passage containing the symbolical representation (vi. 9-15) is variously understood by eminent scholars. Crowns are mentioned in verse 11; but while Mr. Wright, and those who agree with him, think that one crown only is intended, Ewald argues with some plausibility that two crowns were made, one for Joshua and one for Zerubbabel, and that certain words have disappeared from our text. Again, the Hebrew can be explained so as to mean that the same person shall be king and priest, or that two different persons shall hold the two offices, and so Ewald maintains, dwelling on the words "the counsel of peace shall be between them both." The passage then is a *crux*; and the textual difficulties are increased by an inherent obscurity and an asserted contradiction with chap. iv. In that chapter the privilege of constructing the temple is promised to Zerubbabel; but in the sixth chapter it is promised to a mysterious person invested with Messianic attributes. Now, Mr. Wright argues that, as the temple of chap. iv. has already been built, the temple of chap. vi., since no other material temple is possible, must be a spiritual temple—in short, the Church of Christ—and that the mysterious ruler is Jesus, the founder of that Church. To this interpretation we demur. The unknown king is not now announced for the first time; in chap. iii. he is already designated the BRANCH. In chap. iv. a chieftain of the house of David, Zerubbabel, receives a special commission from Jehovah to build the temple, and a caution is given not to despise the day of small things; a description very well suited to a young branch, or shoot. It is also said that when the temple is built, those whom the prophet addresses shall know that Jehovah has sent him. In chap. iv. we find similar language. The growth of the Branch, or of the natural prosperity, may be compared with the creation of the previous chapter, and the guarantee of the prophet's mission corresponds to that given in chap. iv. The asserted contradiction is met by noting that, although Zerubbabel has (chap. iv.) laid the foundation of the house, it does not say that the house is completed; on the contrary, it adds, "his hands shall finish it." We, then, are of opinion that the person invested with Messianic attributes is Zerubbabel. It was "the prophet's dream" that this scion of David's house should be the promised Deliverer, and he darkly intimates what he darkly divined. The context requires a material temple, for it is said in this Messianic passage, that "they that are afar off shall come and build in the temple, and ye shall know that Jehovah of Hosts has sent me unto you." The prophet's dream was not fulfilled any more than the poetic vision of Virgil. Of course, Mr. Wright

applies the same mode of interpretation to the famous Messianic text (chap. ix.), "Behold thy king cometh unto thee . . . lowly, and riding upon an ass," although the context so little favours it. In the well-known passage where the prophet receives thirty shekels for his wages, Mr. Wright is true to the old tradition which refers its fulfilment to Christ, and retains the orthodox but inappropriate reading, which substitutes potter for treasury. Thus, though his book may edify those who are in agreement with him, we cannot congratulate him on the progressive character of his exegesis. He is wild, rash, visionary; and certainly not for want of learning, but from the wilful impetuosity of orthodox prepossession.

In the Rev. C. A. Row's "Christian Evidences, viewed in relation to Modern Thought," we have a companion to Mr. Wright's volume.³ Both these works are written by instructed men who have held the office of Bampton Lecturer; both have reached a second edition, and both are animated by the same purpose, the vindication of orthodox Christianity. Mr. Row's work, however, deals with a larger area of thought, and takes a more comprehensive view of the evidences. His principal theme is the miraculous agency of the New Testament, and in his defence of miracles he frequently refers to the estimate of the evidence adduced for alleged supernatural events by Dr. Carpenter. Mr. Mill's positions also are recognised. Mr. Wallace's acceptance of a spiritual world is made the subject of comment, and the difficulties in Dr. Mozley's accounts of the Scripture doctrine of the evidential character of miracle are reviewed. Thus, there is a directly personal element in the work, which gives it additional animation. When we look into the arguments by which Mr. Row endeavours to sustain his thesis we can only gravely dissent from his conclusions. There is scarcely an important statement which he makes that we can regard as unimpeachable. On the question of miracle, the superhuman character of Christ, the growth of legend, the theory of vision, we are at issue with him; but discussion here is impracticable, and we must refer our readers to the eight lectures comprised in his ingenious and not unthoughtful volume. In the last lecture, Mr. Row examines and rejects several popular theories of inspiration, and affirms the impossibility of constructing a definite theory of the nature and extent of the divine assistance. He appears to regard the Bible as by no means an infallible book; thinks it a mistake to designate the whole of it as the Word of God; allows its omissions, inaccuracies, and discrepancies, and glancing at the difference between "the synoptics and St. John as to the day on which our Lord celebrated the Last Supper and its paschal character," submits that it has been occasioned by the synoptics having passed through a period of oral transmission before they were committed to writing; a perverse way of stating the general fact of disagreement, but an acknowledgment which twenty years ago would not have been made by a Bampton Lecturer.

³ "Christian Evidences, viewed in relation to Modern Thought, &c." By Rev. C. A. Row, M.A., Prebendary of St. Paul's Cathedral. Second Edition. London: Frederic Norgate. 1879.

Our next work is conceived in a very different spirit.⁴ "The Bible for Young People," of which the sixth volume only is on our list, is an attempt to reconcile religious sentiment with the most advanced critical knowledge. Dr. H. Oort and Dr. J. Hooykaas, assisted by Dr. A. Kuenen, have undertaken this somewhat paradoxical enterprise. We are far from saying that the attempt is unsuccessful, from their own point of view, but the Christianity which they offer to the young is a Christianity without miracle, without dogma, without any basis but a purely natural one. The New Testament narratives, as set forth by Dr. Oort in the present volume, contain no trace of the supernatural, and in the index we are advised that miracles should be considered as legends. In accordance with this recommendation, Dr. Oort denies that the resurrection of Jesus was an external fact. The story of Ananias and Sapphira he pronounces a legend; the picture of Christian Socialism at Jerusalem an ideal sketch; and everywhere he finds more or less conscious fiction in the Acts of the Apostles. In the conflict at Antioch between Peter and Paul he sees a definite breach and open warfare; the Epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians, and Thessalonians he contends were written after Paul's death; both the Epistles of Peter and the Fourth Gospel he assigns to the second century, and he asserts that the author of the Apocalypse was a Jew Christian who "brands with infamy Paul's precept to obey the heathen magistracy as God's servant, and in general launches into the most violent attacks upon his doctrine and his followers." With such an exhibition of the history and literature of the Primitive Church we have no quarrel, but we submit that the perusal of "The Bible for Young People" must result in its ultimate rejection by the class for whom it is intended. The work, however, seems in many essential respects well done; but the attempt to translate the simple old legends of the Bible into modern language, sometimes produces a humorous incongruity. If this *Bibleless* Bible should ever reach a second edition, we trust such an expression as "Jesus taking the aggressive" will be removed, as well as others stamped with the same Philistine die, from pages which abound with instruction, and which embody the last results of a ripe criticism and often profound learning.

As the modern spirit pervades the entire presentment of the history of the Early Church, in the work just noticed, so the breath of the ancient and mediæval times quickens into literary life the series of portraits in the picture gallery of the late Dr. Jenkins.⁵ A canon of the Cathedral Church of the diocese of Natal, when under the episcopal charge of Dr. Colenso, his theological position contrasts

⁴ "The Bible for Young People." By Dr. H. Oort, Professor of Hebrew Antiquities at Leiden, and Dr. J. Hooykaas, Pastor at Rotterdam, with the assistance of Dr. A. Kuenen, Professor of Theology at Leiden. Vol. VI. Narratives of the New Testament, II. Prepared by Dr. J. Hooykaas. Authorized Translation. London: Williams & Norgate. 1879.

⁵ "Passages in Church History." Selected from the MS. of the late Rev. John David Jenkins, D.D., &c. &c. With a Brief Memoir of the Author. 2 vols. Oxford and London: James Parker & Co. 1879.

curiously with that of the far-famed Bishop. Ill-health obliged him to return to England in 1859; afterwards he resided, till the close of life, in Oxford, occupying himself principally with literary work. His purpose had been to give a general account of the progress* of the Church, from Apostolic times to the present day, but his record of the centuries was found at his death in an incomplete and fragmentary form. Two volumes, however, of biographical narrative have been compiled from his voluminous MSS., comprising no fewer than seventy-one sketches of the great leaders of ecclesiastical thought and action, from the Saxon Kaisers down to Pio Nono. Those who share in the likings and dislikings of the pious canon will turn over the pages of these volumes with complacent satisfaction; and even those whose modes of thought are alien to his, will often find in the annals of the saintly men whom he delights to honour much to admire and interest them. On the whole, however, we feel compelled to re-echo the sentiment of the editor that "Dr. Jenkins' estimate of historical characters and events is often such as to provoke criticism." All his religious sympathies are conservative; he has no love for the Reformation; he has no welcome for the great popular movements of modern political life; he has no word of approval for the liberation and unity of Italy; he vilifies the Roman Republic of 1849; and applauds Pius IX. dwelling by the tomb of St. Peter, and proclaiming the spotless conception of the ever-blessed Virgin, in words which at least suggest his own acceptance of the dogma to which the pontifical authority was solemnly given.

A work of kindred spirit, though of incomparably higher quality, is the posthumous continuation of "The Monks of the West," by an eminent Catholic writer and publicist,⁶ the Count de Montalembert, the delicate and laborious task of preparing the two new volumes for the press having been courageously undertaken and adequately discharged by the erudite M. Aurélien de Courson. There is, no doubt, much popular Protestant and some Catholic misconception of the age which is pictured in these pages. Judged by an ideal standard, the old Christian society is necessarily defective, but defective as all antecedent social states have been defective. The Church and the State had to create out of conflicting and anarchical elements, out of the Christian element with its unreason, out of the Roman element with its dissoluteness and its disintegration, out of the German element with its stormy independence, out of the barbarism of Frank, Vandal, Hun, and Saracen, an orderly world, the mother of our modern Europe. Feudalism and Catholicism were inevitable growths of time, and brutal and ignorant as the old governing powers may often have been, they did their work, great and noble work, in the midst of still more brutal and ignorant populations, governable in no other way than by feudal and ecclesiastical organization. Still, we think those old times of Faith were bad times, and that the Dark Ages deserve their name, in

⁶ "The Monks of the West, from St. Benedict to St. Bernard." By the Count de Montalembert. Authorized Translation. Vols. VI. and VII. William Blackwood & Sons: Edinburgh & London. 1879.

spite of all the light that the cloistered monk, or sceptred monarch, struggled to diffuse. The bias of the Protestant historian is to bring out all the evil which attended the Catholic movement and to attenuate the good, though splendid exceptions to this uncritical partisanship might be particularised. The bias of the Catholic historian consists in giving prominence to the good and extenuating the evil inherent in the system which he panegyrises. Count de Montalembert has endeavoured to give us a faithful narrative of the past, and if there is defect in his report, it is, details apart, that his magnificent picture has too much light and too little shade. On the whole, however, we accept his general representation. From the ninth to the thirteenth century Christian Europe found but one association, having the Catholic Faith for its source, the Church of Rome for its rule, and the Crusades for its result. Of this social order monks were the principal instruments. It was the monks who proclaimed a more liberal sentiment than that of narrow nationality, and discouraged that pagan patriotism, revived in our own days, which consists in looking upon every foreigner as an object of suspicion or hostility. Monasteries opened their doors to all travellers and all strangers; monks brought to the councils of kings and nations a courage which did not recoil before any danger; they resisted the violence of nobles, sheltered the too feeble freemen from the attacks of Frank feudatories. Abbots, in union with bishops, assisted in maintaining the form and spirit of free government; the monks founded schools, in which were taught poetry, astronomy, arithmetic, the Greek and Latin languages, dialectics, and music; the Benedictines are reported to have founded the Universities of Paris, Oxford, Cambridge, and the Medical School of Salerno; the monks copied manuscripts, and if they sometimes destroyed precious works, it is to them that we are indebted for all that has been preserved of classic antiquity; they were artists, artisans, architects, sculptors, painters, enamellers, goldsmiths, and jewellers; to an illustrious monk, Gregory the Great, ecclesiastical music owes its origin; Guido Arezino, of the Abbey of Pomposa, near Ravenna, arranged the diatonic scale, and so became the inventor of the solfeggio; the manufacture of linen and cloth was successfully carried on by monks; fairs and markets often arose from the assemblies of the faithful at monastery doors; in the day of distress, of famine, of epidemic, the abbeys opened asylums for the indigent and afflicted, and poverty was placed under the protection of the Church. Above all, the monks consecrated themselves to the cultivation of the soil; they cleared lands bristling with brushwood or covered with stagnant waters, built houses, ploughed fields, planted vines and orchards, introduced the rearing of cattle, horse-breeding, bee-keeping, brewing beer with hops, carried corn, busied themselves with fisheries, and "naturalised, under a rigorous sky, the most useful fruits and the most productive grain." Besides this picture of the Church and feudal system, we have, in these volumes, an eulogistic biography of St. Gregory, the famous Hildebrand, connected notices of the predecessors of Calixtus II., and a narrative of the conflict between the Pope and the Emperor in the twelfth century, passing through the three stages of

the victory of the temporal power, the triumph of the spiritual power, and the reconciliation of the Papacy with the Empire.

Basil the Great and Gregory of Nazianzus, were the college associates of the Emperor Julian, whose life, character, and policy are described with admirable clearness, philosophic impartiality, and scholarly appreciation, in the Hulsean Essay,⁷ for the year 1876, by Mr. Gerald Henry Rendall. Such an Essay deserves a welcome which our limits prevent us from according it. In Julian, observes Mr. Rendall, Plato's darling wish was gratified: a philosopher was made king. The movement which he headed marked a crisis in the world's history; it was the final stand made by Hellenism, in a certain qualified sense at its best, with Christianity in some respects at its worst. Julian was dowered with a magnificent prestige; he was the victorious leader of a devoted army; the lord of an acclaiming world; a master of Greek culture; discerning enough to appropriate popular Christian characteristics, its charities, its care of the poor; possessed of considerable intellectual power and capacity for rule, and yet, with all this splendid opportunity to favour him, he failed. The grand old Pagan religion, though recommended by the inculcation of the duties of almsgiving, chastity, prayer, and reinforced by a system of sacerdotalism and temper services, succumbed before the vigorous life of the parvenu religion of Jesus. The Galilaean, according to the fine fiction of the Church, conquered. Paganism was dying out of the hearts and minds of men; it was doomed by its own inherent inefficiency; and all attempts to revive its antiquated traditions were vain. All this is shown, with a lucid force of thought and expression, by Mr. Rendall, in the series of chapters forming his learned, interesting, and beautiful Essay, and treating of the boyhood, youth, and education, the theology, religion, administration, and real or attempted reforms of Julian. The chapter on Neo-Platonism is an instructive and eloquent exposition of that ghost of a religious philosophy, and may assist in showing the opponents of Christianity how little reason they would have for congratulation if, in the struggle for existence, that gibbering spectre had survived its more capable antagonist.

The late revolutionist, M. Proudhon, is the Julian of Dr. John Donoso Cortes, Marquis of Valdegamar, and, if we may believe Dr. de la Gorre Velez, canon and dignitary of the Cathedral of Salamanca, one of the most profound thinkers of the nineteenth century.⁸ His "Essays on Catholicism," translated by Rev. William M'Donald, contain strictures on the contradictory and inconsistent teaching of Proudhon, an examination of "Socialistic Solutions;" remarks on the errors, or what the author conceives to be the errors, of the Liberal

⁷ "The Emperor Julian. Paganism and Christianity, with Genealogical, Chronological, and Bibliographical Appendices, being the Hulsean Essay for the year 1876." By George Henry Rendall, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College. Deighton, Bell & Co: London and Cambridge. 1879.

⁸ "Essays on Catholicism, Liberalism, and Socialism. Considered in their Fundamental Principles." By John Donoso Cortes, Marquis of Valdegamar. Translated from the Spanish, by Rev. William M'Donald, A.B., &c. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1879.

school; and, according to Dr. Velez, "a glorious and sublime apology of religion." Some of the Marquis's fundamental principles are repudiated by Mr. Wright, who, in an "Essay on the Grounds and Principles of Religion,"⁹ calls in question the reality, though not the possibility of miracles, and does not consider them necessary as evidences to the truth of Christianity, which he defines as in its essence the moral and spiritual influence of Christ. A kindred work, though of superior merit to Mr. Wright's, "The Problem of the World and Church,"¹⁰ travels over much the same ground. Its author, a septuagenarian, sees no sufficient reason for believing that the course of Nature was miraculously interrupted on the introduction of Christianity into the world, is surprised that the dogma of Biblical inspiration has so long held its ground, favours the abolition of all tests and subscriptions, rejects the very tenets which the noble theologian, Dr. John Donoso Cortes, regards as fundamental principles, and surrenders the doctrines of the Trinity, the Fall, the Incarnation and Redemption; offers as permanent elements of Christianity the goodness of Jesus; the love of man; self-sacrifice; tenderness to the weak; patience, humility, and the relation of trust towards the universe and its author and governor, which these virtues bring with them. Little more than this reasonable Christian theism seems left as the result of Dr. Keim's "History of Jesus of Nazara,"¹¹ the fourth volume of which, translated by Mr. Arthur Ransom, brings us down to the close of the Galilæan ministry, and the departure of Jesus for Jerusalem. To this free theology we have a curious contrast in Sir Emilius Bayley's orthodox attempt to show the value of *thoroughness* in several departments of Christian Life and Practice.¹²

The accomplished editor of "The Sacred Books of the East,"¹³ translated by various scholars, does well, we think, to apprise the more ardent readers who will be attracted to these volumes, by the expectation of finding in them treasures of primæval wisdom, religious enthusiasm, or sound and simple moral teaching, that such treasures are not there. Fragments of pure gold in a heap of rubbish are all that they must hope to find. We have space only briefly to characterise the three volumes before us. The first volume contains a translation, preceded by an explanatory Essay, of several Upanishads by Mr. F. Max Müller. The Upanishads are philosophical treatises contained in the Vedas. The ancient Upanishads are provisionally referred to a period

⁹ "Grounds and Principles of Religion." By John Wright, B.A. London: Williams and Norgate. 1879.

¹⁰ "The Problem of the World and the Church, reconsidered in Three Letters to a Friend." By a Septuagenarian. Third Edition. With an Introduction by James Booth, C.B. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1879.

¹¹ "The History of Jesus of Nazara," &c. By Dr. Theodore Keim. Translated by Arthur Ransom. Vol. IV. London: Williams and Norgate.

¹² "Thorough," &c. By the Rev. Sir Emilius Bayley, Bart., B.D. Second Edition, revised and corrected. London: Hatchards. 1879.

¹³ "Sacred Books of the East." Edited by Max Müller. I. Upanishad. Translated by Max Müller. II. "Sacred Laws of the Aryas." Translated by George Bühler. III. "Sacred Books of China." Translated by James Legge. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1879.

prior to B.C. 600. The word itself seems primarily to mean session or assembly for instruction, and occurs in the sense of doctrine or of secret doctrine. The second volume contains an instalment of the sacred laws of the Aryas as taught in certain schools. Apastamba and Gautama are the names prefixed to the two collections of legal aphorisms before us. On linguistic grounds, argues the translator, Mr. George Bühler, in his introduction, Apastamba cannot be placed later than the third century B.C., but no attempt is made to connect the Gautamas with the historical period of India. The Sacred Books of China, translated by Mr. James Legge, comprised in the third volume, are the "Shu King," "The Shih King" (the religious portions only), and "The Hsiào King." "The Book of Historical Documents on the Shu King" commences with the reign of Yáo in the twenty-fourth century B.C., and comes down to that of King Hsiang of the Káu dynasty B.C. 651-619. The Shih, or the Book of Poetry, contains five pieces of the time of the Shang dynasty, B.C. 1766-1123; three hundred belong to the dynasty of Káu from B.C. 1231 to B.C. 586. The Hsiào King, or Classic of Filial Piety, can be traced back to within less than a century after the death of Confucius.

POLITICS, SOCIOLOGY, VOYAGES, AND TRAVELS.

THE quarter which has just elapsed embraces a period in which both the publishers and the public, by a sort of tacit understanding, agree to take their annual holiday, and even the critic enjoys an interval of comparative repose. Among the few political treatises which lie upon our table, the most important is a re-publication. Professor Thorold Rogers, who, shortly before the general election which returned Mr. Gladstone to power in 1868, published two volumes of speeches, delivered in the House of Commons and at public meetings, by Mr. Bright, has judged the present a convenient season for editing a series of extra-Parliamentary addresses by the same orator.¹ The speeches, which Mr. Bright has himself revised, extend from 1863 to 1879; much of their contents is purely retrospective, and among the topics of the day with which they deal, from the American War and the policy of Lord Palmerston to the Eastern Question and the policy of Lord Beaconsfield, there is, of course, a great deal which no longer possesses any special interest for the practical politician. At the same time, the selection which Mr. Rogers has made contains no address which may not be read with pleasure, both as illustrating the single-minded conscientiousness of purpose and the power of elucidation and generalisation which are among the most remarkable characteristics of Mr. Bright's oratory, and also as affording an example of that suasive eloquence which is the fruit of unadorned simplicity of diction, and of

¹ "Public Addresses by John Bright, M.P." Edited by J. E. Thorold Rogers. London: Macmillan & Co. 1879.

the oratorical charm which may be exercised by a speaker who, neglecting the exotic flowers of artificial rhetoric, displays a perfect mastery of the English language—a language which assuredly, next to Greek, supplies the speaker with the finest vehicle for the development of argument and expression of thought. Mr. Bright's taste has been cultivated by a wide and appreciative study of the purest models of English literature; and the secret of his great influence as a speaker is perhaps partly to be found in a passage of Milton's, which he tells us has been constantly in his mind, "yet true eloquence I find to be none but the serious and hearty love of truth." Of course in the present volume many arguments are advanced, and more than one theory expounded, in which we are unable entirely to concur. In the first address, for example, delivered at Birmingham, during the American War, we find some observations on the Declaration of Paris which we cannot help regarding as misleading. Mr. Bright does not, we think, give an accurate account of the situation which produced the Queen's proclamation as to the immunity of neutral vessels from search, issued at the beginning of the Crimean War. That proclamation had no special reference to the commerce of the United States, but was rather due to the necessity of establishing a common rule of practice on the part of allied Powers, which had hitherto adopted different maxims in time of war, the French having coupled the principle of "free ships, free goods," with that of "enemy's ships, enemy's goods;" while Great Britain had previously adhered, in the absence of special treaty stipulations to the contrary, to the old rule of the *Consolato del Mare*. Neither is it correct to say that the rule adopted in 1856, on the suggestion of Count Walewski, as between the signatories of the Paris Declaration, was made "the law of Europe for all future time." It was binding only upon the original parties, and those who subsequently acceded to it, a course which Spain has never thought fit to adopt. Mr. Bright's argument for the extension of the principle to the entire exemption of the merchant vessels of belligerent Powers from the effects of war, to the adoption, in fact, of the American suggestion commonly known as the Marcy Amendment, scarcely appears to us more satisfactory. It must be remembered that while Great Britain is naturally a commercial and pacific Power, it nevertheless, if unhappily involved in war, must mainly depend upon its maritime superiority, and we are inclined ourselves, while supporting the Declaration as it stands, to adhere to the principle once enunciated by Lord Selborne that "a political war is inconsistent with a commercial peace." We have perhaps dwelt too long on a somewhat minor point; but it is really impossible, within our narrow limits, to convey any idea of the varied contents of this volume, which contains as many as thirty-three addresses. In the second speech, delivered at Birmingham, Mr. Bright gives an interesting sketch of the political and economical progress achieved by the country since the first Reform Bill. The sixth speech, also a Birmingham address, deserves attention as containing a lucid explanation of a matter little understood either at the time or afterwards—of the ingenuity, we mean, by which the Government of

Mr. Disraeli endeavoured in 1867 to use the practice of composition by landlords for their tenants' rates as a means of turning an ostensibly Liberal concession of the suffrage into a practical nullity, and an actual source of disfranchisement in many boroughs, such as Birmingham, where the system of compounding happened to prevail. The speech delivered at Birmingham on Mr. Bright's re-election, after accepting the Chancellorship of the Duchy of Lancaster, shortly before the disastrous dissolution of 1874, is also well worth referring to at the present time. In the space of five years, as Mr. Bright points out, Mr. Gladstone's Government had grappled with the questions of the Irish Church and the Irish Land, had abolished purchase in the army, introduced the ballot, reformed the judicature, settled our quarrel with the United States, and passed a comprehensive scheme of national education. In the future, he went on to say, the questions of the county franchise and the redistribution of seats, the land laws and the game laws, required attention; and we are not aware that in the six years which elapsed since Mr. Bright indicated this programme, his views have been materially anticipated by the spirited and energetic administration which has been in office. We find, too, in the present volume some of the most celebrated passages of the speaker's loftier mood, such as the allusion to the story of the Shunamite woman, the beautiful description of Mr. Cobden's life, labour, and death, on the occasion of the unveiling of the Bradford statue; and the noble peroration of an address delivered eleven years ago to the working-men of Edinburgh, which we make no apology for transcribing here:—

“The solemn question as to the future condition of a considerable portion of the labouring classes in this country cannot be neglected. It is the work upon which the new electoral body and the new Parliament will have to enter. It is a long way from Belgrave Square to Bethnal Green. It is not pleasant to contrast the palatial mansions of the rich and the dismal hovels of the poor, the profuse and costly luxuries of the wealthy with the squalid and hopeless misery of some millions of those who are below them. But I ask you, as I ask myself a thousand times, is it not possible that this mass of poverty and suffering may be reached and be raised, or taught to raise itself? What is there man cannot do if he tries? The other day he descended to the mysterious depths of the ocean, and with an iron hand sought, found, and grasped, and brought up to the surface the lost cable, and with it made two worlds into one. I ask, are his conquests confined to the realms of science? Is it not possible that another hand, not of iron, but of Christian justice and kindness, may be let down to the moral depths even deeper than the cable fathoms, to raise up from thence the sons and daughters of misery, and the multitude who are ready to perish? This is the great problem which is now before us. It is one which is not for statesmen only, or for preachers of the Gospel only—it is one which every man in the nation should attempt to solve. The nation is now in power, and if wisdom abide with power, the generation to follow may behold the glorious day of what we, in our time, with our best endeavours, can only hope to see the earliest dawn.”

In a collection like this it is perhaps inevitable that there should be not only much reiteration of argument, but also not infrequent repetition of phraseology, anecdote, and illustration. Thus, Mr.

Bright is never tired of reminding his audience of the fourpenny news paper stamp and the tax of 1s. 6d. formerly levied on advertisements and we meet at least twice with Dr. Johnson's advice to persons in delicate health, to walk two miles before breakfast, if possible on their own land. Twice, too, do we come across the story of the sailor who opposed the repeal of the Navigation Laws, through fear of being reduced, like the Norwegians, to a perpetual diet of black bread. Speaking at Birmingham, in 1876, Mr. Bright makes a quotation from the *Saturday Review*, stating that he had never previously had occasion to quote that journal with approval. It is rather curious that he had quoted the same phrase from the same paper in the same place just two years before. Even a poetical quotation is made to do duty in two speeches, both delivered at Birmingham, though with an interval of thirteen years between them. In fact, although the collection will serve as a useful manual of political education for those who have not carefully studied the political history of the last half century, the range of subjects seems to one reading all the speeches together somewhat limited, and the method of treatment somewhat monotonous; an impression, perhaps enhanced by the feeling that Mr. Bright is a little too "cock-sure" of everything, that his opponents cannot always have been the fools or knaves, "imbecile at home, and turbulent and wicked abroad," that he, in perfect sincerity, depicts them; and that the dogmatic tone, though natural enough in a veteran statesman who has fought many a good fight, in the teeth of prejudice and calumny, in the cause of progress, and who has seen most of his predictions realised in fact, nevertheless somewhat detracts from the value of the work as a guide to the political student of the future.

We must hasten on to another work of a somewhat similar kind. Sir John Lubbock has brought together, in a small and attractive volume, ten Addresses,² mostly on political, educational, and economical questions, the majority of them being based, as we gather, on speeches delivered in the House of Commons. Most readers will find something to interest them in this book, the Essays are thoughtfully written, and they contain a good deal of information not elsewhere easily accessible; yet we do not feel quite certain that they possess sufficient permanent value to have deserved the honour of collection. In these days of specialisation, the versatility of an author whose title-page informs us that he simultaneously enjoys the triple distinction of being Vice-Chancellor of the University of London, Vice-President of the Royal Society, and Honorary Secretary of the London Bankers, is in itself almost enough to arouse the suspicions of a critic. Politics and natural history, education and finance, seem to be equally within Sir John Lubbock's range; he has also acquired the reputation of being the most successful amateur legislator of the day; and we confess that the combination somewhat reminds us of another distinguished man, of whom a witty contemporary remarked that omniscience was

² "Addresses, Political and Educational." By Sir John Lubbock, Bart., M.P. London: Macmillan & Co. 1879.

his forte and science his foible. Perhaps the most valuable of these Essays is the defence of the Bank Act of 1844, a remarkably lucid and interesting exposition of a difficult subject, but, as we need scarcely say, quite unsusceptible of abridgment. We are glad to observe that Sir John thinks Mr. Palgrave's estimate of the total banking liabilities, payable at call, of Great Britain and Ireland at 500,000*l.*, to be somewhat over the mark; he incidentally mentions that between 1844, when the Act was passed, and 1872, our imports and exports increased from 144,000,000*l.* to 608,000,000*l.* In other addresses, our author defends the Income Tax, and advocates more energetic measures for the liquidation of the National Debt. The volume also contains a speech in favour of an extension of the principles embodied in the Paris Declaration to an entire exemption of commerce from capture in time of war. The arguments advanced are more elaborate, but not, we think, more satisfactory than those employed by Mr. Bright. Sir John does not seem to see that, unless the laws of contraband and blockade are entirely abrogated, it is impossible for the mercantile relations of different nations to be unaffected by the existence of hostilities. On the other hand, all will sympathise with our author's plea for the preservation of ancient monuments from local ignorance, stupidity, and greed. It appears, too, that private owners, even with the best intentions, are sometimes frustrated in their attempts to protect these interesting relics. We hear of one case in which an Irish nobleman had given orders to build a wall round a field containing the remains of Con O'Neill's castle, in order to preserve the ruins; "but the agent pulled down the old castle, and used the stones to make the wall." Two of Sir John's essays are mainly devoted to advocating the extension of natural-science teaching in public and endowed, and its introduction in elementary schools. With regard to the latter, we certainly agree with Sir John's objection to Lord Sandon's Revised Code of 1876, so far as it tends to limit the discretion of local Boards in the selection of subjects. Those interested in this important subject may perhaps be glad of the opportunity of comparing with Sir John Lubbock's remarks a translation which we have received of the Prussian *Schulerecht*, or Educational Code,³ although we cannot agree with the editor that the system which Mr. Forster introduced has proved "a decided failure after its nine years' operation in England;" neither have we met with the "well-authenticated statements" to which she refers "of the total failure of the Department's enactments to meet the educational requirements of the various grades of the population for whom it legislates." The Prussian system seems to be mainly denominational, tempered by a conscience clause which works without difficulty. Difficulties as to religious instruction occur chiefly in the case of the children of mixed marriages, as to whose training elaborate rules are made. Sir John Lubbock, who objects to the historical teaching of children in our elementary schools being for the most part

³ "The Educational Code of the Prussian Nation." London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1879.

confined to ancient and more or less fabulous stories of battle, murder, and sudden death, will be glad to note that in Prussia the national history is studied consecutively only from the date of the Thirty Years' War.

Liberal politicians who, with a view to election addresses, would like to provide themselves with a *catalogue raisonné* of the sins, great and small, both of commission and of omission, of the present administration, would do well to invest a shilling in a pamphlet by "Nemesis" on "Five Years of Tory Rule."⁴ We are sure that "Nemesis" has nothing extenuated; and we hope that he has set down nought in malice. He certainly seems to have made a note of all the offences of the Government, from what he treats as grave legislative fiascos and diplomatic blunders to the pettiest peccadillo of Lord Beaconsfield's treacherous memory. His criticism is indeed so searching, indefatigable, and minute that we are inclined to suspect that he must for years have found a congenial occupation in animadverting on the faults and chronicling the misfortunes of the Government of the day. His *aperçu* of the Eastern question is necessarily slight, and seems to contain some mutually inconsistent charges; but he puts the case of the opponents of the Home Government and the Viceroy, in regard to the proceedings which led to the Afghan War, in a very clear and trenchant manner; and his *résumé* of the Parliamentary follies, failures, and futilities of the Ministry is at once succinct and powerful. In attacking the Premier for one or two dubious appointments, it is perhaps not surprising that he has not paused to give him credit for several excellent selections which he has made, especially in the exercise of the legal and clerical patronage of the Crown. The pamphlet is, on the whole, extremely accurate in its statements of fact; but "Nemesis" is scarcely justified in saying that Galley "was convicted of a murder of which, though sent into transportation, he was proved to be innocent;" neither is it quite fair to speak of that gentleman as a "wretched sufferer."

Mr. John Matthews, of Toronto, who some years ago published a volume on the Colonial question,⁵ probably considers the present an appropriate season for drawing attention to the suggestions contained in his work, of which we have received a copy. The author's general sketch of the history of our colonial system will give no fresh information to those acquainted with Sir G. C. Lewis's admirable essay, and any of the larger works on the subject, such as Mills or Creasy; and his refutation of Professor Goldwin Smith's plea for compulsory "emancipation" would now, in most quarters, meet with a cry of "agreed." English statesmen have, we think, made up their minds that the demand for independence, if deliberately made by any colony fully capable of self-government, is one in which we have no choice but to acquiesce, but that the maintenance of the present connection is on many grounds desirable, especially as affording a guarantee that

⁴ "Five Years of Tory Rule: a Lesson and a Warning." By "Nemesis." London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1879.

⁵ "A Colonist on the Colonial Question." By John Matthews, of Toronto, Canada. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1872.

the foreign policy and diplomatic relations of something like one-half of the civilised world will be directed by a central power of essentially pacific policy. The writer's main object is to advocate a federation of the British Empire in the form, as we understand, rather of a *Bundestaat* than of a *Staatenbund*, or, to adopt the terminology of Austin, of a supreme federal government as distinguished from a permanent confederacy of supreme states. He makes a vigorous attempt to grapple with the objections urged by Mr. Mill and Mr. Goldwin Smith to the practicability of such an experiment. We cannot here attempt a summarisation of the question, which has, indeed, been more than once exhaustively treated in these pages. Mr. Matthews's work, at all events, contains no such mass of egregious absurdities as we find compressed within the space of two letters of moderate length, which a Mr. Ecroyd has thought fit to republish from the *Bradford Observer*,⁶ and in which, with a view to "the Consolidation of the Empire," he advocates the establishment of differential duties in favour of colonial and Indian produce.

If we would preserve the loyalty of our colonial dependencies, assuredly knowledge must abide with power, and we therefore cordially welcome the contribution to our knowledge which Mr. Wallace has supplied in his work on Australasia.⁷ This book is one of a series which Mr. Stanford is publishing as a compendium of geography and travel, and it contains much valuable information, well arranged by an accurate and intelligent observer. Mr. Wallace is already favourably known to our readers as the author of an interesting work on the Malay Archipelago; and we find that in the present book the word Australasia is used in a very extensive sense; less than half of its contents are devoted to Australia, Tasmania, and New Zealand, and the remainder contains a description, geographical and geological, historical and ethnological, of the various groups of islands sometimes generically referred to as Polynesia, but which Mr. Wallace divides into the Malay Archipelago, Melanesia, and Mikronesia. In the account of Borneo we find an interesting sketch of the career and administration of Sir James Brooke. We should add that the book is well illustrated, and its value enhanced by twenty maps, which leave nothing to be desired; the index, as far as we have been able to test it, we have found highly satisfactory, and our only criticism must be that Mr. Wallace would have made it much more convenient to read a book which deserves to be read if he had found it feasible to divide it into two volumes—as the division of the subject seems itself to suggest—of reasonable dimensions.

Having dwelt for a moment on Canada and then passed on to the Antipodes, we now arrive at a formidable work on Europe and Asia,

⁶ "The Policy of Self-Help. Suggestions towards the Consolidation of the Empire and the defence of its Industries and Commerce." Two letters by W. F. Ecroyd. London: Hamilton, Adams & Co. 1879.

⁷ "Australasia." Edited and extended by A. R. Wallace, F.R.G.S., Author of "The Malay Archipelago," "Geographical Distribution of Animals," &c. With Ethnological Appendix by A. H. Keane, M.A.I. London: Stanford. 1879.

by Mr. Stuart-Glennie,⁸ a gentleman whose earlier works, of which the present purports to be a continuation, have been noticed in these pages. The plan of the history of Herodotus, it will be remembered, was based on the struggle for supremacy between these two continents from the siege of Troy to the battle of Salamis, and it seems that Mr. Stuart-Glennie while ensconced in a canoe paddled down—it does appear by what agency—"the winter-swollen Rieka to the hill-fort of Zabliak, islanded on the inundated shores of the Lake of Scutari"—a sentence which we strongly recommend to inspectors of schools in search of awkward exercises in parsing—discovered "that the Eastern Question could not be adequately treated save as the question of a readjustment of the relations of Europe and Asia to each other, and of both to Africa." He proceeds to explain carefully that he entertains only a "relative" and by no means an "absolute" hostility to Christianity, which, he explains, "was the second of those great movements which, at intervals of about half a millennium, have succeeded each other both in Asia and Europe since that great Moral Revolution of the sixth century *b.c.*, which may be briefly indicated by recalling the approximately contemporary names of Confucius and Buddha, of Cyrus the Great, of Isaiah, and of Xenophanes." His hostility, we find, is only really absolute and implacable when it comes to "Christianism," a mysterious term which he is also good enough to define, but in a manner too theological and abstruse for reproduction here. It appears that the "conditions under which" Mr. Stuart-Glennie "was led, in Illyria, to discuss and reflect on the Eastern Question"—alluding, we presume, to his probably cramped position "while being paddled down the winter-swollen Rieka"—"showed it to involve political, religious, and economic issues, co-extensive with Eurasian civilisation, and such as could be understood only from a general survey of Eurasian history." Here we seem to see Mr. Stuart-Glennie's readers "embarked," to quote a celebrated phrase of Chief Baron Eyre's, "on a very wide sea, and," we fear, "with no very safe guide;" but even this does not reveal the whole extent of our author's grasp; for we find that, having in previous volumes discussed the origin and transformation of Christianity, and having now settled the Eastern Question, in the wide development which it takes when subjected to Mr. Stuart-Glennie's theories, our author treats these publications merely as *promena*, or a sort of *hors d'œuvres* to the literary banquet he has in store for us. Mr. Stuart-Glennie promises those, if any, who have followed him in these trifling precludes, much more solid entertainment in the shape of a "History of the Modern Revolution," beginning apparently with the state of "Eurasian civilisation" in the sixth century before Christ. As we contemplate this awful programme, we cannot help sympathising with the overwrought dramatic critic who expressed a hope that some day people would learn how easy it is not to write a tragedy in five acts.

⁸ "Europe and Asia." By J. S. Stuart-Glennie, M.A. London: Chapman & Hall. 1879.

Two new books on the United States next claim our attention. Mr. Saunders's title, "Through the Light Continent" does not strike us as particularly felicitous; and he goes over ground not very different from that covered by Mr. Hussey Vivian's "Notes," Mr. Dale's "Impressions," and numerous other books of travel; but it is only fair to add that on several subjects of present interest Mr. Saunders has taken a good deal of trouble to obtain accurate information and the latest favourable statistics. We may refer, for example, to his interesting account of the rapid development during the last few years of watchmaking in America. It appears that the Waltham Company alone now sends 30,000 watches annually to England, and has recently secured a contract from the English Government for the supply of watches to India—it does not appear for what exact purpose. Mr. Saunders's discussion of the results of restrictive tariffs and of the American arguments in their favour is also worth reading. It appears that the principal articles on which there is no import duty are tea, jalap, and skeletons; and it would be curious to know on what ground these three classes of goods are treated with such peculiar favour. Mr. Saunders gives an excellent account of the national banking system; and his description of the industries of Pittsburg is very graphic and readable. It seems that American railway companies can charge differential rates without any control, such as is exercised in this country by the Railway Commission and special statutes which deal with the subject; and the unjust treatment of the Pittsburg manufacturers by the railway was one reason why so much public sympathy was enlisted last year in favour of the strikers. We feel bound to add that Mr. Saunders's index, which we have once or twice had occasion to refer to, is nearly as bad as an index can be—which is saying a good deal. Some of the leading politicians, for instance, of whom Mr. Saunders gives an account, are all to be found together, under the letter M and the word "Mr." Among them we find "Mr. Hayes," who, however, reappears with another reference, under the word "President." We should certainly have said that Mr. Saunders's book contained an unusual amount of padding, had we not happened to read it almost simultaneously with the volume published by Sir George Campbell.¹⁰ Sir George seems to have made the mistake of giving up to mankind what was meant, as we infer, for the Kirkcaldy Burghs. His lectures were doubtless acceptable to his constituents; but we shall be glad when it begins to be generally understood that the public really does not expect 400 pages of crude and superficial jottings from every gentleman who has availed himself of the facilities for procuring a return ticket afforded by the White Star line. The most interesting portion of the book consists of a republication, with additions, of the author's views, previously expounded in one of our contemporaries, of the present relations and future prospects of the white and coloured races

⁹ "Through the Light Continent." By William Saunders. Cassell, Petter & Galpin. 1879.

¹⁰ "White and Black in the United States." By Sir George Campbell, M.P. London: Chatto & Windus. 1879.

respectively in the South. We notice, by the way, an incorrect statement twice repeated that, "except to a limited degree in a portion of the Cape Colony," no attempt has been made in any British colony "to admit the coloured races to any share of political franchise;" Sir George should surely be aware that in New Zealand there are not only Maori electors, but also Maori members of the Legislature. We cannot sympathise with Sir George's wish to see the latest monstrosity in American locomotion, the "elevated," or as we suppose it would be called here "High Level," railway, running on girders over the principal streets, introduced in "Oxford Street and Piccadilly." What would Lord Hartington, or even Mr. Bright, say to such a proposal? Of Sir George's Campbell's style the following extract, chosen from the least carelessly written portion of his book, may serve as a specimen. Speaking of the negro congregations (as to which he is on one question of fact diametrically opposed to Mr. Saunders, who informs us that the *preachers* are usually whites, while according to Sir George they are always coloured men), he says:—"I did not witness any of the more active emotions in which I understand congregations sometimes indulge; but the practice of emitting in a hearty way a sort of responses here and there during the sermon seemed to me earnest and not unbecoming. . . . The whole country-side seemed to have come in to assist, both men and women—and they seemed to be making a time of it—camped about for the day." We do not know if this is American, and we do not think it is Scotch, but we are quite sure that it has scarcely the most distant resemblance to English.

We have received a handsome volume, entitled "Loch Etive and the Sons of Uisnach,"¹¹ which contains some pretty illustrations of Loch Etive and the neighbourhood, and a good deal of more or less probable speculation about the Sons of Uisnach and their primitive contemporaries. We think the author has made a mistake in throwing his book into the form of dialogue, especially as his characters, which are supposed to be representative of different races, are personally almost entirely colourless and undeveloped. The book contains a good deal of antiquarian observation, which would have rejoiced the soul of Mr. Jonathan Oldbuck, and furnished him with abundant material for controversial "observations;" but we must leave to specialists the task of determining the value of the ethnological theories advanced, and the plausibility of the author's views as to the pre-historic migrations of the Kelts.

In the year 1773 two English men-of-war, under the command of Captain Phipps, afterwards Lord Mulgrave, were commissioned, at the instance of the Royal Society, for a voyage of Arctic exploration; they succeeded, after many perils, in passing the 80th degree of latitude. Nelson served as a midshipman on board one of the ships, the *Carcass*, and on Captain Phipps's vessel, the *Racehorse*, there was a midshipman named Floyd, who kept a diary of the voyage. This diary was recently

¹¹ "Loch Etive and the Sons of Uisnach." London: Macmillan & Co. 1879.

placed in the hands of Captain Markham,¹² who has edited it, and with the help of the official account of the voyage succeeded in making a connected and interesting narrative out of Mr. Floyd's journal. The sailors a century ago were, as might have been expected, by no means profoundly acquainted with the objects of such an expedition; some of them, we are told, had an idea that the axis on which the globe turned "would not traverse, and the Pole wanted scraping and greasing." Captain Markham has prefixed to Mr. Floyd's narrative a short description of earlier Arctic voyages, from the time of King Arthur to that of King Charles the Second, and added two or three chapters on later attempts to reach the Pole, including Sir E. Parry's sledging expedition, and the various journeys undertaken in 1876 by the force under Sir G. Nares, *quorum*—the writer might have added, *pars magna fui*. The recent discovery by the Swedish *Vega*, under the direction of Professor Nordenskiöld, of the North-East passage, will doubtless contribute to direct public attention to the subject of Captain Markham's volume.

The only book on South African travel which lies before us is a well-executed translation¹³ of an account published last year in Portuguese by Senhor Neves of a journey taken by him in 1860, from Delagoa Bay to the Transvaal, in search of elephants, or rather of their tusks; for Senhor Neves was a hunter, not for pleasure, but by profession, being in fact a trader in ivory. Senhor Neves was an intelligent observer, and the account of his journey is worth reading. The book contains some curious information as to the manners and customs of the Zulu tribes, from the point of view of a friendly merchant; and the account of the origin of the Dutch Republic, and of the struggle of the Dutch with Dingaan, the Zulu King, which ended in his murder and replacement by his brother Panda, is also interesting. The lover of sport will find in this book many exciting stories of adventures with elephants, horses, and buffaloes, and much information as to the habits of these animals.

"A Nook in the Apennines"¹⁴ gives a pleasant account of a three months' holiday spent last year by an English family in the neighbourhood of Pistoja, a district rich in attractions, and (we suppose because it happens to be a little off the beaten route) not nearly as well known as it deserves to be. The book purports to be "by Leader Scott, author of 'The Painter's Ordeal,' &c. &c.," works with which we are unfortunately unacquainted; but we find, as we proceed with the narrative, that "Leader Scott" is not an author, but an authoress—"a signora," it appears, "with a jovial countenance"—and it would therefore be perhaps discourteous if we were to take

¹² "Northward Ho!" By Capt. A. H. Markham, R.N. London: Macmillan & Co. 1879.

¹³ "A Hunting Expedition to the Transvaal." By D. Fernandes das Neves. Translated from the Portuguese by Mariana Monteiro. London: George Bell & Sons. 1879.

¹⁴ "A Nook in the Apennines." By Leader Scott. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1879.

serious exception to occasional puerilities of tone, and the trivial character of some of the incidents narrated. The book gives an interesting account of the people of the country. Like the peasantry of the Cevennes, their chief means of subsistence is the chestnut; and they cultivate the land and gather the chestnut harvest on the *metayer* system. They are a pleasant, leisurely sort of people, though brought into the world and christened, for fear of accidents, in a fashion almost inconceivably expeditious. It seems, too, that they have a good deal of simple artistic feeling, much appreciation of poetry, and some acquaintance with classical literature, such as Tasso. We must give a word of praise to the illustrations, of which some, comparing ancient with modern architecture, pottery, &c., are really interesting, and almost all pretty and appropriate. The Italian quotations, on the other hand, leave something to be desired; *contadini*, for instance, does not mean "peasant girls," and *una giovenca bianca* is not "a young damsel," but "a white heifer," and the mistranslation quite spoils the point of the pretty little pastoral allegory in which it occurs. For peculiarities in the little bits of Latin, which illustrate the writer's archæological researches, some allowance should perhaps be made; still, *Dei Lari* should not have escaped correction, and we do not think the ancient Romans called their "sacred or war songs" *carmi*.

If Miss Séguin's volume on the Black Forest¹⁵ attains the popularity which it in many respects deserves, we fear that the Schwarzwald will soon cease to be the charming and secluded district, inhabited by a simple and uncorrupted peasantry, little known to tourists, and hitherto spared by Mr. Cook and his personally-conducted friends, which Miss Séguin writes of in a manner which our own experience corroborates. The country is rich in legendary lore, which Miss Séguin has been indefatigable in exploring; indeed, from the traveller's point of view, this part of the book would have been all the better for a little compression, its form at present being sufficiently bulky to involve a serious addition to the contents of a knapsack. Although Miss Séguin's volume does not profess to supply the place of an ordinary guide-book—and, indeed, Baedeker is here much too good to be neglected—it nevertheless contains much useful information as to routes, paths, means of conveyance, and even hotels. We have detected a few minor inaccuracies; for instance, from Freiburg to Erzkasten is represented as a six hours' walk, while we remember walking from the Feldburg to Freiburg, through the lovely Wilhelmsthal, in about nine hours, and certainly when we reached Erzkasten we had accomplished a good two-thirds of the way—though it is fair to add, that from Erzkasten to Freiburg we had a good deal of downhill work. On the other hand, the distance from St. Blasien to the Feldburg is considerably under-estimated, and the carriage-way does not extend—or, at all events, in September of last year did not extend—"all the way, as far as the Inn." Neither is our experience of the Post Schaffner so unfa-

¹⁵ "The Black Forest, its People and Legends." By L. G. Séguin. London: Strahan & Co. 1879.

vourable as Miss Séguin's, who must, we think, have been unfortunate in those specimens of a class of men, usually sufficiently obliging, whom she happened to come across. We are surprised at the careless way in which some of the German quotations are printed: "Durch deiner Tannanwilder" offends the eye on the first page, and there is an absurd mistranslation on page 287. Neither the illustrations nor the maps strike us as first-rate. In a word, the book is on the whole a good book, but if Miss Séguin had taken a little more pains it might have been a great deal better.

Mr. E. B. Nicholson, who has published an *Essay on the Rights of Animals*¹⁶—meaning thereby, as we infer from the illustrations on the cover, principally horses, sea-gulls, butterflies, and perch—obligingly warns the reviewer that his style is not worth the trouble of picking to pieces, which is doubtless the case. Yet, a writer who gives us some "forewords" instead of a "preface," and writes "belike" and "formeant" instead of "perhaps" and "intended," can scarcely be surprised if such extravagances of purism run to seed elicit a passing protest. It appears that Mr. Nicholson in his earlier days, following the ordinary rules of composition, "gained such very fair skill that most of the people of England would have been altogether unable to understand anything" which he wrote. We fully accept Mr. Nicholson's statement; but we are not so sure that the "books and newspapers" which he had taken as models ought to be exclusively blamed for so unfortunate a result. It is certainly rather irritating to find our old friend Copernicus under the guise of Koppernigk; to see "therefore," three times in a couple of sentences, deprived of its unoffending final letter; and to be instructed in the "hests" of conscience, all of which peculiarities occur in a single page. It is, perhaps, fortunate that Mr. Nicholson, as he explains, has not had time to be consistent with himself; for we really shudder at the idea of what he might have written if he had had leisure to "grow more understanding" of the results which his principles would logically involve. We should add that we entirely sympathise with Mr. Nicholson's protest against the wanton slaughter of birds and animals for the adornment of ladies of fashion and others who imitate them. We had hoped that before this the appeals which have been made on this subject would have produced more effect on those to whom they are addressed, and whom we cannot believe to be really so heartless as their attire would often seem to indicate.

Herr Paul von Liliensfeld has published, under the title of "Social Physiology," the fourth volume of his valuable "Observations on the Sociology of the Future."¹⁷ Herr Liliensfeld divides the laws of social development into physiological, morphologic, and tectologic. In the present volume he discusses the social organism from the physiological or economic standpoint. His system is based on the theory that all

¹⁶ "The Rights of an Animal." By E. B. Nicholson, M.A. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1879.

¹⁷ "Gedanken über die Socialwissenschaft der Zukunft." Von Paul v. Liliensfeld. Viester Theil: die Sociale Physiologie." Mitau: Behre. 1879.

phenomena, social as well as natural, are to be traced to the principle of Motion, from which the law of Evolution follows as a sort of corollary. His applications of these first principles are often ingenious, and sometimes highly instructive. He is doubtless justified in distinguishing his treatment from Mill's, on the ground that Mill mainly pursued a deductive method of inquiry; but the distinction which he draws between his own system and that of Spencer seems to be one rather of terminology than of principle. The labour question and the "Socialismus" movement are of more immediate practical importance in Germany than with us; and Herr Lilienfeld's elaborate discussion of the subject may prove serviceable as showing the absurd conclusions in which the partisans of extreme views are logically involved. The chapter on Free Trade and Protection will, perhaps, attract more attention in England. Herr Lilienfeld agrees with List, that protection is in some cases required by political economy, but that this science is destined to be ultimately superseded by an economy which will be rather cosmo-political, and which certainly will not regard free-trade as "ein inhaltloses Wort, eine leere Abstraction." As long as the present national system lasts, our author, we regret to say, would regard the policy of restricted tariffs as depending upon a variety of considerations, such as the comparative productive powers of various countries, which fall within the province rather of statecraft than of sociology.

We have received some valuable publications issued by the Statistical Department of the Italian Ministry of Agriculture, Industry, and Commerce,¹⁸ and dealing respectively with population, navigation to and from the Italian ports, and the various communal and provincial debts. These statistics might perhaps prove serviceable as a model for the new Department which, after the success of Mr. Sampson Lloyd's resolution last session, our own Government, we presume, will feel bound to create. The tables seem to have been prepared with extreme care, and, indeed, enter into minute details of almost exclusively national interest. Suicides, for example, are classified with regard to the means of destruction employed, the months in which they occurred, the age, status (celibate, married, or widowed), profession or calling of the suicide, and the presumptive causes of the crime, among which we find *dispiaceri domestici, amore contrariato, disgusto della vita*, and *falso punto d'onore*—the latter an exclusively masculine complaint. We notice that the proportion of still-born children in Italy is—nominally, at all events—much in excess of that in most other European countries, a circumstance which the authorities attribute to a greater interval being allowed to elapse between birth and registration in Italy than elsewhere. The treatment of foundlings in Italy is a subject to which the discovery of great abuses has recently directed public attention; and now that the matter has been taken up by the *Opinione* and other influential journals, it is to be hoped that

¹⁸ "Popolazione: Movimento dello Stato Civile, anni 1862-1867." "Navigazione nei Porti del Regno, anno 1877." "Debiti comunali e provinciali, al 31 Dec., 1877." Roma: 1878-9.

the next statistics will show some diminution of the figures under the unsatisfactory head of "nati mortii." The "civil status" statistics, which are brought down to the end of 1877, are prefaced by an introduction and a comparative table of international returns, to procure which in so complete a manner it is clear that no trouble can have been spared.

Messrs. Knight and Co. have published a Dictionary of Parishes, Townships, &c., in England and Wales,¹⁹ giving the population of each parish, and the poor-law union and petty sessional division to which it belongs. The distinction drawn between those parishes which do and those which do not "maintain their own poor" is to us unintelligible. Surely the compiler cannot have been ignorant of the system by which the burden of poor-rates is apportioned under Mr. Villiers's Union Chargeability Act? In the body of the volume there appear to be some slight inaccuracies and deficiencies, which should be corrected or supplied in another edition. Thus, for example, in Buckinghamshire there are three parishes called East Claydon, Middle Claydon, and Steeple Claydon respectively, and a hamlet called Botolph Claydon. On turning to "Claydon" we find a reference to "East" and "Middle," but none to "Steeple," though the latter is the most important parish of the three; while Botolph Claydon appears apart, as "Botolph Claydor or Bottle Claydon," which is ingeniously wrong in both alternatives.

If the promised contributions to the "Political Library for the People" are of a merit in any way approaching that of Sir Charles Dilke's pamphlet on Parliamentary Reform,²⁰ the series should prove one of extreme utility. Sir Charles points out with great lucidity the direction which Parliamentary reform must take in the immediate future, and also gives a succinct but excellent history of the various questions connected with this subject which have arisen since the Act of 1867 was passed. Those who take the trouble to read these few pages certainly should not feel much doubt as to which political party has been most in earnest in the endeavour to secure to the people, not merely a nominal right of voting, but proper facilities for claiming and exercising this privilege. The abolition of the old franchises which have been retained in boroughs, a more satisfactory and reasonable definition of "poor-relief" as a disqualification for voting, the extension of the hours of polling in large towns, and the introduction, in the event of no candidate obtaining an absolute majority of the votes recorded, of the French system of *ballotage*, are among the minor improvements—putting aside, we mean, such large questions as the assimilation of the county to the borough franchise and the redistribution of seats, which are also ably dealt with—advocated by Sir C. Dilke for reasons and in a manner which command our heartiest sympathies.

¹⁹ "Dictionary of Parishes, Townships, Hamlets, &c., in England and Wales." London: Knight & Co. 1879.

²⁰ "Political Library for the People: No. 2, Parliamentary Reform." By Sir C. W. Dilke, Bart., M.P. London: W. Mullan & Son. 1879.

Mr. Barlee's pamphlet on Land Transfer²¹ deals with another important question of the day, and will be read with interest in connection with the recently published Report of the Select Committee on the subject, before whom Mr. Barlee, who is a solicitor of considerable experience, gave evidence. Mr. Barlee advocates the establishment of a Landed Estates' Court—a tribunal as to the successful working of which in England grave doubts are, we believe, entertained by most conveyancers—of a system of compulsory deed registration, and of an *ad valorem* scale of payment for the preparation of deeds. It is not without some surprise that we find such radical changes advocated by a member of what is probably, on the whole, the most conservative branch of a highly conservative profession. Mr. Barlee has taken pains to collect some comparative information as to the systems of conveyancing employed in foreign countries, and in some of our own colonies; the main characteristic of the latter is usually a *sancta simplicitas*, which in a country like England would, we fear, prove unattainable, at all events while so many different kinds of interest—real and personal, beneficial estates and trust estates, rent-charges and jointures, &c.—are allowed to exist in the same land.

From conveyancing we pass to another branch of English law to which the attention of Parliament has been more directly called during the last two years—that, namely, relating to indictable offences, a subject with which, during the last half century, no less than five Commissions, fourteen Reports, and numerous Bills, have attempted to deal. Almost simultaneously with the Report and Draft Code issued by the Royal Commission, to whom Sir John Holker's Bill was last year referred, an elaborate "Draft Code of Criminal Law and Procedure" has been published by Mr. E. D. Lewis.²² Mr. Lewis has evidently carefully studied the suggestions made from time to time by Sir J. F. Stephen for the simplification and improvement of our criminal law, and many of his proposals resemble those contained in the Report of the Commission above referred to. He is in favour, for instance, of abolishing the presumption of duress in the case of married women, and of abolishing the inconvenient and now unmeaning classification of indictable offences into felonies and misdemeanours. His definition of insanity certainly seems open to serious objection; indeed, we do not understand whether Clauses (a) and (b) are meant to be cumulative or alternative. His proposal to include fraud, an offence which equity has never attempted to define, in his definition of theft, would, we believe, entail insurmountable difficulties in practice, and we much prefer the classification of these offences adopted by the Commission, though it is doubtless of a somewhat empirical character. Mr. Lewis devotes considerable space to discussing the question of the examination of prisoners on their trial, an innovation which he advocates, without failing to appreciate

²¹ "Remarks on Land Transfer." By E. H. Barlee. London: Shaw & Sons, 1879.

²² "A Draft Code of Criminal Law and Procedure." By E. D. Lewis. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1879.

the weight of the objections which may be advanced against it. In the case of certain offences, the official Draft Code enables the prisoner to give exculpatory evidence (see, *e.g.*, sect. 202 and 523); the question is one on which the Commission was divided in opinion; we are ourselves inclined to think that the balance of argument is in favour of the change which Mr. Lewis favours; but we do not know that he attaches quite sufficient importance to the fact that persons innocent of the crime for which they are indicted are often unwilling to give the true explanation of facts which make against them, as such explanation would be far from favourable to their general conduct, and might possibly involve the admission of some other crime. Such persons would be prone to make false statements which, being exposed on cross-examination, would be nearly certain to insure their conviction of offences which they really had not committed, and which the prosecution under the existing system would therefore fail to bring home to them. We cannot enter into the merits of Mr. Lewis's bold proposal for the establishment of a separate court of criminal justice, with a special appellate tribunal, but in so far as this suggestion would involve the appointment of three additional judges we cannot give it our assent, believing as we do that our existing judicial power is really amply sufficient for all practical purposes, if properly distributed and applied. Neither will our space permit us to discuss in detail the language of Mr. Lewis's draft code, which appears to us sometimes unnecessarily cumbersome, but he has certainly spared no pains to make his proposals exhaustive and symmetrical; and it must be encouraging to those engaged in the onerous and often ungrateful work of law amendment to find a practical lawyer giving such substantial proof of his sympathy with their exertions.

Mr. R. E. Melsheimer, a member of the bar, and Mr. W. Laurence, a member of the Stock Exchange, have published a succinct, and at the same time, within the limits marked out by the joint authors, a practically exhaustive account of the law and customs of the latter body.²³ Their treatise may be safely recommended to the investing public as well as to the legal profession. The legal relations between principal, broker, and jobber—the position of the latter differing in many respects from that of an ordinary agent with principal undisclosed—are carefully and, we think, very accurately discussed, with numerous references to the leading cases on each branch of the subject; while the machinery of Stock Exchange transactions is also clearly explained, and the mysteries of “contango” and “backwardation,” the lively game of “put and call,” and the awkward practice of “cornering” elucidated in a manner which the *bonâ fide* investor, though a fool, can scarcely fail to comprehend. Lord Justice James, on a recent occasion, gave some offence to members of the Stock Exchange by remarking that that institution was not “an Alsatia;” as he afterwards explained, it seemed to have been considered that, when he said it was not, he really meant it was a modern counterpart of the law-

²³ “The Law and Customs of the London Stock Exchange.” By R. E. Melsheimer & W. Laurence. London: Henry Sweet. 1879.

less quarter which "The Fortunes of Nigel" immortalised; an impression which, perhaps, arose from the circumstance that, although of course, in theory, "the Queen's writ runs to Capel Court," still in actual practice all questions arising between members of the Exchange themselves whether brokers or jobbers, are decided by the Committee, and withheld from the cognisance of the courts of law. The rules and regulations adopted by the Committee for the transaction of business and the settlement of disputes are given in an appendix to the present volume. It may be well to notice, as our authors point out, that any gentleman may style himself a "sworn broker"—though the oath is no longer taken—of the City of London, without belonging to the "House" or being amenable to the control of the Committee. In fact, the license which brokers have to take out, and the annual subscription which they have to pay to the Court of Aldermen, is really nothing but a fine with little historical justification and no compensating advantages of supervision or protection.

The theoretical study of jurisprudence is a subject which has never yet taken congenial root in England; and our juristic literature, when compared with the voluminous results of the researches, at once comprehensive, systematic, and minute, of foreign publicists, seems meagre and poverty-stricken indeed. England is certainly the only country in which a writer could venture to throw together a miscellaneous and undigested collection of legal maxims and judicial dicta, and style his crude compilation "Philosophy of Law." Under these circumstances, we cordially welcome—especially at this period when the codification of the various branches of our law seems to be no longer an absolutely Utopian dream—an introductory treatise on the Principles of the Law of Contract, by Sir William Anson, the Vinerian Reader of English Law at Oxford.²⁴ The book is primarily designated, as we gather, for the use of law students at the Universities, and its scientific treatment and clear arrangement of the subject should insure its popularity among that class of readers. To those acquainted with Maine—and what law student in these days is not?—Sir W. Anson's preliminary definitions and analysis will offer nothing new, either in form or substance, and indeed novelty in this direction would be a very doubtful recommendation; while in many of the topics subsequently treated, the writer has been to some extent anticipated by the masterly treatise of Mr. Pollock, whose profound acquaintance with Savigny and other exponents of the modern civil law leads him into habits of analysis and classification, usually conspicuous by their absence in an English text-book. Mr. Pollock, however, writes mainly for the practitioner, while Sir W. Anson's book is specially intended for the student; we could wish, indeed, from this point of view, that the Vinerian Reader had been even more sparing in his discussion of case-law, and a little more critical and minute in examination of fundamental principles; but with this qualification we can heartily recommend his work, and venture to predict that it may

²⁴ "Principles of the English Law of Contract." By Sir W. A. Anson, Bart., M.A., B.C.L. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1879.

sometimes prove serviceable in a wider sphere than the author modestly contemplates.

Mr. C. J. Daniell, of the Bengal Civil Service, has published an elaborate, though singularly ill-written, pamphlet on the important question of the Indian Currency.²⁵ He calls attention to the difficulty of maintaining artificial standards of value in presence of the extensively exercised coining powers of the independent Mints of native states, an element in the question which should not be neglected by the advocates of bimetallism. Mr. Daniell, however, is himself a bimetallist; he advocates the introduction in India of the English sovereign as a standard coin, while retaining the rupee for the purposes of ordinary internal trade; and he admits the necessity, within certain limits, of artificial adjustment of the rate of conversion between the two metals. Any expedient not economically vicious for enabling the Indian Government, even at some sacrifice of internal revenue, to defray its home charges without loss on exchange, is certainly to be welcomed; and although Mr. Daniell's own plan seems open to various objections, many of his observations deserve the attention of Indian statesmen and economists.

Between the views of Mr. Bright, with whose addresses we commenced this article, and those of Lieut.-Col. Trevor, with whose pamphlet on army organisation,²⁶ we conclude it, there is indeed a great gulf fixed. The latter gentleman, it may be sufficient to say, looks forward to a future Anglo-Turkish military alliance against Russia, in which our own army is to consist of 740,000 men, "of whom about 580,000 would require to be equipped for field service." About half this force, in the gallant author's view, should consist of native Indians, whose employment in Europe, he remarks with a *naïveté* which is really charming, is not likely to be again challenged after the recent "decision of Parliament." Among other alterations, Colonel Trevor advocates a return to the long-service system, the establishment of four classes of reserves, and a reduction of the number of officers in each regiment.

SCIENCE.

SIR JOHN LUBBOCK'S Scientific Lectures¹ form a handsomely printed and well illustrated volume, in which two lectures are devoted to the relations which exist between insects and flowers; two more treat of the habits of ants; one is upon the study of prehistoric archaeology, and the other is a presidential address to the Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Society. The subjects of the lectures

²⁵ "Gold in the East. Being Observations on a Practical Method of Establishing a Gold Currency in India, and its influence on the Trade and Finance of that Country." By C. J. Daniell. London: Strahan & Co. 1879.

²⁶ "A Suggestion for the Reorganisation of our Armies, British and Indian." By Lieut.-Col. W. S. Trevor, V.C. London: "Anglo-American Times" Press.

¹ "Scientific Lectures." By Sir John Lubbock, Bart., M.P., D.C.L., LL.D. London: Macmillan & Co. 1879.

are interesting : the author's own researches give them an individuality, and the exposition is remarkably clear ; so that while they tell nothing that the scientific man is not already familiar with, they are excellently adapted to the requirements of all readers who are interested in the questions which they expound. The first lecture is designed to show how dependent flowers are upon insects. Since the flowers of the beech and most forest trees which are not fertilised by insects, are small in size, and devoid of honey, colour, and scent, there is no inducement for insects to visit them and carry the pollen from flower to flower. The forms and positions of the several parts of flowers all appear to have some reference to the conditions under which the plants are fertilised. Sir John Lubbock has proved by experiment that bees and wasps are able to distinguish the colours of plants, and they return to the same plant sipping the honey from 50 to 100 times a day, working 12 hours a day in autumn, and longer in summer. Some flowers are visited by but one insect ; thus the common *Antirrhinum* is only entered by the humble bee, while no fewer than seventy-three species of insects visit the common Chevril. The scarlet runner in Nicaragua, and the red clover in some of our colonies, never produce seed, because there are no humble bees to fertilise them.

Flies prefer unpleasant smells, and, consequently, visit the plants which we neglect ; and, in colour, they love the dull reds or yellowish brown. Bees, on the other hand, delight in the odours which please us, and prefer the bright clear colours. The honey of plants exists to attract insects ; and where it is absent plants depend on the wind to bring them the fertilising pollen. Some plants, however, have stores of nectar elsewhere than in the flower, and these are found in some cases, as in a Nicaraguan acacia, to protect the tree by nourishing ants, which defend it from enemies. Ants have been observed to bring small insects into their nest at the rate of 1600 an hour ; but, though useful to plants, the flowers are often defended against them by an impenetrable *chevauc-de-frise*, which keeps out all creeping insects and slugs, and so preserves the honey for the bees, an object which is also attained by slippery and glutinous surfaces in the flower. Plants also exercise a varied influence on insects. The larvæ, for instance, of saw-flies, which feed on leaves, like the caterpillars of butterflies and moths, closely resemble them, though the perfect insect belongs to a different group. And caterpillars generally have the colour and markings of the plants on which they feed, or live, or hide, for this mimicry serves to protect them from their enemies, the birds. The author's experiments with ants, and studies of their habits, are among the most important modern studies of insect life. Ants, which often have several queens in a nest, feed on honey, honey dew, fruit, and almost any sweet animal or vegetable substance. The brown garden ant milks aphides on the trees, and the yellow meadow ant lives principally on the honeydew of aphides, which suck the roots of grasses. They not only keep these insects as domestic animals, but also many beetles, some of which are blind and only found in the nests of ants ; and they have a blind wood-louse which acts as scavenger.

Besides suffering from the attacks of larger enemies like birds, some small flies lay their eggs on the ants, inside of which the larvæ subsequently live. The ant which lives in slavery, *Formica fusca*, is extremely timid, and the slave-making ant is the bravest. Some are cowardly and thievish, others greedy, some cruel. In industry they are not surpassed by bees and wasps, working all day, and often at night, too, in warm weather. As a rule, they probably live but one season, yet some have been kept for five years and are still strong. Usually, only one species is found in a nest; but a smaller species of *Stenammus* follows the *Formicas* when they change their nests, and lives with them as cats live with man. Some foreign ants are unable to live without slaves, which perform all domestic duties, even to feeding them and building their dwellings; and this is probably the only example of an animal having lost the instinct of taking food. Very young ants are at first left at home to take care of the larvæ and pupæ. The evidences of the intelligence of ants are very curious. They are deficient in invention, in matters which would save labour and time, but engage in engineering works for protection. They recognise their friends after long intervals, even more than a year, while ants of the same species which have never been in the nest, when put into it, are attacked or killed. Most ants have a keen sense of smell, lavender-water being detected instantly. They are incapable of hearing those sounds which are audible to us. Their sight is not very good, being unable easily to find objects which have been moved a few inches away. The number of ants in a nest is estimated at from 5000 to 500,000. Their habits in battle vary; some crush enemies with their mandibles, others saw the enemy's head off. Some ants are armed with a sting, a touch from which disables the enemy.

Affection seems to be shown only exceptionally. Occasionally a wounded ant is picked up and carried home, but no notice was taken of ants partly drowned, no search made for those buried in earth, and no help given to ants suffering from parasites. Specimens which had been chloroformed, whether friends or strangers, were nearly all thrown into the water, and this showed a certain discrimination, since ants do not recover from chloroform. But when they were made drunk, so that they lay on their backs, the sober ants in most cases took their friends into the nest, while the strangers were thrown into the water. In Texas ants engage in agriculture, clearing circular discs twelve feet in diameter round the entrance to their nest, on which they permit nothing to grow but the plant called the ant-rice, which is carefully harvested. Their powers of communication seem to depend chiefly on scent, but they can find their way without difficulty. They distinguish colours readily, and prefer red, yellow, and green, while they dislike violet and purple. There appear to be among them three types of life, which correspond to the hunting, pastoral, and agricultural stages of human development.

"Rambles in search of Wild Flowers"² is one of those elegant old-

² "Rambles in search of Wild Flowers, and how to distinguish them." By Margaret Plues. With ninety-six coloured figures, and numerous cuts. Third Edition. London: George Bell & Sons. 1879.

fashioned botanical books which, while adopting the classifications of science, make no pretence at being scientific, and are found interesting in country places, and by young people. First there is an introductory chapter explaining the structure of plants, and the names given to their several parts and organs; and then the volume is divided into eighteen chapters, each of which is devoted to one or several natural orders of plants, with an account of particular species which have been collected by the writer. So that the reader will find the results of the author's rambles digested into a popular form of systematic teaching, which is somewhat intermediate between little lectures and familiar talks, helped out with plentiful quotations of poetry. In such a plan the old English names of plants are naturally used, though the scientific names are given as well; and in harmony with this desire to be simple and intelligible, the notes which concern the characters of plants and their distinction from other species are brief, and limited to a few obvious points; while the various medicinal or other uses or properties of plants, their geographical positions, and the relations between the wild and cultivated races furnish the chief part of the interest of the work for those young readers for whom it is evidently designed. The author finds a true delight in nature, and recalling with gratitude conversations on wild flowers in her own childhood, desires here to impart to others the joy which a knowledge of flowers may give.

The new volume of the "International Scientific Series," by Professor Rood,³ is devoted to colour; and is one of the most admirable of many excellent works which the series includes. Thoroughly scientific in treatment, the book is excellently constructed, and tells its story clearly, always with a view to rendering a knowledge of the laws of colour practically useful. It is divided into eighteen chapters. The earlier of these are devoted to the different means by which colours are produced, such as dispersion by light passing through a prism; the constant properties of colours such as purity, brightness, and hues; the production of colour by interference and polarisation; and the influence on colours of opalescent media, such as the sky. Next succeed an account of the colours due to fluorescence and phosphorescence, the colours produced by absorption, colour blindness and the abnormal perception of colour, and the colours theory of Young and Helmholtz. Then considerable attention is given to the mixture of colours, to complementary colours, and the effects produced on colour by change in luminosity, and by mixing colours with white light. To these follow chapters on the modes of arranging colours in systems, on the principles of contrast in colours, gradation, and combination of colours in twos and threes. The last chapter is on the use of colour in painting and decoration. In many cases the author's views are original and striking; and his treatment of the subject is always interesting. The illustrations are useful, and a good deal of information is

³ "Modern Chromatics, with applications to Art and Industry." By Ogden N. Rood, Professor of Physics in Columbia College. With 130 original illustrations. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1879.

thrown into a tabular form, which otherwise might have appeared too technical.

Dr. Stone has produced an excellent little book on sound,⁴ which is at once clear and interesting. The subject is chiefly the consideration of sound as music, and we are acquainted with no elementary book so well calculated to give the general student a good conception of the scientific principles and nature of ordinary musical instruments. The volume is divided into eight chapters, which treat of the production of sound by different conditions of vibration. In the first chapter, the regular vibrations are classed under nine groups, according as they are produced by strings, rods, discs, bells, membranes, reeds, columns of air, by heat and flames, and by electricity. The second chapter deals with the velocity and propagation of sound, its wave motion, reflection and refraction; and the third chapter similarly treats of its intensity and consonance, and the interference of sound. The fourth chapter is entirely devoted to pitch, which depends upon the rapidity of the vibrations. There are five methods of determining the number of vibrations in a given period, which are classed as mechanical, optical, photographic, electrical, and computative. Illustrations are given of each of these, and the chapter concludes with an account of the different kinds of pitch in use in ancient and modern times. The fifth chapter discusses the nature of musical tone; and the sixth chapter explains the effects of heat, atmospheric pressure, moisture, and density, on strings, tuning-forks, organ-pipes, and other musical instruments. Then follows a chapter on scales, temperaments, and tuning, and the eighth chapter gives a short account of the nature and properties of the chief musical instruments, with an explanation of the structure of the ear and mechanism of the voice. Valuable as the book is, its usefulness might have been greatly enhanced by amplifying the last chapter, so as to make it an introduction to the study of orchestration and the orchestra.

The explosion of the 38-ton gun on board the *Thunderer* having been made the subject of a report to Parliament, it is possible for any one to form an independent opinion as to the cause of the disaster. The author of this pamphlet⁵ has made a skilful analysis of the evidence, with the object of showing that a different conclusion should have been drawn from it than that adopted by the Committee of Investigation, who attributed the explosion to the gun having received a second charge in consequence of a misfire, which had not been detected by officers or men. The writer attaches far more weight to the evidence of the captain and others, who watched the firing, than did the committee,

⁴ "Elementary Lessons on Sound." By Dr. W. H. Stone, Lecturer on Physics at St. Thomas's Hospital. With illustrations. London: Macmillan & Co. 1879.

⁵ "The Explosion of a gun of 38 tons on board H.M.S. *Thunderer*, January 2nd, 1879. An examination of the evidence taken by a Committee assembled on board the *Thunderer* in Malta Harbour, by order of the Lords of the Admiralty, to inquire into the cause of the explosion." By Benjamin Sharpe, Commander R.N., H. Newell Park, Middlesex. 1879.

and argues, from the evidence of the men in the other turret, where a misfire certainly occurred, that such an accident could not have happened without being detected. And from statements that the shot had often previously stopped at the place where the gun burst, he is led to conclude that the gun was faulty, probably cracked, and that the explosion was really due to the shot having become jammed in the bore at a distance from the charge, owing to an obstruction which previously existed there.

The progress of modern chemistry has so far modified many important industries, that a new work for general reference, which should deal with the industries and manufactures of the country from the manufacturer's point of view, has almost become a necessity. This want Messrs. Spon are endeavouring to meet by the publication of a new Encyclopædia, of which the first volume is before us.⁶ It is excellently planned, all the subjects of which it treats being arranged in natural groups, so that each article is often a complete treatise. Acids, for instance, occupy the first 190 pages of the volume; but after an account of acidimetry, or the processes for determining the volume, weight, or strength of acids in a liquid, the various processes of manufacture in which acids are produced or used, are discussed and explained, under such heads as acetic acid, arsenious, carbazotic, carbolic, carbonic, chromic, citric, gallic, sulphuric, hydrochloric, hydrofluoric, nitric, oxalic, and tartaric acids. In each case the processes which are commercially the most important receive the fullest treatment, and figures are given of apparatus whenever these are necessary to make the processes intelligible. Similarly, under the heading alcohol, the various processes of distillation are described, and then the preparation of alcoholic liquors, such as absinth, arrack, brandy, gin, kirschwasser, &c., rum and whiskey. The alkalis occupy considerable space, and the newest knowledge of the various manufacturing processes is here ably digested. The work promises to be a most valuable addition to encyclopædic literature, which may be confidently recommended as a source of the best scientific information.

Professor Tyndall's "Fragments of Science" now appear in two volumes,⁷ and include the more important of his lectures on questions of general interest delivered during the last twenty-five years. In the first volume the subjects are almost entirely connected with physics and physical geography, and include lectures upon the Parallel Bands of Glen Roy, Niagara, Experiments on Fog Signals, in addition to older and well-known subjects, such as Dust and Disease, Faraday, Radiation, Alpine Sculpture, Slaty Cleavage, &c.; concluding with a short article on Science and the Spirits. The second volume contains

⁶ "Spon's Encyclopædia of the Industrial Arts, Manufactures, and Commercial Products." Edited by G. G. André, F.G.S., Assoc. M. Inst. C.E., Division I. containing Acids, Alcohol, Alkalis, Alloys, Alum, Arsenic, Asphalt, Assaying, Beverages, &c. London and New York: E. & F. N. Spon. 1879.

⁷ "Fragments of Science: a Series of detached Essays, Addresses and Reviews." By John Tyndall, F.R.S. Sixth edition. Two Vols. London: Longmans, Green, & Co. 1879.

those articles which more especially endeavour to investigate the higher questions connected with phenomena of life in which the border lands of science and religion are thought by some people to overlap, if not to come into antagonism. Such for instance are the Reflections on Prayer, the articles on Miracles and Vitality, and the well-known Belfast Address and writings in its defence. But besides these there are the Scientific Use of the Imagination, Fermentation, Spontaneous Generation, Professor Virchow and Evolution, and a concluding article on the Electric Light. These are only a few of the interesting subjects on which Professor Tyndall offers his best thought and powerful exposition to his readers. To say that these volumes are more worthy in their new form of general reading than the previous editions, would be but faint praise, for they aim, with eminent success, at showing how scientific methods of thought which are easily intelligible, are permeating with augmenting power all masses of facts in which the human mind finds an absorbing interest. To emancipate the minds of men from any form of slavery by substituting intelligent comprehension for unreasoning formulæ or wonder, has ever been the first step in the liberation of human energies, so that they may produce greater happiness for the individual and advance the progress of the whole community; and we cannot doubt that these utterances of Professor Tyndall will go far towards creating a new element of religious belief in this country, by demonstrating that science is legitimately extending her influence beyond the elementary principles expounded in textbooks to the practical application of those principles among the phenomena of life.

The energy and persistence which Mr. Thoms has shown in investigating cases of longevity are well known, but scarcely, we think, sufficiently appreciated.* It is surely of the highest interest, both from a personal and a statistical point of view, to ascertain the possible duration of life, and it is somewhat strange that physiologists have reasoned so carelessly on the subject, and stranger still that Mr. Thoms' more accurate habit of mind should have been criticised with more or less good-natured banter, or even with sneers. As the author says (p. 3), "In strange contrast with the feeling of indignation so often manifested when doubt is thrown upon any cases of supposed abnormal longevity, is the confidence and recklessness with which the most startling announcements of such cases are given to the world without the least preliminary inquiry, and often without a particle of foundation." It may be love of the marvellous, or may it not be that to have fellow-creatures capable of living so long reflects a certain credit on the race as a whole? It is indeed surprising to read in Mr. Thoms' pages how utterly unfounded are the most brazen statements of the philo-centenarians! How informants will give every assurance of the age of persons whose very names they cannot spell. Nay, many of the cases recorded in respectable journals turn out not to be blunders, but

* "The Longevity of Man." By W. J. Thoms, F.S.A. London: Norgate, 1879.

veritable fictions. In his ninth chapter, Mr. Thoms gives the facts of the only three cases of survival beyond the century which he has been able to prove beyond doubt, though two or three more cases are recorded as doubtful. We consider this pleasantly-written volume not only interesting in itself, but also in the illustrations it affords of the history of error.

The Messrs. Strahan have reprinted, in a small volume, the papers on the "Alcohol Question" which appeared in the *Contemporary Review*.⁹ These papers, written by the leaders of the medical profession, were so widely read and discussed at the time of their appearance, that we need not now do more than notice this republication. It seems to us, that this "Alcohol Question" is now quite threshed out for the present. When any further investigations have thrown a new light on the subject it may come up again; but meanwhile it seems agreed that, although alcohol is an invaluable medicine at times, yet that the common run of cases, and even of fevers, do well without it. Secondly, that the limits of what is called moderation are far narrower than has been supposed. Thirdly, that indulgence in quantities more than equal to, say half a bottle of claret per diem, will in most persons lead to disease. Finally, that between such moderation and total abstinence the difference is slight and almost inappreciable; but that many people seem the better for the moderate use. We may add, that it seems to us a false scientism to assume that the potency of a modicum of wine is to be regarded as that only of the spirit it contains, and that spirits of wine in a medicine bottle can be used as its equivalent.

Dr. Dowse has been well known for some years as an enthusiastic and successful investigator of nervous diseases.¹⁰ For many years he was medical superintendent of the Central London Sick Asylum at Highgate, and enjoyed unrivalled opportunities, of completing the history and the pathology of those tedious maladies which pass out of the care of those who witness their earlier stages. Professor Charcot, of Paris, is among the chief of those physicians who have realised the clinical and pathological value of the infirmaries for incurables, and Dr. Dowse has worked in a similar spirit. In the first instalment of his work, which is to sum up his results, we have an earnest of what is to come; and if future parts equal the first, few books will be able to vie with it in respect of the extent of its information and of the clinical material upon which its conclusions are based. This material is well digested and ably and concisely dealt with, and the work will take a high rank among those of its class. The volume contains also some good illustrations, and is well printed. We shall await the publication of the future volumes with much interest.

We almost wonder that Mr. Bogue has not included this brochure in his series of "Health Primers."¹¹ It is a very useful little book, is

⁹ "The Alcohol Question." London: Strahan & Co. 1879.

¹⁰ "The Brain and its Diseases." Part I. By T. S. Dowse, M.D. London: Baillière. 1879.

¹¹ "Sleep and Sleeplessness." By J. Mortimer-Granville. London: Bogue. 1879.

equally cheap, and almost the same in form. Foolish or weak people, who in all times were tempted to take opiates, in these times have their temptations doubled; they belong to a more "nervous" generation, and they have access to chloral and the hypodermic syringe. Mr. Mortimer-Granville is well known, not only as a well-informed, but also as a popular and pleasing writer, and this little treatise, dealing with the leading facts about sleep, and the common-sense management of sleep, will be useful to practitioners of medicine as well as to the public.

Were Mr. Bradley's volume¹² one of less intrinsic merit, we should at any time welcome its publication, as it deals with a neglected side of clinical work. It is surprising how book after book comes before us on subjects so hackneyed, that a very high degree of originality alone can justify such fruitfulness; while, on the other hand, certain districts of medical science remain nearly uncultivated. Dr. Gowers, Dr. Curzon, and Mr. Bradley have done their best—and an excellent best it is—to rescue the lymphatic system from undeserved neglect, and have shown more and more clearly how grave and how far-reaching are the maladies to which that system is liable, and how necessary it is to bring up our knowledge of it to a higher level. The masterly researches of Klein, more than once noticed in these pages, gives a firm anatomical foundation for clinical writers, and, happily, a surgeon has, in the present instance, been led to deal in his way with the subject almost contemporaneously treated by a physician. Mr. Bradley very properly presents the reader with an account of the Anatomy of the Lymphatics in his preliminary chapter; his second chapter deals with the traumatic surgery of the system; and, in the remaining chapters, he considers those maladies which are due either to septic causes or to causes from within. These chapters are very good; indeed, the sections on surgical and pathological matters are more than good—they are based upon original and laborious work, forcibly and tersely recorded, and leading to valuable results. We think Mr. Bradley has, perhaps, not sufficiently considered how far lymphatic diseases of so-called idiopathic kinds may be due to some primary and long-forgotten septic inoculation. We are glad to notice that Mr. Bradley does not refuse to admit some little hope into his estimate of the perils of the more general adenoid maladies; and, we may add, that the strengthening of such hopes must depend largely upon the means of earlier diagnosis and treatment which such a volume as the present makes more possible.

This little book is a very difficult one for a reviewer to deal with;¹³ the easiest course is not open to us—namely, to say nothing about it, for here it is claiming our word. It is not bad, and it is not very good; the author is evidently intelligent and even able, one in whose quiet judgment and good sense his patients would place a just con-

¹² "Injuries and Diseases of the Lymphatic System." By S. M. Bradley, F.R.C.S. Churchill, 1879.

¹³ "First Lines of Therapeutics." By A. Harvey, M.D. London: Lewis, 1879.

fidence, and this is the book of such a man. But if every intelligent practitioner, and every trustworthy lecturer, is to write a book merely to set forth, more or less prosily, the ordinary views of all the better kind of medical men of his day, we shall be crushed under the weight of professional literature; for such an exposition is the one before us. Dr. Harvey holds the views on the functions of medicine which belong to all thoughtful men of the time. If Dr. Harvey had singular literary abilities, and could fix the floating notions of the day in new and striking forms, or, still more, if he had devoted some of his leisure to original research into the subjects of his speculations, we should have welcomed his treatise; as it is, it leaves us indifferent. There are shrewd thoughts scattered among the pages (as, for instance, on page 260), and many points are put well enough; but there are laxities and small inaccuracies on the other hand which are abundant enough to give a superficial character to the whole. We wish we could say more than that Dr. Harvey's treatise is creditable to him, and wholesome reading for his pupils.

Mr. Bogue is still publishing the useful series of shilling "Health Primers,"¹⁴ which we have on previous occasions been able to commend to the public. The little treatise on the skin now before us is, at least, as good as its predecessors. It is sensible and useful, and attempts no more than can be done in the space and for lay readers.

Pulmonary hæmorrhage is often the most alarming symptom to the patient, and the most puzzling symptom to the doctor.¹⁵ It may be slight, and yet full of terrible meaning; it may be profuse, and yet less significant of evil. It may be but an item in a case of obvious consumption, or its origin may be sought by the practised physician in vain. We may wonder that a symptom so various in meaning and in mode of occurrence, has not been specially handled before; and that so admirable a subject has been reserved for Dr. Reginald Thompson. From his unrivalled opportunities for observation, and from the thoroughness and logical ability of his mind, Dr. Thompson has been able so to handle the subject, that, for the present, his treatise may be said to fulfil its purpose. In it is concisely and thoroughly told all that at present can well be told on this important matter, unless it be that something should have been said concerning the effect of atmospheric pressure on hæmoptysis. One very conclusive section is devoted to demonstrate that the position in which blood may be detected is not necessarily the place of its effusion—indeed, most probably is not. Dr. Reginald Thompson adequately supports his argument with careful notes of cases taken both during life and after death. He considers the inherited disposition to bleeding, its physical causes and signs, and, of course, its treatment. The book, as a whole, is an excellent one; and, we are glad to add, that not the least of its merits is the modesty and good taste which mark it throughout.

¹⁴ "Health Primers. The Skin and its Troubles." Bogue. 1879.

¹⁵ "On Pulmonary Hæmorrhage." By R. E. Thompson, M.D., &c. Smith, Elder, & Co. 1879.

Dr. Semple is so high an authority on Diphtheria that we cannot leave his work unnoticed, although it be a second edition.¹⁶ It moreover claims some attention on account of certain additions in foot-notes and appendix. At the same time, we do regret that this second edition is so little of a new work, and were the writer less eminent, we should scarcely deem it right to review the edition. The three or four essays bound in one volume should, in our opinion, have been recast into a complete and uniform treatise; had the author done this, and had he taken the pains to elaborate his work rather more, he would have given us a treatise of permanent and even classical value—classical, because no doubt Dr. Semple's views published in 1871 are those which the profession of later years has gradually followed. Dr. Semple says in his preface that he has preferred to re-issue his first two essays as originally published, that this merit of prevision in him might be more manifest. We think Dr. Semple need not have put jealousy of his own reputation in the first place. He might have contented himself with stating this in his preface, and referred the sceptical or inquiring reader to his first edition, which is to be found in all libraries. The general reader is more interested to know what Dr. Semple's views are in 1879, and we do not hesitate to say that the author has shown in his work on this subject a consistent and sagacious intelligence and much industry of observation. We believe the opinions he expresses to be those which are best justified by facts, and we think so highly of his work that we regret that too modest a fear of prolixity or little consciousness of the importance of his task, have prevented his giving to this new volume the substance and development which would have been fully worthy of the matter and of the writer.

This second edition of Dr. Fothergill's work on the Heart is really a new book, and needs therefore an especial notice from us.¹⁷ We had sometimes thought Dr. Fothergill's great powers were perhaps those of arrangement and adornment rather than of deeper insight. His very abilities were a danger to him, his restless energy, his strong memory, his quick perception and assimilation of novelties, his dashing dialectic and ready writing—these taking faculties seemed to fit him rather for the work of to-day than for the work of to-morrow—to set forth and adorn rather than to dig and store. The high estimate we place on Dr. Fothergill's services to the profession, and our admiration of his talents and indomitable energy will save us from the seeming of impertinence in discussing him thus. And our readers will find that this really new treatise is a far more solid contribution to medical literature than the first edition of "The Heart and its Diseases." To enter into any adequate account or discussion of its contents would here be out of place; here we have only to say that this work is in its kind less encyclopædic than descriptive; herein contrasting with the

¹⁶ "Diphtheria." By R. H. Semple, M.D. Second edition. London: Baillière & Co. 1879.

¹⁷ "The Heart and its Diseases." By J. M. Fothergill, M.D. London: Lewis. 1879.

parallel treatise of Walsh. Dr. Fothergill's intention has been rather to present the natural history of Heart Disease as a series of vivid pictures before the imagination of the reader and to carry the doctor as a living actor into the scene. For this purpose he has properly chosen to use academic detail not exhaustively, but as a means to this end, and he has brilliantly succeeded. We believe, as becomes a reviewer, that we could point out faults both of omission and commission, and we would gladly break a lance or two with the author on more than one subject; but it must be at another time, and under other auspices.

The beautiful Atlas of Klein and Noble has been so warmly welcomed by physiologists, that we have only to remind our readers of its appearance in parts, three of which are now before us.¹⁸ These parts describe and illustrate the Blood—Epithelium, Endothelium—Connective Tissue, Adipose Tissue, and Cartilage. If the illustrations vary in merit, it is only from their own high standard. No physiologist can be without this work, which the proved ability and accomplishments of the authors will make indispensable. Nor must we forget to add that their work receives its fullest justice at the hands of the publishers, as will be expected of that firm.

Dr. Fancourt Barnes is the son of one of the greatest masters of modern midwifery, and has therefore been brought up in a sound and learned school. He has now in this little book and elsewhere let it be seen that he can claim a hearing on his own merits.¹⁹ The present writer's knowledge of practical midwifery is far below that of the author of whom he is writing, but he may be permitted to say that in style, arrangement, and matter, the present volume seems to be excellent. From those chapters which enter into the domain of general medicine, we can safely judge of the good qualities of the whole. We have received from Dr. Fancourt Barnes not only a concise, sensible, and complete treatise for the use of the midwife, but a treatise which would be welcome were it less ably done. For we think that it is a waste of power for the family practitioner to attend ordinary physiological labours. The great and irregular demands which many calls of this kind have upon his time, interfere with other duties, and wear out those energies which might be devoted to more difficult work. We anticipate that, as a class of really well-instructed midwives is obtained, these latter will take charge of ordinary childbirths, and will only call in the medical man when unusual or untoward accidents arise. We consider Dr. Fancourt Barnes' book, then, to be very opportune and likely to answer its purpose admirably.

We have so many books about nursery management, and babies' food, and suckling mothers, and so forth, books written on the principle of one for the reader and two for the author, that we took up the

¹⁸ "Atlas of Histology." By E. Klein, M.D., and E. N. Smith, L.R.C.P. Smith, Elder, & Co. 1879.

¹⁹ "Manual for Midwives." By F. Barnes, M.D. London: Smith, Elder, & Co. 1879.

present volume a little languidly.²⁰ But we became quickly more interested, and we find it is really a good and valuable treatise, and one written, as far as we can see, in no advertising spirit, but out of a large practical experience enlightened by excellent common sense, and with a genuine love of the subject. "The death of a child is an unnatural event," says Dr. Farr, but there is no doubt that from the sheer stupidity and ignorance of those about them the poor little things wither like the green herb. So we would earnestly commend this little book to all and any who have children or the care of children. It is plain, practical, and concise, and makes no foolish attempt at "household medicine;" but few mothers could, we think, say that they had read Dr. Lomas's volume without learning many things that they did not know, and seeing many things they thought they knew put in a new and forcible light. We may add that the treatise concerns itself also with the management of young people after the days of infancy.

We recently had to notice with commendation a work of Mr. Thomas on the treatment of diseases of the joints. The present volume,²¹ like the former, is written in a controversial spirit—perhaps too controversially. But it is the work of a shrewd observer and clear-headed thinker, and his strictures upon the inconsistent methods of many of his contemporaries are effective and often well-merited. Mr. Thomas proceeds on the sound principle of watching more closely the natural tendency of these terrible accidents, and urges, as in his former book, a fuller recognition of the curative power of rest.

This volume turns out to be a discourse on Hospitals and on the organisation of Medical Charity.²² It has no table of contents nor any index. It seems to be a diffuse, amiably written, and not wholly unwise book, highly theological in style and method, and not leading to any very definite result. It is dedicated to Lord Cranbrook, and we trust that the author may find in his lordship's approval some compensation for any lack of patronage on the part of the profane vulgar.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

MR. MOREL-FATIO has published a handsome volume, containing several previously unedited documents illustrating the history of Spain in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.¹ His zeal and labour are worthy of a German historian; and we observe that this contribution to Spanish history is published at Heilbronn, though the preface is dated from Paris. A memorial to Philip II. from the Marquis de

²⁰ "Children's Lives; and How to Protect Them. By W. Lomas, M.D. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1879.

²¹ "Treatment of Intestinal Obstructions." By Hugh Owen Thomas. London: Lewis. 1879.

²² "The Value of Human Life." By the Rev. J. Dodd. Oxford: Parker. 1879.

¹ "L'Espagne au XVI. et au XVII. Siècle. Documents Historiques et Littéraires, Publiés et Annotés" par Alfred Morel-Fatio. Heilbronn: Henninger Frères.

Mondéjar, justifying his conduct during his campaign against the Moors in 1569; a collection of letters written to his friends by Don John of Austria, from the Low Countries, in 1576-8; another series written by Antonio Perez, the Minister of Philip II., during his residence in England and France; a description of a journey through Spain by Camillo Borghese; a narrative of the war in the Palatinate in 1620-1; a *Cancionero*, or collection of short poems by various authors; and finally an *Academia burlesca que se hizo en Buen Retiro a la magestad de Philippo Quarto el Grande* in 1637, on the election as king of the Romans of the prince who subsequently became the Emperor Ferdinand III.; these form Mr. Morel-Fatio's collection; and he has made an admirable choice for those who would understand thoroughly the political and literary history of Spain during the period which he illustrates. He has prefixed an excellent introduction (in French), to each document, and has edited all carefully.

Dr. Rogers, who from his title-page would seem to be a more or less active member of every Historical Society in the world, has edited for the Grampian Club the Rental Book, and a portion of an abbreviated Register of the Cistercian Abbey of Cupar-Angus.² The volume is naturally not one that will interest the general reader. It will, however, be found most useful by the student of Scottish local history, and by genealogists. It is produced in a handsome form, and appears to be carefully edited.

Messrs. Longmans have recently published one or two series of short historical sketches, intended for use in schools. They now issue a consecutive set of these sketches relating to England, in one volume.³ Though the various parts of the book are written by different authors the work forms a harmonious and convenient whole. It is well supplied with plans and pedigrees, and will make a good school book.

Mr. Bailey has published a small volume on the "Succession to the English Crown."⁴ There is little room for theory, or laying down of principles, in a matter which is so simple. It may almost be said that the succession has been decided by the national will almost from the earliest times. Mr. Bailey has, however, enumerated the members of the reigning family with a most painstaking fulness and accuracy, and has supplied an abundance of birth and death dates, which are often of great importance. He appends several useful pedigrees, one of which shows (to our surprise at the first blush) the descent of Prince Jerome Napoleon, through his mother, from our King George II.

Mr. Mounsey, who was lately Secretary of Legation in Japan, has

² "Rental Book of the Cistercian Abbey of Cupar-Angus, with the Breviary of the Register." Edited by the Rev. Charles Rogers, LL.D., Fellow of the Royal Historical Society, &c. Vol. I. London: Printed for the Grampian Club.

³ "Epochs of English History." In one Volume. Edited by Rev. M. Creighton, M.A., late Fellow and Tutor of Merton College, Oxford. London: Longmans & Co.

⁴ "The Succession to the English Crown." An Historical Sketch. By Alfred Bailey, of Lincoln's Inn, Esq., Barrister-at-law, M.A., &c. London: Macmillan & Co.

written a short history of recent events in Japan.⁵ After briefly mentioning the abolition of the Shôgunate, and the great share which the Satsuma clan had in that great event, he traces the political conduct of Saigô and the other prominent members of the clan during the ensuing nine years, during which it enjoyed the favour of the Mikado, whom it had done so much to restore. The author then narrates with greater fulness the story of the fruitless rebellion of the Satsuma clan under Saigô in 1877. The book is well written and clear. Most of those who read it will be astonished to find how little they know or remember of events so important and of so recent date.

Mr. Page's biography of Thomas de Quincey⁶ proves that his subject possessed a virtue which is, we believe, rare among autobiographers—viz., that in writing an account of his own earlier years he was singularly accurate and truthful. Mr. Page has written a very excellent narrative of a life that was worthy of being written: a life passed in pain and anxiety, but a life of honour and high principle. As is the case with all good biographies, private letters form an important part of Mr. Page's volumes, and no man ever wrote more charming letters than de Quincey. The editor also gives some chapters of excellent criticism of de Quincey's writings. His work is thoroughly well done, and we have no hesitation in pronouncing this *Life of de Quincey* to be a book of permanent value.

The life of Matthew Davenport Hill, Recorder of Birmingham,⁷ brother of the well-known Sir Rowland Hill, who has just left us, has been written by his daughters. This remarkable man was born in 1792, at Birmingham, where his father, a schoolmaster, enjoyed the intimacy of Priestley. Matthew went to the bar, soon attained a good practice, and was returned to the first reformed Parliament as member for Hull. In earlier life he was already closely connected with the leaders of the Liberal cause, and it need not be said that he remained true to that cause to the last. He lost his seat in the election which followed the accession of Queen Victoria, and never again offered himself for election. In 1839 he was appointed to the Recordership of Birmingham, an office which he held with peculiar satisfaction, and which he elevated by the high rank which he attained in popular esteem. He resigned this office in 1866, only from the fatigues of age. It was in his charges as Recorder that he first ventilated his broad views on the reform of the criminal law, specially in matters of juvenile crime and the reformation of criminals. As Recorder of Birmingham, too, he advocated repression of intoxication by some

⁵ "The Satsuma Rebellion." An Episode of Modern Japanese History. By Augustus H. Mounsey, F.R.G.S., Her Britannic Majesty's Secretary of Legation at Athens; recently Her Britannic Majesty's Secretary of Legation in Japan. With Maps. London: John Murray.

⁶ "Thomas de Quincey; his Life and Writings." With unpublished Correspondence. By H. A. Page, author of 'Memoir of Hawthorne,' &c. Two vols. London: John Hogg & Co.

⁷ "The Recorder of Birmingham." A Memoir of Matthew Davenport Hill. With Selections from his Correspondence. By his daughters Rosamond and Florence Davenport-Hill. London: Macmillan & Co.

adaptation of the Maine Liquor Laws. Of the Permissive Bill he was an ardent supporter. His labours in almost every branch of practical philanthropy were vast, and are too fresh in the public memory to need description here. It is, however, very interesting to read in the pages of the *Misses Hill* of the first steps, as they were made, in the progress of such movements as those of the reformatory system and of co-operation. Matthew Hill lived in intimacy with nearly all the leading intellects of his day, and this fact alone would make his correspondence of great value. More than this, however, he was constantly consulted on great questions of social policy by men who filled much higher positions than his own in the eyes of the world, and his letters show how wise those leaders were in seeking his opinion. This biography is a most attractive one, and his daughters have performed their labour of love with great care and with great success.

The life of Samuel Clark⁸ is one of those memorials which we owe rather to the affection of survivors than to the interest of the life, or to any demand for a history of it. Mr. Clark was a Quaker until his thirtieth year. He was a man of business, being a partner in a publishing house. Having made the acquaintance of F. D. Maurice he joined the Church of England under that excellent man's guidance. He presently went to Oxford, and in 1846, in his thirty-sixth year, he abandoned trade, and took holy orders. He became chaplain and vice-principal of St. Mark's College, and afterwards principal of the Battersea Training College. He died in 1875, aged sixty-five years. When we have said this we have described his outward life. It remains to be added, that he was a man of great culture, and that he possessed a deeply pure and religious character. His widow's book consists entirely of extracts from his letters and journals. It will give great pleasure in religious circles, but will not be read much by the general public.

It has become much a matter of course of late that a biography should appear shortly after the death of any man who is well known, it matters not in what way. The friends of deceased preachers seem to be particularly careful of their memories, and it may be remarked that the obscurer the subject the sooner is it thought necessary to crystallise him for posterity. It was, however, to be expected that a sketch of Charles Mathews⁹ would appear. It has been made by Mr. Dickens in the two handsome volumes before us, and is a clear and interesting portrait. Mathews himself had left important fragments of autobiography, and these the editor has been careful to use. Charles Mathews was born the son of a distinguished actor in 1803. He was sent to the Merchant Taylors' School, and afterwards became a pupil of Pugin the architect. In 1823 he was invited by Lord Blesington, who was his father's friend, to join him in a tour to Italy with

⁸ "Memorials from Journals and Letters of Samuel Clark, M.A., F.R.G.S. Edited by his wife. London: Macmillan & Co.

⁹ "The Life of Charles James Mathews, chiefly Autobiographical. With Selections from his Correspondence and Speeches." Edited by Charles Dickens. Two vols. London: Macmillan & Co.

Lady Blessington and Count d'Orsay. His letters during this journey are very amusing. He afterwards spent a short time in Wales as architect to a mining company. In 1827 he made a second Italian tour, this time with a view of studying his profession. On his return, in 1830, he was appointed a district surveyor in the south of London. In 1835 he succeeded to his father's share (with Yates) in the Adelphi Theatre, and became an actor. For the next twenty years his life was a troubled one. His marriage with the notorious Madame Vestris lost him, in part, the exceptional position which he had held in society. His various theatrical speculations turned out disastrous failures, and in 1856 he had the distinction of experiencing treatment in a debtor's prison which was so harsh that it probably helped to procure an alteration in the law. From that time he renounced managership, for which he was ill-qualified, and confined himself to his profession of actor. He married a second time, with the happiest result, lived twenty prosperous years, during which he acted over almost the entire world, and died in 1878. It is, however, rather in what he was, than what he did, that Mathews interests us. It is needless to discuss here his merits as an artist. It is, however, to be observed, that he was an admirable speaker, and a most amusing letter writer, in both of which respects he often reminds us of Dickens, the father of his present biographer, who has wisely given abundant extracts from his letters and speeches. Mr. Dickens's work is admirably done, and his life of Mathews is one of the most entertaining memoirs we have read of late.

Dr. Fitzpatrick's *Life of Charles Lever*¹⁰ is a book which might have been written by one of the light Irish characters in Lever's own books. It is very amusing, very unmethodical, and occasionally curiously inaccurate. Thus Lever believed (and Dr. Fitzpatrick does not seem to see the absurdity of the belief) that a sullen fellow-student of Lever's at Gottingen, who rejoiced in the name of Marouy, was no other than Napoleon III. Lever's career was not of a nature to command the study or admiration of future generations. He seems, indeed, to have got more luxury and pleasure out of small means than most men can, but Dr. Fitzpatrick does not explain to us how this was done, and his book is merely a gossiping collection of sayings of and about Lever. It is good to while away an idle hour, but this is about as high praise as we can give it.

In striking contrast with the last-noticed book stands Archdeacon Denison's fragment of *Autobiography*.¹¹ Dr. Fitzpatrick's work is a sketchy and vague account of a somewhat superficial man, who managed to amuse himself at all times, in all places. The Archdeacon, on the other hand, is a man who looks on most of the changes around

¹⁰ "The Life of Charles Lever." By W. J. Fitzpatrick, LL.D., M.R.I.A., Professor of History in the Royal Hibernian Academy, J.P., &c. Two Vols. London: Chapman & Hall.

¹¹ "Notes of My Life, 1805-1878." By George Anthony Denison, Vicar of East Brent, 1845; Archdeacon of Taunton, 1851. Third Edition. Oxford: Jas. Parker & Co.

him with such indignation that, but for his kindly and pious disposition, he would be a combatant as truculent as he is constant; and he has written his notes of his own life with severe simplicity. He is a member of a most extraordinarily able family. Of his eight brothers, the eldest became Speaker of the House of Commons; the second, Bishop of Salisbury; a third, Governor of Madras; a fourth, Colonel of the 52nd Regiment; and two others were first-class men, and fellows of Colleges at Oxford. The Archdeacon himself was a fellow of Oriel at a time when that society boasted a very remarkable list of names—Whately, Arnold, Blanco White, Senior, Keble, Newman, R. Wilberforce, R. A. Froude, Hampden, and Dornford. Archdeacon Denison's life has been, we need hardly say, a life of combat. His views of the position of the Church, and on the State's share in elementary education, have been very different to ours, and, indeed, to those of most of his fellow-countrymen; but it is impossible not to admire him as a true man and fighter. The constancy with which he clings to his own opinions stamps him as an ultra-infallibilist, though he does not assign infallibility to the quarter in which Cardinal Manning finds it. To us it seems as if the Archdeacon took the wrong side of every question, excepting those in which only charity is involved; and his perverseness (according to our views) is often almost comic. But Convocation, the Education Department, and if there be any powers with whom he has fought even more pertinaciously, all will agree in loading him with respect. And none will read these honest pages with more interest and pleasure than his adversaries. The "Notes" form a most interesting book, which is worthy of real study.

Anna Jameson, whose life,¹² written by her niece, the late Mrs. Macpherson, has just been published, was born in Dublin in 1794, the daughter of a miniature painter named Murphy. In her childhood the family moved to London, where the father obtained a fair practice, but where his expenses also were heavy. There were soon four daughters round him; and, in her seventeenth year, Anna, the eldest, became governess in the family of the Marquis of Winchester. Shortly afterwards she formed the acquaintance of a young north-country barrister, Robert Jameson, who was destined to be her husband. But the earlier part of their connection was hardly smoother than their later years. They were engaged: the engagement was broken off; and, in 1821, Anna once more became a governess with a family that was travelling in the South of Europe. It was, doubtless, now that she laid the foundation of that deep knowledge and comprehension of art which distinguished her. After a few years passed with this and another family, a reconciliation with Mr. Jameson was effected; and they were married in 1825. The husband had a sort of friend in a book-fancying cobbler, who taught Mrs. Jameson the guitar. This man, having once read part of a Diary which the latter had kept while abroad, proposed and brought about its publication. In 1829 Jameson,

¹² "Memoirs of the Life of Anna Jameson, Author of 'Sacred and Legendary Art,' &c." By her niece Gerardine Macpherson. London: Longmans.

whose prospects at home were not too brilliant, accepted an appointment in Dominica. He went out, arranging that his wife should join him as soon as the prospect was sufficiently bright. Shortly after his departure, his wife enjoyed another continental trip with her father and his patron Sir Gerard Noel; and, on her return, she published her book on the "Characters of Shakspeare's Women." In the following year, 1833, her husband returned, but soon again departed for Canada, where he was to prepare a home for his wife. Literary work was now offered her; and she found herself strong and rich enough to go to Germany alone. She went supplied with several good introductions by Major Noel, a cousin of Lady Byron's, who became her lifelong friend. This gentleman subsequently introduced her to Goethe's family, and a warm friendship sprang up between Anna and the poet's daughter-in-law Ottilie. Her pleasant life abroad was suddenly broken by news of her father's dangerous illness, which recalled her to England. More publishing of books, the care of her father, the beginning of a friendship with Lady Byron, occupy her for a few months, after which she returns to Germany. This visit was ended by pressing requests from her husband that she would join him in America. She sailed in September, 1836, evidently with great reluctance. On landing she met a great disappointment. There was no one at New York to receive her, and she had to wait there some weeks before she received a message from her husband to join him at Toronto. The indifference which such neglect showed sign was only too clearly proved afterwards. After they had passed about a year together, Mr. Jameson settled 300*l.* a year on his wife, and authorised her to live where she chose. Early in 1838 she returned to Europe. She never saw her husband again, although they corresponded for a few years. Some time before his death (in 1854) Jameson asked his wife to release him from the settlement of 300*l.* a year, in order that he might make an investment for her benefit after his death. She consented, but found too late that he had made no attempt at a provision for her. On her return to Europe she spent many years in active literary work, broken pleasantly by travel. She was very happy in her friends, among whom were counted many of the most famous of her contemporaries. In 1851 she received a pension of 100*l.* from the Civil List. Some years after she experienced perhaps the greatest sorrow of her life: her friendship with Lady Byron was abruptly broken off. The cause, and even the date of the breach are not known, but it was such a grief to Mrs. Jameson that it forced from her the cry that it had broken her heart. Were the facts known, they would probably, with many small circumstances that are known, go far to show that the poet's widow was a woman of a very peculiar temper. Mrs. Jameson felt it necessary, in consequence of this separation, to break off her friendship with Lady Byron's cousin, Major Noel and his wife, who had been as brother and sister to her. This she did without sternness, but with firm resolution. She would not even open letters in which they prayed for reconciliation. She lived on a few years, chiefly in Rome, in active work almost to the last, and died in London in 1860. The memoir by her

niece, who has followed her to the tomb, is a modest and agreeable book, impartial, and yet a pattern of the monument which personal gratitude and love should raise.

We come now upon a collection of political biographies. The first is a short life of the late King Victor Emmanuel,¹³ by Mr. G. S. Godkin. The story of that manly career is simply and clearly told, and the author gives us a good idea of the personality of the *Rè Galantuomo*, who, whatever his faults or weaknesses as a man, never allowed them to affect his conduct as King. It is not a little wonderful, considering Victor Emmanuel's character, that he was so free from the error of personal favouritism; it is still more wonderful, when we contemplate the inner part of his nature, that he knew how to carry on so well the war with ecclesiasticism, which is, after all, the glory of his reign. His life was a happy one. Struggle was to him an agreeable condition of existence; and his life was to the end a struggle, ending in victory over his foes, and the conquest of their respect. Mr. Godkin writes as an admirer of the King; but he nowhere lets his enthusiasm overcome his impartiality, and he has given us an excellent sketch.

The next volume before us is a translation, published in America, of a French biography of Monsieur Thiers, written by Monsieur Le Goff,¹⁴ which is still unprinted. It seems to us to be a good book, written in a friendly, but by no means adulatory, tone. The President's political career is traced with a firm and clear hand; and the concluding chapters give us a bright sketch of the manners and sayings of the *man*, who was not less distinguished as a wit than as a statesman or historian. The book is not too long, is well-written and accurate, and only needs an index to make it very useful.

Dr. Busch's much-discussed book¹⁵ on Bismarck, during the war with France, has reached a fourth edition. It consists of notes of Prince Bismarck's daily small-talk—purporting to have been written down at the time by his secretary; and with its more or less authentic revelations, and its outspokenness on the subject of persons high in place and power, it at once assumed a position in Germany similar to that occupied amongst us by the "Greville Memoirs." It is evident that there is a very strong appetite for revelations of thoughts and words of our rulers. Dr. Busch's book is one to which we have strong objection. If it was not authorised by the Prince, the author has committed a vile breach of confidence. If, however, the Prince sanctioned the book, he has once more shown himself a man of very

¹³ "Life of Victor Emmanuel II., First King of Italy." By G. S. Godkin. Two vols. London: Macmillan & Co.

¹⁴ "The Life of Louis Adolphe Thiers." By François Le Goff, Docteur-ès-Lettres. Translated from the unpublished manuscript by Theodore Stanton, A.M. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

¹⁵ "Graf Bismarck und seine Leute während des Kriegs mit Frankreich." Nach Tagesbuchsblättern von Dr. Moritz Busch. 2 Bände. Vierte Auflage. Leipzig: F. W. Grunow.

bad taste, and must have had cause to regret his very plain speech. Thus the remarkable amiability which the man of *Blut und Eisen* has been displaying of late in Vienna is not consistent with the terms in which some of the greatest personages in Austria are spoken of in these volumes. Those parts of the book which relate to the Prince's own personality are less mischievous, and are amusing enough, though not always very dignified. The number of his student duels, his appetite for beefsteaks, his powers of beer-drinking—such details are discussed with a fulness and frankness that we are wont to associate with the sketches of prize-fighters or rowing champions in a "sporting" paper, rather than with the conversation of a statesman who holds a commanding position in Europe. We cannot give an idea of the book by quotations, because it is itself only a collection of quotations from the Prince's daily talk. Dr. Busch's share in the work must be that either of an eaves-dropping flunkey, or of a mere tool. The book has been—and will be—read with interest; its author, however, will gain nothing by it, except the money which it will bring in.

Mr. O'Connor's life of Lord Beaconsfield¹⁶ has one fault in common with Dr. Busch's Bismarck; is a "Life" of a man whose life has not yet been lived. It is, however, free from the other vices of the latter book. It contains no breaches of confidence, as it is based entirely on the published records of the Premier's career. On the other hand, it is so hostile to the statesman whom it professes to describe, that it can hardly be supposed to have been inspired by him, although he has stated, that printed abuse, while it may retard a young untried man is harmless when a man is known, and "if unjust, is in the long run beneficial." Perhaps no living man has had more biographies of him written than Lord Beaconsfield. Mr. O'Connor, in the preface to his own, acknowledges his thanks to no less than five earlier publications of the same kind. Nearly all of these were, we believe, written by political opponents, who were inspired rather by dislike of the statesman than by any admiration of his brilliant and romantic career. For no Englishman has ever risen to the first rank in spite of such difficulties. Almost a foreigner, descended from a race which, at least in his earlier years, was still regarded with great prejudice, without considerable fortune or important connections, in spite of early failure and follies, Disraeli has worked his way to the eminent position he holds by his own unaided exertions. There was no duke to give him a pocket borough immediately after attaining manhood; nor had he the advantage of a brilliant University career, and an origin in the wealthy English middle class, as was the good fortune of his great rival, Mr. Gladstone. There has always been much about him that was uncongenial to ordinary Englishmen. In spite of all, however, he has attained the highest rank a subject can hold, and at the same time

¹⁶ "Lord Beaconsfield." A Biography. By T. P. O'Connor, M.A. London and Belfast. W. Mullin & Son.

has conquered a wide popularity. Where a man can overcome such difficulties in a Conservative country like England, it seems to us absurd to decry his power, or to attribute his success to charlatanry, or toadyism, as Mr. O'Connor and others have done. The present book is written in a spirit of deep hostility, though without malice. We believe it contains no untrue facts, though the interpretation of the facts is apt to be of the severest kind. We cannot commend the book; it will probably be much sold and used at the next general election.

BELLES LETTRES.

"IT is by our worst books that we make most money," said Goethe to Schiller. Whether this is the case in England we cannot say. But one thing is certain that an author often attracts far more notice by his inferior books than by his higher ones. This is Mr. James's case. His "*Roderick Hudson*"¹ has attracted far more attention than some of his better works. Of course it is clever, and when compared with the ordinary run of novels, wonderfully clever. But just as Mr. James describes one of his characters, Rowland Mallett, as "a man of genius, half-finished," so would we describe "*Roderick Hudson*" as a book of genius, half-finished. Every page bears testimony to its extreme cleverness. Thus Mrs. Mallett, a Dutch lady, is hit off by her "speaking English with a formidable accent," and Captain Mallett is neatly described as an eccentric man who desired "the Town Library to be opened on Sundays, though, as he never entered it on week-days, it was easy to turn the proposition into ridicule." So, too, Hudson, the young provincial sculptor, is brought before us by wearing "a ring altogether too splendid to be valuable." But we expect something more than cleverness from Mr. James, and we do not in this book, at least, get that something so often as we should. The best portions of the story are those which refer to Italy. These, however, will probably be the very portions for which the ordinary Mudie-reader will care least.

"His Excellency the Ambassador Extraordinary"² is a most difficult tale to review. There is a wild kind of genius about it, to which harsher critics than ourselves might give an uncomplimentary name. The descriptive scenes are the best. The conversations, however, will bear an immense deal of pruning down. The writer should remember that novel readers do not want long disquisitions about things in general, however brilliant the setting may be, but something which

¹ "*Roderick Hudson*." By Henry James, jun. London: Macmillan & Co. 1879.

² "*His Excellency the Ambassador Extraordinary*." London: Richard Bentley & Son. 1879.

contributes to the interest of the tale, and advances the action of the plot. The writer appears to know something of the pitfalls of modern life, of the ways in which money is wasted, and lives rendered miserable, but these things should be made subordinate to the main incidents. As the story stands, with its various disquisitions, it is most difficult to disentangle the plot, and to see the relations of the principal characters one to the other. Upon His Excellency the writer has evidently bestowed much pains, but the effect of so much gorgeousness is rather bewildering.

"The Lady of Oakmere"³ is a pure Mudie-novel of which many hundreds have been written, and many more hundreds will be. This is the sort of thing which we have read over and over again with every possible variation: "There was a frightful thunderstorm that night, and two giant oaks in the park were struck by lightning. A riderless horse was found careering wildly about, the fishing-punt was observed in the centre of the mere bottom upwards, and Sir Neville Beverley was never seen by mortal eye again." We think we need not say anything further.

We have lately had a run upon translations of German novels. We now have a translation of a Spanish tale.⁴ In ease and grace, and, in short, in all the essentials of a novel, it is most decidedly superior to its German rivals. The story, however, is painful, and the hero, an Englishman, is an unmitigated blackguard. These defects probably would not appear so great to Spanish as to English readers, because many of the former at least would be willing enough to believe that baseness was consistent with the profession of Protestantism, especially such as the hero professes. It is a pity that the story is spoiled by this defect, for the writer shows some of the best characteristics of our own best writers, a keen eye for character, no less than for customs and manners, and a happy and vigorous power of description, especially of natural scenery and natural objects, extending to a most minute observation of details. It is this minute observation which gives one of the principal charms to the book. There is an endless variety of scenes, closely connected with each other. We should have liked particularly to have quoted some passages from the shipwreck scene in the first volume, to have shown how artistically it is done, and how natural is the conversation of the bystanders. Space, however, fails us. Some, too, of the social scenes are also admirably worked up. One of the best characters is the Bishop, from whom Protestants may learn much. To those who wish to gain an insight into Spanish life and Spanish sentiment we can strongly recommend the book.

"Thira"⁵ is a romance written fifty years ago, dealing with that most

³ "The Lady of Oakmere; or, Lost Lives." By Charles Durant, Author of "Wynyard of High Wynyard." London: Chapman & Hall. 1879.

⁴ "Gloria." A Novel. From the Spanish. By Perez Galdós. Translated N. Wetherell. London: Remington & Co. 1879.

⁵ "Thira." A Prose Epic. London: The Royal Exchange Office. 1879.

picturesque period of our history, the Norman Conquest. We are afraid that the historical romance has gone out of favour, and we doubt whether just now a second Sir Walter Scott would obtain a hearing. We can certainly, however, say that the scenes in "Thira" are most decidedly stirring, and that the author has arranged his incidents with dramatic effect, and has evidently taken great pains with the whole subject.

"Lancashire Memories"⁶ is a volume of stories so called because the scenes are principally laid in that county. Miss Potter's style is simple, and to a certain extent effective. She evidently not merely loves Lancashire, but clearly sees in what its real natural beauties consist. Moreover, she has a quick eye for character, at least in its superficial aspects, and catches those little foibles and weaknesses which are to be found in the best. Her satire, however, is without any bitterness. Her first story, "Riverton," perhaps, best illustrates her love of natural scenery, and her "Dicksons with the long S" her humour. In the last tale she asks, "What constitutes gentility?" We need not say that no answer is given. "What is Truth?" and "What is Gentility?" are alike insoluble problems. The Dicksons undertake to answer the question. They come daily into collision with common Dicksons, vulgar Dixons, and even Dickensons, who are shoemakers and carpenters, and naturally wish to mark themselves off from such wretches. How they do it the reader must find out for himself. We will merely add that Miss Potter's Dicksons do not adopt Thackeray's plan of "double-barrelling their name," but a very much simpler device. "Aunt Dorcas" shows in another direction the writer's talent for seizing minute points of character. Miss Potter should, however, remember that if she wishes to make any mark in literature she must write something far more substantial than such mere outlines. Sketches are well enough in magazines, which are taken up only to while away a few idle moments. We cannot say of sketches as Aunt Dorcas's old author does of strawberries,—"*Certes, God Almighty might have made a better berry than a strawberry, but certes, God Almighty never did.*" We think that if Miss Potter would give herself the trouble she might write a child's story-book far above the average of such productions.

A far abler collection of tales, however, than Miss Potter's is Miss Blackburne's "Bunch of Shamrocks."⁷ Here we get finer drawing, and a deeper insight into the motives of action. It is a pity that so many of the tales should be pitched in rather a morbid strain, but this is, we suppose, one side of the Irish character. Here and there, however, the sadness is relieved by gleams of genuine humour. Take, for instance, the following conversation from "The Priest's Boy:—

⁶ "Lancashire Memories." By Louisa Potter. London: Macmillan & Co. 1879.

⁷ "A Bunch of Shamrocks." Being a Collection of Irish Tales and Skotches. By E. Owens Blackburne. Author of "Illustrious Irishwomen," "Molly Carew," &c. &c. London: Newman & Co. 1879.

"Brian, acushla, what's a mermaid?" "A lovely colleen dhas," sez he, "for all the world like Miss Grace, up at the big house, wid no clothes on but her hair, an' one end av her is a fish." "Throth an' faith!" sez I, "they must be very ondacint, an' not fit for an honest boy to be spakin' to! Did yeh ever see wan?" "No," sez he, "but I'm sartin Miss Grace is like wan." "Bedad, Brian," sez I, for I didn't like him to be spakin that-a-way av Miss Grace; "ye better not let any wan hear yeh say it." "Why, Mrs. Moran, I didn't mane offence; it was poethry I was talkin'," sez he. "Well," sez I, "I don't purtend to be more larned than nor me aignals, but if that's poethry, all I can say is, that it's a powerful ondacint way to spake of a woman." (pp. 19, 20).

This passage, it should be added, does not stand alone.

"The Cure of Souls"⁸ is a well-meaning book, and is fairly interesting. The writer evidently knows provincial English life, but after "George Eliot" his sketches appear thin. Perhaps the best point in the book is the way in which the Vicar proposes. To invent, at this period of novel-writing, a new method of proposal most certainly requires genius, but this is what the author has done.

"Between the Lights"⁹ is another well-intentioned novel, but the author's power is weaker. Here is the way in which he describes, or rather does not describe, a railway accident:—"The scene that followed was indescribable, and must ever leave its mournful memories on the survivors who beheld it." Perhaps the good old-fashioned plan of leaving it all to the reader's imagination is better still.

"Sidonie"¹⁰ is one of those cleverish fashionable novels which are regularly turned out each quarter. There is nothing whatever in them, but they are all about fashionable society and great people, and so little people like to read them. They are machine-made, and one is precisely like the other, as all machine-made work is. They generally contain faint echoes from "Ouida" and the late Mr. Laurence. "Sidonie" is no exception. Those who wish to know all about great people written in a light style may turn to its pages, but nobody else.

"The Swintons of Warndale"¹¹ is equally clever, and free from the defects of "Sidonie." It is less machine-made, and we hear fewer echoes. Some of the descriptions, especially those of country life, are very freshly drawn. "The Unequal Match"¹² may also be recommended for a certain freshness and vigour. The author's weak point, as with most novelists, is character drawing. We are at an utter loss to account for the popularity of M. Belot's "A Parisian Sultana."¹³ If any one

⁸ "The Cure of Souls." By J. MacLaren Cobban. London: Chatto & Windus. 1879.

⁹ "Between the Lights." By Lisette Earle. London: Remington & Co. 1879.

¹⁰ "Sidonie." A Novel. By Mrs. Compton Reade. Author of "Rose and Rue." London: Chapman & Hall. 1879.

¹¹ "The Swintons of Warndale." By J. Crawford Scott. London: Chapman & Hall. 1879.

¹² "The Unequal Match; or, Is He the Heir." By Vere Grey. London: Chapman & Hall. 1879.

¹³ "A Parisian Sultana." Translated from Adolphe Belot. By H. M. Dunstan. London: Remington & Co. 1879.

wishes to study the recent discoveries in Africa they had far better read Stanley or Livingstone, and so avoid much which appears to us simply repulsive in M. Belot's tale. Dr. Brown's story¹⁴ is spoilt by its tendency to wordiness, or else it is not without clever points.

There are more poets than usual this quarter and less poetry. H. W. is, we suppose, quite young. In a "Mediæval Scribe"¹⁵ he shows facility for rhyming and a semi-poetical turn for looking at things from the monk's point of view. Keats has in one or two places shown us how such subjects should be treated. H. W., however, wants the glow and richness of language to make even the outward points of his theme attractive. A sense of humour might have restrained him from writing, when treating the solemnest subject, such lines as:—

"Dead they lie with palms and nimbi,
Lie beneath the altar floor;
What if light to see be dim by?
They have walked in it before."

No doubt the rhyme of "nimbi" and "dim by" is highly ingenious, but it is just about as much poetry as the couplet—

"There was a cassowary upon the plains of Timbuctoo,
He swallowed down a missionary, his wife and hymn-book too."

"The World Under Glass,"¹⁶ is one of the most foolish little books which we have for some time seen. When we meet such works we are tempted to ask, Have the writers no friends to warn them that they are making themselves ridiculous? The writer means well enough, but he does not possess one single gift which constitutes a poet.

"Poems of the Future"¹⁷ are not so bad as "The World Under Glass." The greater part, however, of the book, more especially the reflective portions, would have been much better in prose. The lighter pieces are unfortunately wanting in delicacy of touch. "Only a Coquette," for instance, is a subject, which, if the writer had possessed any true power of insight into character and any real analysis of feeling, might have been made most effective. But it is hopeless to expect much from a writer who tells us, "I stormed her in one fervid, seething kiss." He certainly deserves all that he gets. On the whole, the more serious pieces are the best. We think, however, that the author would do better to put his thoughts into the shape of essays.

Bohemia¹⁸ is a pleasant enough country to pass through, but not to live in. We could apply to Mr. Welles his own lines,—

¹⁴ "The Unjust Steward." By Herbert Brown, LL.D. London: Chapman & Hall. 1879.

¹⁵ A Mediæval Scribe, and other Poems." By H. W. Paisley: J. & R. Farlane. London: Houlston & Sons. 1879.

¹⁶ "The World Under Glass." By Frederick Griffin. Author of "The Destiny of Man," "The Storm King," and other Poems. London: Trübner & Co. 1879.

¹⁷ "Poems of the Future." By Victor M. Vita. Vol. I. London: Arthur H. Moxon. 1879.

¹⁸ "Bohème." By Charles Stuart Welles. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1878.

“ And he who counts the many stones
Which form the bridge's wall,
May never reach the goolly fields,
Or pass the floods at all.”

If, however, he still prefers to remain in Bohemia we must warn him that he has much to learn. If he wishes to write humour with lyrical sweetness and fancy, we should advise him above all others to study our own clerical Bohemian, Herrick. But it is best to leave that pleasant land of lotus-eating as soon as possible.

The characteristics of Mr. Aubury de Vere's,¹⁹ poetry are so well-known that we need not dwell upon them. We cannot think that he will ever be popular except with a limited circle. He chooses themes from which the leaders of modern thought are turning away their thoughts. He will, however, always be prized by those who love poetry for its own sake. His present volume reveals all his former characteristics—a quiet rhythmic flow, a gentle pensiveness, a love for the past, and above all for natural scenery. In each of the stories he has given a true local colouring, which adds very much to the general effect. Thus in the poem of “Ceadmon” Mr. Aubury de Vere carefully paints for us the scenery of the Valley of the Esk, and the wild Yorkshire sea-coast. Again, in “Bede's Lost Mary,” we have a powerful description of Northumberland, and so on through each of the poems. Here, for instance, is a pretty bit from “King Ethelbert of Kent and Saint Augustine”—

“ While thus they held discourse, there hove in sight,
Seen 'twixt a great beech silky yet with spring,
And pine broad-crested, round whose head old storms
Had wov'n a garland of his own green boughs,
A bark both fair and large.”

Again, here is another description from the “Consecration of Westminster Abbey”—

“ There stood a flowering thorn,—adown it twirled
In zigzag curves, erratic here and there,
Long lines of milky bloom, like ribs of foam
Furrowing the green back of some huge sea-wave
Refluent from cliffs.”

These passages may not perhaps show the very highest powers of imagination, but they are most certainly marked by close observation and genuine feeling.

Hallam used to say that “Lycidas” was a good test whether a person liked poetry. We would rather say Barnes's poems.²⁰ If a person will not take the trouble to master the difficulty of the dialect for the sake of the poetry, his love for poetry is not very deep. The general ignorance concerning our dialects which exists amongst the edu-

¹⁹ “Legends of the Saxon Saints.” By Aubury de Vere. London: C. Kegan Paul. 1879.

²⁰ “Poems of Rural Life.” In the Dorset Dialect. By William Barnes. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1879.

cated classes is simply disgraceful. Boys at school are made to learn Greek dialects, but we think it too much trouble to take the slightest interest in the living dialects of our own tongue. But the time, however, is fast approaching, thanks to railroads and school-boards, when we shall not be able to take any trouble about them, for they will no longer exist. Just as Burns was the last singer in Scotch, so, too, will Barnes be the last singer in the Wessex dialect; Barnes's place, too, is a very high one, perhaps the highest among those who may be called local poets singing in a provincial dialect. He is as popular in Dorsetshire as Waugh is in Lancashire, or Miss Blamire in Cumberland. To do the Dorsetshire people of all classes justice they have always recognised, apart from the dialect, the merits of Barnes's poetry, and have been proud of their poet. For once the prophet has had honour, if not in his own country, at least in his own county and in his own lifetime. The present work contains, we believe, all Barnes's poems, which hitherto have been very difficult to procure, being scattered in three different collections, two of which have long since been out of print. To West-country people we have no need to recommend poems which recommend themselves for their truthful sketches of the rustics, their fidelity to the natural scenery of the district, and their genuine pathos. It is rather to the people of the Midland and Northern counties that we would say, see what a true singer there is in the West singing still in the old dialect of the district.

"Stella"²¹ is an American lady, and in America "Sappho" has received more honour than in our own land. Those who have not read Professor Higginson's excellent criticism, in which he more than holds his ground against our own critics, upon Sappho's moral character, are not in fit position to form any true judgment in the controversy. The Essay was republished a few years ago in "The Atlantic Essays," one of the most scholarly books which we have received from America. We cannot, however, give Stella's poem the same high praise we can give Professor Higginson's essay. Much less can we give it the praise which the American critics have bestowed. To tell the truth, the blank verse appears to us rather bald and the lyrics without any real lyrical power—so many persons unfortunately mistake what we may call luxuriousness of rhyme for sweetness. Even Swinburne himself falls into this mistake. Here, however, is a vigorous bit of blank verse descriptive of a shipwreck, spoken by Alcaeus:—

"Then from Olympus Jove
Wrapt the blue heaven in intermittent flame,
And rocked the ocean like an infant-cradle,
Shook from the yards the pallid mariners ;

* * * * *

A little while the staunch ship braved the tempest,
Parried its blows like skilful duellist ;

²¹ "Sappho." A Tragedy. In Five Acts. By Stella. London: Trübner & Co. 1879.

Then staggered,
And with a wail went down."

This is certainly powerful. Probably one or two more equally fine passages might be found, but the effect of the whole is rather heavy. The tragedy would, we think, be very much improved if somewhat shortened.

Some day the critic of the future will probably employ himself in estimating the influence of Tennyson upon his contemporaries. In nothing, however, is his power so conspicuous as in the way in which he has shaped the higher class of blank verse. The following lines from "Lily Neil"²² might have been written by the author of "Enoch Arden":—

"There never was a house so much the home
Of sweet content as Alston's at the Grange.
Still young he seemed, although his sixtieth spring
Had gone, and so unburdened with his years,
He roamed about, in many things a boy."

Here not merely the outward framework of Tennysonian simplicity is reproduced, but the very structure, cadences, and pauses of the blank verse. Probably the writer has done so unknowingly. But it is a poet's business to act as his own critic. When Keats in writing "Hyperion" found that he was verging perilously near to the style of "Paradise Lost," he resolutely closed his Milton. This is the advice which we would give to Mr. Wingate and the thousand-and-one imitators of Tennyson—close "The Idyls of the King," and turn to the Elizabethan dramatists, to Shakspeare's later plays, to Marlowe, and even rugged Ben Jonson. In this way only can you hope to escape from the trammels which bind you, and which must always prevent you from taking any high position in art. The imitator stands self-condemned.

"April to August"²³ is a series of poems written from youth to middle life. If there is nothing in it to condemn there is nothing to particularly praise. The prettiest pieces are some of the short lyrics, such as "The Lake and the Sky" (p. 23) which is simple and quaint.

In Mr. Salaman's "Ivan's Love Quest"²⁴ we fancy that we discover more traces of individuality than are found in most first volumes of poetry. One thing, however, is certain, that his ear is very correct, and that he manages a number of new metres with great skill and ease. It should be remembered that this question of metres is daily forcing itself into greater prominence. Many probably of these new metres are old ones slightly disguised, and might all, perhaps, be found with slight variations in "The Songs of the Dramatists," which, by the way, might

²² "Lily Neil." A Poem. By David Wingate. Author of "Annie Weir, and other Poems." Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood & Sons. 1879.

²³ "April to August." By Edward Grosvenor. London: T. H. Roberts & Co. 1879.

²⁴ "Ivan's Love Quest," and other Poems. By Malcom Charles Salaman. London: Remington & Co. 1879.

with great advantage be considerably enlarged. Still there is the fact that these experiments in metre are daily attracting more attention, and have certainly found no unskilful exponent in Mr. Salaman. What his verse wants is more substance.

No nobler subject for an epic could have been chosen than that which Mr. Edwin Arnold has taken.²⁵ But such a subject requires, and no one can feel it more than Mr. Arnold, the labour and consecration of a lifetime rather than the leisure hours of a busy man. The great fault which we have to bring against the poem as a poem is that it is too much of an echo. Take, for instance, the following passage:—

“So they rode
Into a land of wells and gardens, where
All up and down the rich red loam, the steers
Strained their strong shoulders in the creaking yoke
Dragging the ploughs; the fat soil rose and rolled
In smooth dark waves back from the plough.”

What is all this but Tennyson transplanted from England to India? What, again, is the following but, we might almost say, “The Gardener’s Daughter” reproduced with a slight variation in another climate:—

“And all the jungle laughed with nesting songs,
And all the thickets rustled with small life
Of lizard, bee, beetle, and creeping things
Pleased at the spring-time. In the mango-sprays
The sunbirds flashed; alone at his green forge
Toiled the loud coppersmith; bee-caters hawked
Chasing the purple butterflies.”

We might multiply this quotation many times over. Another fault strikes us: Mr. Arnold is rather too obvious, and his comparisons and metaphors are a little cheap and worn. We too often feel as we do with regard to the ordinary leading-article writer that it is very good of him to stop, as he might have gone on for ever. We too often come to a passage of which we may say as the man did when introduced to Mr. Smith, we fancy that we have heard that name before. In a word, Mr. Arnold does not take hold of us by any originality of power. We are pleased with his verse, rather than satisfied. The most powerful part, in our opinion, is the conclusion of the eighth book, where Buddha speaks before the king. Here is a stanza on the text that “Speech is silver, silence is golden”:—

“Oh! Anītaya! measure not with words
Th’ Immeasurable; nor sink the string of thought
Into the Fathomless. Who asks, doth err,
Who answers, errs. Say nought.”

Here is a stanza which might have been carved under the statue of Isis:—

²⁵ “The Light of Asia; or, The Great Renunciation. Being the Life and Teaching of Gautama.” By Edwin Arnold, M.A., F.R.G.S., &c. &c. London: Trübner & Co. 1879.

“ Shall any gazer see with mortal eyes,
Or any searcher know by mortal mind,
Veil after veil will lift,—but there must be
Veil upon veil behind.”

Here, too, is a happy expansion of the text Πάρτα ρῆι :—

“ Stars sweep and question not. This is enough
That life and death and joy and woe abide ;
And cause and sequence, and the course of time
And Being's ceaseless tide,
Which, ever-changing, runs, linked like a river
By ripples following ripples, fast or slow—
The same, yet not the same—from far-off fountain
To where its waters flow,
Into the seas. There steaming to the sun,
Give the lost wavelets back in cloudy fleece
To tickle down the hills, and glide again ;
Having no pause nor peace.”

Here again is a happy rendering of the Stoic doctrine, “ Nemo læditur nisi à se ipso ” :—

“ Nought from the helpless gods by gift and hymn,
Nor bribe with blood, nor feed with fruit and cakes ;
Within yourselves deliverance must be sought,
Each man his prison makes.”

These quotations will show that Mr. Arnold's work is no ordinary one. The subjects to which he addresses himself are fraught with paramount interest. Each age solves “ the painful riddle of the earth ” in its own fashion. Buddha and Darwin are far enough apart, but it is by the light of Darwin that Mr. Arnold's poem can only be truly interpreted, so as to be of use to us. ‘ Ο κόσμος σκηνή, ὁ βίος παράδος, is the true moral of both Buddha and Darwin.

“ Coriolanus ”²⁶ from various causes seems to be attracting considerable attention at the present moment. Mr. Watkiss Lloyd has been publishing in our contemporary, *The Athenæum*, a series of learned and acute emendations on the text, and we believe that Mr. Irving contemplates its production on the stage during the present season. Dr. Aldis Wright's edition appears most opportunely. The play itself belongs unquestionably to Shakspeare's later period, his “ third period,” in Mr. Furnival's scheme. It presents far fewer poetical beauties, far fewer quotable passages, than the play to which it is so nearly linked, “ Antony and Cleopatra.” Dr. Wright does not at all exaggerate when he says, “ The sentences are frequently laboured and involved, as if the thought pressed too rapidly upon the words to find a clear expression.” We would ourselves go much further, and say that “ Coriolanus,” like some of the other later plays, even betrayed signs of hastiness.

²⁶ “ Shakspeare. Select Plays (Clarendon Press Series). Coriolanus.” Edited by William Aldis Wright, M.A., LL.D., Oxford : Clarendon Press. 1879.

Thought there is in abundance, in superabundance, but the form, that which above all things shows the poet's loving care for his subject, that in which Shakspeare above all other men is at his best so strong, is in places woefully wanting. Dr. Wright, following Bathurst and Professor Ingram, goes on to point out the great number of "light endings" and "weak endings" which occur in the play. How far these endings were intentional, so as, if we may use the expression, to mass the sentences together for the actor's delivery, how far they were the mere mannerisms, or, as some would put it, the mere carelessness of Shakspeare's later style, is a very large question. There can, we think, from the artistic point of view, be no question as to the many advantages which may be derived from both "weak endings" and "light endings," but they require very delicate handling. In Shakspeare's later plays the ear is the only test for the rhythm. Mr. Furnival very rightly calls Volunmia's celebrated speech "beautiful rhythmic prose." We may seem to some to be going too far when we say that in this speech, as in many others, the eye should not be allowed even to rest on the length of the line, which is a mere concession to usage, but that the ear alone should read, making its own pauses and stops. Such blank verse as this is precisely the reverse of prose cut up into inches by the printer, as is the case with most modern blank verse. Here is the art which conceals art, and which the greatest poet only reaches at the last, when his ear has attained perfect mastery of sound. The rest of Dr. Wright's excellent preface is taken up with a most interesting comparison of the original narrative in Plutarch with the play itself. With regard to the question whether the play had any political significance, Dr. Wright is of opinion that it had none, and remarks that it is well for us to sometimes remember the Spanish proverb, and not search for five legs on a cat. Perhaps Shakspeare did not intend to write a political pamphlet, but "Coriolanus" certainly in some passages reads like one. We now come to the notes. Dr. Wright here more than maintains the high standard of learning and critical judgment which have always distinguished this series of plays. We cannot go into the vexed questions of the various readings, and can merely say that, on the whole, we think that Dr. Wright's text is the best and soundest which at present exists. We can also do no more than refer to the notes. If any one, however, wishes to know how notes to Shakspeare should be written, let him turn to those upon "soule" (p. 229), "full of vent" (p. 230), "end" (p. 253), "cockle" (p. 192), "bulk" (p. 168), and "bissom" (p. 160). Those only who have themselves laboured at the same task can fully appreciate Dr. Wright's learning, critical judgment, and, above all, candour.

Mr. Paton proceeds with unflagging industry at his task of reprinting the First Folio of Shakspeare.²⁷ His theory, if we rightly understand

²⁷ "The Life of Timon of Athens. According to the First Folio." With Tables showing the Number of Emphasis Capitals Lost and Gained by each of Shakspeare's Plays, under each of the Second, Third, and Fourth Folios, &c. &c. By Allan Park Paton. Edinburgh: Edmonston & Co. 1879.

him, is that the capital letters, so plentifully used in that edition, bear a particular meaning and value. The theory may have some truth, but not all the truth which Mr. Paton ascribes to it. Discoverers are apt to see too much in their discoveries. Before we can give any opinion as to the real value of Mr. Paton's theory, especially as a practical guide, we should like to have an analysis made by him or somebody else of the capital letters employed in contemporary works and in subsequent editions of those works. Until this is fairly and fully done we have no facts to go by, or from which to generalise. At present we are working in the dark. The public, which is always uncritical, will probably put very much more faith in Mr. Paton's ingenious argument than we possibly can do. As far as our own experience goes with works contemporary with the First Folio, every printer spelt and used capitals as it seemed good in his own eyes. A larger knowledge, however, than ours might reveal quite a different state of things, and show that the printers of that date followed some general system, and were governed by some general law. But until that larger knowledge arrives we must suspend our judgment as to the value of what Mr. Paton calls the "Emphasis Capitals" of the First Folio. In the meantime we readily admit that Mr. Paton has by their help cleared up one or two difficulties. Again, he thinks that Shakspeare's use of capitals in his manuscript was the means of sometimes misleading the printers of the First Folio. Thus we have in that edition—

" That common chanches, Common men could bear,"

instead of—

" That common chanches Common men could bear."

Mr. Paton thinks that the capital letter given to "Common" made the printer imagine that it was the beginning of a new sentence. Once more, to take another instance. In the First Folio we find—

" I have seen thee Stern, and thou hast oft beheld
Heart-hardening spectacles. Tell these sad women."

instead of—

" I have seen thee Stern, and thou hast oft beheld,
Heart-hardening spectacles, Tell these sad women."

Here Mr. Paton thinks that the capital letter to "Tell" made the printer think it was the beginning of another sentence. These conjectures are certainly most ingenious. Whether the mistakes would bear another explanation is another matter. In both cases, however, Mr. Paton carries out Dr. Ingloby's wise rule that in explaining a difficulty in Shakspeare we should also try to explain how it arose. But Mr. Paton aims at a great deal more than explaining mere textual corruptions. From the comparative tables which he has drawn up of the capitals in the first four folios of Shakspeare, and which, by the way, must have cost him an immense amount of labour, he gathers conclusions which, could they be established, would be of the very greatest interest. By this means Mr. Paton discovers

that Shakspeare bestowed his greatest care upon the English Histories, but that something special befell the manuscript of "King John." He thinks, too, that the manuscripts of the three Roman plays, "Romeo and Juliet," "Timon of Athens," "Macbeth," "Hamlet," "Lear," "Othello," and "Cymbeline" received especial attention from Shakspeare's own hand in the way of correction for the press. We cannot, however, follow Mr. Paton any further in his theories and conclusions. We decidedly think that they call for more attention than they have at present received from Shakspearian critics. Perhaps it would not be time altogether lost if a committee of the new Shakspeare Society should take the subject in hand and thoroughly investigate its bearings.

"The Ethics of George Eliot's Works"²⁸ is a posthumous work, and deserves on that account a certain amount of consideration. The author died a few days after he had, in a state of extreme weakness, dictated the concluding paragraphs to his daughter. It is a well-intentioned little book, but, like so many books of the same class, it totally ignores all other schools but its own. Carlyle, Ruskin, and Tennyson are, in different degrees, the heroes of such writers. Again, like all other books of the same class, the author appears to have no knowledge of any of the writings of "George Eliot" except those which have appeared under that name. He is apparently ignorant of the character of her translations, and passes by in silence all the remarkable Essays which she is known to have written. Had he studied these, his views would probably have undergone considerable modification. It is not for us, at this time and place, to enter into a consideration of George Eliot's moral creed. On the other hand, the book will decidedly do a very great deal of good. It will form an intelligent guide to those thousands of readers who only read George Eliot for the sake of being amused. The literary criticisms, too, are generally intelligent and just. The best analysis, perhaps, is that of "Adam Bede." Sufficient justice is hardly done to "Silas Marner," one of the most artistic tales in our language. "Romola," we are glad to see, receives the treatment which is its due. It stands on such a much higher level than "Silas Marner" that it will probably never become popular in our time. Years hence future critics will take the measure of this generation by the fact that vulgar sensation novels ran into edition after edition, whilst "Romola" was actually a drug in the market. Perhaps the author rather overrates "The Spanish Gipsy" as a poem. George Eliot's verse, magnificent as it is in places, lacks, perhaps, that undefinable beauty of the very highest poetry. In conclusion, we can most heartily recommend this interesting little work to all readers and students of George Eliot.

Sir Lewis Pelly's "Miracle Play"²⁹ requires a specialist. We need,

²⁸ "The Ethics of George Eliot's Works." By the late John Crombie Brown. William Blackwood & Sons: Edinburgh and London. 1879.

²⁹ "The Miracle Play of Husain and Husain." Collected from Oral Tradition. By Colonel Sir Lewis Pelly, K.C.B., K.S.I. Revised by Arthur N. Wollaston. London: William Allen & Co. 1879.

however, do no more than call attention to its publication, as its value is sure to be at once recognised. Mr. Walter Besant gives us "Rabelais"³⁰ as his contribution to "Foreign Classics for English Readers," Mr. Scoones one more translation of "Faust,"³¹ and Mr. Wicksteed six sermons on "Dante."³² These three last books are useful, more especially the last, whilst the second is really poetical.

MISCELLANEA.

WHATEVER interest Mr. Mathews' "Oratory and Orators" may possess, is due to its subject rather than to its author.¹ We may take the book up and glance through it with considerable pleasure, for the names we encounter on every page recall the glories of human eloquence and fill our minds with delightful images. It is impossible to see the name of Cicero without thinking of some one or other of those impassioned utterances which are the chiefest ornament of the Latin tongue, without dwelling affectionately on some passage whose musical cadences would in themselves rejoice the ear even if they had no meaning to the hearer, as the Virgilian hexameters soothed the sick hours of Henri Murger, delighting with the music of their flow the ear that could not take in their purpose. The very names of Demosthenes, of Fox,—

"On whose burning tongue, truth, peace, and freedom hung,"—

of Burke, the literary beauty of whose orations is not to be surpassed in the whole range of ancient or modern eloquence; of the Pitts, mighty son and mighty father; of Grattan, and Erskine, and O'Connell, who could show so well

"What spells of infinite choice
To rouse or lull, has the sweet human voice;"

the very names of these men are so august, so impressive, that, lost in the considerations they conjure up, we forget to be critical of him who conjures with them. In the present case it is perhaps better that we should forget to be critical. It is an ungrateful task to find fault with an author whose book has given us some pleasure, and there really is not much to find fault with in the work. It is rather the lack of anything particular to praise which embarrasses us. The author's observations

³⁰ "Rabelais." By Walter Besant, B.A. London and Edinburgh: William Blackwood & Sons. 1879.

³¹ "Faust." A Tragedy by Goethe. Translated into English verse. By William Dalton Scoones, B.A. London: Trübner & Co. 1879.

³² "Dante." Six Sermons. By Philip H. Wicksteed. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1879.

¹ "Oratory and Orators." By William Mathews. London: Hamilton, Adams & Co. 1879.

are commonplace, his examples trite, and his opinions hackneyed; but he is readable, and his purpose is well-meaning, merits both not to be despised. He aims at affording aid and example to the would-be orator; but for this purpose the book will not be very useful. It is not an instructive manual like Serjeant Cox's book on speaking, nor is it anything approaching to an historical consideration of oratory, nor is it of much value as a treasure-house of eloquent speech. It is a series of rather rambling papers upon the importance of oratory and the merits of particular orators, having no special attractions of style or information but which may be used to some advantage in conjunction with other works. The only special feature of the book is the consideration it affords to American orators who are perhaps scarcely sufficiently appreciated on this edge of the Atlantic. If Mr. Mathews' book is not particularly good, however, a better book on the same lines might be made exceedingly valuable if it succeeded in stimulating attention to the importance of the oratorical art which has for the hour fallen into such neglect. No one can help noticing with regret the dearth of anything approaching to eloquence in the Houses of Parliament. There is a lamentable lack of imagination, of grace of diction, of beauty of expression, of all in fact that makes speech appear most worthy, in the debates of the House of Commons. They sink day by day nearer and nearer to the level of mere business conversations, where the sole aim is to say as much as possible in as short a time, or sometimes, as evidenced in the tactics of obstruction, to say as little as may be in as long a time. Only on those rare occasions when Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Bright, both men belonging to a past generation, rise is there any evidence afforded that the faculty of clothing noble thoughts in noble language still exists in England. The same is the case in the Upper House, where the only other English orator bears the title Burke declined in a silence too seldom broken. Yet the House of Lords cannot advance that plea of want of time, of extreme stress of public business, which might be urged by the Commons in defence of their neglect of eloquence.

It is in vain that we look for a remedy among the ranks of the rising generation of statesmen. No one of them appears to possess a higher idea of his duties as a speaker than to utter what he has got to say in as direct and business-like a way as may be, and so get done with it. This is certainly not a method conducive to oratorical excellence. To what is this strange deterioration of speech to be attributed? To our mind it is in some measure accounted for by the absence of any great political movement to arouse the passions of men. All epochs of great political activity have produced great orators. The combative faculty well aroused in man generally rouses his powers of talking, but it requires some strong cause to arouse it. It would be difficult to wax eloquent over the contested clauses of a judicature bill, or to rival Demosthenes while discussing some measure of game-law amendment. Our great orators of recent times, Bright, Gladstone, Disraeli, Cobden, were all produced during a period of stress and

[Vol. CXII. No. CCXXII.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. LVI. No. II. S S

striving very different from the present, when aims were vaster and when all schemes of reform had to be fought for with a daring and a devotion they do not now demand. In the same way the French Revolution loosened the tongues of men as they had never been loosened before, and literally created a nation of orators. So too some among the finest passages of eloquence in the English language are due to the young Ireland oratory of 1848; oratory of which we are surprised to find Mr. Mathews makes no mention in his consideration of Irish orators. Men like Mitchel and Meagher spoke well, for they were the mouthpieces of a movement for liberty which needed all the aid its supporters could give it. Meagher's speech against the O'Connell theory of not fighting for liberty deserves to rank with the finest utterances of Grattan. One short passage will serve to show that he possessed eloquence in no mean degree, although too florid for the highest praise.

"I am not one of those tame moralists who say that liberty is not worth one drop of blood. . . . Against this miserable maxim the noblest virtue that has saved and sanctified humanity appears in judgment. From the blue waters of the Bay of Salamis; from the valley over which the sun stood still and lit the Israelite to victory; from the cathedral in which the sword of Poland has been sheathed in the shroud of Kosciusko; from the convent of St. Isidore, where the fiery hand that rent the banner of St. George upon the plains of Ulster has mouldered into dust; from the sands of the desert where the wild genius of the Algerine so long has scared the eagle of the Pyrenæes; from the ducal palace in this kingdom, where the memory of the gallant and seditious Geraldine enhances more than royal favour the splendour of his race; from the solitary grave within this mute city which a dying bequest has left without an epitaph—oh, from every spot where heroism has had a sacrifice or a triumph, a voice breaks in upon the cringing crowd that cherishes this maxim, crying, Away with it—away with it!"

We may therefore assume that national eloquence depends chiefly upon national emergency, and while its absence at present may tend to assure us of the safety of the State, we may rest assured that when a political crisis comes it will be made manifest that the art of oratory has not passed from us. But as eloquence, like other arts, requires to be fostered and cultivated, it is much to be hoped that the rising generation of politicians will apply themselves to the energetic study of oratory which has added the names of so many Englishmen to the list of those who have excelled in eloquence.

"Do you ever look at the Latin translation when you read *Æschylus*?" says a schoolboy in Bulwer Lytton's "*Ernest Maltravers*" to Cleveland, who points to the *Laocoon* and replies, "That is my Latin translation." Flaxman's *Homeric Outlines*² might well be the Latin translation of Homer, of Hesiod, and of *Æschylus* to any enthusiastic student. An imaginative boy who had for the first time essayed to enter upon that wide expanse "which deep-browed Homer rules as his demesne," would breathe its pure serene with the greater delight for looking upon such imagings of the war round Troy as these.

² "Classical Outlines Engraved from the Compositions of Flaxman." London: Seeley, Jackson & Halliday. 1879.

The heroic forms pass by in august majesty, gods mingle with mortals in divine condescension and companionship; within the beleaguered city goes fair Helen, whose beauty, according to Mr. William Morris's hero, is the cause

"How almost all men reading that sad siege,
Hold for the Trojans."

Outside the walls the mighty heroes battle; all the war lives in the grand outlines into which Flaxman has translated the world's greatest epic. The wanderings of Odysseus he has no less re-created: so too the melancholy faith and pastoral beauty of Hesiod; so too the tragic grandeur of Æschylus the thunderous. Art students owe a debt of gratitude to Mr. Sparkes for this issue of works the study of which is so eminently calculated to improve the style, and literary lovers of Homer should be no less grateful.

The only illustrations to Homeric legend that we know of, which are at all worthy of consideration after Flaxman's, are Preller's Frescoes from the *Odyssey*, which adorn the walls of one of the rooms in the Museum at Weimar. It is rather to be regretted that these admirable works are not more widely known outside the limits of "the dear little Saxon city where the great Goethe and the good Schiller lived and lie buried," as Thackeray so charmingly styles it. We should be very glad to see some English publisher undertake to make them familiar to English lovers of art. There is, no doubt, a considerable opposition to German art felt by some of the artistic coteries of the hour; but the influence of æsthetic cliques is happily limited, and cannot affect those daring spirits who decline to allow their judgment or their admiration to be fettered by the decrees of any "school." The Preller Frescoes represent the wanderings and the strange fortunes of the wise Ulysses with both the strength and the beauty needful to the fitting interpretation of the great story. The artist is deeply imbued with the feeling of the poem, and his appreciation of the capacities and limits of decorative art are clear and true enough to serve as admirable examples. It is needless to say that they are inferior to Flaxman's designs; but there is no reason why, because we admire Flaxman, we should admire no one else, and there is room for very worthy Homeric illustration not only below Flaxman's designs, but below the *Odyssey* frescoes of Preller.

A newspaper-reader, that is, a school-reader, composed of extracts from journals of the nineteenth century upon events of the day, is a distinctly good idea, and reflects no little credit upon its originators. The ordinary school-readers are a little monotonous in character and a little wanting in the interest which it is difficult to attain while keeping within the limits of literary choice allowed by the scope and purpose of a school-reader. The compilers of the newspaper-reader have succeeded in meeting the want, and have produced a work which school-teachers ought to be glad to welcome³ in the present day, when

³ "Blackie's Comprehensive School Series." "Complete Primer." "First, Second, and Third Readers." "The Newspaper Reader." By Harry Findlater Bussey and Thomas Wilson Reid. London: Blackie & Co. 1879.

journalistic literature is practically all-powerful, and when the newspaper takes a high place in literature. The plan on which the book is formed is clear and advantageous, the selections ranging from the beginning of the century, with the account from the *Times* of the death and funeral of George Washington, down to an extract from the *Daily Telegraph* on ringing out the old year, which is certainly well qualified to give board-school youth an idea of the highly coloured style of that journal. The other school-readers published by the same house are equally meritorious.

A great authority on the collecting taste in mankind advises book-lovers to adopt some settled principle in making acquisitions. Let them, he recommends, attempt for example to collect all the editions of Horace. By following a purpose of this nature, they will be conferring greater benefit on their fellows than by desultory and aimless purchases. Such was the plan followed by the late Mr. Ticknor, of Boston;⁴ but his aim was higher than the hope of collecting all the editions of a single author—he aimed at little less than the collection of a whole literature, and if he did not absolutely succeed in his effort, he came very near it. He devoted the leisure of his life to the getting together of Spanish and Portuguese books, to the number of nearly 4000 volumes. These he left to the city of Boston, “where,” he says, to quote from his will, “I was born, where I have lived a long and happy life, and where I hope to die.” There is something so pleasing in the testimony of a man’s affection for his city, and the interest in humanity which leads to the accomplishment of any worthy work, that no matter how often it occurs—and it cannot occur too often—it calls for admiration and perhaps for some not ill-spent moments of reflection. If every act of human charity served but to quicken in the minds of those considering it some wholesome reflections as to the little they have done for others, and how little they individually deserve, its beneficent effect would be more difficult to determine than the relation of the last widening circle on a pool of water to the little splash caused by the stone thrown into it.

The catalogue of Mr. Ticknor’s library has just been issued by the authorities of the Boston Public Library, and will prove a source of much delight to the bibliophile. Well-prepared catalogues of books really effect the difficult task of uniting amusement with instruction, and the catalogue in question is an admirable example of its kind, and does the highest credit to American scholarship. It will, we have little doubt, prove as valuable a treasure-house of information to the student of Spanish literature as is the Dyce Catalogue to the lover of Elizabethan Drama. Merely to turn over the pages is a source of pleasure to any one who knows or cares anything for Spanish literature. The editions of *Amadis of Gaul* will attract by their titles the lovers of that strange tale of chivalry which Cervantes’ barber was alone

⁴ “Catalogue of the Ticknor Collection, Boston Public Library.” By James Lyman Whitney. Boston: Printed by Order of the Trustees. 1879.

willing to spare from the fate which befell the rest of Don Quixote's library. The lovers of religious poetry will turn to the name of Luis Ponce de Leon, whose attempt to translate the Song of Solomon won him five years of imprisonment from the Inquisition, for infringing the prohibition to render the Bible into the language of the people. Admirers of the Agacreontic spirit in lyrical poetry will at once seek out the name of Villegas, and those who care but for the few great names of any literature, and to whom therefore Spain means only the "Chronicle of the Cid," "Don Quixote," and the Dramas of Lope de Vega and Calderon, will find these Titans of Castille abundantly honoured. The numerous notes by Mr. Ticknor which are scattered over the volume are very valuable. Mr. Ticknor's almost unrivalled knowledge of his subject, the authority which his admirable histories of Spanish literature gave him, his wide culture in all departments of literature, his varied learning, and his extensive travels, all combine to make these notes precious to the careful student. Boston, and through her her American scholarship, are again to be felicitated on the honour of having made so valuable an addition to the literature of bibliography.

Much has been written upon the education of children, and theories the most varied advanced from the poetic and intensely unpractical "Emile" of Rousseau, to the no less poetical but intensely practical "Levana" of Jean Paul Richter. But the question is as fresh as if it had never been touched upon, and any contribution to the subject deserves careful consideration and investigation. The Baroness Marenholtz Bülow has written a little book⁵ upon "Fröbel's Educational Theories," an extremely good translation of which, by Alice Christie, is now before us. Fröbel's name and his *kindergarten* system are both known in England, but neither so well that an attempt to make them better known requires any apology. Those who have anything to do with the education of young children may read and re-read "Child and Child Nature" with very great advantage. Though it may not command absolute agreement with all its theories, it is full of suggestions which may be developed to the eminent advantage both of teacher and taught.

We quite agree with Mr. Wilkins, that no speech of Cicero's is better fitted to be studied by the young student than that which is commonly known as the "Oratio pro Lege Manilia."⁶ We may also add that we know of no edition in which it may be better studied than in the edition which Mr. Wilkins has prepared after Karl Halm for Macmillan's Classical Series. We have had occasion to praise a good many of the works issued in this series, but few have deserved approval more than this. The annotations to this magnificent specimen of patriotic oratory are exceedingly full and exhaustive, nor

⁵ "Child and Child Nature." By the Baroness Marenholtz-Bülow. Translated by Alice M. Christie. London: W. Swan Sonnenschein. 1879.

⁶ "Cicero. Oratio pro Lege Manilia." Edited by A. S. Wilkins, M.A. London: Macmillan & Co. 1879.

are all due to the erudition of the distinguished German scholar : many not the least valuable are due to the culture of the English editor. One of Dr. Halm's notes might, however, have suggested an allusion from contemporary history to Mr. Wilkins. It is where the critic compares the opening of the fifth section with the lines in Verr. v.—“ Quot bella majores nostros et quanta suscepisse arbitrabami, quod cives Romani injuria adfecti, quod navicularii retenti, quod mercatores spoliati dicerentur.” These words were made use of with immense success at the time by Mr. Cockburn in supporting Lord Palmerston's famous “ Civis Romanus” speech at the time of the “ Don Pacifico” difficulty.

Messrs. Macmillan send us two more additions to the already vast number of aids to Latin prose composition in existence.⁷ Their appearance is, however, justified by considerable merit, the examples for translation in each being well chosen and expressive.

We have received the Post Office Directory for 1879,⁸ which well sustains the character its predecessors won for accuracy and completeness.

⁷ “Short Exercises in Latin Prose Composition.” Part II. By the Rev. Henry Belcher. Macmillan. “Passages for Translation into Latin Prose.” By A. W. Potts. Macmillan.

⁸ “Post Office Directory for 1879.” Kelly & Co., London.

INDEX.

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

- ADALBERT, Carl, "The Book with Seven Seals," from the German of, 266
- Adams, W. D., "Our Native Land: its Scenery and Associations," Part I., 237
- "Africa, South, Further Correspondence respecting the Affairs of," 233
 ———, 296 301, 557-564
- "Airy Fairy Lilian," 264
- "Alcohol Question, The," 605
- "Ambassador Extraordinary, His Excellency the," 619
- "Analytical Index to the Remembranced, preserved among the Archives of the City of London, 1579-1664," 251
- Anderson, Alex., "Ballads and Sonnets," 268
- "Annual Register for 1878, The," 251
- Anson, Sir W. A., Bart.: "Principles of the English Law of Contract," 597
- Argyll, Duke of, "The Afghan Question from 1841 to 1878," 229
- Arnold, Edwin, M.A., "The Light of Asia; or, The Great Renunciation," 627
 ——— W. T., B.A., "The Roman System of Provincial Administration to the Accession of Constantine the Great," 260
- Arnoldt, Emil, "Kant's Prolegomena nicht doppelt redigirt. Widerlegung der Benno Erdermann'schen Hypothese," 229
- "Aryan Society," 62-100
 In Aryan civilisation the family is the basis of all social growth, 73—but always tended to increase in size, 74
 —Conflicting views as to the origin of the family held by M. de Coulanges and Sir G. Cox, 77-79 — Organisation of ancient societies into isolated groups of kinsfolk, 80—held together by the authority of the eldest male ascendant, 81—advance from pastoral to agricultural life, 82 —Become Village Communities, 82 —best evidence of early Aryan system of land tenure found in system of 'co-ownership' in India, 83—division of lands of village communities, 84—Social life of the Village Community in Orissa, 85—Kandh Hamlet of Orissa, 86, 87—Village Communities in Attica, 88 —Cleisthenes introduced principle of local association in place of consanguinity, 89—Village Communities by the Tiber, 90 — Primitive customs of Teutonic race preserved in England, 91—Teutonic Mark, 92 Common and Arable Marks, 93—Traces of Village Community recently observed among the peasant proprietors of France, 93—under the name of Clan or Sept it forms essential unit of all Keltic society, 93—is seen in Croatia, Servia, Dalmatia, 94 —Russian Mir, 95 — Knowledge of primitive Aryan institutions aids in understanding history, politics, and common law of England, 96—Study of Aryan Society enables us both to draw a lesson of toleration for ancient customs, and to discern a law of progress, 99
- BAGHOT, W., M.A., "Literary Studies," 257
- Bailey, A., "The Succession to the English Crown," 611
- Barlee, E. H., "Remarks on Land Transfer," 595
- Barnes, F., M.D., "Manual for Midwives," 609
 ——— W., "Poems of Rural Life," 624
- Bayley, Rev. Sir E., Bart., B.D., "Thorough," 579
- Beet, J. A., "A Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans," 217
- Belcher, Rev. Henry, "Short Exercises in Latin Prose Composition," Part II., 638
- Bell, Clara, "The Hour will Come," 266
- Bellamy, G. Somers, "Essays from Shakespeare," 272
- Belot, Adolphe, "A Parisian Sultana," translated by H. M. Dunstan, 622
- Bent, J. T., "A Freak of Freedom; or, the Republic of San Marino," 236

- Besant, W., B.A., "Rabelais," 632
 Bevington, L.S., "Key-Notes," 269
 Billing, Sidney, "Scientific Materialism and Ultimate Conceptions," 227
 Bismarck, 444-479
 Bismarck's entry on the scene of European politics as Prussian plenipotentiary at Diet of 1851, 445—his ancestors, 446—his early years, 447—"Mad Bismarck," 448—his marriage in 1847, 448—becomes leader of the Conservative Party, 449—appointed to Embassy at St. Petersburg in 1859, and at Paris in 1862; recalled in same year to take supreme control of affairs at Berlin, 450—Pacillanimity of Prussia in 1854, 451—Prussia's "three needs" in 1859—Accession of King William 1st January, '61—Bismarck becomes Minister in '63—dismissal of the Chambers, 452—Bismarck follows out system of "Thorough,"—His Case for the Crown, 453—Polish Insurrection of '63 and Alliance of Prussia with Russia, 454—Schleswig-Holstein, 455—possessed by Prussia in '65, 456—Bismarck issues his Circular to all believers in German Unity, 456—Corresponds with Kossuth and Mazzini—Seven Days' War—Königgrätz and exclusion of Austria from Germany, 457—Franco-Prussian War—Sedan—Proclamation of German Empire, and Bismarck nominated Chancellor, 459—His aims and means of acting, 460-463—Personal character, 464—Foreign policy of the Empire, 464—"Three Emperors' League," 465—Berlin Congress—Present condition of German politics and society, 467—Bismarck, the "homme nécessaire" of German Unity, 468—the Culturkampf, 469—Falk Laws, 470—Bismarck and the Press, 471—"Reptile Fund," 472—Social and commercial disturbance, 473—The Spin, 473—The Crash, 474—Bismarck and Protection, 475—The Reichstag, 476—The Socialists, 477—Repressive Measures, 478—Bismarck a "Man of War," 479
 Blackburne, E. Owens, "A Bunch of Shamrocks," 621
 Blackie, Professor, "The Wise Men of Greece. Dramatic Dialogues," 270
 "Blackie's Comprehensive School Series," 635
 Blackie, James, M.A., "The Elements of Dynamics (Mechanics)," 246
 Blunt, Rev. J. H., M.A., "The Annotated Bible," 217
 "Bohemians and Slovaks," 413-444
 The Königshof MSS., 416—Legend of Libusa, 421—and founding of Prague, 422—Thomas of Stitny, 424—Hus, 425, 426—Hussite Wars, 427, 428—First Press set up in Prague in 1487, 429—At the time of the Renaissance the Bohemians were on a level with the best nations—Battle of Mohacs, 1526—Ferdinand I. of Germany claims both crowns of Hungary and Bohemia, 430—Is elected King—is resisted by Bohemian States, 431—Battle of Muhlberg, 1547, and submission of citizens of Prague, 432—Insurrection of Bohemians against Ferdinand II.—30 Years' War, 435—Battle of Bile Hore and defeat of the Elector Palatine, 435—Cruel treatment of Prague citizens by Ferdinand, 436, and annihilation of Bohemian nationality—the language proscribed, 437—Decadence of Bohemia—lost from the nations of Europe for 200 years—Balbin—Comenius, 438—Wencelous Hollar—Revival of Bohemia under Emperor Joseph II.—Professorship of Bohemian Language and Literature founded in 1793 in Prague University, 439.—Paul J. Schlafarik, author of "Slavonic Antiquities," 440—A Bohemian National Museum formed 1820, 444—Krizanic the Croat, and Jan Kollar, a Slovak, the founders of doctrine of Pan-slavism, 441—Francis Palacky, the historian of Bohemia, 442—The Slovaks almost completely Magyarised, e.g. Kossuth, 443—Slovakian authors, 444
 Booth, James, C.B., "Problem of the World and the Church," 579
 Boulton, T., "A History of the Church of England, Pre-Reformation Period," 252
 Bradlaugh, C., and Westerby, Rev. W. M., Report of a Public Debate between, 252
 Bradley, S. M., F.R.C.S., "Injuries and Diseases of the Lymphatic System," 606
 Bright, John, M.P., "Public Addresses," edited by Thorold Rogers, 580
 Broglie, Duc de, "The King's Secret," 252
 "Brougham, Lord," 480-539
 His birth and ancestry, 484—His edu-

- cation at the High School and University of Edinburgh, 485—His early friends, 486—"Passes advocate"—His first appearance on Circuit, 488—Establishment of the *Edinburgh Review*, 490—General Election of 1807—Brougham's exertions on behalf of the Whigs, 492—hinder his call to the English Bar, 493—Joins the Northern Circuit—enters Parliament, 494—his first speech, 495—Brougham takes lead in the Anti-Slavery Cause, 496—Out of Parliament—First great speech at the Bar in defence of the *Examiner*, 497, 498—His second defence of the Hunts, 499—Returned for Winchelsea, 500—Connection with Princess Charlotte, 501—503—The Queen's Trial, 504—509—Brougham's defence of the Queen, 510, 511, 512—From 1820 to 1830, Brougham heads reforms, 515—University College and London University Founded, 516—Case of Missionary Smith, 517—Brougham's Anti-Slavery Motion, 518—Rouses the country, 519—And leads to his election for Yorkshire, 520—Becomes K.C., and leader of the Northern Circuit—Relations between B. and Pollock, 521—Relations with the Whigs, 522—His Scheme of Reform, 523—Ld. Grey unable to form his Cabinet without B., is fain to offer him the Great Seal, 524, 525—"Baron Brougham and Vaux," 526—First Speech—and Speech on second reading of Reform Bill, 527, 528—Creation of Whig Peers to carry Reform Bill, 530—Close of Brougham's official career, 531—Municipal Reform Bill, 533—Efforts for Law Reform, 537—Passes each winter at Cannes, 537—Applies to Provisional Government to be naturalised as a French Citizen, 538—His death, 539
- Brown, Herbert, LL.D., "The Unjust Steward," 623
- Brown, J. C., "The Ethics of George Eliot's Works," 631
- Browning, Robert, "Dramatic Idylls," 266
- Buckton, Catherine M., "Town and Window Gardening," 246
- Bülow, *see* Marenholtz.
- Busch, Otto, "Arthur Schopenhauer," 229
- Dr. Moritz, "Graf Bismarck und seine Leutewährend des Kriegs mit Frankreich," 617
- Bussey, H. F., and T. W. Reid, "Blackie's Comprehensive School Series," "Complete Primer." "First, Second, and Third Readers." "The Newspaper Reader," 635
- Butler, Samuel, "Evolution, Old and New," 224
- CALDERWOOD, H., LL.D., "The Relations of Mind and Brain," 223
- Campbell, Sir G., M.P., "White and Black in the United States," 588
- Campion, J. S., "On Foot in Spain," 237
- Canada, 564—569
- Candler, H., M.A., "Groundwork of Belief," 216
- Canning, Hon. Albert S. G., "Philosophy of the Waverley Novels," 227
- Cavour and Lamarmora, 386—413
- Genius of Cavour, 387—Comparison of Cavour and Bismarck, 388—Italian national deliverance due to Cavour, 389—He takes office in 1850—Review of his life, 390—his employment and pursuits, 391—Founds the *Risorgimento*—Protests against "extreme measures"—Disaster of Novara, 393—Accession of Victor Emmanuel—Who clings to the "National Flag," and the "reformed constitution," 394—Cavour returned for Turin at the head of the poll, 394—Lamarmora and army reforms, 395—In 1852 Cavour becomes Prime Minister and absolute ruler of the destinies of his country, 396—Contracts new loans to stimulate productiveness of the country, &c., 397—His ecclesiastical policy, 398—Temporary unpopularity, 398—Alliance with France and England, 399—Troops sent to Crimea, and victory of Tchernaya, 400—Cavour's influence over Napoleon III.—Defensive system of the Po—La Spezia built and fortified—Deepening hostility between Piedmont and Austria, 401—Orsini bomb incident threatens rupture with France, 402—Sardo-French Alliance—Peace of Villafranca, 403—Cavour resigns office and travels in Switzerland—Garibaldi's Sicilian expedition, 404—Completion of Italian Unity by Cavour, 405—Cavour personally attacked by Garibaldi—his death—his career, 406—407—Lamarmora commands in Lombardy in 1860, 407—Visits Berlin in 1861, 408—Charged with civil and military administration of

- Naples, 409—Reasons for publications in 1873 by Lamarmora of "Un po' più di luce," 410—Battle of Custoza; Lamarmora retires to Florence, 411—his latter years, 412—and character, 413
- Chapman, M. F., "The Gift of the Gods," 265
- Charles I., State Papers, 101-147
- Charles' character and disposition, 103 — Foreign wars and home difficulties consequent on his marriage, 104, 105—First Parliament: conduct of the Country Party, 106 — The Plague, 107—Parliament meets at Oxford and is dissolved, 108—Causes of hostility of the Commons—George Villiers, 109—The virtual ruler of the State—Privy Seals issued, 110—Cadiz Expedition, 111—Second Parliament: Buckingham impeached, and dissolution of Parliament; Charles' arbitrary means of raising money, 112—War with France—expedition to Rhè, 113—Siege of St. Martin — Buckingham's bravery, 114—Letters to the duke from his wife and mother, 115, 116—Third Parliament: Petition of Right, 117 — Commons meddle with "tonnage and poundage," and Charles prorogues Parliament, 118 — Assassination of Buckingham, 119—Wentworth, 120-122—Charles enters on personal Government, 123—Laud, 123, 124—His conduct as a Church reformer, 125 — Investigation of Brent, 126 — Minute Books of Court of High Commission, 127—Honours heaped on Wentworth, 128 — His despotic conduct as President of the North, 129—and as Lord Deputy of Ireland, 130—Calls a Parliament—His reforms in Ireland, 131 — His policy feebly imitated by Charles in England, 132 — Charles's piety—his prayer, 133 — His direct taxation: 'ship-money,' 134, 137—Charles attempts to impose the Five Articles on the Scotch, 137—Riots in Scotland: the king yields, 138.—The Covenanters emboldened, provoke a war, 139 — Charles collects an army, 139—His proclamation: preparations of the "traitorous Scots," 140 — King revives feudal claim to military service, 141—His plan of the campaign: its ill-success, 142—Truce made: disloyal conduct of the Scotch, 143—Wentworth appealed to. by the King, 144—Advises the calling of a Parliament, and proposes a loan in England; further raises an army, and obtains supplies in Ireland, 145 — Abrupt cessation of State Papers, 146
- "Cheveley Novels: Saul Weir," Parts XI. and XII., 263
- Christ, H., "Das Pflanzenleben der Schweiz," 245
- Christie, W. I., "A Universal Dictionary for Architects," Part I., 282
- "Cicero: Oratio pro Lege Maniliâ," edited by A. S. Wilkins, M.A., 637
- Clark, Edson L., "The Races of European Turkey," 232
- D. Kinnear, "Fuel: its Combustion and Economy, &c.," edited by, 249
- W. W., "A Forecast of the Religion of the Future," 216
- "Clark, Memorials from Journals and Letters of Samuel," edited by his wife, 613
- Clements, Hugh, "A Manual of Organic Chemistry," 247
- Cobban, J. Maclaren, "The Cure of Souls," 622
- Collins, Rev. W. Lucas, M.A., "Foreign Classics for English Readers, Montaigne," 277
- Colomb, Captain J. C. R., R.M.A., "Colonial Defence and Colonial Opinion," 234
- The Naval and Military Resources of the Colonies, 234
- Colonial Empire, India and our, 284-312, 540-569
- "Combe on Education: its Principles and Practice," 237
- Cortes, J. D., Marquis of Valdegamar; "Essays on Catholicism, Liberalism, and Socialism," 578
- Cowper, V. King, M.A., "Tales from Euripides," 277
- Creighton, Rev. M., edited by—"Epochs of English History," 611
- Crutwell, C. T., and Peake Banton—"Specimens of Roman Literature," 283
- "Cyprus, Reports made to the Admiralty on the Anchorages, &c., of," 232
- DANIELL, C. J., "Gold in the East," 598
- Davenport-Hill, "The Recorder of Birmingham," by the Misses, 612
- "Debiti Communalis e Provinciali al 31 Dec. 1877," 593
- Dempsey, G. D., "A Rudimentary Treatise on the Locomotive Engine," 248

- Denison, Rev. G. A., "Notes of my Life, 1805-1878," 614
- "Dialect Society, English, No. 24." Series C. Original Glossaries, X. Edited by W. Dickinson, 274
- "Dialect Society, English," Series B. Reprinted Glossaries, XVIII to XXII. Edited by Rev. W. Skeat, 275
- Dickens, C., edited by, "Life of Charles J. Mathews," 613
- Dickinson, W., F.L.S., *see* Dialect
- "Dictionary of Parishes, Townships, Hamlets, &c., in England and Wales," 594
- Dilke, Sir C., Bart., M.P., "Political Library for the People: No. 2. Parliamentary Reform," 594
- Dodd, Rev. J. "The Value of Human Life," 610
- Dodds, Sarah J. V., "Stories from Early English Literature," 274
- Dodgson, C. L., M.A., "Euclid and his Modern Rivals," 277
- Dowse, T. S., M.D., "The Brain and its Diseases," Part I, 605
- Durant, C., "The Lady of Oakmere; or, Lost Lives," 620
- Dutt, Shoshee Chunder, "Historical Studies and Recreations," 255
- EARLE, Lisette, "Between the Lights," 622
- Eastwick, Captain W. J., "Lord Lytton and the Afghan War," 229
- Ecroyd, W. F., "The Policy of Self Help," 586
- "Education," *see* Combe
- "Educational Systems—An Unrecognised Element in our," 197-210
- "Educational Code of the Prussian Nation," 584
- Eliot, George, *see* Theophrastus
- "English Dialect Society," *see* Dialect
- "English Empier," *see* Federation
- "Epochs of English History," *see* Creighton
- Escott, T. H. S., edited by, "Pillars of the Empire," 259
- FABER, J. A., "Zululand and the Zulus," 233
- , "Primitive Manners and Customs," 235
- Fatio, *see* Morel-Fatio
- "Federation of the English Empire," 46-52 and 313-334
- Argument showing that under a federal system it would be England's aim to encourage emigration to the Colonies, 47-48 — Emigration statistics, 49—England dependent on other countries for the necessities of life, 50—Shown by Statistics, 51-52 — Surplus population statistics, 53—Figures dealing with population and development of the Colonies, 54—Canada, 55—Effects of assisted emigration, 57-60—Colonial view of Federation, 61—Main principles of Federation considered, 313 — Objections offered and answered, 314-317—Proposition of Sir Julius Vogel, 318—Rearrangement of Parliamentary System, 319-323—Financial condition of the Empire under Federation, 324-328—Financial Condition of the Local Governments under Federal System, 329-331—"Federation" no Party Cry, 331—View of the British Taxpayer as to Federation, 332—of the Canadian, 333 — Future growth of Colonial population, 333
- Field, Horace, "The Ultimate Triumph of Christianity," 215
- Fischer, Kuno, "Geschichte der Neuern Philosophie," 228
- Fitzpatrick, W. J., LL.D., "Life of Charles Lever," 614
- "Flaxman, Classical Outlines Engraved from the Compositions of," 634
- Fletcher, J. S., "The Bride of Venice," 269
- Flint, R., D.D., "Antitheistic Theories," 225
- Fothergill, J. M., M.D., "The Heart and its Diseases," 608
- Fraser, A. C., LL.D., "Selections from Berkeley," 229
- Frege, Dr. Gottlob, "Begriffsschrift, eine der Arithmetischen Nachgebildete Formelsprache des Reinen Denkens," 229
- "Free Trade, Reciprocity, and Foreign Competition," 1-46
- Argument of opponent of Free Trade, 2—Evidence of depression in Trade, 3—At home and abroad, 4—Protection in early times, 5—Definition of Free Trade — of Protection 7 — "Reciprocity" considered, 8-12 — Value of our Imports and Exports from and to the United States, 13—French Competition, 14—Table of French Woollen and Silk Exports in 1865 and 1877, 14—Report of Bradford Technical School in relation to Woollen Trade, 15—Style and finish of certain French goods are preferred, 16—Belgian iron, 17—Import of manufactured goods, 17—Remission of Import Duties always followed by increased Exports,

- 18—Results of Protection if carried out, 19—Mr. Thompson's suggestion that Colonies should adopt with us Protective Policy, 20—Results of Protection in United States, 21, 23—National Wealth of United States, 24—Signs of Commercial Improvement in United States, 24—"The Balance of Exports and Imports," 25—Proofs that our balance is on the right side, 26, 27—Spectre of foreign competition exposed, 27, 28—Mr. Hatton's advocacy of Protection, 29—controverted, 30, 31—Comparison of American and British Cotton Trade, 32—Facts about the Iron Trade, 33—Reasons why Trade is bad, 34-36—Disturbed condition of currencies, 37, 38—Wages, 39, and English Workmen, 40-42—Our position as a commercial people, 43—Emigration—Restriction of production—Improving Trade, 44—Our drinking customs, 45—"Shoddy," goods must be discouraged and inventions encouraged, 45—and land laws reformed, 46
- Galdo's, P., "Gloria," 620
- Geikie, A., LL.D., F.R.S., "Outlines of Field Geology," 243
- Gosse, E. W., "Studies in the Literature of Northern Europe," 276
- Godkin, G. S., "Life of Victor Emmanuel II," 617
- Green, J. R., M.A., "Readings from English History," 255
- _____, edited by, "Classical Writers," 259
- Grey, Vere, "The Unequal Match," 622
- Griffin, F., "The World under Glass," 623
- Grosvenor, E., "April to August," 626
- Grundy, F. H., "Pictures of the Past," 259
- Guest, M. J., "Lectures on the History of England," 251
- Guyan, M., "La Morale Anglaise Contemporaine," 228
- H. W., "A Mediæval Scribe, and other Poems," 629
- Haeckel, Ernst, "Freedom in Science and Teaching," 225
- Hamley, W. G., Major-General, "The House of Lys," 265
- Hare, A. J. C., "The Life and Letters of Frances, Baroness Bunsen," 261
- Harlan, C., M.D., "Elflora of the Susquehanna," 268
- Harvey, A., M.D., "First Lines of Therapeutics," 606
- "Health Primers," "The Skin and its Troubles," 607
- Heath, F. G., "Trees and Ferns," 246
- Herzog, Dr. J. J., "Abriss der gesammten Kirchengeschichte," 211
- Hinton, J., "Chapters on the Art of Thinking, and other Essays," edited by C. H. Hinton, 221
- Hood, Tom, "Excursions into Puzzledom," 281
- Hopkins, Ellice, "Work among Working men," 218
- Hullah, John, "How can a Sound Knowledge of Music be Best and Most Generally Disseminated?" 282
- Hunt, Mrs. A. W., "Basildon," 264
- INDIA and our Colonial Empire, 284-296 and 540-557
- "India Imperial," see Prinsep
- "India during the Year 1876-77, Statement exhibiting the Moral and Material Progress and Condition of," 231
- Indian Mutiny, 358-386
- Causes of, 359-362—Barrackpore incident, Gen. Hearsey and Sepoys, 363—Incident of Mogul Party—disbandment of 19th Regiment, 364—Mutiny at Meerut, 366—Nana Sahib, 366—Annexation of Oude, 367—Punishment of Meerut Mutineers, 368—leads to massacre of Europeans by Sepoys, 369—who flee to Delhi—Inaction of British Troops under Gen. Hewitt, 370—Delhi seized by Meerut Mutineers, 371—Defence of the Magazine by Willoughby, 372—Steps taken by Lt. Canning and John Lawrence, 373—Gen. Neill saves Benares and Allahabad, 374—Cawnpore falls into hands of Nana Sahib, 375—His treachery—Massacre at Cawnpore, 377—Sir H. Lawrence defends Lucknow residency, 378—His death, 379—Vincent Eyre's relief of Arrah, 379—John Lawrence secures the Punaub and forms "moveable column" under Gen. Nicholson, 380—Assault on Delhi—death of Nicholson—capture of Delhi, 381—Havelock wins Battle of Cawnpore, 382—Marches on Lucknow—superseded by Sir James Outram—Relief of Lucknow and death of Neill, 383—Sir Colin Campbell takes the field, 383—Raises blockade of Lucknow—death of Havelock—Sir Colin defeats Tantia Topi—and wins "crowning victory" of Lucknow, 384—Lessons of the Mutiny, 385
- Italian Blue-Books on Agriculture, Industry, and Commerce, 593

- JAMES, H., jun., "Roderick Hudson," 619
 Jefferis, Mary, "Some of Life's Lessons," 265
 Jenkins, Rev. J. D., D.D., "Passages in Church History," 575
 Jennings, Hargrave, "The Rosicrucians," 256
- KAUFMANN, Rev. M., "Utopias, or Schemes of Social Improvement," 236
 Kay, J., Q.C., "Free Trade in Land," 238
 Koim, Dr. T., "Jesus of Nazara," 579
 Kennedy, R. H., edited by, "P. Vergilii Maronis Opera," 277
 Kenny, C. S., "The History of the Law of England as to the Effects of Marriage on Property, and on the Wife's Legal Capacity," 238
 Kerr, J., "Essays on Castism and Sectism," 238
 Klein, E., M.D., and E. R. Smith, L.R.C.P., "Atlas of Histology," 609
- LAMARMORA, *see* Cavour
- Le Goff, F., "The Life of Louis Adolphe Thiers," 617
 Leslie, T. E. C., LL.D., "Essays in Political and Moral Philosophy," 226
 Lewes, G. H., "The Study of Psychology," 222
 Lewis, E. D., "A Draft Code of Criminal Law and Procedure," 595
 — J. D., "The Letters of the Younger Pliny," 276
 Life of the Prince Consort, 147-185
 Lilienfeld, Paul v., "Gedanken über die Socialwissenschaft der Zukunft," 592
 "Loch Etive and the Sons of Uisnach," 589
 Lomas, W., M.D., "Children's Lives; and How to Protect Them," 610
 Lopez, *see* Moore
 Lubbock, Sir J., Bart., "Scientific Lectures," 598
 — "Addresses, Political and Educational," 583
 Lucas, T. J., "The Zulus and the British Frontiers," 233
 Ludwig, A., "De Rigveda oder die Heiligen Hymnen der Brahmana," vol. iii., 218
 Lumsden, M. H., "Won, but Lost," 265
- MACFARLANE, A., "Principles of the Algebra of Logic," 282
 MacLachlan, Mrs., "Notes and Extracts on Everlasting Punishment and Eternal Life," 218
 Macpherson, Gerardine, "Memoirs of the Life of Anna Jameson," 615
- Marenholtz-Bulow, Baroness, "Child and Child Nature," 637
 Markham, Captain A. H., R.N., "Northward Ho!" 590
 Martin, Mrs. H., "For a Dream's Sake," 265
 Martin, Theodore, "The Life of the Prince Consort," vol. iv., 147
 Mathews, W., "Oratory and Orators," 632
 Matthews, J., "A Colonist on the Colonial Question," 585
 Mayor, J. E. B., edited by "Juvenal," Satires X., XI., 280
 Melsheimer, R. E., and W. Lawrence, "The Law and Customs of the London Stock Exchange," 596
 Menon, P. Shungoony, "A History of Travancore from the Earliest Times," 255
 Milnes, A., B.A., edited by "Johnson," 276
 Moncel, Count du, "The Telephone, the Microphone, and the Phonograph," 247
 Montalembert, Count de, "The Monks of the West," 576
 Moore, F. F., "Mate of the Jessica," 265
 — G., and B. Lopez, "Martin Luther, A Tragedy," 270
 Morel-Fatio, A., "L'Espagne au XVI^e et au XVII^e Siècle," 610
 Mortimer-Granville, J., "Sleep and Sleeplessness," 605
 Mosser, F., "L'Esprit de L'Economie Politique," 240
 Mounsey, A. H., F.R.G.S., "The Sattsuma Rebellion," 612
 Müller, Prof. W., "Field-Marshal Count Moltke, 1800-1878," 262
 Max Müller, edited by, "Sacred Books of the East," 579
 Murphy, J. M., "Rambles in North-Western America," 237
- "NEMESIS," "Five Years of Tory Rule," 585
 Neves, D. F. das., "A Hunting Expedition to the Transvaal," 590
 "New Zealand for 1877.—Statistics of the Colony of," 233
 Nicholson, E. B., M.A., "The Rights of an Animal," 592
 Noad, H. M., Ph.D., "The Student's Text-book of Electricity," 248
 Noire, Ludwig, "Max Müller and the Philosophy of Language," 227
- O'CONNOR, T. P., M.A., "Lord Beaconsfield," 618
 Oort, Dr. H., "A Bible for Young People," 575

- PAGE, H. A., "Thomas de Quincey: his Life and Writings," 612
- Park, A., "A Manual of Method," 282
- Parker, J. H., "The Twelve Egyptian Obelisks in Rome," 281
- Paton, A. P., "The Life of Timon of Athens, according to the First Folio," 629
- , "The Hamnet Shakespeare," Part III., 273
- Patrick, Mary, "Mr. Leslie of Underwood," 265
- Payn, J., "Under One Roof," 264
- Pelly, Col. Sir Lewis, "The Miracle Play of Hasan and Husain," 631
- Philanthropus, "The Institution of Marriage in the United Kingdom," 281
- Pinckard, A. O., edited by, "The Persæ of Æschylus," 281
- Plews, Margt., "Rambles in Search of Wild Flowers," 600
- "Police (Counties and Boroughs)," 242
- "Poor-Law Union and Lunacy Inquiry Commission (Ireland)," 242
- "Post Office Directory for 1879," 638
- Potts, A. W., "Latin Prose," 638
- Potter, Louisa, "Lancashire Memories," 621
- Powell, *see* Vigfussen
- Prescott, G. B., "The Speaking Telephone, Electric Light, and other Recent Electrical Inventions," 248
- Pressensé, E. de, D.D., "The Early Years of Christianity," 570
- Prideaux, T. Symes, "The Economy of Fuel," 249
- "Prince Consort, Life of the," 147—185
- The Prince's "meddlesomeness" with public men, 149—His position, 150—As a social Reformer, 151—The Prince best understood by the poorer classes, 153—An art patron, 154—Advises chronological and systematic arrangement, 155—Anglo-French Alliance, 157—First meeting of the Educational Conference of '57, 159—The Prince and Napoleon, 161—"Revision of the Map of Europe," 163—"Holstein Question," 163—Favourable impressions made by Prince on the Emperor, 164—"Indian Mutiny"—Impatience of the Queen and the Prince with the Ministry—Lord Palmerston's letter, 165—The Prince and Lord Palmerston, 166, 167—"Transfer of India to the Crown, 167—The Marriage of Princess Royal, 168, 169—Palmerston Ministry thrown out, 170—Second Derby Government, 171—The Prince and his children, 172—174—Visit to Cherbourg, 175—Criticism of Kingsley's "Saint's Tragedy," 177—A great admirer of George Eliot, 178—His appreciation of free discussion, 179, 180—His view of a Radical Reform of a Conservative Ministry, 180—Election of the "six years' Parliament," 181—Palmerston-Russell Ministry, 182—Baron Stockmar's warning to the Prince as to his health, 184
- Prinsep, Val. C., "Imperial India," 230
- Putnam, G. H., "International Copyright," 242
- READER, Mrs. C., "Sidonie," 622
- "Real Property, The Law of," 334—357
- No reform more necessary than a reform of our land laws, 335—But law reformers differ, 336—Results of the Inquiry by Committee of the House of Commons show failure of recent Statutes, 337—The causes—"Registration of deeds" not compulsory admits of frauds, 338—Suggested "free registry of titles," 338—Proposed repeal of Statute of Uses, 339—Distinction between *real* and *personal* property a permanent cause of mischief, 340, 341—"Postponement of women" and Salic Law, 343, 344—Primogeniture and local customs of descent, 345—"Doctrine of conversion," 346—Law concerning the effect of marriage on property, 347—Position of a tenant-in-tail, 348—Summary of case for reform of land laws, 353—355—which is a Conservative Reform, 356
- QUATREFAGES, A. de, "The Human Species," 249
- REID, M. F., "A Handy Manual of German Literature," 277
- "Religion," *see* Supernatural
- Rendal, G. H., M.A., "Emperor Julian, Paganism and Christianity," 578
- "Rental Book of the Cistercian Abbey of Cupar Angus," edited by Rev. C. Rogers, vol. i., 611
- Ribot, Th., "La Psychologie Allemande Contemporaine," 227
- "Roget's Thesaurus of English Words and Phrases," 283
- Rood, Ogden N., Prof. "Modern Chromatics," 601

- Row, Rev. C. A., M.A., "Christian Evidences viewed in relation to Modern Thought," 574.
- Rutley, F., "The Study of Rocks," 243
- SALAMAN, M. C., "Ivan's Love Quest," 626
- Sandys, R. H., M.A., "In the Beginning: Remarks on Certain Modern Views of the Creation," 213
- Saunders, J., "The Sherlocks," 265
- W., "Through the Light Continent," 588
- Schurz, Hon. Carl, "Honest Money and Labour," 241
- Scoones, W. D., B.A., "Faust," translated by, 632
- J. C., "The Swintons of Warrdale," 622
- Scott, L., "A Nook in the Apennines," 590
- Scudder, M. L., Junior, "National Banking," 241
- Séguin, L. G., "The Black Forest: its People and Legends," 591
- Semple, R. H., M.D., "Diphtheria," 608
- Shairp, Principal, "Robert Burns," 257
- "Shakespeare," *see* Bellamy, Paton, Wright
- Sharpe, B., Commander R.N., "The Explosion of a Gun of 38 tons on board H.M.S. *Thunderer*, Jan. 2, 1879," 602
- Simpson, F. P., edited by, "Select Poems of Catullus," 280
- Skeat, *see* Dialect
- Skeat, Rev. W., "An Etymological Dictionary of the English Language," Part I, A. to Dor.: 282
- Smiles, Samuel, "Robert Dick, Baker, of Thurso," 260
- Smith, J. H., M.A., "Short Notes on the Greek Text of the Acts of the Apostles," 217
- Snodgrass, J., "Wit, Wisdom, and Pathos of Heinrich Heine," 273
- "Spon's Encyclopædia of the Industrial Arts, Manufactures, and Commercial Products," edited by G. André, 603
- Stantel, K. E., "The Marriage Tie," 266
- "State Papers," *see* Charles I.
- Stella, "Sappho," 625
- Stevenson, R. L., "Travels with a Donkey in the Cevennes," 237
- Stone, Dr. W. H., "Elementary Lessons on Sound," 602
- Storer, J. M. A., the late, "The Wild White Cattle of Great Britain," 244
- "Supernatural Religion," 219
- Symonds, J. A., "Sketches and Studies in Italy," 270
- TAYLOR, R., Lieut.-Gen., "Destruction and Reconstruction; Personal Experiences of the late War in the United States," 256
- Tennyson, Alfred, "The Lover's Tale," 266
- "Theophrastus Such," 185-196
- His failings and defects, 185—His mental faculties, 186—Passages from "Looking Backward," 187—Harsh aspects under which Theophrastus views literary men, 189-190—and women, 191—Such's vanity reproved, 192—his occasional verbosity, 193—his protest against the irreverent spirit which aims only at provoking laughter, 195—Theophrastus rebuked, 196
- "Thira," a Prose Epic, 620
- Thomas, H. O., "Treatment of Intestinal Obstructions," 610
- Thompson, E. M., "Phidias, and other Poems," 269
- , R. E., M.D., "On Pulmonary Hæmorrhage," 607
- Thoms, W. J., "The Longevity of Man," 605
- Ticknor, *see* Whitney
- Tolingsby, F., "Elnora," 270
- Trevor, Lieut.-Col. W. S., "A Suggestion for the Reorganisation of our Armies, British and Indian," 598
- Trollope, Anthony, "Thackeray," 258
- "Turkey, Further Correspondence respecting the Affairs of," 231
- Turkey, *see* Clark
- Tyndall, J., F.R.S., "Fragments of Science," 603
- Tyrrell, C., "A Son of Sweden," 266
- VERE, A. de. "Legends of the Saxon Saints," 624
- "Victoria—Further Correspondence," Bluebook, 234
- Vigfusson, Dr. G., and F. York Powell, "Icelandic Prose Reader," 282
- Vita, V. M., "Poems of the Future," 623
- "Volunteer Force," Blue-books, 242
- Voysey, Rev. C., B.A., "The Sling and the Stone," vol. vii., 214
- WAITE, A. E., "A Lyric of the Fairy Land," 270
- Wallace, A. R., F.R.G.S., "Australasia," edited by, 536
- "Weir, Saul," *see* Cheveley

- Welles, C. S., "Bohème," 623
 Westerby, *see* Bradlaugh
 White, D'Aubigne, "Patty's Dream,"
 265
 Whitney, J. L., "Catalogue of the
 Ticknor Collection, Boston Public
 Library," 636
 Wilkins, A. S., "Cicero De Orations,"
 280
 Williams, C. W., "Fuel, its Combustion
 and Economy," 249
 Wittich, Dr. K., "Struensee," 252
- Wordsworth, C., D.D., "Miscellanies
 Literary and Religious," 212
 Wright, Rev. C. H. H., "Zechariah and
 his Prophecies," 572
 ———, J., B.A., "Grounds and Prin-
 ciples of Religion," 579
 ———, W. Aldis, "Shakespeare-
 Coriolanus," 628
- YONGE, Prof. C. D., "The Seven
 Heroines of Christendom," 259
 ———, Charlotte M., "History of
 France," 257

END OF VOL. LVI.

